Chapter 1
Prelude: Tuning the Instrument

Lejf Moos

1.1   New Discourses Meet Established Structures and Social Capital

A *Nordic model* of education seems to be well known internationally. In the Nordic research network: 'Transnational Tendencies and Nordic Education', we wanted to find out if such a model really existed or had existed prior to massive global and transnational influences. Are new expectations furthering or limiting the development of Nordic values? Are transnational influences homogenising educational politics and practices? And are traditional cultures and discourses persistent?

The focus of this book is therefore to explore to what extent transnational influences change national and local values and practices in the Nordic education systems and specifically in educational leadership. The transnational and global discourse on educational leadership is mostly formed according to UK/US thinking and traditions. Pivotal bases of these discourses are social division and cleavages, strong hierarchical societies/class societies with liberal democracies and clearly segregated education systems with school streaming.

The Nordic discourse describes a more equal society and flat hierarchies with participatory democracy and a comprehensive schooling with strong local community roots. The Nordic discourse also builds on a very long tradition for trust between stakeholders. The governments used to trust municipalities to be able to run good schools without demanding documentation. It has also been a tradition that government, municipal authorities and school leaders trusted teachers' professional knowledge and practices.

L. Moos (✉)
Department of Education (DPU), Aarhus University, Copenhagen, Denmark
e-mail: moos@dpu.dk

There is a strong tendency in research on educational leadership to acknowledge the importance of the context. Leadership needs to be aware of the political, societal, cultural and institutional context in which it works (Leithwood and Riehl 2003). But it may be true that we forget about the history in which leadership is embedded: the practice, structure, values and norms of the local and greater communities that have emerged over the years and are still present as a sounding board for new perceptions, impressions and influences (Bourdieu 1990).

It is very important to get a better understanding of the historical and societal background for school leadership in the Nordic systems, because leadership thinking and practices, individual and community social capital (Bourdieu 1990) are formed by the society, culture and context they are part of. They are only partially shaped by politics, discourses and literature, but primarily by national/local values, traditions, structures and practices. It is difficult to distinguish the sources for Nordic leadership thinking and practice. The reason for this could be that so much of the literature we are using in the Nordic contexts is basically of a UK/US origin, and many of the research projects we are engaged in have UK/US foundations. An example of this is the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) (Day and Leithwood 2007), in which many of the Nordic members of the network still participate.

School leadership researchers from the Nordic countries (Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Norway and Sweden) have for 3 years participated in a Nordic researcher network. The purpose of the network was to find out how Nordic educational politics and practice are influenced by the signals and advice of transnational agencies like the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) and the European Commission.

We wanted to find out if the new expectations are promoting or restraining the development of a Nordic model. To what extent are transnational influences homogenising educational politics and practices? And to what extent are traditional values, cultures and discourses persistent? To what extent are Nordic education systems similar? And to what extent is this similarity different from other systems? Here we shall restrict our analyses to comparing the Nordic system with UK/US systems.

In order to put the analyses in the chapters into perspective, we shall give outlines of the overarching transnational influences and of the cultural and structural capital they meet from 1970 and onwards: differences and similarities between UK/US and Nordic social structures and norms, because they are seen as pivotal foundations for relations and norms in schools. We also outline educational traditions in the two areas, because educational purposes, values and structures are the basis of educational leadership.

To get a clearer picture of similarities and differences, we apply two perspectives: country cases from all the Nordic countries give a rather short analysis of the state of values, practices and discourses in the five systems. These cases are produced by local researchers and thus give insights into national and even local cultures and discussions. The second part of the book consists of six thematic chapters. We have chosen themes which are important across education systems, as we see

them through the present lenses. The thematic chapters thus give comparisons and discussions that clarify where differences and similarities are found, both between Nordic systems and in relation to the international literature.

The findings and arguments are enlightening to leadership researchers, students and practitioners within as well as outside the Nordic countries, because local/ Nordic findings are put into perspective by external analyses, and they in turn put the international analyses into perspective. This is mainly so, though, because they give new images – in relation to neo-liberal descriptions – of relations between global influences and Nordic participatory democracy and comprehensive education and of the ways Nordic school leaders develop their thinking and practice.

The chapters draw on economic and governance theories: neo-liberalism (e.g. Pedersen 2010), governance and new public management theories on how transnational and national agencies influence societies and institutions (e.g. Foucault 2001/1978; Moos 2009b); theories from Scandinavian neo-institutionalism on how institutions respond to pressure and influences from above (e.g. Røvik 2007); and theories on educational purposes and aims (e.g. Eisner 1996; Telhaug et al. 2006) and on educational leadership with a focus on relations and functions (e.g. Leithwood and Riehl 2003; Røvik 2007; Spillane 2006; Woods 2005, 2011). Interpretations of these theories will be unfolded here and in the chapters.

