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Abstract

The impact of successive government reforms in education over the last twenty years has had its greatest impact on headteachers. The increase in responsibilities imposed on headteachers has led to the inextricable linking of effective schools with effective leadership. School improvement and school effectiveness research has identified the significance of the role played by headteachers in developing the school and raising standards of achievement. Preparation for school leadership and management has become one of the major issues of the last decade. The emergence of the Teacher Training Agency in 1993 enabled the government to establish a number of training programmes for potential and experienced headteachers.

The National Professional Qualification (NPQH) provides training and development for aspiring school leaders. The qualification is based on nationally agreed standards for headteachers and in due course will be mandatory to all seeking headship appointments. This thesis tracks the significant milestones in headteacher training and development within the England and Wales alongside comparative developments in Singapore and the United States. Through the use of a survey instrument and semi-structured interviews, NPQH candidates and their respective headteachers revealed their experiences of the programme, its impact on the candidates, colleagues and headteacher, and its impact on the school. Because of the difficulty in obtaining permission to survey candidates, the sample was restricted to the first cohort of candidates from Cambridgeshire LEA. The thesis concludes with a consideration of some of the approaches used in other countries, the role of the headteacher of a candidates' school and whether preparation for this highest position in school leadership can solely be through assessing a candidates' competence in specific aspects of school management.
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Chapter 1:

Introduction and Background to the National Professional Qualification for Headship
Preparation for School Leadership: The National Professional Qualification for Headship

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Background

The British government’s reforms over the past twenty years has covered all state schools, within England and Wales (approximately 25,000) their headteachers and around some 400,000 teachers, all of whom have had to respond to pressures for change from governmental policies. This has involved the introduction of:

- a National Curriculum and national testing related to four key stages (pupils aged 7, 11, 14 and 16);
- external school inspection and publication of performance tables;
- local management of schools - control over budgets, staff appointments, premises and buildings;
- increased powers for parents and community representatives in schools, governance and parental choice of school;
- development of different kinds of school - grant maintained, technology colleges, and more recently specialist schools;
- increased powers of central government and a reduction in powers of the local education authorities (LEAs);
- government imposed national salary scales and conditions of service, teacher and headteacher appraisal;
- the establishment of the Teacher Training Agency with responsibility for initial teacher training and until recently continuing professional development, including head teacher training.

The 1997 White Paper ‘Excellence in Schools’ that set out further reforms which included:

- a new framework of Community, Foundation and Voluntary schools;
• a general teaching council;
• education action zones;
• an increased role for parents;
• a focus on literacy and numeracy with set targets for achievement by the year 2002 for each local education authority;
• a new role for LEAs – an Authority education development plans and inspections.

The impact of this avalanche of change has been greatest on headteachers. Headship in the late sixties and seventies was seen by many as the pinnacle of a professional career, often achieved through time serving or patronage, not always on merit or professional expertise, according to Poster (1986). The increase in responsibilities imposed on headteachers has led to the recognition that the effectiveness of schools is inextricably linked to effective leadership, and this in turn depends critically on supporting, training and developing headteachers. Bolam (1997) argues that the previously accepted view of headship has:

been challenged by the wave of national policy initiatives, the changing culture of school, by findings of research on effective schools, on school improvement strategies and on school management (p.266)

The emergence of the comprehensive school and the increase in awareness about school management brought about a change in perception of headship. No longer could headteachers undertake every action themselves. They needed to delegate tasks. According to Poster (1986), this concept of ‘manager head’ was first purported by Ree (1968):

The manager-head of today has no need to be a great scholar, although this gift might well prove valuable to any Head in order to open up and lubricate relationships; it is not, however essential. What the Head does need to do, if he is to play his part effectively, is to organise multifarious relationships and attachments to a diversity of groups with skill, which can be learnt, and with sensitivity, which is perhaps more a matter of personality. (p.11)
Thinking like that throughout the late sixties and seventies led to the development of a 'task leadership role' Poster (1986), having separate functions. Poster defines these as:

functions of 'innovating, defining, decision-making' on one hand and procedural leadership on the other, with a clear demarcation between the roles of the head and deputy. (p.32)

The changes in school management associated with the eighties have supported the growing recognition that strategic planning and execution are related activities. The distinct separation of functions, as described by Poster, would not now be acceptable to headteachers or their deputies.

1.1.2 The impact of Education Reform - the creation of the self-managing school

The promotion of schooling as a quasi-market activity, which Whitty et al (1998) refers to as:

a combination of parental choice and school autonomy, together with a considerable degree of public accountability and government regulation. (p.4)

has resulted in radical changes in the culture of education and the teaching profession. The market led relationship between LEAs and external providers, developed in the later part of the 1980s, has also contributed to the changing concept of headship in state schools. What has emerged is a devolution of many responsibilities, once the province of the local education authority, to the school governing body, and in particular to the headteacher, for example school budgets and personnel matters such as appointments of staff. The school has become in many respects like a small business with the ability to manage its resources in support of its defined goals and aspirations. This increased responsibility of headteachers, and in the cases of large secondary schools the senior management team, has preoccupied many, creating a new division to arise between the
professional activities associated with teaching and learning, and that of managing an autonomous institution.

This trend in school management has not been unique to England and Wales. There is an international move towards self-management in education. In Australia, New Zealand and parts of the USA, the management of schools has largely been devolved to principals and governing boards. Caldwell and Spinks (1992), two Australian writers, are advocates of decentralisation of authority. They define this as:

A self-managing school is a school in a system of education where there has been significant and consistent decentralisation to the school level of authority to make decisions related to the allocation of resource (p.4).

This promotion of the self-managing school is seen by governments as a vehicle by which higher educational standards can be achieved. Giving greater control over decision to the schools means that

There is expected to be a better alignment between the goals of the school, resource allocation and improved educational outcomes.
(Bush and Chew 1999, p.43)

Autonomy also implies accountability and this is shared between governors and headteachers. In England and Wales the 1992 White Paper clearly defines this:

The objective has been to put governing bodies and headteachers under the greater pressure of public accountability for better standards and to increase their freedom to respond to that pressure. The autonomy offers schools enhanced powers to achieve better performance in their schools to match their increased accountability for that performance (DFE 1992, p.18).

Levacic's (1995) research unequivocally supports this view:
It is a truth universally acknowledged that a single school in possession of its own decision-making must provide better quality education than a school run by centralised bureaucracy (p.1).

The self-managing school places more demand on principals and headteachers. The requirement to manage budgets, staff, premises and a range of other activities has in itself increased pressure on these leading professionals and in some cases may cause stress leading to the demand for early retirement, according to Crawford (1997).

A significant impact of the creation of autonomous schools has been the increasing isolation of heads. Once the arm of the local education authority extended out to every school providing support and direction for their headteachers. Now such arrangements are through buy back agreements or subscription services. The programme of school inspection by the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED), introduced in 1993, documents areas of school management, leadership and efficiency and in particular the impact these have had on school standards. There is a growing collection of evidence from the inspection process that implies a need for more rigorous management training.

A change of national government in 1997 has seen the introduction of national literacy and numeracy strategies for all primary schools. They are required to introduce regular daily teaching of these initiatives. Increased direct government funding such as the Standards Fund, direct grants to schools through the National Budget, plus programmes such as Education Action Zones and Excellence in Cities, has resulted in a decline in the autonomy of schools.

1.1.3 The National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH)

The introduction of a qualification for headteachers in 1996 by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), has come after a long period of time in which management training for headship has been in many cases an optional extra for any aspiring headteacher. The proposed training for headteachers through NPQH has received widespread support in
principle, but the structure for achieving the level of competence deemed appropriate for the awarding the qualification, is as yet untried and untested.

The NPQH initiative is seen as one part of the provision of nationally approved assessment, training and qualifications at four key stages of continuing professional development: - newly qualified teachers, expert teachers, experts in subject leadership and management, and a leadership programme for serving headteachers. Having established a national set of competencies for headteachers, this stage has been given the highest priority by the TTA.

The TTA's then chief executive is in no doubt that the central issue is one in which:

we need to tackle leadership, in particular how the qualities of leadership can be identified and fostered...we should make explicit all of the key characteristics of those most likely to succeed in establishing and maintaining excellence as the headteacher of the school...the NPQH will provide the preparation for headship that our headteachers and our children deserve. (Millett 1996, p.23)

Millett sees the qualification developing headteachers who are well prepared to lead effective and flourishing schools, where challenge and improvement are the norm and where pupils get a taste for learning that will stay with them throughout their lives.

1.1.4 National Standards for Headship

The core purpose of headship has been defined by the TTA as follows:

  to provide professional leadership for a school which secures its success and improvement, ensuring high quality education for all its pupils and improved standards of achievement.
The NPQH is founded on four key principles, namely it is:

- rooted in school improvement and draws on the best management practice inside and outside education,
- based on a set of agreed national standards for headship,
- signals readiness for headship, but does not replace the selection process,
- rigorous enough to ensure that those ready for headship gain the qualification, while being sufficiently flexible to take account of candidates' existing proven skills and achievements and the range of contexts in which they have been applied.

The national standards set out the knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes, which relate to the key areas of headship. They define expertise in headship and are designed to serve as a basis for planning the professional development of both aspiring and serving headteachers. The Standards have been established in five key task areas:

(a) strategic direction and development of the school
(b) learning and teaching in the school
(c) people and relationships
(d) human and material resources and their development and deployment
(e) accountability for the efficiency and effectiveness of the school

(TTA National Standards for headship 1997, p.1)

The five key areas are divided into 28 tasks. In addition there are 12 areas of knowledge and understanding that a headteacher should have:

a) what constitutes quality in educational provision, the characteristics of effective schools, and strategies for raising pupils' achievement and promoting their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and their good behaviour;

b) how to use comparative data, together with information about pupils' prior attainment, to establish benchmarks and set targets for improvement;
c) requirements and models for the curriculum and its assessment;
d) effective teaching and assessment methods, including the use of educational technology;
e) political, economic, social, religious and technological influences which have an impact on strategic and operational planning;
f) leadership styles and practices and their relevance in different contexts within the school;
g) management, including employment law, equal opportunities legislation, personnel, external relations, finances and change;
h) the national policy framework and the complementary roles and functions of the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), Welsh Office Education Department (WOED) and national bodies;
i) the statutory framework for education, and its importance to the key tasks of headship, including the provisions of the Education Acts 1944 to 1997, Health and Safety, the Children Act and equal opportunities legislation;
j) the implications of information and guidance documents from the DfEE, WOED and national bodies;
k) governance at national, local and school levels;
l) the contribution that evidence from inspection and research can make to professional and school development.

(TTA National Standards for headship 1997, p.3)

The skills and attributes that a headteacher is expected to display are broken down into four skill areas each with the required level of ability illustrated, namely:

1. Leadership skills, attributes and professional competence: the ability to lead and manage people to work as individuals and as a team towards a common goal.
2. Decision making skills: the ability to investigate, solve problems and make decisions
3. Communication skills: the ability to make points clearly and understand the views of others
4. Self-management: the ability to plan time effectively and to organise oneself well.
In total there are 81 skills, competences and attributes that will require some form of assessment of a headteacher's knowledge of, understanding in, competence in, possession of or responsiveness to, before the NPQH certificate can be awarded.

1.1.5 Reservations about NPQH

Several questions such as: "Can all of these be assessed through assignment and summative assessment processes?", "Is the qualification manageable?", "What constitutes best management practice outside education?", are of legitimate concern and require consideration. Early comments from professionals and educational researchers raise other questions about the qualification. Downes (1996) sees aspiring heads needing to:

develop a range of skills and abilities...and that they will need to do a lot of homework on among other topics, legislation, personnel, finance, curriculum and assessment models and leadership and management. (p.27)

Downes warns that it will not be easy to assess the required skills and knowledge and that 'finding objective evidence on skills like sensitivity and adaptability will not be easy'. (p.27)

The concerns of Downes are supported by Bolam (1997) who believes:

it to be essential that consideration of values and professional knowledge should be included (p.278).

Bolam goes further, and states, 'the messages of research should be an integral and continuing component of NPQH'.

Management practice is susceptible to changes, fads and fashions. Kay (1993), a leading consultant on the subject of strategic planning, cites a growing disenchantment with this type of approach in the business world:
elaborately quantified corporate plans lay gathering dust on the shelves of managers who went on making the decisions they would have made had the plans never existed. (p.341).

Glatter (1997), in his paper for the 25th BEMAS Annual Conference, concludes that:

identifying best management practice outside education will require the judgement of Solomon, and will require some notion of cultural compatibility if it is to be of real value for education. (p.187).

