

Editors

Slavica Ševkušić ■ Dušica Malinić ■ Jelena Teodorović

LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

Initiatives and trends in selected European countries



Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia

Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia

Hungarian-Netherlands School of Educational Management, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

Edition
“PEDAGOGICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE”
49



LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

Initiatives and trends in selected European countries

Publishers

Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia
Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia
Hungarian-Netherlands School of Educational Management, University of Szeged,
Szeged, Hungary

For the publisher

Nikoleta Gutvajn
Violeta Jovanović
Tibor Baráth

Editors

Slavica Ševkušić
Dušica Malinić
Jelena Teodorović

Proofreaders

Esther Helajzen
Ivana Ćirković-Miladinović

Desktop publishing

Vladan Dimitrijević

Cover design

Miloš Đorđević

Illustration

License obtained from Canva.com

Printed by

Kuća štampe plus

Printed in 300 copies

ISBN 978-86-7447-149-4

COPYRIGHT © 2019 INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, BELGRADE, SERBIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC, JAGODINA, SERBIA
HUNGARIAN-NETHERLANDS SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT,
UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED, SZEGED, HUNGARY

LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION
Initiatives and trends in selected European countries

Editors
Slavica Ševkušić
Dušica Malinić
Jelena Teodorović

Belgrade
2019

Editors

Slavica Ševkušić, Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia
Dušica Malinić, Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia
Jelena Teodorović, Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia

Reviewers

Prof. Em. Dr. Eric Verbiest, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Antwerp, Belgium; independent consultant at Samen Wijs – consultancy and research in Education and Education management, the Netherlands

Prof. Paed. Dr. Ilze Ivanova, Department of Education Sciences, University of Latvia, Latvia

Prof. Dr. Henryk Mizerek, Department of General Pedagogics, University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

Note. This book is the result of the projects “Improving the quality and accessibility of education in modernization processes in Serbia” (No. 47008) and “From encouraging initiative, cooperation and creativity in education to new roles and identities in society” (No. 179034), financially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (2011–2019).

CIP - Каталогизacija у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

371:005.322(082)(0.034.2)
005.322:316.46(082)(0.034.2)

LEADERSHIP in education [Elektronski izvor] : initiatives and trends in selected European countries / editors Slavica Ševkušić, Dušica Malinić, Jelena Teodorović. - Belgrade : Institute for Educational Research ; Jagodina : Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac ; Szeged : Hungarian-Netherlands School of Educational Management, University of Szeged, 2019 (Beograd : Kuća štampe plus). - 1 USB fleš memorija : tekst ; 1 x 2 x 8 cm. - (Edition Pedagogical Theory and Practice ; 49)

Системски захтеви : Нису наведени. - Nasl. sa naslovnog ekrana. - Tiraž 100. - About the Authors. - Napomene i bibliografske reference uz tekst. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad. - Registar.

ISBN 978-86-7447-149-4 (IPI)

1. Ševkušić, Slavica G., 1961- [уредник] 2. Malinić, Dušica, 1974- [уредник] 3. Teodorović, Jelena, 1973- [уредник]

а) Образовање -- Управљање квалитетом -- Зборници б) Лидерство -- Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 280651532

INCREASING LEADERSHIP CAPACITY AND IMPLEMENTING PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP IN FINLAND

Jukka Alava*

Institute of Educational Leadership, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Abstract. This paper discusses recent developments in school leadership practices in Finland. The focus is on what effects the major changes of education paradigms had in educational leadership. The theoretical discussion is based on several research findings. A meta analysis of 30 PhD studies was done by Alava, Halttunen & Risku (2012) in a research commissioned by the Finnish National Board of Education. Some of the key findings in this study were the need for stronger future orientation, the importance of broad pedagogical leadership, and understanding leadership as a resource with emphasis on shared leadership, change leadership and values leadership. The empirical examples in this paper are from two municipalities, Åland and Mäntsälä, where extensive development efforts were carried out in 2005-2018. The development in Åland was instigated by the rather poor results the students got in mathematics in the PISA 2003 assessment (Uljens, Sundqvist & Smeds-Nylund, 2016). In Mäntsälä the development was initiated by the two new administrators, who became worried about the rather stagnant organizational culture and the level of leadership competence in the schools. Both cases reveal the need for system wide effort, the importance of culture and values, the role of participation and dialogue, and the need to re-define leadership. They also show the way to lead schools into professional learning communities.

Keywords: system-wide development, cross-school teams, pedagogical leadership, school culture, learning community.

CHANGE OF THE DRIVERS OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

The most profound change and development in educational administration and school leadership in Finland took place during the period from 1970 to 1999 when the entire system was changed from top-down to an almost opposite bottom-up approach (Alava 2007; Lehtisalo & Raivola, 1999). This was due to the development of society and a major paradigm shift in the guiding principles of education. Finland saw the change from 'Nation Building' in the 1950s, building the welfare state in the 1980s, and national competitiveness at the turn of the millennium into 'Future Creation' of today.

*E-mail: jukka.v.a.alava@jyu.fi

The latest developments also dramatically changed the roles and responsibilities of school leaders and principals. As described by Alava, Halttunen & Risku (2012) and Isosomppi (1996) their role changed from being civil servants performing simple administrative tasks into real leaders as described by Nikki (2000), responsible for all matters – strategy, finances, management, personnel, leadership, culture, values, stakeholder relations, and pedagogical leadership (Mustonen, 2003). In the new millennium new paradigms arose in education policy and practice. Accountability, results, quality, freedom of choice, and national competitiveness became new drivers of development. Many of these elements can be seen in the latest 2016 curriculum, which is still in the implementation phase.

Gradually, also, theoretical interest in educational leadership grew, and several new studies were conducted. In 2010 the National Board of Education commissioned the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Jyväskylä to undertake a meta-study of the last 30 PhD theses focused on school renewal and school leadership in Finland. The goal of the study was both to synthesize the theoretical aspects of the theses and to explore the practical solutions and guidelines in them. This was highly important for development of educational leadership in Finland, because in the 20th century most academic research on educational leadership had been international.

One of the key findings of the meta study was that the new situation called for a stronger future orientation alongside traditional teaching and management duties (Alava, Halttunen & Risku 2012). This was in line with the understanding that Finland was transforming from the ‘Nation Building’ phase into the ‘Future Creation’ phase; Kirveskari (2003) called for visionaries to express how things should be and to feel responsible for both their own organisation and broader society. The report also summarizes the results into a new understanding of educational leadership and presents a framework of broad pedagogical leadership with four key development processes: curriculum development; development of organizational culture; creation of vision objectives and agreement on strategies; and specification of the basic mission. In addition to these, the broad pedagogical framework includes three competencies and attitudes of leadership: shared leadership, change leadership, and values leadership. Leadership is not a person or an act; it is a resource to be utilized in the situation at hand; different schools are in different situations so they need different resources.

Finally, combining the future orientation, developing school culture, increasing teaching staff’s competencies, and building the new curriculum highlight the roles of both teachers and the principal as learners. Then, members of the school organisation should form a community of learners,

where the principal is a learner along with everyone else (Alava *et al.*, 2012). It is therefore, following Moilanen's (2001) argument, possible to consider that the objective of internal school development is to create a community of learners.

Like the meta-study described, the situation in schools and the role of school leaders had changed a lot. On the governmental level the situation has instigated further studies in order to clarify the new roles and responsibilities of principals (National Board of Education, 2013). The report concluded that it is impossible to identify and decide very detailed tasks, roles and responsibilities of school leaders because the schools are different, the municipalities with their norms and regulations are different, and the school contexts are different. Therefore, there cannot exist any uniform nationwide solutions, although the base for any school leader's work is in the new legislature. It includes increased responsibility in managing, finances, and buildings (in collaboration with the municipality), but more and more matters related to pedagogical leadership (curriculum, work plan, evaluation; school culture and values; developing the whole school community; leading competencies; student affairs and welfare; external networking; all personnel matters – recruitment, temporary appointments, training, well-being). Looking to the future the report emphasizes pedagogical leadership and knowledge-based management (National Board of Education, 2013).

REFORM IN PRACTICE

We can link the framework of broad pedagogical leadership presented above to two recent empirical studies. Because in Finland municipalities have the responsibility to organize education, and because they are very independent, there are multiple ways to understand education and school leadership in Finland. These two cases were selected because they have made major efforts and developments leading to notable changes and results in their work.