A general perspective is that many new policies are being developed and implemented at present. When they meet the educational and governance fields, they meet embedded structures, discourses, norms and values that are sounding boards for new influences. Some new ideas are implemented, others are transformed into new forms and some are ignored. There is no one-to-one transfer from one field to others (Bourdieu 1990; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1996). We are interested in determining if the new forms of educational leadership in Nordic systems are so similar that they can be referred to collectively as a Nordic model.

1.2 Global Influences

The following description is very general, as it focuses on the relations of global and transnational agencies and national stakeholders. It does not go into detail on how national and Nordic politicians and policymakers interpret, translate, channel and use those influences. This is done in the country cases and the thematic chapters.

Governance analyses (Dean 1999; Foucault 1976/1994) have established that it is not possible to govern a nation, its institutions or even its individuals by economic and administrative regulation through legislation only (this section is adapted from Moos 2009b). This understanding is being supplemented, or perhaps even replaced, by the understanding that societies cannot be governed from one point, i.e. the government. Governments and other authorities must see themselves as 'leaders of leaders' through indirect forms of power in 'polyphonic settings' (Pedersen 2005). These forms are meant to influence the ways in which institutions and individuals perceive, interpret, understand and act. The actions themselves

become less important in this era. The values and norms behind them are more important from a governmental point of view, because indirect forms of power attempt to influence values and norms.

Paralleling that trend are supra- and transnational agencies such as the OECD and the European Commission, which are – when it comes to education and its governance and politics – not commissioned to use direct forms of power, like regulations, and therefore develop *soft forms of governance* within very general globalisation trends.

Globalisation is an intricate pattern of changes in economics and the division of labour (e.g. the emergence of more than 50,000 massive transnational companies, which are loyal to their shareholders and therefore able to force governments to shape their financial policies according to market logics), changes in communication (especially the Internet and other forms of split-second, global mass media), changes in politics (with only one global political system remaining), and changes in culture (Martin and Schumann 1997). More recent areas affected by global interdependencies are the financial market, the climate and the environment.

One can detect strong tendencies towards designing a new global marketplace with few or none barriers for cross-country operations: the free flow of finances, goods and workers (Pedersen 2010). The prime driver for this deregulation of cooperation was neo-liberal economy; hence, the core logics and theories of the new world order were economic: public choice, rational choice, principal-agent, transaction cost theory and scientific management (Pedersen 2005).

The German philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas (2001) writes that societies engaged in the process of financial globalisation tend to possess four characteristics:

- An anthropological view of human beings as rational instruments willing and able to make informed decisions and to offer their labour freely in the market place
- An image of a post-egalitarian society that tolerates social marginalisation, expulsion and exclusion
- An image of a democracy where citizens are reduced to consumers in a marked society and where the role of the state is redefined to that of a service agency for clients and consumers
- Finally, a view that policy should be aimed at dismantling state regulation (author's translation)

These are building bricks for a neo-liberal picture of the world, says Habermas. The latter element would seem to challenge the very basis of democracy. If Habermas is correct in his somewhat polemic and therefore crude depiction of the neo-liberal effort to transform policy-driven societies into marked-driven societies, there have to be fundamentally new conditions for institutions, citizens and democracy.

One global effect is the trend towards neo-liberal market politics (with a focus on decentralisation, output, competition and strong leadership) (Pedersen 2010) as well as accountability politics in the public sphere (with a focus on re-centralisation and centrally imposed standards and quality criteria). This trend is known as new public management (NPM) (Hood 1991; MacBeath et al. 1996; Moos 2006a).

Barriers between nations in the areas of economics, industry and trade and culture and communication have been torn down, and new relationships and new coalitions and liaisons have been formed. Some of these new relationships are ad hoc; some are more formal. Most of them have been established primarily to promote economic cooperation. The G8 (2006) (the coalition of France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the UK, the USA, Canada and Russia), the World Bank, the OECD and the EU are just a few of these powerful agencies.

1.3   Supra- and Transnational Agencies

The OECD and the European Commission are two powerful players in the global field of educational politics. They have so far not been positioned to make educational policy regulation on behalf of member governments. However, this fact might change in respect to the EU due to the Lisbon Agreement. National policies are influenced by supranational EU policies 'that create, filter and convey the globalisation process' (Antunes 2006, 38). This influence is one of the purposes of the EU, but not the purpose for which it was originally intended. In the Lisbon Agreement education is defined as an aspect of social services and, therefore, within the range of commission decisions and regulations (EC 2000).