The TTA has embarked upon an ambitious programme and Glatter (1997) has expressed concerns about this agenda:

the risks and dangers are obvious, particularly of establishing a heavy bureaucratic apparatus which all our experiences, both within education and outside it, shows would be counterproductive. (p.190).

Southworth (1998), from his survey of primary deputy headteachers in Hertfordshire, concluded that despite the close partnership with their heads, deputies are still relied upon for their management role rather than being trusted with leadership tasks. If this is the case is it possible to train deputies to exercise leadership skills if they are unable to experience this first hand? Southworth (1998) in the same piece of research goes on to ask:

are heads hanging on to too much leadership themselves and not including and encouraging deputies to lead aspects of the schools' work and performance? (p.24).

Increasingly emphasis is being attached to the school improvement dimension of the NPQH qualification, not just to the candidates' future schools, but also to their existing ones. This may raise some concerns for an existing headteacher who is not familiar with recent developments and research in school improvement. It needs to be noted that aspiring headteachers undertake the training for this qualification whilst swerving in another headteacher's school.
1.2 The Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to examine the relative merits of different approaches that have been and are currently been used to prepare teachers for headship in the United Kingdom and internationally. Of particular interest is the impact that national training programmes, such as NPQH, has on candidates themselves, their colleagues and their current school. Of equal importance and interest is whether such training does have an impact on the leadership and management of a school, and ultimately on the standards being achieved by pupils.

The NPQH is not yet compulsory for teachers if they wish to become a headteacher but there is an expectation that it will become so from 2002. However, the very status of NPQH will put pressure on those aspiring to become headteachers to seek this qualification and governing bodies may be more likely to shortlist applicants who have completed the programme.

As Glatter (1997) remarked: 'we are moving in uncharted territory'. (p.190)

There is little doubt that knowledge and skills are essential elements of capability in educational management, but the ability to use them effectively in action is critical. It is to do with judgement and intuition mixed with personal qualities such as integrity, stamina and commitment.

There are three main research questions to be addressed in this study:

1. If one of the objectives of the qualification is to achieve better school leaders can NPQH provide the leadership and management skills necessary to achieve strategic direction and vision for a school?
2. Can the skills of school leadership and management be met through a qualification that relies heavily on demonstration of competences?

These pose a number of supplementary questions which directly refer to the training and assessment aspect of NPQH. As a result will candidates be:
i) able to articulate the vision for their current school to include raising standards of achievement?

ii) able to distinguish between the processes of evaluation, monitoring and review and use them effectively in support of their school’s development?

iii) able to provide the strategic direction to achieve an aspect of the vision for their school?

iv) better equipped personally to manage themselves in the headship role?

v) able to help with leading a different team of people?

vi) will they help with strategic leadership and achievement of the vision?

vii) are the skills learnt transferable?

A third question, and of particular interest given the current drive towards school self improvement, would be:

3. What impact will NPQH have on the candidates’ current school?

This question relates to the potential problems for the candidate’s school whilst they are under going the training and assessment. A series of supplementary questions arise, namely:

i) Has the training for NPQH had a positive or detrimental effect on the school, their colleagues and the head teacher?

ii) Has the school been a beneficiary of the process or not?

iii) Will the reformulated model of NPQH bring greater benefits to the school?

1.2.1 Training and Assessment

NPQH training and assessment currently is provided through eleven centres for training and development and a further eleven centres for assessment under TTA regulations. There has also been an option for candidates to prepare for the
qualification through supported open learning (SOL) using materials and support arrangements developed by the SOL provider (a partnership between the Open University and the National Association of Head Teachers). In Wales similar training is available through the medium of Welsh.

Assessment Centres are responsible for:

- the selection of certain candidates for the NPQH;
- needs assessment for all candidates;
- the assessment of any national standards not assessed through training;
- final assessment for all candidates.

Training and Development Centres and the SOL provider are responsible for:

- the compulsory module and its related assessment;
- the three further modules and their related assessment (where candidates undertake training).

All training and assessment is carried out by TTA accredited trainers. SOL tutors-mentors and assessors are trained to meet rigorous national standards. National consistency is of high importance and the TTA attempts to ensure this through regulations. On the surface this appeared to be sound and unproblematic.

Following extensive consultation the DfEE have introduced from January 2001 a streamlined, better-structured and more accessible programme. This is to be delivered through centres combining training, development and assessment. There will be no supported open learning option. These changes are discussed in chapter 3.

1.3 Summary

The self-managing school is a well-established feature of many national education systems. It is also clear that the leadership qualities of headteachers are of paramount importance for a school and for success in raising the standards of
education. It is not surprising that the training and preparation for headship is of such concern to the government.

The relative merits of different systems used to prepare people for headship in the United Kingdom and internationally are the focus of this research. Of particular interest is whether national training programmes, such as NPQH, does have an impact on candidates, colleagues and a candidate's current school. Will such programmes have an impact on the leadership and management of a school and the standards achieved by its pupils? In its first version NPQH clearly contained a number of faults, and its attractiveness to candidates was limited not wholehearted. The recently introduced changes to the qualification will no doubt be subjected to considerable scrutiny by the teaching profession.
Chapter 2:

Literature Review of the professional development of Headteachers
Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature associated with the development of school leaders and the various training programmes that have been established in England and Wales, and also internationally.

2.1.1 Background

Being a headteacher and managing a school in England and Wales has changed dramatically over the past twenty years. The increased responsibilities imposed on headteachers by the Education Reform Act 1988 have led to the recognition that the effectiveness of schools is inextricably linked to effective leadership, and this in turn depends critically on supporting, training and developing headteachers. Bolam (1997) argues that the accepted view of headship has:

been radically challenged by a raft of national policy initiatives, by changing conceptions of the overall culture of schooling, by research findings on effective schools, on school improvement strategies and on school management. (p.266).

This is in stark contrast to the perception of headship in the 1960s, when appointments to headship were often as a result of time serving or by grace and favour Poster (1986). The notion that an aspiring headteacher needed to have training in the art of management and leadership prior to appointment was not considered. The school certificate, higher certificate and university education were deemed to be sufficient achievement for headship. Headteachers were products of the same system of education as were their headteachers - grammar school, an assistant teaching post, through departmental headship and on to deputy headship. The management style adopted by these headteachers often mirrored that of the headteacher of the schools in which they had worked. Schools had no direct
responsibility for budgets or the appointment of staff, as these were managed by
the LEA.

The evolution of schooling as a quasi-market activity has resulted in radical
changes in the culture of education and the profession. This is particularly evident
in the area of management of schools and the associated area of management
training. The introduction of a qualification for headteachers, the National
Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), has come after a long period of
time in which management training was not a prerequisite for headship.

This literature review looks at the historical development of management training
for headteachers in the United Kingdom, leading to the establishment of the
Teacher Training Agency (TTA) in 1993. It traces the period from the early 1980s
until the transfer of NPQH from the TTA to the DfEE in 1999. To set the UK
experience within an international context a literature review of related activities in
Australia, Canada, Singapore, Spain and the United States is considered in the
second section of this chapter.

2.12 Management Development in the United Kingdom

The work of school effectiveness researchers first came to general attention
through the work of Rutter and his colleagues. They focused on classroom practice
and school culture and in doing so they found evidence to suggest that leadership
and management did play a significant part in 'why schools make a difference'.
Rutter, Maugham, Mortimore and Ouston (1979). Hughes (1975) drew a seminal
distinction between the head as chief executive and leading professional. A study
by Lyons (1976) of heads' tasks arrived at similar conclusions. This gave rise to a
boost in studies of, and training in, educational leadership and management. Glatter
(1997) wrote:

that methods, or implementation skills as they are considered now, were as
important as knowledge, understanding and value orientations (p.185).
More recently (Hallinger and Heck (1999)) concluded that leadership can enhance school effectiveness. They found that leadership influences the organisational systems through the primary avenues of: ‘purposes, structures and social networks’. They conclude that these three main avenues of leadership are the ‘hallmark components of a learning organisation’, something purported by Senge (1990). Although the research by Hallinger and Heck (1999) reinforces the notion that leadership makes a difference in school effectiveness, there is no evidence to suggest that ‘school leaders alone made effective schools!’

2.13 In-Service Training

External in-service courses were and still are the predominant form of planned support for school managers. These ranged from the practical training courses of the 1960s, such as the Committee on the Organisation, Staffing and Management of Schools (COSMOS), courses organised by HMI and the long award bearing courses (MA and PhD) with a more theoretical basis developed within universities, to the rise of Advanced Diplomas, MBAs and more recently Doctorate programmes in education. Despite the concern over the effectiveness of school management since the mid 1970s, it was not until the 1980s that an improvement in the range of in-service training for heads and senior staff came about.

Successive governments in the 1970s and early 1980s became increasingly aware that education in common with other public services was an area for change and development.

2.14 The National Development Centre for School Management Training

The idea of management development was probably first applied to education in England and Wales by Glatter (1972) and came to prominence in the mid-1980s when the National Development Centre (NDC) proposed the following definition:

Management Development is the process whereby the management function of any organisation is performed with increased effectiveness. (NDC, 1983)
A survey by Hughes, Carter and Fidler (1981) into the professional development provision for headteachers and senior staff revealed that the availability of courses was found to be patchy, due to the uneven regional distribution of providing institutions, variation in the support from LEAs, and the lack of any real partnership between LEAs and higher education. Of the 86 award bearing courses reviewed in 1979/80 only a third were devoted entirely to management. The research team comments:

the disturbing impression gained is that in many areas the provision is fortuitous and unplanned (p.23).

Hughes and his colleagues proposed a national initiative to set up a central support unit for school management training in order to bring more coherence to provision. The response from the Department for Education and Science (DES) to this survey was to introduce a scheme of direct grants for in-service training.

The definition of management development by the NDC presented it as a generic concept that aimed to balance the needs of the individual manager with those of the organisation. The view that management development is the responsibility of the employer, and in this case the LEA or the school, suggests:

the need for a policy for dealing with the needs of individuals according to age, qualifications, gender, ethnic group, school type and job stage, or as induction (Morgan et al 1983) in-service and transition to the next stage, e.g. promotion, re-deployment or retirement (McMahon and Bolam 1990, p.274).

This is consistent with the thinking about total quality management and the ‘Investors in People’ scheme, which Bolam (1997) interprets as:

the need for employers and schools to create working conditions and systematic support which will enable headteachers and teachers, and all other staff too, not only to work effectively but also to learn to be self-
reflective, to develop and to improve as an integral part of their jobs (p.274).

2.15 The Department for Education and Science (DES) Circular 3/83

As a response to the study by Hughes et al (1981), the DES White Paper ‘Teaching Quality ‘(DES 1983a) was drafted. The Circular 3/83 outlined the provision for the infusion of funding into programmes of training in management, giving a broad-brush approach. LEAs were entitled to claim for a contribution towards the costs of heads and senior staff attending courses. But it was clear that at that time there was little consensus as to what educational management was about or on appropriate training approaches to be used. However, 3/83 saw value in headteachers learning through commercial experience. Coulson (1985) reported that:

some of the provision has been hasty and ill-considered, based on no sound or coherent theories of management or adult learning (p.111).

He went further and argued that for the expectations of such training:

to increase the confidence and competence of heads and teachers - to be fulfilled, there is: a need to urgently examine in depth the whole issue of management education for school people (p.111)

At this early stage it became clear that there were many people seeking to define a framework of expectations, particularly in respect of management training. These advocates for change wanted greater recognition to be given to the demands of headship that shape and constrain how headteachers carry out their role. Consideration of these demands is equally an essential component and complementary to the preparation of individuals for management posts.

Part of the approach recommended in the DES Circular referred to - Management Training for Heads and other Senior Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools. The circular outlined provision of direct grants for in-service training either in the
form of a twenty day basic course or a One Term Training Opportunity (OTTO), consisting of at least 50 consecutive working days’ release:

Such courses would make provision for visits to schools, and other institutions, seminars and private study, and encounters with managers from other fields. Part of the philosophy behind the OTTO course was an attempt by the DES to train participants as trainers of others through a cascade training approach to increase provision (DES 3/83).

DES circular 3/83 outlined an enormous variety of approaches to training in management; although it is clear that there was as yet no consensus as to what education management was really about, and also on what might be perceived as appropriate training courses

2.2 Headteachers as Learners

Gray (1987) examined why some headteachers appeared to be irritated with management training courses, why some found it more difficult to become a learner! Gray reported that headteachers appear to have difficulty with the matter of authority, and that the organisation of schools seemed to exacerbate the matter. They (headteachers) appeared to be:

more separated as authority figures from their colleagues than other senior managers are from one another and the confusion heads experience in matters of status is a strong element in making it difficult for them to learn (p.37).