The first is a follow-up study of a ten-year development process in a district called Åland, a region with 16 small communities. The second is an on-going study by the author in a city of Mäntsälä. Both conducted a major educational renewal process in the period 2005-2018 but for different reasons. The educational administrators in the district of Åland got worried about rather poor results in mathematics revealed in the PISA 2003 studies. The PISA results can be calculated on a regional level, which is the case in Åland. In Mäntsälä the two new administrators got worried about the rather stagnant organizational culture and the level of leadership competence

in the schools. It needs to be noticed that, while Mäntsälä is a rather typical mid-size municipality in Finland, with around 20 000 people, the region of Åland is different, because it has, for historical reasons, a semi-independent role and is mostly a Swedish speaking community with around 30 000 inhabitants. Åland has 22 elementary schools and two secondary schools. Mäntsälä has 14 elementary schools and one secondary school.

The PISA 2003 results in Åland first inspired self-critical reflection and developed in teachers and principals a growing awareness about their function in schools, leading to a ten-year multi-level school regional developmental turnaround process (2003–2012) (Uljen, Sundqvist & Smeds-Nylund, 2016). The process has been successful. In PISA 2012, Åland was found to be performing at the nation's top, achieving better results in mathematics than Finland on average, thereby demonstrating major development (Harju-Luukkainen, Nissinen, Stolt & Vettenranta, 2014).

In the city of Mäntsälä a similar education reform process was initiated in 2011 by the new superintendent. The focus was first to increase the leadership capacity of school leaders and restructure the educational administration. Also, the emphasis was on the school level development led by the school leaders. Major reform has taken place; a new team structure was developed, emphasizing cross-school collaboration; an intensive leadership training program was launched and several new approaches for school development were introduced and implemented at school level. In the district of Åland, two phases of development can be seen: first, the use of evaluation results for development purposes (2001–2004), and second, an intentional, full-scale school development program (2005–2013). According to Uljen *et al.* (2016), several major efforts could be identified in the process: the curriculum was revised and clarified; work was organized by creating horizontal discussion arenas striving for more precise content, greater coherence, and common goals; pedagogical dialogue was increased, and work teams were strengthened; the principals exhibited strong, quality-oriented thinking, and saw the advantages of, and often attended, in-service training. The areas of actions and approaches found in the cases of Åland and Mäntsälä link to the framework of broad pedagogical leadership.

System-wide change effort

It is notable that the major school development did not take place in isolation at school level in either case. In both places, the regional/municipal administrative leaders (superintendent and basic education leaders) played a major role. In addition to the collaboration of the municipal education

office and the school principals, wider collaboration was also of importance. For example, in Mäntsälä, the team structure involving all schools proved to be very efficient, as did the dialogue with parents and other stakeholders.

In both municipalities, collaboration inside the different sections of operations was important. In Åland this included a process that involved health care, youth organizations, and social services (Uljens *et al.*, 2016). In Mäntsälä an in-depth comprehensive plan of collaboration in the entire sector of cultural activities was accepted (Lehtinen, 2014). The municipal activities included schools, the library, community college, culture, youth and sports sections, and the secondary school combined with the activities in the NGO sector. The plan also emphasized moving from a management-driven model into a team and collaboration model. In a small municipality this created a lot of synergy. The contacts and dialogue with parents played a significant role in both municipalities. In Åland a lot of open meetings were arranged. Uljens *et al.* (2016) argue that it was important that the principals saw parents more as resources in new ways of communication. It was obvious that in a small and tight community where most people knew each other, dialogue was easy due to a positive approach of development.

In Mäntsälä the situation was somewhat different. Several small rural schools had to be either closed or merged, and that raised some tensions among the parents involved. There, too, meetings were held mostly to inform the public and to give citizens a voice in the planning process. Later, another kind and very positive collaboration with parents occurred in the implementation process of the new 2016 National Curriculum. This curriculum included a new element called multidisciplinary teaching and learning. This new pedagogical method was called phenomenon-based learning, and unfortunately, it was very often misunderstood, as if Finland was abolishing all subjects and replacing them with studying phenomena. Naturally, that was not the case, but multidisciplinary learning meant that each school would carry out one one- or two- week long period where a real-life phenomenon is studied in a new way, emphasizing student responsibility, external connections, and concrete results. In these projects parents had a significant and positive role (Hellström, S., Personal interview, May 15, 2016). Very positive results, student activity, and parents' involvement in this new pedagogical approach were also reported by another principal (Laasila, S., Personal interview, June 2, 2016).

The new team structure in Mäntsälä was constructed for two main reasons. First, to increase collaboration among the schools, and second, to harness all knowledge available in order to conduct all the changes and renewals needed. This new collaborative approach is understandable,

because the schools were all only medium-sized, and all of them had to do the same changes. It would have been a significant waste of resources if all of them had done the same tasks in isolation, which had been the way for many years. The change process of the team structure was led by the administrative director of basic education, but all principals were included in determining what cross-school teams would be needed, who members in the teams should be, and how the tasks decided in teams would be implemented in schools. The new team structure consisted of six teams: a team for school safety, a team for ICT development, a team to support daily learning and schooling (including special education and immigrants), a team for pedagogical development, a team of school secretaries, and a team for resources. Three of the chairmen of the teams were regional principals¹, two were educational experts working in the municipal administrative office and the resource team was led by the administrative director of basic education. These six people also formed the management team for basic education. All the schools selected members to every team. Team members had the responsibility to disseminate all the decisions and best practices to all schools and they also brought initiatives from the schools in a bottom-up way to be discussed in the management team. In addition to these teams, there were also six designated coordinators, whose tasks were to promote their special areas in order to benefit all schools; for example, coordinators of school safety and ICT (Mäkinen, J., Personal interview, March 12, 2019).

In sum, the following key elements that made system-wide educational development possible, were:

- cross-school team structure and collaboration;
- dialogue between municipal educational managers and school principals;
- multi-professional co-operation;
- recreating curriculum and collaboration with parents.

Importance of school culture and values

The importance of values was seen in many aspects of the development of both Åland and Mäntsälä. According to Uljens *et al.* (2016), in Åland the rather low scores in PISA 2003 results created a growing awareness and shared responsibility for the situation. All that reflected the importance of values, responsibility, and the notion of care for education. The role and importance of school culture was also seen nationally in the new 2016

¹ Regional principals are 'regular' school principals with additional duties.

curriculum in Finland, where it is stated that learning community should be at the core of school culture, alongside well-being and safe school day, interaction, cultural diversity, participation, equality and sustainable future (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016). The dissertation of Lahtero (2011) opens a new perspective on leadership culture by examining it as a network of meanings by the teachers. In addition, Lahtero's work offers an illustrative perspective on the complexity and role of the school's organisational culture as part of the principal's everyday activities as seen in the both cases described here.

In Mäntsälä, the developing of school culture was seen as important at both municipal and school levels. When the two new educational administrators started their work in 2011 the two priority foci for them were increasing the leadership capacity of the school principals and changing the school culture, which they then saw as very conservative, like 'stagnant water' (Lintonen, P., Personal interview, March 12, 2019). With new leadership behavior, structural changes, recruitment, leadership training and school level guidelines, major cultural development took place (Mäkinen, J., Personal interview, March 12, 2019). The principals cannot undertake the school-level changes alone, and need a lot of support from their municipal education directors (Vuohijoki, 2006). In recruiting the new principals, their competence and potential to lead were sought after (Lintonen, P., Personal interview, June 13, 2016).

At the school level, the development of school culture began with initiatives and actions by the principals. One of the principals, who started in 2011 in Mäntsälä, analyzed the school culture at that time and concluded that it was rather isolated and conservative (Lipponen, M., Personal interview, June 1, 2016). Knowing that cultural change would not be easy, he included the change and development of school operations with several initiatives and actions. He also strongly advocated the stand that the core values are important and good behavior in school is a must. The main driver in his leadership philosophy was student focus – putting students in the center. This meant, for example, taking some students into the interviews of the applicants for a teacher's position. Clearly, this raised some eyebrows, but principal's example encouraged teachers to include students in many other activities.

