

## Chapter 3

### Commitment or surveillance: the ecology of change

*In healthy systems there is sharing and networking of good practice within and among schools on a collegial basis. It is an unhealthy system which relies on the constant routine attentions of an external body to police its schools... In such a system there is an important role for an Inspectorate or Office of Standards: to make itself as redundant as possible. (John MacBeath 1999:1)*

Improving a school is a journey of hope based on shared beliefs and values and real commitment. Michael Fullan has consistently written of school leaders working with their colleagues to build a vision for the future - a message enthusiastically adopted in numerous schools around the world.

By contrast, teachers in England in particular have been subjected to an extraordinary drive to control schools from above. The mechanisms and language of 'accountability' are everywhere, corroding educational processes, and affecting teachers and students alike.

The 'high surveillance, low trust' described by Mahoney and Hextall (2000:102) is not an ecology of sustainable development. It is profoundly demotivating, and a direct contributor to teacher shortages. It undermines the daily dynamics of teaching, which depend as much on emotions and flexible responsiveness as rational planning, and destroys the trust on which lasting improvement depends.

It is also subversive of the community building which is a necessity in any serious school improvement effort (Sergiovanni 1994:xi). Sergiovanni writes of a Californian school:

In their self-driven research processes, participants came to openly discuss their hopes and dreams. Through this process, we understood there were

shared common values around which we could begin to imagine a more ideal school.  
(ibid: 21).

This is the most essential difference between changes driven from within and without. Self-evaluation is intimately linked with the desire to improve; external evaluation which is imposed from above leads to a mess of conflicting emotions. We know that even when school inspections go well and the school gets a positive report, the staff are often left burdened and exhausted. Far from leading to improvement, research in England has shown that examination results dip in the summer after a school is inspected (Cullingford 1999). When the inspection goes badly, schools are left in a morass of negative feelings.

Authentic sustainable change requires a climate of trust.

Without trust, people divert their energy into self-protection and away from learning.

When trust is lacking, people will not take the risks necessary to move the school forward. When distrust pervades a school culture, it is unlikely that the school will be an energetic, motivating place. Instead a culture of self-preservation and isolation is likely to pervade the school. (Mitchell and Sackney 2000:49)

Without that trust, teachers are in no position to care for their students, and the environment is too fragile for fruitful change:

A great deal is said in the school improvement literature about a positive ethos and high expectations. When teachers feel badly about themselves, how can they make their students feel well about themselves?

A regime that provides human beings with no deep reasons to care for one another cannot long preserve its legitimacy. (Richard Sennett 1998:148)

### **Accountability or responsibility**

Fred Inglis draws a sharp distinction:

‘Accountability’ is, after all, not the same thing as responsibility, still less duty. It is a pistol loaded with blame to be fired at the heads of those who cannot answer charges.  
(1989:35-54)

Drawing on this thought, Michael Fielding (2001c) argues that accountability ‘tends to operate in hierarchical regimes... Motivation tends to be extrinsic to the task in hand and the sustainability of the required work rate or specified outcomes has more to do with the threat of penalties than the fulfilment of internal satisfaction or moral obligation.’ Such accountability is profoundly undemocratic, and quite different from a genuine

sense of responsibility to an identifiable community, but the concept has become reified, so that we no longer ask why or to whom we are accountable.

It undermines teacher professionalism, by always placing them in a position of deficit to externally-set targets which they can never hope to meet. Jamieson and Wikely (2001:172) argue that this model of accountability derives from the world of mass production as in the early American car factories, and is deeply alien to educational environments:

It is tempting to see a shadowy Tayloristic model in some of the school-effectiveness writing. There are 'experts' who have discovered the best way of teaching certain subjects; it is 'science' (cf Reynolds' 'applied science of teaching') and the 'workers' are to be instructed in these new models.

Management experts such as Senge now argue that this is not a good way to manage a commercial enterprise; it is truly ironic, at a time when industrial management consultants are drawing upon complexity theory, that government agencies are trying to impose an archaic and mechanistic model of linear rationality on schools. But there are deeper problems in trying to manage schools this way. The central processes of education are undermined by language that doesn't articulate moral purpose (Fullan 1993). The discourse of performativity, of efficiently fulfilling specific targets, is deeply corrosive of education. Fielding, in a critique of the language of SMART targets, argues:

Overemphasis on what works (in this case the raising of test scores) forces prior questions of purpose, i.e. what test scores are for, from the centre to the periphery of our attention and, in so doing, runs the risk of marginalising education in favour of a more limited notion of schooling. (Fielding 1999)

The more specific the government is about what it is that schools are to achieve, the more likely it is to get it, but the less likely it is to mean anything. (Reay and Wiliam 1999)

### **Caged birds don't fly**

'You can't mandate what matters. The more complex the change, the less you can force it.'  
Michael Fullan's aphorism is pertinent but not strong enough, as the accountability regime for English schools is actively undermining even what is already established.