Gray explored further the notion that headteachers found the idea of changing their behaviour threatening and that many were just looking for answers to their managerial problems. He found many headteachers expected management development courses to be full of content by which they meant:

prescription of the ‘right’ theory and ‘correct’ practice and they expect to learn management by listening to experts and best practitioners (p.35).
This view was supported by Everard (1986) in his book *Developing Management in Schools*, and is a theory currently developed in the United States.

On a similar level Coulson (1985) refers to the implicit assumption that persists with headteachers that, 'leadership can be trained into people, that a leadership style can be performed' (p115).

The idea that there is some kind of leadership model for headteachers to shape their behaviour was mooted by Jentz and Wolford (1979), writing of their work with American school principals. They concluded that:

> the critical outcome of a leadership development programme is not particular new knowledge or behaviour, rather it is the trust in the capacity to make new sense, to create new forms of action, and to take action in a context of doubt and uncertainty (p.98).

Jentz and Wolford adopted a standpoint that places headteachers, their perceptions and values as of primary concern. The authors believe management development becomes a serious attempt to attend to the personal growth needs of the individual and at the same time, to integrate this with efforts to increase the headteacher’s sense of professional competence and effectiveness.

Courses in England have not developed along these lines; instead they embraced a variety of activities such as learning about theories of organisation and of management, receiving advice from experienced practitioners, working on case studies and simulation exercises. Legal and employment issues and financial matters also featured. All of these are largely unconnected with the head as a person.

Coulson (1985), in discussion about the approaches to management development for headteachers, refers to the work of Argyris (1976, 1982) in which Argyris showed that the crucial difficulty of bringing about significant change amongst managers by a skills-learning approach would only occur if those new skills were
accompanied by a new set of governing values. In essence Argyris was saying that those who wish to gain credibility not only must learn those new skills but also must internalise a new set of values.

Headteachers also experience difficulties with the authority of adult tutors. Gray (1987) reported that it was quite common for headteachers to be sceptical of a management trainer unless they had recent classroom experience. The rise of the professional trainer has led to a much looser way of working and a presentational style that comes with a different sense of authority. This brought out suspicion on the part of the headteacher about the competence of the tutor. This Gray believes was:

an outward expression by headteachers of their resistance to engaging in a process of personal change (p.39).

The early eighties, according to Wallace and Hall (1989 p.165), witnessed ‘increasing advocacy within the profession of a policy led systematic approach to in-service training’.

About the same time a compulsory system of biennial appraisal for headteachers and deputy headteachers was being implemented, providing for the first time an opportunity for identifying training needs in the context of the role and the school.

2.2.1 The Management Skills of Headship

By 1985 considerable attention was being given to the management training of current headteachers following DES circular 3/83. However, the training of heads in post was questioned by many and Coulson (1985) quotes from previous researchers such as Fielder (1967) and Fielder, Fried, Chemers, and Maker (1977) at the folly of this approach, arguing:

that leadership styles and motivational patterns of leaders or managers are relatively stable characteristics of the individual, training based on
modifying leadership behaviour (especially after appointment) may be of limited value. (quoted in Coulson, 1985, p.112).

Coulson (1985) argues further that:

If there is validity in this claim, then post-appointment training for heads is unlikely to pay substantial dividends in terms of managerial improvement or school effectiveness (p.112).

Fielder (1977) also believed that matching the person to the situation was more likely to be successful because it called for the particular style of management they had. Fidler (1998) sees leadership development as context dependent.

If this is the case then Coulson goes on to argue that:

an analysis of the work of headship and the overall management needs of the school might when it comes to the recruitment achieve a more balanced team of professionally experienced people (p.112).

Morgan and Hall (1982) took concepts from Katz's *Skills of an Effective Administrator* (1974) as their starting point for looking at the secondary head's job. Coulson (1985), like Morgan and Hall, employed Mintzberg's *The Nature of Managerial Work* (1973) as the basis for his conceptual framework of the primary headteacher's job. His framework broadly defines a head's managerial role into three categories, 'interpersonal, informational and decisional'.

Poster (1986) argued that the eight basic management skills identified by Mintzberg were equally applicable to the role of the deputy headteacher, as they were to the headteacher. Poster gave a stark warning that it was easier to identify a range of management skills particularly appropriate to a deputy head but it was quite another thing to find or devise courses of management training within the education field that would develop those skills. Poster saw the availability of the long courses promoted through the DES Circular 3/83 as enhancing the training of deputies more so than headteachers.
The establishment by the end of 1983 of the National Development Centre for Management Training (NDC) by the DES led to the devising of criteria for advice to the DES on course recognition, and the identification and promotion of ‘good practice’. Thus began the shift towards experiential Courses in education, a movement away from what Everard and Marsden (1985) observed as:

educational courses mainly focusing on administration, or the management of the status quo, whereas managers are increasingly expected to steer their organisations towards new goals (p.63).

Bolam (1982) suggested that courses:

should be an integral part of an LEA’s wider strategy for management development of heads and senior staff (p.33).

The NDC survey in early 1984 revealed that few LEAs had a strategy. In fact no LEA had a written policy on school management development and training, although a few provided a wide range of external and on the job support. One exception was the Inner London education Authority who used the Grubb Institute to develop potential headteachers through a six-week course.

A project undertaken by NDC with 8 LEAs and 53 of their schools explored how the notion of management development for schools might be undertaken at school and LEA levels. The resulting handbook (McMahon and Bolam 1987) was disseminated nationally. The project findings suggested that, according to Wallace and Hall (1989):

...in contrast to large companies which have provided original models for management development, LEAs possess certain features which give rise to some difficulties in developing a coherent LEA-wide strategy: they have diffuse goals; they are administratively complex organisations with relatively weak links between the various functions (p.164).
2.2.2 Headship in Small Primary Schools

One of the projects initiated by the NDC focused on the management development needs in small primary schools. The aim of the project was to identify whether heads of such schools have distinctive management development needs. Reporting on this project, Wallace (1988) used, as the basis for the investigation, a framework of management task areas. Those with management responsibility must manage:

1. the overall policy for the school
2. the school communication decision-making structures
3. the curriculum for pupil's learning
4. staff
5. pupils
6. material resources
7. external relations
8. the process for monitoring and evaluating the work of the school

This list had been devised from a literature search with heavy influence from HMI and other informed professionals. The research attempted to bring together factors, which in combination may be unique to small primary schools and ones that generally affected the management and class teaching tasks performed by the headteachers. From the interviews carried out Wallace defined the most critical stage in a head’s career as the period from appointment through the early years in headship. Most heads found difficulty with administrative tasks and managing external relations. Another aspect is monitoring and evaluating the work of the school and here headteachers stated they lacked the ‘technical knowledge’ and were more concerned not to jeopardise positive relations with staff. In summary, Wallace (1988) wrote:

the job of headship in a small primary school seems to be distinctive in so far as the context in which management tasks have to be carried out is specific to small primary schools (p.16).
The isolation of headteachers was identified through the NDC project and is usually associated with the more rural areas of the country. In 1985 at the time of this project over 2000 schools had fewer than 50 pupils in England and Wales, with only 70 located in metropolitan districts (NUT 1985). The report identified the following factors that can be associated with the rural situation:

- schools may be far from their neighbours and in-service project training centres;
- release of teachers for in-service training requires external provision of supply cover as there is often no ‘non-contact time’ available;
- where heads are promoted from urban situations they are likely to find the context of their new job very different from their recent past experience.

In another group of factors Wallace found that small size schools suffered from amongst others:

- limited possibilities for delegating management tasks;
- the need to develop within a small staff the expertise needed to provide a broad curriculum;
- limited non-contact time for heads to carry out management tasks during the school day.

2.3 The White Paper ‘Better Schools’ 1985

The White Paper (DES 1985) marked the beginning of a policy thrust to improve the coherence of in-service training provision as a way of achieving central government’s goals for the education service. Education Support Grants were introduced by the DES in 1985, whereby LEAs had for the first time to set out detailed plans in their bids for grant support. A further refinement came through the LEA Training Grants Scheme (LEATGS), which required LEAs to submit an annual bid for in-service training, including support for school management. National priority areas were designated, including management training. Also the scheme removed the restriction on the range of providers and types of provision,
opening the door to trainers and consultants who were independent of the LEA and of higher education institutions. LEAs were charged with the responsibility for quality control, the DES believing that they would exercise this through their ‘power to purchase’.

Through a series of monitoring visits, the NDC in 1987 revealed the difficulties encountered were very similar to those associated with external courses exposed by Rudduck (1981). These were:

- implicit selection criteria leading to anxiety among participants,
- lack of preparatory activities irrelevant or unchallenging,
- lack of variety in training methods or exclusive use on didactic teaching or participants’ experience,
- lack of follow up support after the course, and
- the lack of procedures for evaluating impact on participants’ performance as opposed to the quality training experience, (quoted in Wallace and Hall 1989, p. 165).

In the light of this Bailey (1987) suggested that all courses should be planned in partnership with participants from selection, preparation and follow up.

2.3.1 The Education Reform Act 1988

Towards the end of the 1980s a new market relationship between LEAs, external providers and schools began to emerge. The onslaught of education reforms and centrally imposed innovation implied major new management tasks for all teachers but in particular for heads and senior staff. Notions of headship were challenged by this wave of national policy initiatives, the changing culture of schools, by the findings from research on effective schools and emerging strategies about school improvement and management. At about the same time LEAs were themselves going through a period of restructuring in order to carry out their tasks of implementing the reforms in schools, inspecting and evaluating the work of schools; responsibility for professional development and in-service training of the teaching force, including management training and development. The incorporation of higher education institutions into new universities led to the direct
link between LEAs and some of these external providers becoming weaker. Thus, as Wallace and Hall (1989) described it:

all partners in the management training and development process were faced with new tasks within a new context (p.172).

Bolam (1997) refers to these changes, including the pressure from external inspection, as:

bring pressure on designers of training and development programmes to rethink their answers to basic questions like: what are the in service training needs of school headteachers, how they ought to be determined and what model(s) of leadership should headteachers be trained to adopt (Bolam 1997, p.275).

2.3.2 The School Management Task Force (SMTF)

In January 1989 the Secretary of State established a small School Management Task Force of experts from education and business to advise the government on the best ways of improving the quality and provision of school management development and training. Their remit set by the Secretary of State was to:

- survey the pattern of existing provision of management development and training for heads and senior staff in schools;
- identify gaps and variations in current training provision to ensure adequate provision is available;
- help LEAs to establish practical strategies for ensuring adequate management development and training for heads and senior staff in schools;
- assist LEAs to set quantified targets for achievement of management training of their existing heads and senior staff over a given period of time.

In addition the School Management Task Force was asked to look at how to maximise the use of the grant for management training, which the Secretary of
Their report, Developing School Management - The Way Forward, outlined a number of management development objectives for the education service as a whole and concluded with detailed general guidance on the approaches that should be adopted. In their conclusion the School Management Task Force stated:

schools cannot look forward to a period of untroubled calm, nor can school managers of the future be expected to emerge from the system without careful thought and action being taken to enhance their development... schools will continue to face challenges: from the tension between local autonomy and national needs, from the exercise of parental choice, from the increasing demands of society about the standards it expects and needs, and from conflicting educational values. (School Management Task Force 1990, p.34)

2.4 Headteacher Mentoring

In response to this the School Management Task Force proposed a new approach to school management development that focused attention on the support that should be available in and near to the school and one that placed less emphasis on off-site training. They stated that:

preparing, inducting and developing headteachers is a major responsibility of the education service. (School Management Task Force 1990, p.34)

The SMTF was impressed with the progress being made towards regional collaboration by LEAs and they proposed to actively encourage this by devising new approaches to management development. A direct result of their work emerged in 1992 when the government funded a national pilot scheme on mentoring for new headteachers. The scheme applied to the first year of headship and provided an opportunity to inculcate good practice. Bush (1995) made the observation:
many professionals take up their first principalship without any structured management training (p.3).

The SMTF identified the keys to successful mentoring - mentors, mentees and the people who supported them:

Southworth (1995) makes the observation from working with heads in the East Anglian consortium that there is strong agreement that:

mentoring involves listening, acting as a sounding board for the new head and being a confidante to them (p.19).