In another school in Mäntsälä, whose principal has been regarded as a visionary leader, school culture was important. She also emphasized the strong student focus in the multidisciplinary projects that the school had in 2016. It was a major effort, and some might say daring, because the principal guided the work so that students took the lead on all 90 projects that the entire school was involved in during the two last weeks of spring semester

of 2016. She assured the teachers by saying that perhaps there would be some chaos, but that all of them could do it. As part of the renewed school culture, she also allowed different opinions in an open dialogue. One important element linked to values and culture is the notion of pedagogic wellbeing and positive leadership, which could be seen in this school. Liusvaara (2014) argues that leader's support strengthens the sense of coherence, which is the basis for wellbeing. Safe and open culture enhances pedagogic wellbeing. Positive leadership, which consists of the principal's own positive interaction with others, causes positive feelings and action on others (Wenström, 2019).

The principal had a lot of experience as a teacher in entrepreneurship classes, and therefore, she had a strong belief in the students. As the result, all 90 projects were completed with great success. The topics ranged from kickboxing to camping to an international visit to Amsterdam. All projects were carefully documented, photographed and evaluated (Hellström, S., Personal interview, May, 31, 2016). The findings from Mäntsälä clearly reflect the notion of trust, which has been one key element in Finnish society. The principal trusted the teachers to exercise their informal leadership that served the school community. And in return, the teachers also trusted the principal to best serve the teachers' work and wellbeing by using formal leadership. Doing this, the principal proved to be a caring school leader and, as Kanervio, Pulkkinen & Risku (2015) emphasized, strived to ensure that teachers engage themselves in sharing their expertise to develop their professional capacity together. Trust has also been one element in distributed leadership (Tian, 2016). In her study about values and ethics, Teikari (2016) found several similar important values among Finnish school principals – safety, fairness, care, courage and friendship. The importance of culture was discovered in the studies by Kunnari (2008), Lahtero (2011), Erätuuli and Leino (1993) and Vulkko (2001).

In sum, the key elements in stressing values and culture in educational development were:

- developing school culture begins from leadership culture;
- applying positive leadership;
- putting oneself on the line as a leader;
- placing students at the center.

Participation, communication and dialogue

Participation and shared leadership were also present in the two municipalities in question. In Åland this was the combination of strong central initiative

and broad dialogue among all participants. The local educational administration was proactive in launching the development but according to Uljens *et al.* (2016) this was done in a manner whereby the local government did not leave them or or blame them. Also, at the school level there was a lot of dialogue; developmental actions were carried out in a culture aiming at coherence, open, two-way communication. Uljens *et al.* (2016) also saw that as the government and the superintendents did at higher levels, so could a more positive atmosphere be created.

In Mäntsälä the two new administrators adopted several new ways of communication. They launched regular meetings for all principals, where both practical, everyday issues were discussed but also future-oriented visionary matters were deliberated. New teachers were carefully inducted, and the in-service training of teachers was delegated to regions (Lintonen, P. Personal interview, Oct, 31. 2016). A very important phase of school-based development was a workshop among all management teams of all schools in Mäntsälä. In that workshop all these teams analyzed their school culture, defined goals for development, and reported their work to everybody else. This kind of work with teachers from all schools working together was new and created several new connections between teachers and schools, fostering a new kind of school-to-school networking (Mäkinen, J., Personal interview, March 12, 2019). These observations are in line with theoretical findings. Mäkelä (2007) found that external networking takes up a significant proportion (22%) of a principal's time. According to Pesonen (2009), principals expect school management to develop towards collegial management between principals from different schools and to expand to both internal and external school networks. Also Paukkuri (2015) in her dissertation found the importance of networking. She argued that new meanings of shared leadership could be reflected on and learned in networking with other schools.

This network-based collaboration was, however, not limited to the municipality of Mäntsälä alone. An important example of that is a close collaboration between the neighboring municipality, Tuusula. In western Mäntsälä it became necessary to build a new school for grades 7–9 because in that area there already existed three elementary schools for grades 1–6. These three schools were near the border with the neighboring municipality and rather far from the closest grade 6–9 school in Mäntsälä municipality. Therefore, these two municipalities made a contract and financial arrangements so that the children from these three schools in Mäntsälä could go to the school for grades 7–9 in Tuusula although they lived in Mäntsälä.

In addition to the school networking level, at the school level a lot of dialogue-based practices have also been adopted in Mäntsälä. One of the new issues demanding discussion was the new system to evaluate student achievement and progress in the 2016 curriculum. The aim was to give continuous feedback to the students during the whole year and the progress of the student to be evaluated against the goals mentioned in the curriculum. The evaluation is not based solely on isolated tests, but is also grounded on classroom activity and the quality of homework. In addition to giving a plain mark, the teacher can also give written feedback. This has raised a lot of questions among the teachers, so one area of internal dialogue among them has been defining the evaluation procedures to be used (Hellström, S., Personal interview, May, 31, 2016). One important medium in increasing communication and dialogue with parents has been an electronic platform called Wilma, which is used in most Finnish schools in order to inform the parents about school's activities, their children's issues, and collecting feedback from them.

In sum, the key elements in enhancing participation, communication and dialogue were:

- understanding through inclusive dialogue;
- wide participation to secure commitment;
- dialogue through entire education administration;
- leading the school-level dialogue as a key task for the principal;
- communicating expectations through proactive and trusting leadership.

Re-defining leadership

As can be seen in this article, traditional leadership and management practices in schools were challenged in many ways. Those schools moved far away from the 'one-man' leadership practice: traditional administrative work is no longer sufficient, and leadership is emphasized, values are the new base for school development, and emerging school culture is a strategic effort. According to Uljens *et al.* (2016), in Åland, the role of the principal used to be mostly managerial. The principals held common meetings, but the discussions were not goal-orientated and the teachers mostly "ran their own race". During the developmental process, principals started visiting classrooms. This was perceived as an expression of recognition of the teachers' work and thus was perceived positively by teachers.

As mentioned earlier, in Mäntsälä, one of the key focus areas of educational development and reform was to increase the leadership capacity of the principals. This was initiated by the superintendent and carried out

by the administrative director of basic education (Lintonen, P. Personal interview, March 12, 2019):

- Structures were renewed in order to support school-level leadership; very small schools were merged to form bigger units in order to secure the possibilities to really lead and manage; this way principals could be appointed as full-time school leaders, not part-time as before;
- The former top-down management was abolished, and a participative and distributed leadership approach was introduced;
- Leadership training for all principals was arranged²;
- The superintendent and the administrative director of basic education attended a two- year along university-based leadership program;
- Leadership skills and potential were valued in recruiting new principals;
- A regional model for school leadership was created with three areas with a regional principal in each of them;
- A new management team for elementary education was created.

It can be said the development in Mästäälä has been from non-leadership to leadership to shared leadership to team leadership (Mäkinen, Personal interview, Oct. 31, 2016). The structural formation of the geographical regions was a very important start in school level collaboration; schools do not work together unless the school principals work together and encourage collaboration. According to Mäkinen (Personal interview, March 12, 2019), the new structure first forced principals and teachers to collaborate, but after some years it became a normal way to work, leading to the next step of building the cross-school team system where all schools collaborated. In addition to cooperation, the new structure enabled shared and distributed leadership, which focuses on leading the entire organisation's knowledge and learning emphasizing dialogue and mentoring, where every member of the organisation is a learner. The organisation thus becomes a community of learners (Alava *et al.*, 2012).

Both the superintendent and the administrative director of basic education in Mäntsälä emphasized their role as supporters of school-level leadership. In doing so, they developed and introduced a detailed handbook for

² The two first short one-day training session for school principals in Mäntsälä were facilitated by outside trainers. The first focused in leading school's processes and the second in twelve leadership areas in public management (Strategic leadership, managing resources, quality leadership, leading competencies, leading the working community, leading innovation in complex context, leading networks, managing change, leading communication, leading everyday action); a framework developed by the lecturer (Stennvall & Virtanen, 2010). Later, the administrative director of basic education used considerable time in the regular school principals' meetings for topics he learned in the extensive leadership training programs he had participated at the University of Jyväskylä.

school leaders and adopted a quality framework to enhance school level operations (Lintonen, P., Personal interview, March 12, 2019). One important result of the increased collaboration and communication has been the increase of trust, which was lacking in the early years of the time period in question (2011–2018). The main reason for the possible mistrust was misunderstanding and usage of different constructs and terminology (Mäkinen, J., Personal interview, March 12, 2019).