I tell you what I am finding tricky at the moment... it has to be an ever deepening sense of loss of time... I feel so tired all of the time and just seem to be chasing shadows... its effect is to gnaw away at self-confidence... never enough time for us to stop and think as a team about what this initiative or that initiative means... we just do it...

It is a sense of loss as well... we feel like we have lost the closeness that we really value here... I feel ashamed really... I'm harassing people I've worked really closely with for five years to conform because their performance threshold depends on it.

The climate has shifted... it is all so damn serious now... lots of suits... grey-suit reform... I feel *compromised*. (Headteachers interviewed by Paul Clarke 2001:26-27)

This disruption of time, of relationships, of trust, ethic and ethos, is ultimately the manufacture of despair.

I think it undermines our professionalism particularly when it comes to being told what we can or can't do with our students here... I can put up with most things in this job but I fear for my colleagues who are disillusioned... good teachers who are reporting to their team leaders a sense of despair at the scale of the demands they face... they are saying that they don't have time to build reasonable relationships with the students...

They don't have the fun with students that they used to... they feel more detached and isolated from the curriculum they are teaching... give us the book and we'll teach it is something I'm hearing more and more of but I know that it is a cry of despair. (ibid:28)

This concern is shared by Michael Fielding, who questions whether teachers can give proper attention to young children when they are constantly under pressure of external demands:

How many teachers, particularly those of younger children, are now able to listen openly, attentively, and in a non-instrumental, exploratory way to their children / students without feeling guilty, stressed or vaguely uncomfortable about the absence of criteria or the insistence of a target tugging at their sleeves. (1999:280)

Emotions are central to teaching, not an optional extra, so a loss of authenticity or emotional integrity totally undermines our relationships and actions. Inglis warns against the *instrumentality* brought about by constant quality control:

The preposterous edifice of auditing, the mad rout of acronyms – HEFCE, TQM, OFSTED, TTA - blinds vision and stifles thought. Their most

certain consequence is to make enquiry service, knowledge instrumental and, above all, to make all of us, teachers at whatever level, boring, exhausted and hating the job. (Ingليس 2000:428)

Sustainable school improvement depends on a sense of hope and authentic purpose. As Paul Clarke argues, the current performativity regime is destroying teachers' orientation towards the future; it produces a 'sinister seriousness' which 'is eroding the identity of the teacher as a caring professional and replacing it with a functional technician... The fragmentation of the teaching process through target setting, combined with the depreciation of value as a currency of meaning inside the system, leads to alienation, lack of concern for each other as people and loss of any sense of sustainable self.' (Clarke 2001:30-31)

It is important for teachers and heads to speak out, and to articulate their experience and analysis of this environment, but more, to engage together in a collective resistance to the mechanisms of the accountability regime. Academics concerned for school improvement would do well to support the development of a collective voice – this would make a more significant contribution to sustainable improvement than collusion with the accountability regime.

Collective action and pressure were sufficient, for a while, to prevent tests being run and to delay the introduction of performance-related pay in England. In Scotland, the idea of performance bonuses was rejected in favour of an enhanced pay scale linked to study towards a Masters degree. Teacher unions in Canada and Australia are engaged in debates and active resistance to such destructive regimes. In the USA, teachers and academics have organised in the collective Rethinking Schools to campaign against government policy and at the same time to publish resources for socially-critical learning.

However, it is right to demand that politicians and officials should waken up to the limitations of the present regime. The caged bird cannot fly - or at least, not very far.

### **Opening the cage**

What can be done to resist and undermine the present accountability regime and to replace it with practices of responsive evaluation which are more democratic and build on the principle of hope? What are the issues and possible strategies?