Since both agencies – and their member governments – are interested in international collaboration and inspiration, they have developed alternative methods for influencing the thinking and regulation of education in member states. The EU has developed the *open method of coordination* (Lange and Alexiadou 2007) and the OECD a method of *peer pressure* (Moos 2006b; Schuller 2006).

At the European Commission's meeting in Lisbon, participants agreed to develop a flexible method based on reflexivity and indicators. This method should include flexible governance tools that rely on *soft law*. A major feature of the open method is reflexivity; member states and institutions should inspire each other through *peer reviews* and policy learning, e.g. best practices. An important tool is a set of indicators meant to enable the identification of best practice (Lange and Alexiadou 2007).

CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation), the OECD bureau that manages education and educational research, is a powerful player in the globalisation of economies and, thereby, the restructuring of nation states (Henry et al. 2001).

Both the EU and the OECD are very much in accordance with the decision of the WTO's GATS agreement (WTO 1998) to include education services in the areas of free trade, thus transforming education to a commodity (Moos 2006b; Pitman 2008).

These influences on policy and practices are not linear and straightforward. Lingard (2000) describes them as 'mutually constitutive relations' between distinctive fields or spaces. Lawn and Lingard claim that transnational organisations such as the OECD act as shapers of emerging discourses of educational policy, as 'expressed in reports, key committees, funding streams and programmes' (Lawn and Lingard 2002). The main influence comes from the OECD setting the agenda (Schuller 2006), both within the whole organisation – e.g. international comparisons

such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) (Hopman 2008) and TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) – and within individual member nations. If a government wants to put an issue on the national agenda, but lacks the strength to do so on its own, it can call on the OECD for help. The OECD then forms a team that reviews the state of affairs in the member state, based on a detailed and comprehensive framework designed by the OECD. The team's report often forms the basis for political action in the states. The review of educational research and development in Denmark is a relevant example (Moos 2006b).

This strategy is explicated in the OECD publication Education Catalogue (OECD 1998) as a strategy of 'peer pressure' that 'encourages countries to be transparent, to accept explanations and justification, and to become self-critical' (OECD 1998, 2).

Both agencies distinguish between *hard governance* and *soft governance*. The choice of terms is interesting, because hard law/governance stands for regulations that influence people's behaviour, while soft law/governance influences the way people perceive and think about themselves and their relationships with the outside world. Soft governance therefore influences agents in much *deeper* ways. While these methods of influence might seem softer, or more educational, the effects of soft influence are harder and more profound.

Accompanying soft governance, transnational agencies develop social technologies that national governments build on, adjust and use in their endeavour to influence public sector institutions and practitioners. Social technologies are technologies with a purpose or an aim. It can be routines, manuals, methods and tools that very often conceal the aims (Dean 1999; Foucault 1991; Moos 2009a). The social technologies used by the two transnational agencies seem to follow the same pattern, which builds on the liberal core concept of citizens' (or consumers') choice, presupposing that citizens are given a screen, a background, upon which to make their choices. Therefore, there must be comparisons between competitors and, eventually, some kinds of indicators that can function as yardsticks for making the selection the national interpretations.

Transnational influences are, as mentioned, forms of *soft governance*: advice, discourses, etc. These are to some degree taken in by the national political and administrative systems and transformed to national policies, reinventing national education. However, something central spills over. When joining international comparison programmes, like PISA or TIMSS, national governments take over international standards and let them replace national standards (Hopman 2008).

The influences are described and analysed in much more detail in the chapters of this volume. Impacts on the discourses and practices in schools and school leadership in the Nordic countries are being discussed. Do we see a homogenisation – as a kind of institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1983) – towards a UK/US model or towards a Nordic model?

One example can illustrate the tendency. When we – Danish, Norwegian and Swedish researchers – joined the ISSPP in 2002, we agreed to observe a shared format for national research. That meant that we should follow the same set of

criteria for selecting schools. The schools should have an upward performance track on national league tables over a period of 3–4 years, very good inspection reports for the same period of years and principals with good reputations among peers. The criteria were born in the UK/US political systems and posed problems for the Nordic colleagues. We had at the time no public national testing and thus no league table, and we had no national inspection. But of course we could find school principals with a good reputation. We had to modify the criteria in different ways. In Denmark we involved superintendents and asked them to point to successful principals in their school districts (Moos et al. 2007, 104).

1.4 Different Societies, Diverse Discourses and Practices

In short, the Nordic countries are by tradition more egalitarian than the UK and the USA. This historical-sociological fact constitutes a basis for the development of local practices, relations and values. In the UK and the USA, it is part of the traditional consciousness and discourse to accept steeper hierarchies and stronger, more direct leadership than in the Nordic systems, where flatter structures and more collegial relations are expected.