New pedagogical approaches and methods were also introduced in Mäntsälä. More and more participative leadership was emphasized. As was underlined by Hellström (Personal interview, May 31, 2016), leadership is also part of pedagogy; it is implementing the strategic plans into real action among the teachers. It needs also to be individualized because teachers are different, and they need to be supported and encouraged individually. It has been found that renewal processes require the principal's strong pedagogical leadership (Hellström, 2004). In addition to planning and organising teachers' work, Raasumaa (2010) suggests that a principal as a broad pedagogical leader also attends the quality development of knowledge and learning just as the municipality had done.

Another school-level emphasis in Mäntsälä has been teamwork. In the beginning schools had teams for everyday school matters like information, security and well-being. Later, the more comprehensive team structures were created, often subject-based – teams of mathematics teachers, arts teachers, language teachers etc. In Finland, the special education has had a big role in practice and is behind good PISA results. All schools have different support for students with special needs, either through part-time or full-time special education teachers. Considering that this is a demanding area, not all teachers have a good command of it. Therefore, an interesting solution was to include in each team structure in school at least one teacher who is qualified in special education. Therefore, such a team can discuss any problems related to children with special needs, regardless of which teacher raises the issue (Lipponen, M., Personal interview, June 1, 2016).

In sum, the key elements for re-defining leadership, were:

- applying new pedagogical leadership understanding that leadership is part of pedagogy;
- superintendents and educational administrators' important job is to support principals;
- principals' important job is to support teachers;
- shared leadership can be enforced by management teams, restructuring management systems, delegating tasks to various teams; leading through team structures.

CREATING A COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS

There is an increased theoretical discussion about networked learning communities, but not much empirical examples have been presented. As discussed earlier, the formation of a learning community was also the end goal in the model of broad pedagogical leadership and emphasized also in the PhD work by Raasumaa (2001). However, the two municipalities discussed above have taken concrete steps towards a new kind of learning community where both school-to-school and school-to-community networks have been created as part of their school culture development and new, student-centered model of teaching. As Uljens *et al.* (2016) explain, the development began with national level initiatives during the first period and then continued to self-directed developmental work in regional, municipal and local settings. Educational administrators clearly turned the Åland school system into a professional learning community. In doing this, a system-wide approach was needed, where strong participation and dialogue were crucial.

As we can see, the two cases described earlier reflect the theories of professional learning communities (Morrow, 2010; Jackson, & Temperley, 2007; Nkengbeza, 2013). Are the two examples discussed above perfect learning communities? Perhaps not, but we can find essential elements in their development efforts towards that goal. And we can conclude that:

- *If schools are to improve*, staff – teachers and leaders – must develop the capacity to function as professional learning communities.
- *If schools are to function as professional learning communities*, they must develop a collaborative culture and network orientation.
- *If schools are to develop a collaborative culture*, they must overcome a tradition of teacher isolation and adopt new pedagogical leadership.
- *If schools are to overcome their tradition of teacher isolation*, teachers must learn to work in effective, high performing teams supported and encouraged by school leaders.

REFERENCES

- Alava, J. (2007). Koulutuksen käytäntö [Practice of training]. In Teoksessa A. Pennanen (Ed.), *Koulun johtamisen avaimia [Keys to leading a school]*. PS-kustannus. Jyväskylä.
- Alava, J., Halttunen, I. & Risku, M. (2012). *The Changing School Management*. National Board of Education. Reports 2012:3. http://www.oph.fi/english/publications/2012/changing_school_management Retrieved on March 12, 2015.
- Eräutuuli, M. & Leino, J. (1993). *Rehtorin työ opettajan näkökulmasta. [The principal as the pedagogic leader]*. Department of education research 138. University of Helsinki.
- Finnish National Board of Education (2016). *National Core Curriculum for Basic Education*. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, March 3, 2019. file:///C:/Users/alava/AppData/Local/Packages/Microsoft.MicrosoftEdge_8wekyb3d8bbwe/TempState/Downloads/ellibs-9789521362590%20(1).epub
- Harju-Luukkainen, H., Nissinen, K., Stolt, S. & Vettenranta, J. (2014). *PISA 2012: Resultatnåvån i de svenskspråkiga skolorna i Finland. [PISA 2012: Results in Swedish speaking schools in Finland]*. Finnish Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyväskylä. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, March 25, 2019. <https://www.kulturfonden.fi/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/PISA-2012.pdf>
- Hellström, M. (2004). *Muutosote. Akvaarioprojektin pedagogisten kehittämishankkeiden toteutustapa ja onnistuminen*. Helsingin yliopiston soveltavan kasvatustieteiden laitos: Tutkimuksia 249. [The way of change – the implementation and success of pedagogical development projects at the experimental schools of the Aquarium project]. Department of Applied Sciences of Education: Research Reports 249.
- Hellström, S. (2016.) *Personal interview*, May 31, 2016.
- Isosomppi, L. (1996). *Johtaja vai juoksupoika. Suomalaisen yleissivistävän koulun johtamiskulttuurin ja sen determinanttien tarkastelua. [Leader or a messenger. analysis of the leadership culture and its determinants in the Finnish general education.]* Tampereen yliopisto. Tampere.
- Jackson, D. & Temperley, J. (2007). From professional learning community to network learning community. In E. L. Stoll & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Professional learning communities: divergence, depth and dilemmas*. Goodson & Hargreaves. Open University Press.
- Kanervio, P., Pulkkinen, S. & Risku, M. (2015). Trust in educational leadership: Finnish way. In P. Kanervio, S. Pulkkinen & M. Risku (Eds.), *More Trust, less Control – less Work? Culture of Trust as a Basis of Educational Leadership and School Improvement. Studies in educational leadership 2*. University of Jyväskylä.
- Kirveskari, T. (2003). *Visiot oppilaitoksen johtamisessa – Tulevaisuuden tahtotilaa muodostamassa. [Visions in the management of schools – Forming a strategic intent for the future.]* Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 933.

- Kunnari, E. (2008). *Kohti ulkorajoja – Lukion toimintakulttuurikuvaus ohjauksen ja johtamisen näkökulmasta*. [Towards the outer boundaries. The description of the operational culture in the upper secondary school from the view of steering and leading]. University of Helsinki, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, Department of Applied Sciences of Education: Research Reports 289.
- Laasila, S. (2016). *Personal interview*, June 2, 2016.
- Lahtero, T. (2011). *Yhtenäiskoulun johtamiskulttuuri – symbolis-tulkinnallinen näkökulma*. [Leadership culture in unified comprehensive school, symbolic-interpretative approach]. *Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research*.
- Lehtinen, T. (2014). *Mäntsälän kunnan sivistyspalveluden yhteistoimintasuunnitelma 2015–2020*. [The plan for collaborative activities in cultural sector in Mäntsälä 2015–2020]. Mäntsälä.
- Lehtisalo, L. & Raivola, R. (1999). *Koulutus ja koulutuspolitiikka 2000-luvulle* [Education and educational policy in the 2000s]. WSOY. Juva.
- Lintonen, P. (2016). *Personal interview*, June 13, 2016.
- Lintonen, P. (2016). *Personal interview*, Oct. 31, 2016.
- Lintonen, P. (2019). *Personal interview*, March 12, 2019.
- Lipponen, M., *Personal interview*, June 1, 2016.
- Liusvaara, L. (2014). Kun vaan rehtori on korvat auki. Koulun kehittämisellä pedagogista hyvinvointia. [If the principal only has his/her ears open. Pedagogical well-being through school development]. *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*, C 388 Turun yliopisto. Retrieved March 26, 2019 from the World Wide Web <https://www.utupub.fi/handle/10024/98844>
- Moilanen, R. (2001). A learning organization: machine or human. *Jyväskylä Studies in Business and Economics*. No. 14.
- Morrow, J. R. (2010). *Teachers' perceptions of professional learning communities as opportunities for promoting professional growth*. Doctoral dissertation, Appalachian State University, USA.
- Mustonen, K. (2003). *Mihin rehtoria tarvitaan*. [Why do we need a principal?]. University of Oulu, Faculty of Education, Kajaani Department of Teacher Education.
- Mäkelä, A. (2007). Mitä rehtorit todella tekevät. Etnografinen tapaustutkimus johtamisesta ja rehtorin tehtävistä peruskoulussa. [What principals really do. An ethnographic case study on leadership and on a principal's tasks in comprehensive school]. *Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research*, 316.
- Mäkinen, J. (2016). *Personal interview*, Oct. 31, 2016.
- Mäkinen, J. (2019). *Personal interview*, March 12, 2019.
- National Board of Education (2013). Rehtorien työnkuvan ja koulutuksen määrittämistä sekä kelpoisuusvaatimusten uudistamista valmisteleavan työryhmän raportti [A report by the work group focusing in the principals' job description and training and in the renewal of qualifications]. *Report 2013*, 16.