An early evaluation of the pilot by Bolam et al (1995), based on a sample of 303 mentors and 238 new headteachers, reported that they regarded the process had either been successful or very successful.

Southworth (1995), reflecting on the evaluation, identifies four main benefits and four disadvantages of mentoring, namely:

Advantages
• peer contact and support for the beginner;
• mentoring as a key part in the transition of the newcomer from previous post to the one of headteacher;
• mentoring as beneficial to the new heads and their mentors;
• the mentoring process as a reflective one.

Disadvantages
• the pairing of new heads and mentors as problematic;
• mentoring became fashionable when education and headship was in a state of change;
• mentoring can be categorised as help from veterans;
• by supporting an individual can sustain the belief in the centrality of school leaders.
He concluded that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. In reviewing the experience of mentoring new headteachers, Southworth (1995) identifies the major benefits of mentoring as:

The development of reflective leadership... the implicit recognition of the benefits of life-long learning and... resulting benefits to all members of the school (pp.24-27).

adding that, the contribution of the mentoring process to the reflective school is:

an attractive notion... we need critical reflective school leaders. Heads who lead their self-managing schools by analysing their own and the school’s strengths and weaknesses and who develop and improve the quality of the learning for pupils, staff and themselves (p.27).

However, the lack of rigour and the fact that mentoring was a voluntary, in-service programme, operating in the first year of headship, and its disconnection from other initiatives, reduced its value. Southworth (1995) contends that mentoring need not be a coping strategy for newcomers, but:

It can also be regarded as playing a significant part in the transformation of school leadership (p.25).

This point is further endorsed by Southworth (1998) from his unpublished research with deputy headteachers. The distribution of responsibilities in a primary school between a headteacher and deputy headteacher may not be sensible. Southworth believes the balance between management and leadership needs to be right and is school specific.

Southworth (1998) concludes that, 'looking into deputy headship means looking into headship as well'.

2.5 A Competence Based Approach to Professional Management Training

Management development can be traced back to 1983, but as Bush (1999) points out, educational management is a fledgling discipline and is yet to be justified in the academic world, a situation mirrored in all management development courses such as MBA. Earlier Poster (1986) claimed that it was easier to define management skills for a deputy headteacher than for a head.

In an earlier attempt the School Management South group, undoubtedly influenced by the MCI initiatives, defined 250 performance criteria, and as Bush (1998) pointed out it was not surprising it had little impact on the preparation of headteachers. Earley (1993) concluded that as a result of that project the adoption of the MCI standards made a significant contribution to individual and institutional development, concluding that competence-based approaches may well be able to contribute to the improvement of schools and their managers. A note of caution was raised by Argyris (1978 and 1982) that managers must not only learn new skills if they are to have credibility but, 'internalise a new set of values'. This is far removed from the work of Morgan and Hall (1982) who attempted to define a secondary headteacher's job through Katz' effective skills of an administrator – 'interpersonal, informational and decisional'.

Since the mid 1980s there has been a renewed interest in competence-based learning and training. The National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) assess performance linked to the workplace. This in turn has had considerable influence on the development of competence-based approaches to professional education and training. This is particularly true with the Management Charter Initiative (MCI) level three award – Management II MCI (1990), which is designed for middle managers. However, competence models are not without their critics. Jones and Moore (1995) that the model presented in NVQ was 'narrow and behaviouristic', and is only one way to approach competence. As Bolam (1997) points out:

the industrial competence based approach impact on school management training is well exemplified in the School Management South project and in the establishment of assessment centres... the competency approach has
undoubtedly been widely influential in creating a shift in the overall perspective on school management training, but it is unclear how far it has been incorporated into programmes and courses (p.274).

Here Bolam (1997) is articulating the perceived tension that exists between theory and practice, particularly in the traditional training programmes, especially those from universities. He cites some conceptual and theoretical problems:

first, a general one with the literature in this field;
second, educational management is a field of study which draws upon a range of sub-fields;
third, the two most common approaches, that of organisational theory and educational;
administration theory is beset by dilemmas (p.275).

Cullen (1992) noted that competences are 'inevitably based on best practice and may date very quickly'. Similarly Hyland (1993b) suggests that competence-based approaches to education have a weak and confused conceptual base. He goes as far to suggest that they are 'founded on dubious and largely discredited behaviourist principles'. Bolam (1997) expresses concern at the bureaucratisation of educational management training and development as presented by the TTA.

In an attempt to go beyond competence and develop a more relevant and intellectually rigorous educational paradigm, Boyatizis et al (1996) calls for a more holistic model of education and training which incorporates and extend competence frameworks. Such a model has been argued by Finn (1996) where the notion of 'collective competence' in organisations and the creation of 'competency profiles' for roles, individuals and teams.

Davies and Ellison (1994) see the development of the self-managing school creating new management development needs for headteachers:

what is needed is formalised provision which links 'on-the-job' experience, individual development and award bearing structures... management
development should be flexible and focused on school-related needs of educational leaders, rather than on fixed programmes (p.363).

These perspectives underlay Davies and Ellison thinking, and that of others of the evolving MBAs in Educational Management. The introduction of the new TTA qualifications has not been without its critics. Revell (1997) suggested that academics were angry about the threat to traditional MAs in educational management. Revell stated that:

To say that the Agency's proposed structures of professional qualifications house had a mixed reception would be to understate the situation considerably. Its Chief Executive has sailed her armada into some stormy waters (p.13).

From the outset of the NPQH no formal construction of links between the national qualification and higher degrees in educational management was articulated which has led according to Brundrett (1999) to identify some inherent tensions between these emerging traditions. This apparent tension in higher education between the traditional reflective type course and a competency based one was not new, and that Revell through his survey, detected that the majority of Masters course contacted claimed to cover all five of the key areas in the National Standards.

2.6 The Teacher Training Agency (TTA)

Despite the importance of issues like the problematic link between theory and practice, the growth and development of in-service provision for school management training, like the MBA, has not slackened.

The TTA was established in 1994 and gave a high priority to headteacher development, encouraged by the then Secretary of State, who recognised the vital role headteachers played in implementing government reforms.
2.6.1 HEADLAMP

In 1995 HEADLAMP (The Headteachers Leadership and Management Programme) was launched to provide training for first time headship appointments. A grant of £2500 was made available for headteachers to access training in their first two years of headship. The HEADLAMP programme introduced the idea of abilities which Bush and Chew (1997, p.47) describe as, 'a competence-based approach to defining the qualities required by effective heads'.

But, there is in schools limited understanding as to what using competences for development actually means:

There exist very real prejudices of some against competences and NVQs. This has undermined wide discussion on how greater effectiveness in improving performance, claimed for the competence approach, could be linked with the traditional academic approach, which builds concepts and skills. (Lumby 1995, p.11)

The approach designed by the TTA has combined a mixture of functional and personal competences through a list of tasks and abilities, as the basis for planning development of new headteachers. It is alleged that the TTA constructed these without consultation or consideration of the work of Earley (1993). Employed at the time by the School Management South Earley had researched a complete set of competencies based on the Management Charter Initiative. Jirasingh et al (1993), working with an established leading firm of occupational psychology management consultants, derived a set of management competencies that reflected the dimensions of headship. Neither have been referred to in TTA documentation and the word competence, has been avoided completely. Lumby (1995) says:

the avoidance of the term competence offers another example of the semantic nervousness of those involved with the development of professionals (p.11).

Bush (1999) cites HEADLAMP as:
A welcome indication that the TTA, and the government, recognised the importance of preparing heads for the demands of school management. (p.245).

2.6.2 National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH)

One of the most recent initiatives in England and Wales has been the introduction of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) by the TTA. Under TTA regulations, training and assessment for NPQH was to be provided by eleven Assessment Centres and 11 Training and Development Centres. In addition candidates could undertake training and development using materials and support arrangements developed by a supported open learning (SOL) provider.

Assessment centres were responsible for:

- the selection of candidates from non-LEA maintained schools and those not employed in schools;
- needs assessment for all candidates;
- the assessment of any of the national standards not assessed through training;
- final assessment of all candidates.

Training and development centres and the SOL provider were responsible for:

- the compulsory module (Strategic Leadership and Accountability); and the three remaining modules (Teaching and Learning, Leading and Managing Staff and the Efficient and Effective Deployment of Staff and Resources) and their assessment, where candidates are required to undertake training.

Regulation was with the TTA, which operated strict criteria for training and assessment to ensure consistency nationally.
All candidates were assessed against all the National Standards, through a range of assessment techniques focussing on the core purpose of headship:

To provide professional leadership for a school which secures its success and improvements, ensuring high quality education for all its pupils and improved standards of achievement. (TTA 1997, p.4)

Candidates were able to select any of the 11 Assessment Centres for any part of the assessment programme, but as Collarbone (1998) points out:

This can lead to piecemeal provision for the candidate and an inevitable lack of coherence, even though the programme is a national one and moderated nationally (p.338).

The process was planned to take 1 – 3 years, depending upon the candidate’s assessment of their experience and needs.

Trials of the programme took place between January and July 1997. As a result of these the TTA introduced a number of changes in key areas, before full implementation, namely:

(a) consistency: need to secure greater consistency of practice in training and assessment within and between NPQH centres;
(b) streamlining procedures: materials to be straightforward and unbureaucratic as possible;
(c) needs assessment and action planning: better guidance on action planning and better use to be made by training providers of the findings from the need assessment process;
(d) support: the need to ensure that NPQH candidates have the necessary support to undertake the qualification successfully. (TTA 1997, p.3)

Lodge (1998) recorded 4000 candidates had undertaken training including those on the accelerated route, created for those near to headship or in an acting headteacher
role. Gunter (1999) however, expressed concern that this would put more emphasis on:

A speedy measurement of competency against the National Standards than on providing a developmental training experience (p.256).

This view was endorsed by the House of Commons Select Committee on Education and Employment Second Special Report, Session (1997-98). In that same report the government was asked to consider the proposal for more systematic mentoring of heads.

Similarly, Bush (1999, p.246) makes a strong case that a headship training programme, which includes mentoring alongside theory and practice of educational management, as in Singapore, was 'likely to be more effective than the summative approach of NPQH'.

Research undertaken by one of the Assessment Centres in 1997 was aimed at improving a process already in existence. Collarbone (1999) reported:

more than 90% of candidates were enthusiastic about the Needs Assessment process. They found it professional, rigorous, constructive and developmental (p.344).

Candidates particularly valued:

The personal interview, the self-evaluation exercise, the observed group discussion and the psychometric test (p.344).

It was clear that in the initial development phase, the needs assessment process required detailed organisation. Collarbone (1999) concludes that:

Candidates’ experience of Needs Assessment is now raising questions about the links between Needs Assessment and Training and Development. The link is not always clear to the candidate (p.344).
Training and Development is not targeted at individual need, where as the Needs Assessment process provides candidates with considerable individual attention (p.345).

A national evaluation of NPQH has been undertaken over the 3 year period 1998 – 2000, resulting in a revised programme commencing in April 2001. The results of the evaluation have yet to be published, begging the question as to why?

Following that review led by Collarbone (1999), the length and organisation of the training and the nature of the assessments have been changed. The three-year programme is to be reduced to one year and some of the assessments will be replaced by tasks more closely related to candidates’ work in their own school. The course will become:

i) phase related;
ii) greater use will be made of ICT;
iii) less time spent on residential weekends; and,
iv) candidates will receive more support from tutors.

The DFEE were quick to add that the changes did not mean a lessening of rigour!

Revell (2002) viewed the prototype NPQH as ‘a TTA qualification’, didactic and failing to attract sufficient aspirant heads. He welcomed the changes to NPQH and recorded the complaints from candidates about the mountains of paper work and the over didactic nature of the training contributed significantly to the high non completion rates for the course, particularly from candidates who achieved headship whilst in pursuit of the qualification.

This perspective of NPQH was further endorsed by Tomlinson (2001), who predicted that there would not be enough teachers interested in gaining the qualification if it stayed in its present form. He went further suggesting that an
accelerated route will be needed and that greater prominence will have to be given to candidates’ previous learning and experience.

2.6.3 National Standards

In 1996 the TTA launched a new initiative based on the provision of nationally approved assessment training and qualifications at four key stages of continuing professional development: newly qualified teachers, expert teachers, experts in subject leadership and management, experts in school leadership and management. Having established a national set of competences for headteachers, it is not surprising that priority has been given to the fourth stage, NPQH.