Political differences contribute to this trend. The UK and the US democracies are more liberal with a deep belief in individual choice and competition, while the Nordic countries have a more social democratic history with a deep belief in community and collaboration. The Nordic welfare state is described as based on belief in a strong state, in a particular set of labour market institutions and a high rate of investment in human capital (Andersen et al. 2007). This is (only a fraction of) the background that forms the prism through which new impulses and expectations are seen and understood.

1.4.1 Social Differences

The first theme is the theme of social conditions, relations and differences. Building on materialistic, sociological theories (Bourdieu 1977, 1990; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977), it is reasonable to take the social conditions in which education is placed as the point of departure for educational analysis. Therefore, a few figures from the UK and the USA as well as the Nordic countries are included.

Differences in equality/inequality and distribution of income (the GINI index, after taxes and transfers) show that on a scale from 0 (total equality) to 100 (total inequality), the UK and the USA score around 36–40. The Nordic countries score 22–29 (OECD 2012). This means that the gulf between poor and rich is much wider in the UK and the USA than in the Nordic countries. Over a period of 10–15 years, unfortunately the gap is widening in all these countries. The difference between the Nordic countries and the USA and the UK remains the same.

Similar results are seen in a UN report. In the Nordic countries the richest 20% of the population is approximately four times richer than the poorest 20%, while the richest 20% of the population is approximately eight times richer than the poorest 20% in the UK and the USA (UN 2006 in Wilkinson and Pickett 2009, 17).

Health and social problems are closely related to social inequality, not to average incomes, as might be expected. The divide produces health and social problems (UN 2006 in Wilkinson and Pickett 2009, 20).

Another effect of social inequality is the level of people who believe that *most people can be trusted*. The level is 60–70% in the Nordic countries and only 30–35% in the UK and the USA (Arbor 2005 in Wilkinson and Pickett 2009, 52). A very similar picture arises, when we look at relations between social inequality and *women's status* (Wilkinson and Pickett 2009, 60).

These figures point to analyses and discussions on social class. Social class is a concept in social sciences and political theory, centred on models of social stratification in which people are grouped into a set of hierarchical social categories. A social class encompasses people with the same social, economic or educational status. Marxist theory tells us that class relations build on relations to means of production. So class is a sociological signifier for the distribution of wealth and thus predominantly an economic category. However, some sociologists argue that 'Class is no longer an important basis of social identity and interests […] Perhaps of more importance is the noticeable effect of education on class identity and perceptions' (Evans 1992, 251).

When it comes to the perception of social position and belonging, it is interesting to combine Evans' argument with analyses of free – state funded – access to education. The proportion of public versus private proportions of funding for education differ. For example, Norway has only 1.8% and Denmark 7.8% private funding for education, while the UK has 30.5% (Eurydice 2012, 93), which means that it is a greater challenge for families to find funding for education in the UK (and the USA) than in the Nordic countries. It is fair to argue that there is a clearer social divide – and perception of social positioning in the UK and the USA than in the Nordic countries. The gap between poor and rich is larger in the UK and the USA, and this coincides with the perception of trust: half as many people can be trusted in the UK and the USA as in the Nordic countries. There used to be a steeper hierarchy in the UK, though.

This is also evident from the traditional institutional structures. In the UK there were eight layers in schools: school leader, deputy, assisting deputy, department leader, deputy department leader, assistant deputy department leader, teacher and assisting teacher. The Nordic countries usually had a flat structure with three layers: school leader, deputy and teacher.

1.4.2   Educational Legacy

It is sometimes forgotten in political discourse that school leaders are leading the schools. Danish policymakers and administrators claim that school leadership is not different from leading other public institutions like daycare centres, elderly care or road maintenance (Klausen 2001). Therefore, there is only one formal diploma

education for all public middle leaders, with no attention to specific institutions (EVA 2012).

We do not agree with this approach. School leaders are supposed to manage schools and ensure optimal conditions for the core function of a school (student learning), the core mediator of learning (teachers' education) and the core context for education and learning (the school organisation) (Day and Leithwood 2007; Moos 2011).

As this is the basis for our analyses, we need to describe both Nordic and UK/US ways of thinking education. In order to get an idea of the traditional ways of thinking education in the UK and the USA and in the Nordic countries, we provide a short account of the history of progressivism. The US description is inspired by Blossing et al. (forthcoming 2013). Building on Dewey (1901, 1916), progressive education reconciles both individualism and community by stimulating the child to develop in her/his own way and learn from personal experience and concurrently organise the learning processes so that cooperation and social interdependence are encouraged. This is an educational ideology that is well suited for a school system that aims to embrace all societal groups and a wide variety of students. Unfortunately, Dewey's notion of democracy, as a way of life, is a part of progressivism that is being overshadowed by the recent neo-liberal and user-oriented claims for adapted teaching and effective learning for the individual child.