### *Motivation*

It is possible to establish checks to establish a minimum level of quality such as ‘maximizing time on task’ and ‘keeping accurate records of pupil progress’, but this will never be enough to lead to high achievement. High reliability checks may be OK for McDonalds, but student motivation is what really counts in schools. Teachers too will be better motivated if they are able to reclaim their creativity in curriculum development, and to engage in some negotiation about content and methods with the students.

### *Risk-taking*

The confidence to take risks is vital in a changing environment. Learning from the Jackson-Keller School in San Antonio, Sergiovanni (1994: 173) says risk-taking involves:

- Going beyond the ‘norm’ and being open to new ideas
- Fear and excitement at the same time
- Assuming responsibility – flexibility – reaching new heights
- Going out on a limb with a safety net and being allowed to fall
- Going beyond what you feel you can do
- Believing in yourself
- ‘Going for it’
- Doing things you haven’t done before, falling out of your mould, not getting stale
- Gambling to go beyond mediocrity
- Trying new methods / approaches – being able to accept the consequences.

### *Keeping an eye on the big picture*

In a high-surveillance regime, ‘The push is more for the specific, the detailed, and the obvious. Slowly... we begin to lose the ability to focus on the moral, aesthetic, existential and intellectual dimensions of learning to live inside communities of people.’ (Inglis 2000:30) Teaching is more than a set of discrete competences which lead to a ‘drab utilitarian view of schooling’. Teachers work cannot be ‘calibrated... pre-defined in accordance with requirements which circumscribe the degrees of choice and decision-making within which they operate’. (Mahoney and Hextall 2000:90)

### *Thinking skills need thinking teachers*

Narrow attempts to direct teachers can only achieve restricted types of learning:

There is evidence that technicist approaches based on a behaviourist view of learning promote some basic skills and raise tests scores. This narrow and shallow perspective on teaching and learning, however, contributes little to pupils' desire to imagine, create, appreciate, and think critically. (Fink 2001:232)

### *Build the capacity for self-evaluation*

Low-trust regimes are very expensive to administer.

The 'conventional wisdom', propagated by the popular press, corporate leaders, and ambitious politicians, is that teachers and other educators are the source of most problems. They must, therefore, be obliged to comply with mandates through elaborate and usually expensive accountability measures. (ibid:231)

Dean Fink also points out that the very states (North Carolina and especially Texas) which British officials have used as exemplary models are those where the testing tail wags the teaching and learning dog and where the system discriminates heavily against the least advantaged.

### *Share higher-level aims*

Bureaucratic measures lead to a tokenistic fulfilment. Teachers change 'just enough to avoid sanction. Change stops when sanctions are moved.' Even in schools which depend on personal loyalty to a strong leader, without a shared vision teachers change 'just enough to receive gratification of needs' (Sergiovanni 1998:580). The energetic pursuit of worthwhile goals requires a genuinely collegial environment.

### *Focus on values*

Competences don't discriminate between formal and real fulfilment. A 'trainer' for NPQH, the main English headteacher qualification, argues:

The big questions aren't dealt with at all in the Standards – what if the candidate is a Nazi? I've got a woman at the moment and she's not a nice person... she shouldn't be there. I wouldn't want her near my child. She's horrible. She can't stand kids... but there's nothing in the NPQH Standards that says you have to like kids or care about them – or other human beings come to that. (Mahoney and Hextall 2000:54)

*Develop a broad view of quality indicators*

The competences discourse is so widespread that it is essential to look at the alternatives. The *Standard for Headship in Scotland* (SEED 1998), for example, sandwiches broad descriptors of professional actions' between values and personal qualities. The new *Standard for Chartered Teachers* (SEED 2002) examines the contribution of the experienced professional in terms of broadly defined areas of commitment, rather than a list of competences; the supporting examples are illustrative rather than prescriptive. It places great importance on educational and social values, and on teachers as reflective practitioners. The word *effective* is used to refer to more than just attainment: it entails promoting students' personal and social development, and facilitating the learning of children who are facing difficulties. (This definition of advanced professionalism was not, of course, achieved without the foresight and determination of the academics and teachers who drew up the key document, and their refusal to be drawn down the performativity road.)

*Publicly challenge the accountability regime*

Michael Fielding (2001a) uses the sub-title *Four Years Hard Labour* for his outstanding book on New Labour's educational policies in England and Wales. The previous government's mechanisms of control and surveillance have been extended and tightened, so the struggle to dismantle them will not be easy. A monolithic system has been established in which professional requirements established by the Teacher Training Agency are disseminated by the Standards Unit of the DfES and policed by OfSTED. This body now inspects everyone from toddlers to directors of education – a monolithic surveillance from cradle to grave. This means, however, that more people have a stake in dismantling it!