The National Standards (TTA 1997a) are in five sections and present 81 criteria which a candidate has to meet and which the training and development needs to address. (Lodge 1998, p.350)

The five sections are:

1. core purpose of headship
2. key outcomes of headship
3. professional knowledge and understanding
4. skills and attributes
5. key areas of headship, which are:
   - strategic direction and development of the school
   - learning and teaching in the school
   - people and relationships
   - human and material resources and their development and deployment
   - accountability for the efficiency and effectiveness of the school

The National Standards are based on a competence approach, although the term competence has been neatly avoided. Millett (1996) claims that the requirements
for headship can be specified and measured: ‘We should make explicit all of the key characteristics of those most likely to succeed in establishing and maintaining excellence as the headteacher of a school’.

The five key areas are divided into 23 tasks. To develop in these key areas, Downes (1996) sees aspiring heads needing to:

develop a range of skills and abilities... and that they will need to do a lot of homework on among other topics, legislation, personnel, finance, curriculum and assessment models and leadership and management theory (p.27).

Downes warns that it will not be easy to assess the required skills and knowledge and that “finding objective evidence on skills like sensitivity and adaptability will not be easy” (p.27).

The concerns of Downes are supported by Bolam (1997, p.278): “it is essential that consideration of values and professional knowledge should be included,” adding that: “the messages of research should be an integral and continuing component of NPQH.”

Bush (1998) links the NPQH development to:

the set of functions of school management in the 1980s defined by the School Management South, of no fewer than 250 performance criteria, “surprisingly, this approach had little impact on the preparation of heads” (p.327).

Millett (1996) sees the qualification developing headteachers:

who are well prepared to lead effective and flourishing schools, where debate, challenge and improvement are the norm and where pupils get a taste for learning that will stay with them throughout their lives (p.23).
The training for NPQH is focused on activity which is both practical and relevant to school improvement, and should draw on inspection findings and the best practice from inside and outside education.

NPQH, according to Millett (1997) is one of the most exciting developments in education and it will equip our future headteachers with the skills they need to lead schools successfully. Millett sees school leadership as the key to school effectiveness.

Gunter (1999) believes that the introduction of centrally determined and accredited training for those moving into headship, breaks with the past and as Fidler (1998) states:

There has been a conscious attempt not to use the existing qualifications, structure or experiences as the backbone for the new initiative (p.314).

Gunter (1999) concludes:

It seems that locating the development of educational professionals with individuals, unions, higher education institutes, local education authorities and consultancies is no longer regarded as appropriate (p.252).

This state has largely risen as a result of the tension between educating headteachers and training them. The NPQH and other TTA designed course ensure that they follow centrally directed practices, in other words training. Educating headteachers might lead to diversity and independent thinking!

In welcoming NPQH as the first national development programme for the next generation of school leaders, Bush (1999) warns:

that it remains to be seen whether the apparently straightforward process of setting out the ‘key characteristics’ of leadership (not management) will lead to excellence’ in schools (p.245).
Adding further that Taylor’s (1976) remarks about the lack of any evidence that links success in competency-based programmes with job performance may be too negative in the late 1990s, (quoted in Bush 1999, p245).

The National Standards reflect the separation of leadership from management with the latter assigned to a supporting role to leadership Fidler (1997). Management and administration, being routine maintenance activities, are seen as supportive to the leadership activities of strategic planning and development of the school.

The first educational management courses in the England and Wales were largely derived from commercial settings and from the United States, where programmes in educational administration had developed strongly in the 1950s and 1960s. The London Institute of Education offered some of the first specialist educational administration course in the 1960s. The Open University course, ‘E321 Management in education’ (1976) was typical of this genre in that it drew on both commercial and Unites States models. Bush (1999, p.239) describes this early approach as ‘a fledgling discipline seeking to justify its place in the academic world.’

Of the many critics of this approach, Taylor (1976) was concerned of the prospect of industrial concepts having an undue influence on education, although not the case now:

The business analogy tends to encourage a ‘them’ and ‘us’ relationship between head, senior staff, teachers and students, instead of stressing shared values within the academic community (p.41).

Parallel growth in the educational management development also occurred in Europe and the Commonwealth during the 1970s and 1980s. The Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration, now the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management was founded in 1973. The European Forum on Educational Administration was established in 1976 with 20 members currently.
The generalisability of the principles of management has evoked lively argument. On the one hand Handy (1984) regarded education as just another field for the application of the general principles of management whereas Bush (1995a) argued it should be consider a separate discipline, given the difficulty of defining and measuring achievement of educational objectives, the presence of children as outputs of schools.

By the mid-1990s Bush (1999, p.241) concluded that the literature was substantial and claimed that: “educational management had become an ‘established’ discipline.” These arguments for and against whether the principles of educational management are sufficiently different from those of general management and are well documented elsewhere (West-Burnham, 1992, Bush and Middlewood, 1997 and Torrington and Weightman, 1989).

The emergence of the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) in 1994 rekindled the debate with its emphasis on taking account of the ‘best practice outside education’ in devising professional development programmes for headteachers. What is the best practice and who decides is not straightforward. Glatter (1997) saw this issue as highly problematic:

> It is not always clear what constitutes best practice in management outside education. As in education itself, there are different approaches and contending schools of thought (p.187).

Research on school effectiveness and school improvement by Stoll (1996) firmly places the topics of teaching and learning as central ones for school leaders to focus on, not the generic tasks of managing human resources, finance and external relations.

This view is further reinforced by Bullock and Thomas (1997) in their assessment of self-managing schools. They argue that judgements should focus on educational outcomes, the standard and quality of learning. However they conclude that:
...it is not apparent that the policies and practices of decentralisation... are adequately geared to that achievement (p.222).

But it can be argued that, without organisational structures being secure, can educational objectives be effectively achieved?

The preparation of headteachers in both the UK and US is well documented, but Gunter (1999) argues that, within the restructuring of public sector services, challenges to professional practices are emerging, adding that for headteachers:

The emphasis (in the past) has been on voluntary and pluralistic provision. The introduction of centrally determined and accredited training for those seeking to move into headship is an attempt to break with the past it seems, that development of educational professionals with individuals, unions, higher education institutions, local authorities and consultancies is no longer regarded as appropriate (p.252).

Ouston (1998) sees the development of NPQH as being part of a centrist approach:

It is part of a ladder of qualifications controlled and funded by the TTA. Each is set within current political values and tightly controlled from the centre (p.318).

Gunter (1999) goes on to ask a number of important questions for those involved in the study and practice of educational leadership:

- How do we understand the professional practice of the headteacher?
- What are the knowledge claims on which the NPQH structures and curriculum are based?
- How does this fit in with research and debates about appropriate professional development? (p.252)

adding:
The NPQH seems to be about integrating new headteachers into the work which site-based management is constructing... In a performance driven education system the headteacher must know how to perform and how to produce the data which validates performance (p.252).

In contrast Grace (2000) considers that preparation for school leadership should cover all aspects of the professional role:

the discourse and understanding of management must be matched by a discourse and understanding of ethics, mortality and spirituality, of humane educative principles, of the praxis of democratic education of power relations of class, race and gender in education and some historical sense of place of schooling in the wider formation of society (p.244).

Without the broader connection with the social and the moral, Greenfield (1993) argues that creative people will be put off headship:

to be humane, to escape the fact-driven, calculable world, we must be humane, reaching beyond our grasp, towards heaven.

(Greenfield and Ribbins 1993, p.268)

Gunter (1999) continues to argue that, in the fast changing world of the public sector:

what was once considered as preparation for headteachers is being replaced by the training of headteachers, but, it is the skills and knowledge to make successful bids that will meet the external requirements for effectiveness (p.259).

The problematic nature of gathering evidence was also considered by Gunter (1999, p.261) as a concern and who saw the NPQH award as really about the candidate's ability to construct evidence, claims that it is an, 'anti intellectual and emotional sterile qualification'. This argument supports the concerns expressed by Hargreaves and Evans (1997) and Ouston (1998), namely conformity as opposed to
creativity, educational values as opposed to organisational, observable and measurable ones.

Creissen (1997) believes that there are:

Aspects of the head’s job that are hard to assess through the NPQH and which have to be measured through confidential references and the interview process...there is also an intuitive nature to headship which is a problematic issue for assessment (p.118).

It increasingly appears to be the case that what may not be assessable is actually at the centre of the reality of headship.

NPQH was presented as a professional qualification, designed to provide rigorous and above all practical training for senior managers in educational institutions, with no formal links between the qualification and higher degrees in educational management that had been established over the previous decade. NPQH was challenged critically by higher education institutions. In a survey of providers of higher degrees in educational management by Brundrett (1999), concern was raised about the nature of the knowledge base within NPQH as a qualification. Bolam (1997) has added the view that this is part of a wider debate on the knowledge base for educational leadership. The inherent tension between the qualification and higher degree programmes was illustrated by Lumby (1995) on the use of competencies. Lumby (1995) views the use of competencies as an appropriate answer to headteacher development but noted that the list of ‘tasks and capabilities’ identified by the TTA were:

...a thinly disguised mixture of functional and personal competencies, (the things that teachers do and the personal qualities they need). The TTA’s avoidance of the term ‘competence’ offers another example of the semantic nervousness in the development of professionals (p.11).

But there is little doubt that the National Standards for Headteachers exhibit the characteristics that of the former TTA Chief Executive declared as key to
establishing excellence. The TTA, through its design of HEADLAMP, adopted an approach that combines a mixture of functional and personal competences through a list of tasks and abilities. Not so with NPQH. However, the lasting impact on school leadership programmes undoubtedly has come from the development of Assessment Centres.

The link between theory and practice is one of the dilemmas in educational training and development according to Bolam (1997). The introduction of the NPQH qualification was in the belief that academic higher degree courses were too theoretical. Millett (1997a) expressed that NPQH was a more rounded and relevant, professional and practical approach to training, and this was one of its attractions. Revell (1997) suggested that academics were alarmed about the threat to traditional MAs in education management posed by this new qualification.

Following the change of government in 1997, Bush (1998 p330) perceived a determination to avoid what he describes as; ‘...the pretentious claim that only the NPQH can prepare aspiring heads’.

This change was signalled in a letter from the Secretary of State to the chair of the TTA Board in October 1997:

The Prime Minister has already welcomed the launch of the NPQH and the Agency’s professional standards for headship on which it is based. I now look to the agency to continue to develop and further strengthen the NPQH as the new mandatory qualification for all first time heads. In doing so I will expect you to ensure that appropriate recognition can be given to Masters degrees and other existing high quality qualifications. (Blunkett 1997, p.31).

The last point is one that ‘needs greater clarification,’ Bush (1998), adding that:

The process of articulating NPQH and Master’s degrees is already in progress and promises to overcome a potentially unhelpful dichotomy between two legitimate approaches to management development. It should
also introduce some welcome diversity into a programme that was threatening to become a monopoly with all its associated dangers (p.331).

But Bush (1998, p.331) issues a cautionary note that: ‘until those who have gained the qualification and are in post as a head, NPQH cannot be properly evaluated’.

Collarbone (1998, p.346) sees the aim of NPQH as increasing the chance that a newly appointed headteacher will be better sustained and better enabled to their job properly.

As articulated in the preceding paragraphs, headship has changed significantly over the last forty years. Can any qualification such as NPQH equip people for headship? Given, as West-Burnham (2001) argues, that ‘headship is one of omni competence, a skilled practitioner, a curriculum leader, a technical expert plus all the manifestation associated with a figure head’.

2.7 Management Development: International Perspective

The pressure for change in schools is not unique to England and Wales and the implication for headteachers and their preparation has been felt across the world over the past two decades. In this section a review is undertaken of the international experiences with the preparation for headteachers. Consideration is given to themes such as mentoring, preparation programmes and collaboration/partnership with Universities. Throughout this section the term headteacher will be used generically alongside the specific title attributed to similar positions in other countries.

2.7.1 Headteacher Preparation and Training Programmes in the United States of America

Individual States in the USA have their own education system and they have developed their own approach to headteacher preparation. In the United States the role of principals is very different from that experienced by headteachers in England and Wales. It must also be pointed out that in USA principals are
accountable to the school superintendent, except in Charter or privatised schools. It is the latter who undertake many of the tasks and decisions that are taken by headteachers in the England and Wales.

From research by Lyons (1983) the USA experience identified similar pressures on schools as in Britain. There was a lack of in-service education in schools and in particular for principals. With the aid of universities a number of programmes were established. One in particular Results Oriented Management in Education (ROME) was based at the University of Georgia and produced a comprehensive set of performance evaluation instruments for heads. Principals record their self-perceptions of how well they perform 100 job related tasks. The tasks represent five areas of their administrative responsibility:

a) curriculum and instruction  
b) staff personnel  
c) pupil personnel  
d) financial management  
e) system policies and operation

As a result of field-testing, a high priority set of 80 competencies and 338 performance indicators were identified, thus creating a basis for the preparation of training materials.