- Nikki, M. L. (2000). Rehtori tietää, taitaa... [The principals knows and succeeds...]. Department of Teacher Education. *The Principles and Practices of Teaching*, 36. University of Jyväskylä.
- Nkengbeza, D. (2013). *Building professional learning communities in a conflict and post conflict environment: a case study of Anabela high school in Liberia*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Paukkuri, E. (2015). *How is the phenomenon of shared leadership understood in the theory and practice of school leadership? A case study conducted in four European schools*. Tampere University Press.
- Pesonen (2009). Peruskoulun johtaminen – aikansa ilmiö. [Comprehensive school leadership – phenomenon of its time]. *Publications in Education* No. 132, University of Joensuu.
- Raasumaa, V. (2001). Perusopetuksen rehtori opettajien osaamisen johtajana [Knowledge management functions of a principal in basic education]. *Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research*, 383.
- Stenvall, J. & Virtanen, P. (2010). *Julkinen johtaminen [Public management]*. Tietosanomaa.
- Tian, M. (2016). Distributed Leadership in Finnish and Shanghai schools. *Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research*, 571. University of Jyväskylä.
- Teikari (2016). Exploring ethics. A philosophical inquiry into the education sector of one Finnish city. *Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research* 546. Jyväskylä.
- Uljens, M., Sundqvist, R. & Smeds-Nylund, A-S. (2016). Educational leadership for sustained multi-level school development in Finland – A non-affirmative approach. *Nordic Studies in Education*, Vol. 36, 2–2016. Retrieved March 29, 2019 from the World Wide Web. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303780207_Educational_leadership_for_sustained_multi-level_school_development_in_Finland_-_A_non-affirmative_approach
- Vulkko, E. (2001). *Opettajayhteisön kokema päätöksenteko kouluorganisaatiossa. Joensuun yliopiston kasvatustieteellisiä julkaisuja. [Decision-making in school organization as experienced by the teacher community]*. University of Joensuu Publications in Education, No. 66.
- Vuohijoki, T. (2006). Pitää vain selviytyä. Tutkimus rehtorin työstä ja työssä jakamisesta sukupuolen ja virka-aseman suhteen tarkasteltuna. [One Just Has to Survive. A Study on Principal's Work and Coping at Work from the Point of View of Gender and Position]. Publications of University of Turku, *Annales Universitatis Turkuensis*, Series C, *Scripta lingua Fennica edita*, Vol. 250.
- Wenström, S. (2019). *Positiivisella johtamisella pedagogista hyvinvointia. [Pedagogical well-being through positive leadership]*. ePooki 10/2019. Retrieved March 29, 2019 from the World Wide Web https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/163445/ePooki%2010_2019.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Christian Wiesner, MA, was the head of the Educational Standards Department and led its formative integration into the Austrian school system at the Federal Institute (BIFIE). He was responsible for the scientific development and improvement of educational standards in Austria. He was actively involved in many projects related to educational reforms and is now professor of education at the University College of Teacher Education, Lower Austria. His primary areas of work include innovation research; leadership; therapy and counseling theories in school practice, the development of personality, teams, organisations, and schools, as well as learning and feedback research.

Michael Schratz, Ph.D, has been working in the field of education in many countries, focusing on system transformation, leadership, and learning. He was the Founding Dean of the School of Education at the University of Innsbruck (Austria) and has been Austrian representative for the EU, OECD, and Council of Europe. Prof. Schratz is Academic Director of the National Leadership Academy and Chairman of the jury of the German School Award. He is Scientific Director of the European Doctorate in Teacher Education (EDITE), in which five universities work towards *Transformative Teacher Learning for Better Student Learning within an Emerging European Context*. He was President of ICSEI (International Congress of School Effectiveness and Improvement) from 2016–2017 and had the Fritz Karsen Chair at the Humboldt University of Berlin (Germany) in 2018. Michael Schratz is the author of many books, several translated into other languages, and editor of several journals on leadership, school improvement, and learning.

Hariz Agić became a professor of mathematics at the Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics in Sarajevo. He graduated in postgraduate studies in Management Education from the Faculty of Management in Kopar, at the Manchester Metropolitan University franchise. In 2009, at the University of Novi Sad, he defended his doctoral dissertation entitled “Managing Director’s Activities and Managing Changes in Education”. Since 1982, he has been teaching mathematics: from 1993 to 2007, at the University of Tuzla, and from 2009 until now engaged as a teacher at Brcko District European Universities and Kallos Tuzla at the Faculty of Pedagogy of the University of Sarajevo. Since 2001 he has been employed by the Pedagogical Institute of Tuzla Canton, as Director until 2005 and as education advisor to date. He has published over 30 scientific papers in the field of methodics and areas of management. He has written several books in the field of mathematics and management in education. Married, he is the father of two daughters and grandfather of three grandchildren.

Žaneta Džumhur is employed by the Agency for Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education. She graduated from the Faculty of Sciences and Mathematics in Sarajevo and postgraduated from the Faculty of Humanities in Mostar. From 1991 until 2002 she taught mathematics in grammar schools in Sarajevo. Since 2002 she has been employed by the Agency for standards and assessment in education for the Federation of BH and Republika Srpska. She has intense experience in external evaluation at national and international levels. She has published several technical and experts reports at national level regarding the state of education in BH. She has actively participated in many projects related to educational reform in BH. She has organized and conducted many conferences, seminars and workshops for teachers and school directors. She has participated as a speaker or panelist at many international conferences. Married, mother of two sons.

Bozhidara Kriviradeva is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education, Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Sofia, Bulgaria. She provides lectures in organizational culture in educational institutions, management of institutions of social work, children's rights, working with children at risk, etc. Her main research work for the past decade is in the field of leadership and organizational culture at school, along with job satisfaction in educational and social institutions. Prof. Kriviradeva has served as deputy rector for strategic development at Kokshetau state University "Sh. Ualikhanov", Kazakhstan for academic year 2016/2017 and also a lecturer in Leadership in education at the same University. She leads a master program "Pedagogy of deviant behavior". Her research interests in leadership in education inspire intensive research work in the field, especially in relation to strategic management of educational institutions.

Vesna Kovač is a full professor employed at the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Education. Her central academic interest has been focused on the field of education policy and leadership. She is a principal researcher of a research project titled "Predictors and Obstacles of Instructional School Leadership in Croatian Schools", supported by the University of Rijeka. She runs various courses on education policy, leadership, and quality at the level of undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate study programs. She is the head of the postgraduate specialist study program intended for school's principals. In 2015, she was appointed as a member of the Ministry of Education's Expert Working Group responsible for improvement of educational leadership. She has been a member of the European Network for Improving Research and

Development in Educational Leadership and Management (ENIRDELM) since 2015.

Stjepan Staničić, PhD, graduated in pedagogy, obtained an MSc degree in the internal school development, and a PhD degree in the field of leadership in education. He was a teacher, pedagogue, and principal of primary and secondary schools, as well as an educational consultant and the head of the Institute of Education in Rijeka. For the last 15 years, he has been a professor at the Department of Education, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Rijeka. For more than 25 years, his key research interests have been management and leadership in education. Thus, he introduced a course School Management and lectured at undergraduate and postgraduate studies of several faculties, as well as participating in numerous national and international conferences. He was leading the national committees for the development of conceptual and operational documents on educational leadership (professional training programs, principal's certification exams, competency standards, licensing model, etc.). He was the expert leader of the School for Principals of primary and secondary schools. He is the author of the book *Management in Education* (2006) and around 50 field-related papers.

Milan Pol works at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, as Professor of Education and, since 2014, Dean of the Faculty. His professional interests are divided between school leadership/management and educational evaluation, recently focusing more intensely on evaluation in higher education settings. Among other subjects, he has been involved in research in school culture, school governance, organizational learning in schools and life/professional careers of school leaders. He is author and co-author of a variety of domestic and foreign publications and has been editor-in-chief of the journal *Studia paedagogica* since 2009. Currently, he is also board member of ENIRDELM (European Network for Improving Research and Development in Educational Leadership and Management).

Bohumíra Lazarová works as an associate professor at the Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University. Her main focus is on teachers' professional development, mentoring, and school counseling. She is a co-founder of the Czech Association of Mentoring in Education and acts as a trainer in courses for mentors of teachers and headteachers (see <https://www.phil.muni.cz/en/about-us/faculty-staff/2201-bohumira-lazarova>).