In the USA progressive education has from the beginning been said to be in opposition to the Herbartian subject-oriented tradition, and later on it disapproved of both the social efficiency movement and the psychological child-centred pedagogy, respectively (Kliebard 1985). According to Eisner (1996), several competing ideologies struggled for hegemony in the development of the American public school. Progressivism has incorrectly been considered the leading ideology in the USA, which it was not. It flourished in some small independent schools, but overall there was more talk about progressivism than practice.

Progressivism met many challenges in the second half of the twentieth century. The Sputnik chock in the 1960s directed attention towards programmes in mathematics and natural sciences and since the 1970s American school policy has focused on school effectiveness and high standards. National tests have had a strong position in the USA for a long time. The destiny of progressivism is summed up by Eisner in this way: 'Hence, since the late 1960s public concerns about the quality of American education have grown, and as a result, interest in progressive practices, often seen as antithetical to what is truly educationally substantive, has decreased' (1996, 321). The American preference for achievement tests can also serve as an explanation for its fate, according to Kliebard. The things that Dewey sought to promote through his curriculum were difficult to measure and therefore difficult to fit into a system that depended on 'that kind of external inspection which goes by the name of examination' (Dewey 1901 in Kliebard 1995, 74–75).

Three elements in the American curriculum tradition in particular became a challenge for progressivism: first, the American idea about curriculum objectives, originating from, among others, Franklin Bobbitt (1924); second, the conception of *learning outcomes* as an entity that can be measured objectively; and third, the technological means-end model formulated by Ralph Tyler (1949). They have all

contributed to a focus on education as an end and not as the process Dewey argued for. These three elements serve as important tools in the neo-liberal governance systems that have been developing since the 1990s, both in the USA and in the rest of the world. They are very important foundations for the emergence of global competition in education-based comparisons, transnational indicators and political demand of accountability, measured on outcomes.

In Europe the progressive pedagogy had a less ideological character than in the USA; it was directed more towards normative advice about how to organise teaching and learning programmes. Often, we find a combination of visions from several sources, partly supported by research on good practice. For many years, in the inter-war period, Nordic educationalists found their main inspiration on the European continent: George Kerschensteiner and Maria Montesorri. Kerschensteiner developed the concept of the *Labour School* (*Arbeitsschule*). A key aspect of his theory was that he considered children to be physically active by nature. This characteristic should be given room and further developed in school. This is in line with psychological and philosophical trends of the time, to base education on the nature of children. Consequently, some referred to this as child-centred education (*Vom Kinde aus*). The other key aspect of Kerschensteiner's theory was that learning in schools should take place in peer groups, student communities, in order to strengthen their social education (Kerschensteiner 1928/1980).

The second major inspiration was the Italian physician and educational theorist Maria Montesorri (Montesorri 1917). In line with Kerschensteiner and psychological theories of the time, she believed that children were perfectly able to learn if they were allowed to act according to their own needs and interests. While Kerschensteiner inspired teachers of youth in lower secondary school (eighth and ninth forms), Montesorri was more inspirational to teachers in preschools and the first forms in primary school.

One strong trend in Nordic, as well as much European, educational politics from the Second World War until the 1970s and 1980s is a belief in comprehensive education, *Bildung*, and thus in education for democracy. The welfare state was emerging and needed education to support its nation-building processes in order to gain acceptance and support from all citizens (Pedersen 2010; Tjeldvoll 1997). The main aim of this education was education for active participation in a democracy; thus, it builds on a social-democratic concept of strong relations between individuals and communities, leaving many curriculum decisions to professional teachers in collaboration with students and parents. Telhaug and colleagues in an analysis of 'The Nordic Model in Education' write:

> In the golden age of Nordic social democracy, social virtues such as equal opportunity, co-operation, adaptation and solidarity were considered to be the main goals of compulsory schooling. Mainly for this reason, the ideal was that the adaptation of education to the individual should take place within the framework of the school class. The argument for the comprehensive school was made both directly and indirectly, using, in addition, a third objective to which considerable attention was paid in the post-war period. This was the political objective, or the democratic socialization of pupils. (2006, 253)

Based on theories on education from the European continent, one can describe the Nordic approach as a *Bildung* approach; the purpose of education is comprehensive

Bildung. According to this understanding children need to understand themselves as parts of bigger communities and, at the same time, as authoritative individuals by acquiring common knowledge, insight and historical, cultural and global understanding. The UK/US competitive state understanding underscores the need for acquiring competencies, readiness for action, which can be understood as tools for action. Human beings are seen as resources, and the need of education is linked with the need of developing employable students, says J.E. Kristensen from Aarhus University in a recent interview (Olsen 2012).