The notion of excellence from an analysis of successful companies by Peters and Waterman (1982) has had an impact on education in the USA. In 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in American Education (1983) identified 'a rising tide of mediocrity' in the nation's schools, and recommended improvements be made in the quality of teacher recruitment, the leadership of schools and the academic rigour of the curriculum. Research in the USA has identified that effective schools require effective leaders. By asking the question 'what do effective heads do?' it is the heads' performance that singularly makes a difference. (Clarke et al, 1984, Fullan 1982). The idea of Principal Centres was put forward by Dr Roland Barth at Harvard University in 1981. The centre's activities were largely self-generated by the heads themselves and were seen to be more suitable to
Wallace (1987) describes many of the activities as reminiscent of the work of teachers’ centres in Britain. He went on to say that the principles of the bottom up support approach contradicts those of the top down training perspective. However, coexistence of the two is not impossible. The concept of a ‘principal centre’ is not paralleled in Britain at the moment. Such activities that are associated with ‘principal centres’ exist in a variety of settings. Wallace argues that it may be in the best interest of principals to consider a club style centre to be separately located, not run by LEA staff, but the training aspect could be run by them.

The competency of newly appointed principals was explored by Lyons (1992). In the review of the current practice he concluded that:

far less is being done in school districts to aid new appointees to principalship... the usual practice is for the newly appointed principal to be given a school, a set of keys, and wished good luck The novice principal seldom understands the full scope of the issues, expectations, and scope of the responsibilities that accompany the position (p.4).

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) describe the situation as follows:

Whatever the reasons for wanting to become a principal, most aspirants to the role have a vague understanding of how much it entails. The loneliness, the conflicts, the dullness of routine, the ‘busy work’, and the anguish that accompany having to solve complex emotional and organisational problems with limited resources are usually not part of a teacher’s perception of the principalship (p.153).

The focus in the past has largely been on what principals do rather than on how teachers learn to become principals. Daresh’s study in 1986 revealed that the new principals were worried about how students, parents, and particularly teachers will
react to them. Basically headteachers want to be accepted, liked and respected, like any teacher.

Macpherson (1986) saw the problem as one of whom does a principal serve? Those to whom you are responsible or for whom you are responsible? This suggests an essential skill for principals is one of brokering, between central administration and school staff. Duke (1988), in a similar study to Daresh, found that new principals had difficulty with understanding their leadership role and in particular with respect to knowing about individuals and groups.

The issues of isolation and feedback have been identified by many researchers as the two problems that most new principals encounter. There is no one in the school who they can turn to, although in the England and Wales the governing body provides a supporting role. There is a fear of making mistakes because the pace of the job is fast and time consuming. According to Morrison and Crowson et al (1984) many new principals resort to 'problem anticipation'. A search routine operates in which they move around the school trying to head off or identify potential problems before they erupt.

A further concern for new principals has been identified by Lyons (1992) as their failure to delegate. He identified five reasons for this, namely:

1. They have a strong need to be involved in every aspect;
2. Others may wonder whether they are capable of handling the job;
3. They are not confident that others will do a good job;
4. They have a strong need to be recognised as the leader;
5. They are concerned that delegating responsibility to someone else weakens their position (p.11).

There are duties that principals prefer over others so it is not surprising that it is common to find them concentrating on those activities that are personally most fulfilling. Lyons (1992) concludes that the astute principal:
...quickly learns the organisational culture, norms and values, and how they relate to the reward system. They learn quickly how to exploit the formal and informal rules to enhance their own or the school’s future (p.10).

Thomson (1988) contends that a successful principal stands on a professional knowledge base supported by three legs; namely:

management, leadership and knowledge of schooling. (Thomson 1988, p41)

His recommendations for success in principalship included the following:

1. university preparation programmes must prepare individuals to successfully assume the role;
2. school districts must be willing to provide new principals a comprehensive programme of principal orientation;
3. provide new principals regular feedback;
4. provide new principals formative feedback;
5. require a professional growth plan.

Lyons (1992) concludes that, without adequate support, even the best new principals will not necessarily reach their full potential:

it is too important a task to leave the training, selection and support of principals to be left to chance or happenstance (p.19).

Behar-Horenstein (1995) advocates principal preparation programmes to be, 'developing leaders who are prepared to deal with the change process', (p. 20). This she anticipates will challenge institutions and their departments of educational leadership to:

reconsider their organisational structures and culture norms and personal beliefs systems that preclude the emergence of a new vision of training (p.20).
In Florida there is a two-tiered level certification process. According to Behar-Horenstein (1995), to achieve level one certification aspiring principals are required to complete 8-10 courses and pass the Florida Educational Leadership Examination. Successful completion of level two obligates prospective principals to complete an on the job training component and demonstrate the 19 state adopted principal competencies. The competencies are associated with the domains of purpose and direction, cognitive skills, consensus management, quality enhancement, organisation, and communication. The latter can be completed in a variety of ways.

In the State of Illinois, Universities and colleges play a major role in the certification process of the one tier system. Aspiring principals are expected to complete 10 courses of which they can select 3. The universities and colleges are requested to provide documentation validating that students have completed the requirements.

There has been considerable debate about the preparation for principalship and what it must include. Behar-Horenstein (1995) speaks about the need for a carefully conceived balance of knowledge and interpersonal skills. In this way the aspiring principal will be more able to:

...effectively guide change, explore innovative ways to cope with the challenges posed by our changing society, and support individuals who are reluctant to move towards less traditional models of schooling (p.36).

Through this route Behar-Horenstein concludes that aspiring principals will become empowered and promote the development of effective leadership skills within a school.

Erlandson (1997), examining the situation in Texas, sees the demands on principals in the 21st century will not diminish and that they will need a knowledge base that is more comprehensive and a range of skills that are more complex than ever before, and that preparation programmes must be linked closely to the demands of the work place. In the same article he argues that the major criticism levelled at
universities responsible for the preparation programme is the one of lack of relevance for what is required for effective performance in the job.

A direct outcome from an in depth scrutiny of the principal preparation programme was the generation of the knowledge and skill base of principalship, encompassed in the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) 21 domains. These 21 domains act, according to Erlandson (1997):

As a map for the preparation programme, link theory and knowledge directly with the skills needed in the principalship (p.13).

Similarly the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) uses the same knowledge and skill base to form six standards for school leaders. The state of Texas has developed areas of proficiency related to the development of learner-centred schools towards which this knowledge and skill base identified by NPBEA and ISLLC has to be directed.

The knowledge base and skills associated with each domain is not questioned by Erlandson, but whether they are an appropriate foundation for developing leadership in schools has still to be made. Erlandson stresses that universities should play a major part in the pre-service preparation stage, and that other stakeholders should assume greater responsibility in the induction stage.

Overall Erlandson (1997) is attempting to draw a distinction between principalship and the principal:

The principal must ensure that all the requirements of the principalship are effectively met, but because the job has become so complex, the principal cannot fulfil its requirements alone (p.15).

An interesting initiative in Texas refers to the development of schools as leadership laboratories, training grounds for future principals. Fifteen schools from the Texas Education Collaborative were selected in 1996 to begin the School Leadership Initiative (SLI). The schools themselves had a number of goals, notably to:
The goal for the principal of the school would be to become a ‘leader of leaders,’ for the school to become a training ground for future principals. Professionals were selected to serve in leadership laboratories as assistant principals. Individual programmes were constructed, by personnel from the Principals Centre at Texas A&M University, to support these chosen people. All individuals would attend an advanced intensive workshop for principal growth; the entire programme to last approximately two years. There is recognition that this is a trial approach and that outcomes are not assured. Zellner and Erlandson (1997) conclude their article by stating that:

If the strategies we have described cannot be replicated in other contexts, at least they should be expected to furnish principles that may be applied to other settings (p.49).

Peel and Wallace (1996) evaluated a school internship based model of practical applications supporting theories being taught in the classroom. During the first year of a two-year programme participants attended monthly seminars on topics relevant to administrators. The second year was an internship. Participants who had completed most of the requirements for licensure were given the opportunity to complete a six-week internship. A feature of the programme according to Peel (1996) was:

that every participant had a mentor and a university supervisor who offered guidance throughout the programme. (Peel and Wallace 1996, p.11)

The resulting survey of participants suggests that the internship was the strongest link between theory and real-life experience. Again, according to Peel (1996), the mentor system:
was also highly rated by participants. The most effective mentors enabled novice administrators to critically examine current educational leadership processes. Effective mentors challenge their mentees and allow them freedom to assume responsibility for certain duties. (Peel and Wallace 1996, p.11)

They conclude that the findings supported the view that practical ‘hands on’ experience served to augment the traditional, higher education, theory based programmes. This is a topic discussed further in the next section.

2.8 Headteacher mentors and mentoring – English and international experience

In a review of the literature involving mentoring in education Shute et al (1989) found no single definition of the term. Descriptions include such things as a broad range of developmental relationships between junior and seniors, or among peers, an adult who befriends and guides a less experienced adult. Levine (1985) described a mentor as:

A wise advisor who manages, nurtures, encourages and teaches organisational responsibility (p.46).

Mentoring to enhance professional preparation is not a new idea. Phillips-Jones (1982) referred to mentors as, ‘influential people who significantly help you reach your major life goals,’ (p21). Levison’s (1978, p.33) description of a mentor as ‘a critical actor in the developmental process is one defined.’

The potential value of mentoring as a feature of professional development for educational personnel has become more readily appreciated as an important component of induction at critical points in careers of teachers, including preparation for school leaders.
2.8.1 The Headteacher Mentoring programme in Singapore

A mentoring programme for school principals has been operating in Singapore since 1984. Their programme uses a three-point definition as a guide, namely:

1. A mentor is a more experienced headteacher who undertakes to guide a less experienced manager’s (the mentee) career and professional development.
2. A mentor develops the unique abilities of the mentee, without detriment to others in his or her organisation.
3. Mentoring is a development process. (Chong et al 1990)

According to Stott and Walker (1992, p.154), the Singapore scheme sees mentors, ‘...as developers of the future potential.’

The mentoring programme is housed within a diploma course, the Diploma in Educational Administration (DEA), through which the potential candidates for headship must pass. The programmes are designed for primary and secondary principals. Bush and Chew (1999) describe the DEA as:

A unique development programme targeted at potential principals who are sponsored for a year of full-time pre-service training conducted by the National Institute of Education (NIE) (p.45).

In each programme there is a compulsory 310 hours of coursework, and in addition there is an eight-week practicum for all participants. The mentoring component comprises two four-week long periods, which mentees spend in their mentors’ schools. Taken together, Bush and Chew (1999) say that:

the internship experience and management theory input acquired through coursework provide for a strong training background (p.45).

The actual mentoring process takes place when protégées are attached to their mentors’ schools on a full time basis. They are expected to:
take on school leadership tasks negotiated with their mentors to allow them to practice the core leadership skills. At the same time mentors role model through their daily school management behaviour how they deal with different situations and leadership tasks (p.45).

Each mentor - protégé pair works closely with the National Institute of Education (NIE) facilitator whose role is to ensure that learning objectives are clearly understood and pursued.

Bush and Chew (1999) describe the Singapore model of mentoring as:

Highly structured and elaborate and is working well, judging by the Ministry of Education’s support of it and feedback obtained from yearly cohorts of DEA participants (p.46).

There are similarities to the US scheme, but there are significant differences to the mentoring scheme introduced in the UK in the early nineties. However Stott and Walker (1992) found similar findings as a result of their study into the headship mentoring programmes in Singapore. For example, the process found reciprocal benefits for both mentor and mentee. Isolation from peers has been consistently cited by headteachers as one of the most significant problems they face. Daresh and Playko (1992) in a review of their experience of development of mentoring programmes for practising and aspiring principals in the USA commented, ‘serving as a mentor enabled them to form networks and form contacts with other school leaders’.

Successful mentoring includes the quality of preparation, systematic support for the programme and acceptance by other staff in the school. Overwhelming was the choice of mentor, perceived as the critical element in the programme. But this alone is insufficient to guarantee success. Training is an essential part alongside the equally valid competence gained through experience. The preparation and the on going support for mentors is of course crucial. The School Management Task Force (SMTF) in the UK established in 1989 recommended the introduction of mentoring as part of an induction programme for newly appointed heads. The
programme applies in the first year of headship and is not preceded by any compulsory training. Bush (1995) describes mentoring as:

an in-service model of professional development. It might be regarded as a substitute for training rather than forming part of it as in Singapore and the USA (p.46).