Jukka Alava is former director and emeritus professor of The Institute of Educational Leadership in The University of Jyväskylä. He earned his PhD degree at The University of Kentucky. He has been an adjunct professor at East China Normal University and a visiting professor at the University of Pretoria. His research interest and focus in training are school leadership, educational change and development, organizational change and learning, strategic change, and organizational culture. He has lectured in several universities and he has been a consultant to over 200 major organizations in Europe, Chile, China, Croatia, Nepal, Serbia, South Africa, USA. As the CEO and senior consultant of Didactica Consulting he has developed several frameworks, instruments and technologies to be used in training and consulting. He has published several articles and book chapters in managing and leading change in schools.

Tibor Baráth graduated at MSc level as a Mathematics and Physics teacher and took his Doctor's degree in Mathematics in 1986. He took part in leadership and expert training programs offered by the Netherlands School of Educational Management (NSO) and University of Amsterdam (UvA) in Holland. He has acted as the director of the Hungarian-Netherlands School of Educational Management (HUNSEM) at the University of Szeged from 1998. He led the development of several MA level training programs for directors and experts in education. He is a change manager (PricewaterhouseCoopers) and quality assurance adviser. His specific field is leadership, organizational and human resource development. He was involved – as leader or leading expert – in 10 national and 11 international programs in the field of education. He takes an active role in the European Network for Improving Research and Development in Educational Leadership and Management. He established a team – called Learning Experience Laboratory – for researching and improving the learning in HE institutions. He is involved as board member of three tracks of the Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics and Affiliated Conferences. He is an invited editor for different journals and books.

László Horváth, PhD, is an assistant professor at ELTE Eötvös Loránd University (Hungary) Institute of Education. He has an MSc degree in economics (leadership and management) and an MA degree in adult education (andragogy). Currently he is working in a state-funded research project concerned with the emergence and diffusion of local innovations in education. Previously he was engaged in several national and international public and higher education development projects. His research interests are higher

education management, learning organization, knowledge management and educational innovations.

Attila Nóbik is an associate professor at the Institute of Special Education, University of Szeged. He graduated as a history teacher. He defended his doctoral thesis in 2011 and completed his habilitation in 2018. His research interests are: content regulation in Hungarian education, history of childhood, professionalization of elementary teaching, and the history of schooling. He participated in various educational leadership programmes as trainer and developer.

Éva Verderber is a PhD candidate at the Doctoral School of Education at the Faculty of Education and Psychology, ELTE. Her main research interest focuses on the effect of school leaders' reflective thinking on the organizational learning process and organizational reflective capacity. She is a soft skill trainer who has experience in developing training programmes; she also took part in several institutional development projects. Now she is leading a Regional Teacher Training Center at ELTE within a European Union Project which focuses on decreasing early drop out from Hungarian schools.

Biljana Maslovarić has over 25 years of experience of working in education, as follows: from 1992 to 1998, she was hired as a professor of social sciences. From 1998 to 2001 she was an employee of the Open Society Foundation/Open Society Institute – Representative Office in Montenegro. From 2001 to 2010 she was working as a coordinator of the Pedagogical Center of Montenegro (PCMNE). Since 2012 she has been the executive director of the Pedagogical Center of Montenegro. In 2007 she obtained an MA in Management in Education at Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad. In 2009 she earned her PhD in Management in Education with the thesis "Democratic Education and the Role of Teachers in Forming a Democratic Attitude of Students". In 2007 she took the position of a teaching associate at the Faculty of Philosophy. She was appointed assistant professor by the Senate of the University of Montenegro in 2011 and from 2016 she was re-appointed for a period of five years. She has been serving as a Deputy Dean for Science and International Relations at the Faculty from 2014.

Jelena Ivanović, MA, completed her Bachelor's and Specialist's degree at the Department of Pedagogy, Faculty of Philosophy, the University of Montenegro, on time, with the highest mark. She defended her graduation thesis,

entitled “Models of identifying gifted children in elementary schools”. In the academic year 2017/18, she enrolled in the postgraduate studies at the University of Montenegro, and defended her master’s thesis entitled “Models of identifying and encouraging gifted children in the third cycle of elementary schools”. She took part in a literacy volunteer campaign for RAE students in Konik refugee camp. She participated in the International Pedagogy conference “Innovations in teaching”, which was held on May 2016 in Novi Sad. Since January 2018, she has been engaged as a teaching assistant at Study program for Pedagogy, Study program for Preschool education and Study program for Teacher education.

Konstantin Petkovski is a full time professor at St. Kliment Ohridski University, Bitola, Republic of North Macedonia. His professional experience is also as school director, deputy director of Bureau for development of education, head of commission for school directors’ examination. His key qualifications are as researcher, consultant and trainer in educational management, HRM, VET and Entrepreneurship. He has experience in leading national projects and is an expert in international projects.

Zoran Hristovski obtained a master’s degree in MHR with the thesis “Management of generational differences and characteristics in the behavior of human resources in function of the school performance”. Currently he is a primary school Principal. He has experience as a trainer in courses: Teacher training for the subject of computer work, MRCGO, BRO; Professional competences among directors, professional associates and teachers at schools and developing a personal plan for professional development, Coaching – N.

Jelena Teodorović is an associate professor at the Faculty of Education in Jagodina, University of Kragujevac, Serbia. She is the head of the Education policy master programme and Leadership in education master programme. She obtained her doctorate in education policy with a focus on international education from the George Washington University, USA. Jelena recently led two international projects in education: Comenius project “Improving educational effectiveness of primary schools (IEEPS)” and TEMPUS project “Master program in Educational Leadership (EdLead)”. She was one of the editors of the handbook *Steering the quality of work of educational institutions – Handbook for principals*. Her professional interests are: leadership in education, teacher quality, educational effectiveness, and education policy.

Slavica Ševkušić, senior research associate, is employed at the Institute for Educational Research in Belgrade, Serbia. She is also a lecturer for doctoral studies at the Faculty of Education in Jagodina, University of Kragujevac, Serbia (course of qualitative methodology). During more than 30 years working in the field of education, Slavica has been involved in numerous national and international projects. She was the research team leader in the TEMPUS project “Master program in Educational Leadership – EdLead” (2013–2017). Within the framework of this project, she was the president of Programme Committee of the international scientific conference “Challenges and dilemmas of professional development of teachers and leaders in education”, held in Belgrade in 2015. She was one of the editors of the handbook *Steering the quality of work of educational institutions – Handbook for principals*. In 2016/2017, she was a member of the Working Group in the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Serbia for preparation of program proposals and training scenarios for principals of educational institutions and draft regulations that will address all issues of importance for training, examination and acquisition of a principal’s license. From 2009 to the present she has been the Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of the Institute for Educational Research*, an international scientific journal (indexed in Scopus, ESCI-WoS, etc).

Dušica Malinić is a research associate at the Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia. She has a PhD in education from the University of Belgrade. Her main focus is on the causes of students’ academic failure, teachers’ pedagogical and methodical competence, and leadership in education. She was involved in several national and international projects in the field of education. From 2012 she has been the head of a subproject „Accessibility, Justice and Participation in Education“ within the national project „Improving the Quality and Accessibility of Education in the Process of Modernization of Serbia“. She participated in the TEMPUS project “Master program in Educational Leadership – EdLead” (2013–2017) as a member of the research team. She was one of the editors of the handbook *Steering the quality of work of educational institutions – Handbook for principals*. Dušica was a member of the Working Groups for the preparation of the document “Framework for the National Curriculum” (2017) and for the Revision of the standards and indicators for the quality of the work of educational institutions (2017–2018).

Jasmina Đelić, BA in Pedagogy, is head of the Department for Monitoring and External Evaluation of the Quality of Elementary Schools and Pre-School Institutions at the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological

Development of the Republic of Serbia. Ten-year-long experience in the development and implementation of the national framework for the quality of education. Participation in the development of standards and indicators for the quality of schools and pre-school institutions. Head of numerous projects for the development of evaluation and self-evaluation methodology in education. Head of the team for the establishment and implementation of the system for licencing directors of elementary schools and pre-school institutions, and the development of training programmes for leadership in elementary schools and pre-school institutions.