An important aspect of comprehensive education is the structure of the education system. Is it segregated or coherent? The Nordic countries progressed gradually from the beginning of the twentieth century from segregated schools or streaming in schools towards a comprehensive, non-streamed school and succeeded in that respect in the post-war years (Ekholm and Moos 2012). The situation in the UK and the USA is very different, as many students still attend segregated schools.

A very rough summary of different educational visions in the US and the Nordic systems in the three decades following the Second World War should include the following: the USA developed scientific curriculum thinking with focus on national/scientific goals and measurable outcomes. There is an inclination for Taylorism, i.e. scientific management (Taylor 1911) in education, building on the idea that by splitting up all processes, one may be able to manage them to perfection. These ideas often result in detailed aims, standards and quality indicators and *manualisation* of practice by prescribing it step by step. In the Nordic education systems, there was a strong belief in democratic participation, student activity and comprehensive schooling.

History illustrates that UK/US education was well prepared for the contemporary forms of accountability promoted by transnational agencies. The Nordic systems were not that well prepared. Not only did new transnationally inspired expectations meet the cultural capital outlined above: the traditions, structures, norms and values of the education systems and practitioners (Møller 2009). They also met long-standing structures: the century-old buildings with their architecture and furniture built in former times and under different conditions. In many cases, they also met learning material as well as the training and education of teachers and leaders. For economic reasons, political decisions to renew buildings, ICT and furniture are not made as quickly as decisions about educational aims and methods in the move from national education to global education. This provides for the battlefield between traditions, values and new expectations, where national stakeholders and practitioners struggle to find and agree on acceptable local interpretations, when they reinvent, restructure and re-culture their education.

1.5   The Network and the Book

The NordNet research network, Transnational Tendencies and Nordic Education, was established with funding from NordForsk in 2009. Roughly 60 researchers from 16 different universities in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden met for 32-day seminars over a period of 3 years. We shared introductions by Nordic

and international colleagues about trends and tendencies, and we formed five working groups: a school for all (Blossing et al. 2013), pre- and primary schools, ambivalences and paradoxes, accountability in higher education and educational leadership.

The educational leadership group agreed to write this volume and worked for a year on the structure of it. We agreed to have country cases make up one part of the book, because we wanted to include descriptions from within country contexts that would demonstrate both similarities and differences between Nordic systems. We also agreed on a shared frame with a contemporary history of governance and leadership, short descriptions of the education systems with facts and figures and analyses of dominant understandings of school leadership functions. These descriptions and analyses give – within the provided scope of the cases – nuanced images of the state of education and educational leadership in five countries. In order to make room for national situations and perspectives, we did not ask the authors to follow the frame rigorously.

Discussing the country cases we found a number of themes, problems and issues of common interest. They were seen as pivotal in describing the Nordic situation of educational leadership, between tradition and contemporary expectation. One theme is independent schools in different Nordic contexts – implications for school leadership (Chap. 7). It was chosen, because privatisation of schools is increasing today, and it can be seen as a new set of conditions – carried by neo-liberal trends – for educational leadership. A second theme is leadership for democracy (Chap. 8), because democracy in schools, whether deliberative or participative, is a difficult phenomenon. It is so by schools logics. Teacher-student relations are by definition asymmetric, and contemporary accountability systems seem to widen this gap. But there is still a general wish to further democratic education. The third theme is reprofessionalisation of Nordic school leadership – challenging academic teacher professionalism (Chap. 9). Here the analyses focus on professional relations between teachers and school leaders and leaders' – shrinking – need for academic subject knowledge.

The next theme is successful school leadership, which builds on the ISSPP project findings and analyses them in a Nordic light, looking at Nordic similarities and comparing them to UK/US systems to find similarities and differences (Chap. 10). Following this chapter is a chapter entitled 'Local Decisions Under Central Watch – A New Nordic Quality Assurance System' (Chap. 11). The focus of this chapter is on local decisions under central watch, meaning relations between schools, local agencies and governments with respect to quality assurance systems. The theme is central to contemporary governance in a transnational light, and it sheds light on Nordic ways of thinking and doing quality. Following the line of governance, we look at superintendents in the chapter 'The Nordic Superintendents' Leadership Roles: Cross-National Comparison' (Chap. 12). This theme was chosen to follow up on the previous theme and also as an acknowledgement of the fact that schools are now, less than ever, isolated from their contexts.