Coleman et al (1996, p.7) carried out research into the role of mentoring in the training of principals, making a comparison between the roles adopted in Singapore and England. Background of mentors, was not entirely dissimilar. The Singaporean mentors had learnt the skills in mentoring through the Diploma in Educational Administration (DEA) guidelines and their own experience, whereas their English counterparts were trained on a regional basis. The main value of mentoring as a training mode for new heads, is in the Singapore pre-service model that gives the aspirant head first hand practical observation and tutored experience, 'they can reflect on their observations and build their own views based on their observations.'

Coleman et al (1996, p.9) identified benefits to mentors as well as mentees. Twenty percent of the Singaporean mentors questioned, 'formed networks and life-long friendships.'

Other benefits were identified by Singaporean mentors as:

it is enriching and satisfying to know that someone is learning from you... I also learnt as I was forced to reflect on my thinking and actions in carrying out my duty as a principal. (Coleman et al, 1996, p.9)

Experiences in the USA put one-to-one mentoring relationships as the centrepiece of programmes of support for beginning principals. Such programmes have been mandated in the states of Ohio, Maine, North Carolina and California.

Daresh and Playko (1992), in their review of mentoring for headteachers, concluded that:
1. Not all experienced school leaders are necessarily capable of serving as mentors;
2. Even if individuals possess the desirable characteristics of effective mentors they still need training to carry out the role (p.149).

In concluding their study Stott and Walker (1992) see mentoring as one method amongst others in preparing for headship. The Singapore system, and that in the US, appears to be valued.

The fact that the system is prepared to continue supporting an expensive programme demonstrates a conviction... Mentoring is a powerful tool for improvement and worth the considerable investment in preparing school leaders of the future (p.163).

The most common problem associated with mentoring in England is one of time, to be an effective mentor (Coleman et al, 1996). Singapore mentors see this as a potential disadvantage whereas grading mentees was more problematic to them given that there is no benchmark to assess performance against.

Overall Coleman et al (1996) conclude that the major difference between the two systems is indicated by the more developmental nature of the Singaporean relationship. They go on to say:

British mentors and their protégés might find benefit in the professional stimulus of a more challenging relationship, that goes beyond the largely supportive models that operate at present (p.16).

Bush and Chew (1999, p.48) see the two main issues for effective mentoring as 'The selection and status of mentors and mentor training'.

According to Bush and Chew (1999), there is general agreement in the literature that the success of the mentoring experience hinges largely on two factors: the relationship between the mentor and the protégé (Stott and Walker 1993, p.81) and
how skilful mentors are in honing the strengths and leadership qualities of protégés. Allerman et al (1984) believe that:

Mentoring relationships can be established or enriched by learning or encouraging mentor-like behaviour rather than selecting certain types of people (p.330).

A more fundamental problem in England, according to Bush et al (1996, p.140), is the lack of rigour: ‘the process needed to be more rigorous and developmental’.

Despite all the difficulties and limitations, Bush and Chew (1999, p.50) conclude that: ‘from research in both Singapore and England the benefits outweigh the problems’.

They go on to say that:

The integrated approach pioneered in Singapore, where mentoring is a central component of the training process and aspiring principals receive continual feedback on their performance, seems to offer a better model than England’s sequence of apparently disconnected initiatives. (p.51)

2.9 Research questions reviewed

A number of prominent themes have arisen through this review of British and International literature. These focus around the fundamental issue of educational management, leadership and management, training and development, being academic as opposed to competence based training.

Historically, headteachers in England and Wales have been powerful definers of the culture, organisation and ethos of learning. They were the keepers of knowledge, the curriculum and pedagogy. Increasingly, schools have adopted a wider management structure, delegating tasks and actions to members of a school leadership team, to fulfil local management functions. In doing so the headteachers have reduced their hold on matters such as school ethos, relations and
organisational culture. The push for change in schools appears to be more about changing the consciousness, values and behaviour of headteachers. Such forces are contributing powerfully towards changing the very nature of headship.

It is evident that, in suppressing the review findings of NPQH, the Government concedes that the original formulation was too complex and bureaucratic to achieve the main objectives of the qualification. Although modifications have occurred, and these have been welcomed by most in the profession, do they address one of the fundamental objectives to raise standards in school? NPQH is the gateway to headship and has to be viewed, not simply as a technical/professional programme, but in addition as a strategy for cultural transformation.

As a result of this literature search, the research questions as set out in chapter one need slight modification:

1. If one of the objectives of the qualification is to achieve better school leaders, can NPQH provide the leadership and management skills necessary to achieve strategic direction and vision for a school?
2. Can the skills of school leadership and management be met through a qualification that relies heavily on demonstration of competences?
3. Will the impact of NPQH on a candidate’s current school increase under its new formulation?

2.10 Summary

This chapter has tracked the development of in-service training, in the main for headteachers, over the last few decades in the UK. In its earliest form, in-service training was spasmodic. For those aspiring to become headteachers, no additional qualification was required, long service and suitable experience being the main criteria for selection. During the 1980s more attention was given to the training of headteachers already in post and, through the work of National Development Centre, the focus for such training moved away from administration and status quo management to organisational goal setting. The 1988 Education Reform Act had a substantial impact on training and development programmes for headteachers. The
most significant changes have resulted from the establishment of the Teacher Training Agency in 1994. Over its short life the TTA has given high priority to headteacher development within its all-embracing remit, HEADLAMP, NPQH and more recently the Leadership Programme for Serving Heads (LPSH).

A number of similar developments to NPQH, HEADLAMP and the Leadership Programme for serving heads have occurred internationally. Successive governments in recent times have linked the preparation and training of headteachers as a crucial element in the drive to achieve higher educational standards in England and Wales. Although there are similarities in training and development programmes that have emerged internationally and in the UK, mentoring is a distinctive feature of most countries. However there is no equivalent to NPQH. There is strong evidence of the value of the mentoring process. The importance given to such a role in school improvement, and in raising educational standards, is now well documented.
Chapter 3:

Methodology of research in the context of education
Methodology of research in the context of education

3.1 Introduction

If school leadership makes a difference to a school’s effectiveness as concluded by Hallinger and Heck (1999), will the considerable investment into the training and preparation of headteachers through NPQH bring about the changes in student outcomes, the main objective of successive governments since the late 1970s?

The establishment of National Standards for headship and the intention to make the NPQH qualification mandatory in due course has increased substantially the influence and control by government into education. The concentration within NPQH on specific knowledge, understanding, skills and attributes, and these being demonstrated by candidates prior to headship, raises questions about the appropriateness of a model that is largely isolated from other forms of professional education and training. Is it possible for such a model as NPQH to provide candidates with what is required to achieve effective schools?

The focus of this enquiry is the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH), the process being established in England and Wales to develop the next generation of state school headteachers; its impact on them as professionals; their current school and the school in which they become headteacher.

As with most research limitation of time and the access and availability of evidence, restrict the researcher. The strategy chosen for this research reflects the growing confidence shown by social scientists Robson (1993) in a ‘multiple perspectives and methods’ approach. This decision is explored in the following sections.

3.2 Models of Research

Before discussing the research hypotheses in this research programme, the general issues of research method will be discussed. These will then be explored within the context of researching NPQH.
There are varying views about how research should be carried out, and different methods exist for different types of questions and sets of circumstances. What has emerged over time are two traditions which continue to be the subject of debate. These are the scientific approach, commonly referred to as positivistic, natural-science based, hypothetico-deductive, quantitative approach, as opposed to the qualitative approach, anti-positivistic, otherwise known as interpretive or ethnographic.

With the first it is usually regarded as starting with theory, a general statement that summarises and organises knowledge by proposing a general relationship between events. This involves five sequential steps Robson (1993):

1. Deducing a hypothesis (a testable proposition about the relationships between two or more events or concepts) from the theory.
2. Expressing the hypothesis in operational terms (ie ones indicating exactly how variables are to be measured) which proposes a relationship between two specific variables
3. Testing this operational hypothesis. This will involve an experiment or some other form of empirical study.
4. Examining the specific outcome of the enquiry. It will either tend to confirm the theory or indicate the need for its modification.
5. If necessary, modifying the theory in the light of the findings. An attempt is then made to verify the revised theory by going back to the first step and repeating the whole cycle (p.19).

One of the main differences between the scientific and qualitative approaches is that the former the hypothesis is tested whilst with the latter hypotheses can be generated.

Another difference between the above and the interpretive, ethnographic approach is that in the latter, theories and concepts tend to arise from enquiry. They come after data collection rather than before it. Robson (1993) sees researchers who follow the interpretive or ethnographic approach as explorers:
They explore, gathering information, going first in one direction then perhaps retracing that route, then starting out in a new direction (p.20).

In this type of research, data collection and analysis are not rigidly separated. Often an initial burst of data collection is followed by analysis, the results of which are then used to decide what data should be collected next. Early theories can be formed and checked as the process continues.

Kerlinger (1970) defined scientific research as:

the systematic, controlled, empirical and critical investigation of hypothetical propositions about the presumed relations among natural phenomena (p.2).

Pring (2000) concludes that the scientific model is not appropriate, as it largely deals with understanding the mental life of an individual person.

According to Robson (1993), research is a combination of both reasoning and experience and has become regarded as the most successful approach to discovery of truth, particularly as far as the natural sciences are concerned.

Progress in educational research has advanced in recent years through the application of social scientific approaches, but this has not been without controversy. In adopting a social science orientation, educational research has at the same time absorbed two competing views of the social sciences - the established, traditional view and the more radical view. The former holds that the social sciences are essentially the same as the natural sciences, whereas the latter shares the same concerns and rigour of natural sciences and those of traditional social science to describe human behaviour. It places greater emphasis on how people differ from inanimate objects and each other.

These two views of social science represent two very different ways of looking at social reality. Cohen and Manion (1997) refer to the work by Burrell and Morgan (1979) who identified a number of assumptions that underpin the two views and that
have direct implication for the methodological concerns of researchers. The contrasting ontology's epistemologies and models of human beings associated with the two social science views require different research methods. Cohen and Manion (1997) suggest that with a positivistic approach to the social world the hard, real and external world the traditional options, including surveys and experiments, are the most likely choices. Alternatively, to view the social world from an anti-positivistic approach is much softer, personal and human and therefore the likely choices of approach will include such techniques as accounts, participant observation and personal constructs. This imposes on the researchers an involvement with their subjects and a rejection of the approaches of the natural scientists.

3.2.1 Positivistic Social Science

The nineteenth-century French philosopher, Auguste Comte is associated with positivism through his Law of Three Stages in which the human mind progresses from a theological stage through a metaphysical stage to a final positive stage. Oldroyd (1986) suggests that it was Comte who invented the new science of society - positivism - and thought it possible for:

social phenomena to be viewed in the light of physiological (or biological) laws and theories and investigated empirically, just like physical phenomena (p.11).

The term positivism is used by social scientists and implies two connected suppositions, namely, a particular stance concerning them as an observer of social reality, and secondly as analysts or interpreters of their subject knowledge. Positivism is less successful when applied to the complexities of human nature and the nebulous quality of social phenomena, according to Cohen and Manion (1997).

This is nowhere more apparent than in the contexts of classrooms and schools where the problems of teaching, learning and human interactions present the positivistic researcher with a mammoth challenge (p.12).
There is considerable criticism levelled at positivism, and in particular on the mechanistic and reductionist view of nature associated with the scientific method. Kierkegaard (1974), the Danish philosopher who originated the movement that became known as existentialism, challenged the imposition of rules of behaviour and thought, and the making of a person into an observer set on discovering general laws governing human behaviour. The capacity for subjectivity, he argued, should be regained - the ability to consider one's own relationship to whatever constitutes the focus of enquiry.

Further criticism levelled at positivistic social science included its failure to take into account our unique ability to interpret our experiences and represent them to ourselves. Another sees the findings of positivistic social science:

as banal and trivial and of little consequence to those for whom they are intended, namely, teachers, social workers, counsellors, personnel managers and the like. (Cohen and Manion 1997, p.25)

3.2.2 Alternatives to Positivistic Social Science

Opponents to positivistic social science agree that the social world can only be understood from the viewpoint of the individual involved in the investigation. Proponents of the anti-positivistic approach argue that individual's behaviour can only be understood by the researcher sharing the same frame of reference, being on the inside, not the outside. Dealing with the direct experience of people in specific contexts. The approach adopted by the anti-positivistic social science researcher is fittingly described by Beck (1979):

The purpose of social science is to understand social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how their view shapes the action they take within that reality. Since the social sciences cannot penetrate to what lies behind social reality, they must work directly with man's definitions of reality and the rules he devises for coping with it. While the social sciences do not reveal ultimate truth, they do help us to make sense of our world.
What social sciences offer is explanation, clarification and demystification of the social form which man has created around himself (p.41).