Alena Hašková is a professor of Technology of Education. She works at the Faculty of Education, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra (Slovakia). Her primary interests are methodology of teaching, IT applications in education, development of educational environments and their use for specific purposes, and optimization of school management and school leadership. She acts as an expert in both national and international committees aimed at research in education. She regularly contributes with articles to the national and international journals dedicated to the topic of education. From her rich publication activity 46 publications have been indexed in WoS and 38 in Scopus database. Besides that, she is the author of several monographs or chapters in monographs and textbooks in the area of pedagogy. From those focused on school leadership the most outstanding are “The Role of School Leadership in the Improvement of Learning” (M. Schratz et al.; Budapest, Tempus Public Foundation, 2009) and “The Competences of School Leaders and the Impact of School Reform on Their Positions” (A. Hašková & M. PISOŇOVÁ, In *Progress in Education*; New York, Nova Science Publishers, 2019).

Majda Cencič is a professor of didactics at the University of Primorska, Faculty of Education in Koper, Slovenia. She deals with a variety of educational topics such as school space, teaching methods, quality and evaluation, reflexive teaching, etc. Since 2011 she has also been involved in researching leadership in educational institutions. In 2011 she was invited to participate in the international Lifelong Learning Programme titled “European Policy Network on School Leadership” (2011–2014) with FORTH (Foundation for Research and Technology) of Heraklion, Crete (Greece) as the leading partner. From 2014 to 2016 she participated in the Erasmus+ project “Entrepreneurial Competences for School Leadership Teams” (EC4SLT). Given the above, her main interests are in the areas of ethical leadership, competences, and roles of school heads, influence of school heads on the creativity of teachers,

and the like. In 2014 she edited – jointly with her colleague Dr Justina Erčulj – the fourth thematic issue of *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, titled “Leadership in Education”. Majda Cencič is also involved in the activities of the Slovenian National School for Leadership in Education in the programme “Managing and Leading Innovative Learning Environments”. Since 2016 she has been a member of the editorial board of the journal *Leadership in Education*.

Justina Erčulj has been working in education for almost 40 years. Since 1996 she has been employed in the National School for Leadership in Education as a lecturer and lately as a programme and project developer. She has been involved in the development of several programmes for head teachers, such as the programme for headship licence, mentoring newly appointed head teachers, head teachers’ learning networks, etc. From 2016 on she has been coordinating an extensive national project “Leading and managing Innovative Learning Environments”. She has also coordinated or participated in international projects aimed at support for head teachers. At the moment she has been the lead Slovenian partner in Erasmus+ project “Leading Learning by Networking”. Beside this, she has also been a member of national project POGUM aimed at the development of entrepreneurship competencies of primary school head teachers. Her main interests are in the areas of head teachers’ lifelong learning programmes at different stages of their professional career. She is also interested in closer cooperation between schools, business companies, and different actors in schools’ environment. Therefore she has been searching for new ways of professional development that would help head teachers perform their role more effectively. She has been a member of several editorial boards of professional journals for teachers and head teachers in Slovenia.

AUTHORS' INDEX

A

Agić, H., 33, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42
 Alava, J., 97, 98, 99
 Aleksova, M., 149
 Alfirević, N., 72, 73, 74
 Ali, A. K., 123
 Alibabić, Š., 170
 Amanchukwu, R., 48
 Anderson, S., 164
 Andevski, M., 72
 Anđić, D., 76
 Angerer, S., 23
 Anka, Á., 124
 Armstrong, A., 123
 Arnold, R., 136
 Arsenijević, J., 72
 Avdić, A., 39
 Avguštin, P., 222
 Avramović, Z., 169, 172
 Ažić Bastalić, A., 74
 Ažman, T., 217

B

Bajrić, A., 39
 Balázs, É., 115
 Baráth, T., 124, 128
 Barber, M., 175
 Bass, B. M., 39
 Beavin Bavelas, J., 21
 Bell, L., 33, 36, 37
 Beño, M., 190
 Beycioglu, K., 138
 Bilankov, M., 65
 Biott, C., 19
 Bitterová, M., 192, 194
 Blažević, I., 71
 Bocsi, V., 114

Bodroža, B., 177
 Bohony, P., 198
 Bolden, R., 33
 Bouda, T., 95
 Boudová, S., 95
 Brečka, P., 198
 Bredeson, P., 136
 Breit, S., 23
 Brunclíková, Z., 198
 Bryk, A. S., 18
 Buchberger, I., 33, 70, 73, 74
 Buhač, Lj., 70
 Burcar, Ž., 71
 Bush, T., 33, 36, 37, 38, 44, 45, 48, 197

C

Cameron, K., 123, 124, 125, 126, 127
 Čelinák, Š., 198
 Cencić M., 219
 Cheng, Y. Ch., 197
 Clark, M., 175
 Cseh, Gy., 124

D

Damjanović, P., 34
 Dampster, N., 223
 Delors, J., 32
 Dempster, N., 208
 Devos, G., 25
 Dewe, B., 20
 Đaković, O., 73
 Đerić, I., 177
 Đurišić-Bojanović, M., 169, 170, 172
 Dougherty, P., 162
 Drandić, B., 63, 66, 68, 75
 Drucker, P., 43, 136

Dubs, R., 15
 Džinović, V., 171, 172

E

Eger, L., 198
 Ender, B., 31, 32
 Erätuuli, M., 104
 Erčulj, J., 36, 42, 214, 215, 216, 217
 Everard, B., 37

F

Faerman, S. R., 126
 Fazekas, Á., 124
 Fegeš, K., 72
 Fend, H., 14
 Firestone, W. A., 23
 Fischer, W., 19
 Foley, P., 123
 Fráterová, Z., 198
 Fullan, M. G., 38, 42

G

Gajger, V., 72, 74
 Gajić, O., 138
 Garvin, D. A., 123
 George, A. C., 23
 Glatter, R., 33,
 Glover, D., 48, 197
 Goljat Prelogar, L., 214, 215, 216, 217
 Gonzalez, R. A., 23
 Gregorzewski, M., 19
 Gros-Ophoff, J., 27

H

Hafner, H., 24
 Halasz, G. 115
 Halilović, H., 39
 Halinger, P., 164
 Halttunen, I., 97, 98

Harju-Luukkainen, H., 100
 Harris, A., 38
 Harrison, C., 57
 Hartmann, M., 21, 22, 25
 Hasanović, H., 38, 39, 42
 Hašková, A., 192, 194
 Heck, R., 164, 178
 Heilinger, A., 136
 Hellström, M., 101, 104, 106, 108
 Helmke, A., 22, 23
 Hentschke, G. C., 219
 Herich, J., 190
 Hersey, P., 38, 39
 Hitrec, S., 65
 Hlousková, L., 123
 Hofbauer, C., 29
 Hoi Lee, T. T., 197
 Holečková, A., 95
 Hopkins, D., 192
 Horn, D., 115
 Horvárhová, K., 197
 Horváth, L., 124
 Hosenfeld, I., 27
 Hruzíková, Z., 198
 Hučín, J., 95
 Huseinagić, E., 38, 39

I

Iby, M., 22
 Ingersoll, R., 162
 Isaković, Z., 38
 Isosomppi, L., 98
 Ivanović, S., 172
 Ivanuš Grmek, M., 80

J

Jackson, D., 21, 109
 Jahić, M., 39
 Janík, T., 95
 Janković, M., 72
 Jantzi, D., 46
 Jašić, S., 137

Javornik Krečić, M., 80
 Jelovac, G., 137
 Joshevska, F., 150
 Jukić, D., 72
 Jurić, V., 70

K

Kanervio, P., 104
 Kašparová, V., 90, 91, 92
 Käufer, K., 15
 Kemethofer, D., 21, 23
 Kendelić, S., 71
 Kézy, Zs., 124
 Khan, I., 48
 Killion, J., 57
 Kirkham, G. A., 18, 19, 122, 192
 Kirveskari, T., 98
 Kitzberger, J., 192
 Knežević, Z., 138
 Koch, U., 23
 Ko, J., 197
 Kotur, J., 217
 Kovač, V., 70, 72, 73, 74
 Kovács, A., 129
 Kozák, A., 114
 Kozina, A., 80
 Kozma, T., 116
 Krenn, S., 28
 Kriviradeva, B., 55
 Kubr, M., 215
 Kunnari, E., 104

L

Laasila, S., 101
 Lahtero, T., 103, 104
 Lalovic, Z., 138
 Lančarič, D., 197
 Lašek, J., 92, 93
 Laššák, V., 197
 Lazarová, B., 92, 93, 94, 123
 Lehtinen, T., 101
 Lehtisalo, L., 97
 Leino, J., 104