The last chapter will draw on the findings and arguments of the chapters. The chapters in this volume illustrate that leadership must be seen in relation to its

context: culture, history and traditions, as well as local, national and transnational political and governance contexts. It is important to get a better understanding of the actual background for school leadership in the Nordic systems, because leadership thinking and practices are formed by the context they are working in.

We wanted to find out if the new expectations are promoting or restraining the development of a Nordic model. Are transnational influences homogenising educational politics and practices? Or are traditional values, cultures and discourses persistent?

The country cases and thematic chapters give nuanced insights into ways in which transnational agencies influence national governance and discourses, and how they in turn influence school leadership values, culture and practice while traditional values at the same time remain the foundation.

Country reports argue that one of the main bases for contemporary school leadership thinking and practice is the construction of the *Nordic welfare state* model and the comprehensive school. Both of these have roots in nineteenth-century societal, political, cultural and educational discourses and practices. Societies were seen as basically equal, socially just and democratic and education as a means to sustain and further this kind of society. This is the case, although in different forms, in all the Nordic countries, as the balances between local and national governance differ.

The thematic chapters analyse Nordic education and school leadership from diverse perspectives: new balances between public and independent schools. Independent schools influence the position and role of school leadership in different ways. Looking at school leadership from a democratic perspective, we see that its roots in the welfare state's participatory, democratic thinking and practice are transmitted into the new, more trade-oriented business ways of thinking, disseminated by transnational agencies, among others. School leaders are not the only ones who carry culture and tradition, so do teachers. Contemporary initiatives to reprofessionalise teachers and teaching are based on neo-liberal thinking but also on a democratic, equal and compulsory school. A new analysis of ISSPP data demonstrates that underneath some of the new public management trends to homogenise school leadership concepts cultural basics remain, shaping actual practices and thinking. Comparing Nordic school superintendents also shows strong links to both ends of the continuum: from welfare state to competitive state.

References

Andersen, T. M., Holmström, B., Honkapohja, S., Korkman, S., Söderström, H. T., & Vartiainen, J. (2007). *The Nordic model. Embracing globalization and sharing risks*. Helsinki: Taloustieto Oy.

Antunes, F. (2006). Globalisation and Europeification of education policies: Routes, processes and metamorphoses. *European Educational Research Journal, 5*(1), 38–55.

Arbor, A. (2005). *European values study group and world values survey association*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. Tilburg University.

Blossing, U., Imsen, G., & Moos, L. (Eds.). (2013). *The Nordic education model: 'A School for All' encounters neo-liberal politics*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Bobbitt, F. (1924). *How to make a curriculum*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). Uddannelsessystemets ideologiske funktion [The ideological function of education]. In B. Berner, S. Callewaert, & H. Silberbrandt (Eds.), *Skole, ideologi og samfund* (pp. 42–69). Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1996). *Refleksiv sociologi* [Reflective sociology]. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Day, C., & Leithwood, K. (Eds.). (2007). *Successful principal leadership in times of change*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. London: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1901). The situation as regards the course of study. *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Fortieth Annual Meeting of the National Education Association*, 333–348.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy in education*. New York: Macmillan.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983, April). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 147–160.

EC. (2000, March 23–24). *Presidency conclusion*. Lisbon, DOC&00&8.

Eisner, E. W. (1996). Curriculum ideologies. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 302–326). New York: Macmillan.

Ekholm, M., & Moos, L. (2012). Examining the myth of Nordic uniformity. The production of educational policy in Denmark and Sweden. In B.v. Veltzen & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Political cultures*. New York: Palgrave.

Eurydice. (2012). *Key data on education in Europe 2012*. Brussels: European Commission.

EVA. (2012). *Lederuddannelsers betydning for ledelsespraksis* [The effects of leader education and leadership practice]. Copenhagen: The Danish Institute of Evaluation.

Evans, G. (1992). Is Britain a class-divided society? A re-analysis and extension of Marshall et al.'s study of class consciousness. *Sociology, 26*(2), 233–258.

Foucault, M. (1976/1994). *Viljen til viden. Seksualitetens historie 1* [The will to knowledge. The history of sexuality 1]. Copenhagen: Det Lille Forlag.

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentalité. In G. Burcell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87–104). Hempel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (2001/1978). Governmentality. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Power–Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984*. London: Penguin Press.

G8. (2006). http://en-g8russia.ru/news/20060602/1151807.html. Accessed 15 Oct, 2012.

Habermas, J. (2001, June 26). *Warum braucht Europa eine Verfassung?* [Why does Europe need a constitution?]. Die Zeit.