*Expose the inadequacy of the 'quick-fix' solution*

Government agencies are still laying down quick-fix top-down methods for improving struggling schools, such as OfSTED's recipe for 'turning round' schools in special measures:

- *strong* leadership
- *vigorous* action to improve the quality of teaching, pupils' progress and levels of attainment *quickly*
- and taking steps *quickly and effectively* to improve pupils' behaviour.

Let us focus instead on providing sustainable and non-threatening support for schools in difficulties.

### *Rebuild initial teacher education*

The system is seriously damaging the education of new teachers. One headteacher commented on the new competences:

We need professionals not technicians, thinking and reflective intellects not insensitive bullish practitioners, flexible, developmental learning providers and not routine, systems-orientated instructors... Unless they (teachers) can inspire the young people they teach as well as instruct or direct them, they will end up as... the teaching version of Mr Plod. (Mahoney and Hextall 2000:45)

Teacher educators, and their mentors in schools, need to reassert the need to consider issues such as democracy, social justice, curriculum design and personal and social development. These are professional rights and responsibilities, not an optional extra. Beginner teachers need encouragement to see themselves as reflective practitioners from the start.

### **Models of responsible professionalism**

#### *Self-evaluation*

We have to argue for processes which promote genuine responsibility rather than its parody 'accountability'. Internally-driven school review has been shown to work in many different education systems. John MacBeath successfully promoted the idea of school self-evaluation, which is officially embedded in the Scottish system through the document *How Good is Our School?* There is always a danger of complacency, but schools are beginning to use critical friends and consultants, including local authority advisers, to avoid this.

#### **The three principles of successful evaluation**

- i. Self-evaluation must have priority. It is much more effective for school development than external evaluations, and should therefore be the starting point of any evaluation process.
- ii. External evaluation is necessary, because the internal participants inevitably have their blindspots. (External evaluation may include standardised tests or a formal inspection, but invited consultants, peer reviews from colleagues in other schools, and observation by academics or parents might be more useful.)
- iii. Authentic evaluation must be distinguished from 'façade evaluations'. Façade evaluations are most likely when they are imposed from without, or when there is no agreement between internal and external actors, or when it is felt to be threatening. (Rolff 1998:31)

John MacBeath's recent books (1999; MacBeath, Schratz, Meuret and Jakobsen 2000; MacBeath and McGlynn 2002) provide accounts of many different approaches to self-evaluation, including an entire 'toolkit' to support different activities.

### *Networks*

In the United States, many schools have engaged in voluntary networks such as the League of Professional Schools, the Coalition of Essential Schools and Accelerated Schools Project (see References for websites). Often these bodies unite around principles which run counter to official policy or traditional practices. Members agree to the central aims of the coalition, but are free to find their own solutions. For example, the Coalition of Essential Schools seeks to develop challenge and in-depth learning rather than wide curriculum coverage. It believes in establishing smaller communities within larger schools, each with a team of responsible teachers who can cover the major specialisms between them – and no teacher to be involved with more than 80-90 pupils in total. The organisation provides conferences and on-line communities for sharing ideas, as well as support through resources and with evaluation.

### *Parents*

We cannot and should not go back to a principle of full professional autonomy. The world has changed, and other professions such as doctors have had to adjust to an increasingly vocal and informed client group.

It is claimed that professionals who are opposed to accountability are simply refusing to be responsible to the public who finance the service. (The bizarre accusation of 'provider capture', implies that teachers want to dominate education for their own ends.) We need to insist on establishing genuine responsibility to a visible community, rather than to remote government bodies and their agents. Jorunn Møller (Norway) emphasises the importance of defending standards and values by engaging in open discussion with parents:

Principals and teachers should enter the public debate with both their critiques of educational policies and their internally defined criteria of teacher professionalism. A professional role entails professional responsibility, and this implies that teachers and schools leaders must make their experience more visible and public. (2002: 18-19)

This involves real debate, including a struggle for values:

Education's responsibilities are primarily to the democracy of *citizens* rather than to the democracy of *consumers*. (ibid:19)

### *Student voice*

Finally, we need to develop new ways of recognising student rights. John MacBeath and Kate Myers are coordinating a project *Consulting Pupils about Teaching and Learning* which involves learners researching their own schools. The students are involved in framing the research questions, and not only in providing or gathering information. The findings then feed into school development planning. (See the special issue of *Forum on Student Voice*, Fielding 2001b.) The most exciting and ambitious project has been the *Learning School* project involving students from eight different countries in evaluating their own and each others' schools (MacBeath and Sugimine 2003).