Leithwood, K., 38, 46, 164, 197
 Leko, I., 62
 Lhotková, I., 91, 192
 Lintonen, P., 103, 105, 107, 108
 Lipponen, M., 103, 108
 Liusvaara, L., 104
 Louis, K. S., 164
 Lovšin, M., 222
 Lukas, J., 92

M

MacBeath, J., 208
 Mäkelä, A., 105
 Mäkinen, J., 102, 103, 105, 107, 108
 Maksić, S., 169, 170, 172
 Male, T., 208
 Malić, J., 62
 Malinić, D., 171, 172, 175
 Matijević-Šimić, D., 71
 Maxwell, J. C., 47, 48, 56, 57
 Meador, D., 136
 Menyhárt, A., 124
 Mihanović, Z., 76
 Milenković, S., 34
 Milin, V., 177
 Miljević-Ridički, R., 73
 Mitchelmore, S., 211, 220
 Mlinarević, V., 72, 74
 Moilanen, R., 99
 Moorman, H., 19, 22, 29, 192, 198
 Móré, M., 114
 Morris, G., 37
 Morrison, K., 33, 37
 Morrow, J. R., 109
 Mrnjaus, K., 70
 Mršulja, N., 137, 148
 Mulford, B., 123, 128
 Munk, M., 198
 Mustonen, K., 98

N

Najvar, P., 95
Nawaz, A., 48
Nikki, M. L., 98
Nissinen, K., 100
Nkengbeza, D., 109
Northouse, P. G., 39
Novotny, P., 96, 123
Nusche, D., 29, 192, 198

O

Obdržálek, Z., 191
O'Donoghue, T., 172
Ololube, N. P., 48
Ouchi, W. G., 126

P

Pahić, T., 73
Palaiologou, I., 208
Pant, H. A., 30
Paseka, A., 20
Pashiardis, P., 138
Pastuović, N., 64
Paukkuri, E., 105
Pavičić, J., 72, 74
Pavlović, M., 173
Peček, P., 222
Peko, A., 71, 72, 74
Pelivanova, G., 150
Pesonen, J., 105
Petković, S., 72
Petkovski, K., 149, 150
Petrović, D. S., 170
Petz, B., 33
Petzold, K., 19
Pirolt, R., 24
Pisoňová, M., 191, 192
Píšová, M., 95
Plitzová, H., 83
Pol, M., 86, 89, 90, 93, 123, 128
Poláchová Vašátková, J., 95

Polák, J., 191
Pont, B., 29, 192
Pool, S., 19
Potužníková, E., 95
Pulkkinen, S., 104

Q

Quinn, E. R., 123, 124, 125, 126, 127

R

Raasumaa, V., 108, 109
Radeka, I., 71
Radišić, J., 171, 172
Radnitzky, E., 22
Radoslavova, M., 48, 57
Rafajac, B., 73
Rahm, S., 19, 22
Raivola, R., 97
Raković, J., 172
Rauch, F., 19
Rauscher, E., 28
Relja, R., 72
Revai, N., 18, 19, 122, 192
Ribbins, P., 33
Richter, D., 30
Riemann, F., 21
Risku, M., 97, 98, 104, 109
Ristić, Ž., 34
Robbins, S. P., 33
Rogić, A. M., 73
Roncelli Vauput, S., 43
Rösler, L., 29
Rowley, J., 211, 220
Rukavina Kovačević, K., 73
Rýdl, K., 198

S

Sajko, L., 70
Scharmer, O. C., 15, 21, 22
Schildkamp, K., 29
Schleicher, A., 214

- Schley, V., 21
 Schley, W., 19, 21, 22, 27
 Schliesing, A., 30
 Schmid, K., 24
 Schratz, M., 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
 Schreiner, C., 23
 Schrittmesser, I., 18
 Schwarz, J., 23, 24
 Seashore, K. L., 26
 Sedláček, M., 92, 93, 95, 96, 123
 Senge, P. M., 15, 20, 29, 123
 Sergiovanni, J. T., 38
 Ševců, M., 95
 Ševkušić, S., 171, 172, 175
 Silins, H., 123, 128
 Šimčáková, L., 190
 Šimková, Z., 197
 Simon, T., 129
 Sipos, J., 124
 Sirinides, P., 162
 Sitášová, Z., 198
 Škunca, D., 34
 Slavić, A., 73, 74
 Smallwood, W. N., 21
 Smeds-Nylund, A-S., 97, 100
 Sorić, I., 71, 80
 Soukup, P., 95
 Southworth, G., 211
 Spajić, B., 72
 Stanić, I., 71
 Staničić, S., 62, 63, 65, 66, 70, 72, 75, 136
 Stanković, D., 171, 172, 177
 Stanley, G. J., 48
 Steinbach, R., 46
 Steinkellner, H., 22
 Štemberger, T., 219
 Stenvall, J., 107
 Stoll, L., 19, 22, 29
 Stolt, S., 100
 Strakoš, J., 198
 Strittmatter, A., 32
 Strugar, V., 64
 Sundqvist, R., 97, 100
 Sunko, E., 73
 Suša, B., 34
 Szabó, I., 115, 116
 Szebedy, T., 116
- ## T
- Tavčar, I. M., 33
 Teikari, K., 104
 Temperley, J., 109
 Teodorović, J., 171, 172, 175, 177
 Terhart, E., 22
 Thomann, C., 21
 Thompson, M. P., 126
 Tian, M., 104
 Tóblová, E., 198
 Townsend, T., 27
 Trnková, K., 95
 Trojan, V., 95, 192
 Trojanová, I., 198
- ## U
- Uljens, M., 97, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 109
 Ulrich, D., 21
 Urbánek, P., 92
- ## V
- Van Velzen, B., 26
 Varga, R., 71
 Velichkov, A., 48, 57
 Verderber, É., 124
 Veselková, J., 198
 Vettenranta, J., 100
 Vican, D., 71, 72, 73, 74
 Virtanen, P., 107
 Vizek Vidović, V., 73
 Vršnik Perše, T., 70
 Vujisić, B., 137
 Vulkko, E., 104
 Vuohijoki, T., 103

W

Wahlstrom, K., 164
Watzlawick, P., 21
Wenström, S., 104
West-Burnham, J., 36, 37
Whelan, F., 175
Whitaker, K., 192
Wiesner, C., 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Wilkins, A. L., 126
Wu, N., 126
Wurster, S., 22, 23

Y

Yu, T., 126

Z

Zarins, S., 123, 128
Zavašnik, M., 222
Zenger, J., 21
Zrilić, S., 72
Žunić-Pavlović, V., 173



Slavica Ševkušić



Dušica Malinić



Jelena Teodorović

There are good arguments in favour of a publication about the development and current status of leadership in education in the context of the education policy and practice of Eastern and Central Europe. Indeed, compared to publications about educational leadership in Western Europe and Anglo-Saxon countries, there is a gap in knowledge... *Leadership in education - Initiatives and trends in selected European countries* reflects in a clear and readable manner the many developments and challenges of educational leadership in the selected countries and the work of many people who are committed to the scientific study of this field and to the development of schools and educational leaders.

Prof. Em. Dr. Eric Verbiest, University of Antwerp, Belgium

It is a great idea that the Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia, Faculty of Education, University of Kragujevac, Jagodina, Serbia, and Hungarian-Netherlands School of Educational Management, University of Szeged, Hungary, have taken the idea to create very acute and topical material for education, school leaders and policy makers, and not only them: it is also very useful for students in higher educational institutions studying programmes of educational management and teacher education. This book gives us insight not only into educational leadership, but also the policy of education, the system of education, and vision of the future of the development of educational leadership.

Prof. Paed. Dr. Ilze Ivanova, University of Latvia, Latvia

The book reviewed here presents a range of qualities. The first of these is its cognitive value. The texts collected in the publication create a multi-voice and thus a rich picture of the experiences gathered during the process of development of leadership in education in selected European countries. It happened thanks to the careful selection of authors and the quality of the texts they have prepared... The book provides intellectual tools to analyze what happens when we undertake the effort to carry out changes in social practice. The message of the book is to encourage further exploration, emphasizing the ambiguity, ambivalence, and complexity of educational leadership.

Prof. Dr. Henryk Mizerek, University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

ISBN 978-86-7447-149-4