Henry, M., Lindgard, B., Rizvi, F., & Raylor, S. (2001). *The OECD, globalisation and education policy*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Hood, C. (1991, Spring). A public management for all seasons. *Public Administration, 69*, 3–19.

Hopman, S. T. (2008). No child, no school, no state left behind: Schooling in the age of accountability. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40*(4), 417–456.

Kerschensteiner, G. (1928/1980). *Arbejdsskolen* [The labour school] (M. Husen, Trans.). Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag.

Klausen, K. K. (2001). *Skulle det være noget særligt?* [Is this supposed to be special?]. Copenhagen: Børsen, Offentlig ledelse.

Kliebard, H. M. (1985). What happened to American schooling in the first part of the twentieth century? In *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing* (Eighty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, pp. 1–21). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum 1893–1958* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Lange, B., & Alexiadou, N. (2007). New forms of European governance in the education sector? A preliminary analysis of the open method of coordination. *European Educational Research Journal, 6*(4), 321–335.

Lawn, M., & Lingard, B. (2002). Constructing a European policy space in educational governance: The role of transnational policy actors. *European Educational Research Journal, 1*(2), 290–307.

Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What do we already know about successful school leadership?* Toronto: OISE.

Lingard, B. (2000). It is and isn't it: Vernacular globalization, educational policy, and restructuring. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education. Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

MacBeath, J., Moos, L., & Riley, K. (1996). Leadership in a changing world. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 223–250). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Martin, H.-P., & Schumann, H. (1997). *Globaliseringsfælden. Angrebet på demokrati og velstand* [The globalizational trap. The attack on democracy and welfare]. Copenhagen: Borgen.

Møller, J. (2009). Approaches to school leadership in Scandinavia. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 41*(2), 165–177.

Montesorri, M. (1917). *The advanced Montesorri method* (A. Livingston, Trans.). New York: Frederick A. Stokes.

Moos, L. (2006a). Fra politiske demokratidiskurser mod markedsorienterede effektivitetsdiskurser [From political discourses of democracy towards market-oriented efficiency discourses]. *Nordisk Pedagogik, 26*(4), 322–332.

Moos, L. (2006b). A real change or a change in rhetoric? – Comments to two OECD reviews on educational research: England in 2002 and Denmark in 2004. *European Educational Research Journal, 5*(1), 63–67.

Moos, L. (2009a). A general context for new social technologies. *Nordic Educational Research, 29*(1), 79–92.

Moos, L. (2009b). Hard and soft governance: The journey from transnational agencies to school leadership. *European Educational Research Journal, 8*(3), 397–406.

Moos, L. (2011). Sustaining leadership through self-renewing communication. In L. Moos, O. Johansson, & C. Day (Eds.), *How school principals sustain success over time* (pp. 127–150). Dordrecht: Springer.

Moos, L., Krejsler, J., Kofod, K., & Jensen, B. B. (2007). Communicative strategies among successful Danish school principals. In C. Day & K. Leithwood (Eds.), *Principal leadership in times of change*. Twente: Springer.

OECD. (1998). *Education catalogue*. Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2012). *GINI*: http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?QueryId=26068

Olsen, J. V. (2012). To menneskesyn tørner sammen [Two views of human nature collide]. *Folkeskolen*, 34–37.

Pedersen, D. (2005). Ledelsesrummet i managementstaten [The leadership space in the management state]. In D. Pedersen (Ed.), *Offentlig ledelse i managementstaten* [Public leadership in the management state]. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Pedersen, O. K. (2010). *Konkurrencestaten* [The competitive state]. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Pitman, A. (2008, November 27–29). *Capacity-building in South-East Asian universities: International challenges*. Paper presented at the Korean Education Research Association, Seoul.

Røvik, K. A. (2007). *Trender og translasjoner. Ideer som former det 21. århundrets organisasjon* [Trends and translations. Ideas that form the 21st century organisations]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Schuller, T. (2006). Reviewing OECD's educational research reviews. *European Educational Research Journal, 5*(1), 57–61.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, O. A., & Aasen, P. (2006). The Nordic model in education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 50*(3), 245–283.

Tjeldvoll, A. (1997). Quality of equality? Scandinavian education towards the year 2000. In A. Tjeldvoll (Ed.), *Education and the welfare state in the year 2000. Equality, policy and reform in Scandinavia*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

UNDP. (2006). *Human development report*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, R., & Pickett, K. (2009). *The spirit level. Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Penguin.

Woods, P. A. (2005). *Democratic leadership in education*. London: Paul Chapman.

Woods, P. A. (2011). *Transforming education policy. Shaping a democratic future*. Bristol: Policy Press.

WTO. (1998). *Council for trade in services*. Education Services. Background Note by the Secretariat. In WTO, ed.