Michael Schratz (Innsbruck) has developed a new approach to consulting young children on school development. Recognising the imbalance of power when adults interview children, he gave children cameras to take a set of photographs which they displayed and discussed with each other and their teachers (in MacBeath et al 2000:151). Another method is to ask pupils to keep a diary (ibid:153).

Other models of learner involvement are being promoted by the Scottish School Ethos Network (see website), through the enhanced use of school councils and the promotion of student-run initiatives. The network organises an annual conference and produces regular school reports.

### **Changing conceptions of leadership**

One of the most misleading declarations of school effectiveness research is that schools need 'strong leadership'. (The choice of adjective was not, however, decided by the statistics; it was a category chosen by the researchers, starting in the late 1980s – and it is worth noting that leadership and management were barely mentioned in Michael Rutter's (1979) famous study *Fifteen Thousand Hours*.) The word *strong* is capable of a range of meaning. It might reflect determination in protecting colleagues from bureaucratic overload or less important government initiatives; it might mean enabling staff to reinterpret them to fit local needs; it may involve skill and sensitivity in changing the attitudes of more cynical teachers. Government agencies which sought out 'superheads' who could 'turn schools round' found the formula of little practical value when many of those recruited proved ineffective in the situation or resigned. The nature of headship clearly depends upon our view of educational purposes and the particular context.

Given the serious difficulties of school development in areas of high poverty and migration, it is remarkable how few qualitative studies have

been undertaken. There is the beginning of a body of evidence which indicates that the improvement of inner city schools requires a strong values base, including social justice and a willingness to engage with community perspectives. (Blair and Bourne 1998; Wrigley 2000)

Often headteachers derive meaning and motivation from their own roots. I interviewed Carol Howarth, head of Spittal Primary School in Glasgow, a school with a mainly white working-class population and high levels of poverty:

I get very angry when people write off working class communities, partly because that's the background I'm from. My parents were keen that all of us gained qualifications, and it upsets me to hear people talk as if parents in an area don't care about education.

(Wrigley 2001a:17).

Tom MacDonald, head of All Saints High School, Glasgow, has spoken to the media many times about the positive impact of asylum seekers on his school. He clearly identifies with their situation not only from a Catholic perspective on social justice but also from his own family roots:

We have had families removed in the middle of the night to the Detention Centre at Dungavel, people who suffered terribly in their home countries. But we should also question the words *economic migrant*. My own family were economic migrants from Ireland. It's about survival, not greed, and a natural desire for a decent life. And many Scots left for the USA and Canada as economic migrants. (Wrigley 2002a:4)

'High expectations' for his school is a political concept, involving dimensions of personal effort and international solidarity:

It's not 'how clever are you?' but 'how are you clever?' If you're clever at organising a disco, we value that, and you can move from one area of success to another...

We emphasise at assembly that it is our *privilege* to help our International Students, and that we can learn a lot from them – about the world, about different ways of living, and about other people's problems. And it's about the gospel values of caring for one another, of being a community where people care for each other. (ibid)

Reva Klein interviewed a Hackney primary head 'of Italian parentage, married to a Turkish Cypriot, speaking with an unmistakeable Belfast twang. No wonder she's rapturously at home with parents from the four corners of the world.' There is clearly an autobiographical element in her determination to provide an exciting education for her diverse community, and to 'get away from drumming things into the children according to the National Curriculum' (Klein 2001:3).

The responsiveness and rootedness of school leaders has received far too little attention in official documents and in research. In explaining the qualities of an *intelligent school*, and consequently of intelligent leadership, Barbara MacGilchrist lists contextual intelligence, reflective intelligence, collegial intelligence, emotional intelligence, spiritual intelligence, and ethical intelligence. These are aspects which we should continue to explore for schools in particular contexts.

- Contextual intelligence... is characterised by a welcoming responsiveness to visitors, new ideas and events in the immediate environment.
- Collegial intelligence describes the capacity for staff in particular to work together to improve their practice in the classroom... Underpinning collegial intelligence is a recognition that whilst individuals can make a difference, the sum of the parts is greater than the whole when staff work together to improve and develop one another's practice.
- Emotional intelligence is to do with a school's capacity to allow the feelings of both pupils and staff to be owned, expressed and respected. (MacGilchrist 1997:104-8)

### **Shared leadership in context**

There is increasing interest in the distribution of leadership in schools (see Chapter 2 above). This may require structural as well as cultural changes, in order to enable teachers to work together. Its success also depends on thoughtful evaluation of the ways in which power is shared.

The distribution of power and influence is context dependent. A particular feature of successful schools with bilingual students is leadership from the English as an Additional Language specialists, including discussion of whole-school policy, observing lessons from the learner's perspective and coaching colleagues in the classroom when introducing new teaching methods (Wrigley 2000). This cannot happen successfully if the language specialists are simply peripatetic visitors, floating between schools and unable to develop a sufficient level of trust. It also requires serious professional development for the EAL teacher, through extended courses and regular cooperation with similar specialists working in other schools. Similarly there is considerable untapped potential for development of the leadership role of learning support and pastoral / guidance staff in other types of school.

A major dilemma for new headteachers is the balance between personal leadership and developing the leadership of others. Fullan insists that it is

insufficient to speak of conveying or sharing a vision, there must be collective vision-building. However, new headteachers often find some resistance to these more democratic expectations.

Some people quite frankly said, 'Look, it's the principal's job to make decisions' and almost accused me of abdicating my position. I explained to teachers that I don't have a monopoly on good ideas. (Blase 1995:107)

This is clearly a difficult tension to negotiate, requiring flexibility and compromise alongside conceptual clarity. Sergiovanni accepts that a new principal, faced with a lack of consensus on goals, may have to begin by relying on *bureaucratic authority* ('position power, the authority of rules, the control one has over rewards and punishments') and *personal authority* ('in the form of human relations skills – to enter into a series of trades with teachers'). This might be necessary to 'get enough unity in what we are doing, enough common effort, to begin a meaningful dialogue' (1994:194). It is important to be clear from the start, though, on the need for community building.

This involves building a community life involving staff, students and parents, and moving towards a shared purpose, a strong sense of collegiality, collaboration and professional community. Roles are no longer so sharply differentiated: 'Let kids be leaders – let teachers be learners'. (1994:171) Sergiovanni argues that his ideal of a community of leaders is not impossible:

In communities leadership is not defined as the exercise of power over others. Instead it is the exercise of wit and will, principle and passion, time and talent, and purpose and power in a way that allows the group to increase the likelihood that shared goals will be accomplished. (ibid: 170)

He is critical of styles of 'personal leadership' which take the form of people-handling skills. His preferred focus is on shared meanings:

Leaders rely less on their people-handling skills and more on the power of compelling ideas and the meanings they hold for others.

### **Cultures and values – the wider environment**

School improvement research, along with the practical efforts to develop schools, is focusing increasingly on the transformation of school culture, but there is a temptation to concentrate on the internal dynamics within schools as if this could be separated from the wider context. In reality, school culture and development is closely bound up with the wider environment, both in terms of the school's locality and in terms of political policies.

Authentic school improvement, in a context of accountability and top-down control, is a problematic activity. Shared leadership and collegiality are necessary in order to resist some of the pressures, but they require ideological clarity about the wider environment.

In a blame culture, it is helpful to remember Bourdieu's advice that, even it is painful to make social suffering visible and to theorise the connections with the power structures, it is also 'liberating for those who had thought it was all their fault' (Bourdieu 1999:629).

Teachers and principals who wish to turn their schools round need to begin by turning themselves around to engage with the life experiences of the families they serve. They need to reconnect education to the life of the community, however difficult this may seem.

Clarity is the beginning of resistance. School leaders need to defend their educational values against an adverse wider culture. *Leading Schools in Times of Change* (Day et al 2000) shows how headteachers need skill in resolving tensions and dilemmas in ways which do not leave them compromised. Their leadership depends on the cultivation of hope, in themselves and in their schools:

In mediating between their own moral framework and those of the communities in which they worked, their focus was always upon the betterment of the young people and staff who worked in their schools. They remained also, often against all the odds, enthusiastic and committed to learning. Their strength was demonstrated in their hopefulness at all times. (ibid: 178)