The influence of the anti-positivistic movement has had its greatest impact on psychology, social psychology and sociology, to such an extent that several collateral developments have arisen alongside the mainstream approach. Within sociology three schools of thought represent the anti-positivistic movement in, namely, phenomenology, ethnomethodology and symbolic interactionism, each having a significant role in contemporary research in classrooms and schools. Cohen and Manion (1997).

Phenomenology advocates the study of direct experience taken at face value and that sees behaviour as determined by the phenomena of experience. One of the distinguishing features of this approach, is according to Curtis (1978):

a belief in the importance, and in a sense the primacy, of subjective consciousness (p.37).

Ethnomethodology is concerned with everyday life and how people make sense of their everyday world. It sets out to treat practical activities, practical circumstances, and practical sociological reasoning as topics of empirical study. Burrell and Morgan (1979) see ethnomethodology:

as attempting to understand social accomplishments in their own terms and from within (p.87).

Whereas symbolic interactionists are concerned with the nature of interactions. By focusing on the interaction itself within a social world where subjective meanings and the symbols by which they are produced and represented, Cohen and Manion (1997) perceive:

instead of focusing on the individual, then and his or her personality characteristics, or on how the social structure or social situation causes individual behaviour, symbolic interactionists direct their attention at the
nature of interaction, the dynamic activities that take place between people (p.33).

All three match well to the kind of concentrated action found in classrooms and schools, action that is continually adapting, adjusting and evaluating, and thereby the influence of the researcher is less prominent than in other research approaches. They are not without their critics. Bernstein (1974) sees the way in which meanings of situations are negotiated presupposes a structure of meanings wider than the area of negotiation. He goes on to state:

situated activities presuppose a situation; they presuppose relationships between situations; they presuppose sets of situations (p.41).

The point here is that the process of interpretation and definition of a situation is itself a product of the circumstances in which the researcher is placed. Dixon (1973) sees the tasks of social science to:

develop sets of concepts such as norms, expectations, positions and roles in order to formulate a generalising science of behaviour. Only in this way is it possible to move from the interpretation of one specific action or event... to a theoretical explanation of behaviour (p.124).

3.2.3 The normative and interpretive paradigms

The positivistic and anti-positivistic viewpoints are more usefully expressed through the two generic terms, normative and interpretive. Their associated paradigms or models are characterised by the normative being rule-governed and being investigated by the methods of natural science, whereas interpretive is concerned with the individual. A key concept within the normative paradigm is about behaviour, a person(s) response either to external or internal stimuli. With the interpretive paradigm concern is with action - intentional behaviour, behaviour with meaning suggest Cohen and Manion (1997). They conclude:
in respect of theory normative researchers attempt to devise theories of human behaviour and to validate them through the use of complex research methodologies. Interpretive researchers believe theory follows research, it emerges from and is ‘grounded’ on the data generated by the research (p.36).

According to Mouly (1978), research:

is best conceived as the process of arriving at dependable analysis, and interpretation of data... For promoting progress, and for enabling man to relate more effectively to his environment... (p.35).

This definitive statement by Mouly on the nature of research is helpful in that it gives legitimacy for some combination of research methods and methodologies. It mirrors closely the sentiment expressed by Merton and Kendall (1946) over the social scientists’ concerns with qualitative and quantitative data. It is about when to adopt one approach. In essence it is wise for the social science researcher to establish as close as possible to a scientific model, making every attempt to justify structure and scope of the enquiry and that replication can take place, although virtually impossible to achieve.

However, Pring (2000) warns against drawing to finer a distinction between qualitative and quantitative research; that the distinction is epistemological, but that it does need to be borne in mind lest research wrongly attempts to quantify that which really cannot be quantified.

3.3 **Research Methods**

Investigating research questions is not a simple matter of following a line of enquiry that can loosely be related to either the positivistic or interpretive paradigms. Rather it is a challenge to define what is the best kind of research that suits the study of relationships and environments undergoing change. Salomon (1991) refers to analytical or systematic approaches. The analytical approach to these questions makes an assumption that discrete elements of complex educational phenomena can be isolated for study, with all others left unaltered. A systematic approach assumes
that the elements are interdependent and even define each other in a transactional manner so that a change in one changes everything else and thus patterns and not single variables need to be studied. An additional limitation to the validity of each approach is imposed by the questions asked and the methodologies used. This enquiry is about individuals, it is also about their interactions with others and therefore it would seem there is virtue and necessity in using both approaches in a complementary way.

Salomon (1991) makes a great deal of the complementarities of approach in particular for educational research:

classrooms (schools) are complex, often nested conglomerates of interdependent variables, events, perceptions, attitudes, expectation, and behaviours, their study cannot be approached in the same way as for single events and single variables (p.11).

Again, Pring (2000) questions whether the control group approach, as purported through the scientific paradigm, can ignore the uniqueness of individuals.

Such realisation has led to the increasing acceptance of a qualitative approach to research as opposed to an entirely quantitative approach. That is not to say that one is preferable to the other, but further substantiates mutual complementarity:

that both quantitative and qualitative approaches are applicable to both controlled, "simple" studies and to the study of complex environments.

(Salomon 1991, p.11)

3.4 Three Main Research Strategies

Experiment, survey and case study are recognised as the three broad research strategies. The classification of research into three main types does not imply a logical partitioning covering all possible forms of enquiry. Robson (1993) suggests that researchers have tended to place themselves into one of the three camps on the
basis of their preference for certain ways of working. Such rigidity can lead to the assumption that all problems can only be tackled through one strategy.

It is difficult to support an experimental - statistical approach or even a quasi-experimental one. An essential feature of experimental research is control over the conditions of the experiment by the researcher. As Johnson (1994) points out:

...it is rarely possible for the researcher to undertake true experiments. Uncontrolled variables intervene to cloud the experiment (p.28).

According to Cohen and Manion (1997), in any experimental situation, which involves people, ethical dilemmas exist:

In real world research we may not be able to, or wish to, control the situation but there is almost always the intention or possibility of change associated with the study (p.30).

A more hybrid line of enquiry may provide the small-scale researcher with helpful advantages. Cohen and Manion (1980) suggest attempts should be made to adapt the experiment to cope more effectively with the conditions found outside the laboratory.

3.4.1 The Survey Approach

The use of surveys is a common descriptive method in educational research. It usually involves a range of data collection techniques such as structured or semi-structured interviews, self-completion or postal questionnaires or standardised tests of attainment for example. A simple definition is given by Johnson (1994) that covers all types of survey activities gaining equivalent information from an identified population (p.13).

Robson (1993) defines the central features of the survey strategy as:
the collection of a small amount of data in standardised form from a relatively large number of individuals, and the selection of samples of individuals from a known population (p.124).

A survey does not depend upon an outside observer who records what is observable and forgets what are the views of the observed. Hutton (1990) defined survey research as a method for collecting information through asking preformulated questions.

What is important from these definitions is that, in order to obtain equivalent information, the survey questions need to be standardised so that the same kind of information is extracted from every respondent. Although individuals are the main source for data collection, a survey approach maybe applicable when the 'unit' is not an individual, such as a school. Bryman (1989) attempts a more formal definition of surveys:

survey research entails the collection of data on a number of units and usually at a single juncture in time, with a view to collecting systematically a body of quantifiable data in respect of a number of variables which are then examined to discern patterns association (p.104).

Bryman goes further in stating that survey research is almost always conducted in order to provide a quantitative picture of the individuals, or other units, concerned. This emphasis on quantification and variables and sampling from a population aligns survey research with the more scientific view of the nature of research.

As with any research technique, surveys have their strengths and weaknesses. Johnson (1994) sees the strength of surveys as being the breadth of coverage, generalisability/comparability and descriptive power. Robson (1993) sees the strength in survey research as being a 'real world' strategy, giving a reassuring scientific ring of confidence that satisfy complex technological concerns to do with sampling, question-wording, answer coding. The disadvantages or weaknesses with the survey research technique are often shallow coverage or unsuitable for sensitive issues and the possibility for bias. (Johnson, 1994)
Robson (1993) argues that generating large amounts of data may be of dubious value. He goes further:

Falsely prestigious because of their quantitaitve nature, the findings are seen as a product of largely uninvolved respondents whose answers owe more to some unknown mixture of politeness, boredom, desire to be seen in a good light, etc. than their true feelings, beliefs or behaviour (p.125).

Thus is also warned against by Pring (2000), believing that a survey exists independently of the thoughts and feelings of the recipients and therefore it may not be wholly appropriate in itself to an understanding of human feelings.

Securing a high degree of involvement by respondents is vital with a survey approach to research. This may be particularly the case if it is carried out by post and is also still difficult when carried out face to face. Length of questionnaire, question design and timing are critical to achieving a good response. Robson (1993) refers to this as part of 'internal validity'. Robson (1993) warns against having a problem of 'external validity'. Poor sampling and generalising from what people say in a survey to what they actual do are two such problems. Robson (1993) sees securing a positive relationship between the attitudes of respondents and their actual behaviour as most difficult to demonstrate.

The guarantee of confidentiality is usually quite possible with a questionnaire and it is important to ensure that whatever is promised does actually happen. Hence the importance of sampling cannot be stressed too strongly. (Fogelman, 2002)

3.4.2 Case Study Research.

The case study approach in educational research has become more popular as a research tool in recent times. It is usually a form of qualitative research. Cohen and Manion (1994) describe the case study researcher as:

One who typically observes the characteristics of an individual unit - a child, a clique, a class, a school or a community. The purpose of such observation
is to probe deeply and to analyse intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle of the unit with a view to establishing generalisations about the wider population to which the unit belongs (p.106).

Encouraged by an antipathy towards the experimental - statistical paradigm, researchers have been quick to use diverse techniques in the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data.

Whilst Macdonald and Walker (1975) describe case study as an ‘examination of an instance of action’, Adelman et al (1976, 1980) refer to a case study as ‘a step to action’.

Yin (1984) refers to a case study as:

an enquiry which uses multiple sources of evidence. It investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (p.131).

In qualitative research the case study approach can be seen to act as an umbrella for a family of research methods that together can be used systematically to investigate a contemporary phenomenon. (Adelman et al, 1976, 1980)

Johnson (1994) sees case studies as being concerned with the interaction of factors and events over a period of time. Johnson goes on to say:

...issues, rather than the situations of individuals, are the focus of case study in educational management or other forms of social research (p.21).

If case studies are a naturalistic type of enquiry and do not require an experimental situation then the boundaries to any enquiry will be only those imposed by common sense. For the reader strength of the case study approach is the identification with real life examples. Through the use of multiple sources of evidence a reader gains a rounded picture rather than a uni-dimensional view provided by the normal survey.
Another strength is its flexibility. As new insights emerge, methods and measures can change; innovation is acceptable.

There are limitations to the case study approach of which the chief one is the lack of scientific rigour, for there are no set rules by which a case study should be governed. Secondly, as Johnson (1994) describes it:

If a case study focuses on a unique phenomenon... there is no bonus of relatability... Non uniqueness is the aim (p.23).

The justification for the case study approach is stronger when supported by other evidence. The rounded picture that is the desirable outcome requires additional conceptual analysis of the elements that make up the picture. Glaser and Strauss (1967) refer to the creation of ‘grounded theory’, theory based on emerging data rather than a pre enquiry hypothesis. An alternative approach to this is to relate the findings from an enquiry to an existing body of knowledge or previous studies.

Using a case study approach relies heavily upon the trustworthiness of the researcher; Miles and Huberman (1984) see the skills of the researcher as of crucial importance. They also believe that the researcher needs:

Some familiarity with the phenomenon and the setting under study; strong conceptual interests; a multidisciplinary approach; ...good investigative skills and the ability to draw people out (p.46).

There are strong arguments for using a case study approach to this research. Coleman and Briggs et al (2002) set out seven stages for undertaking case study research, beginning with identifying the research purpose. They classify three possibilities, although recognising that the purpose can be defined under more than one heading:

1. A research hypothesis – a statement or conjecture that can be tested.
2. A research problem – a contradiction between what is happening and what should be happening.
3. A research issue - an enquiry where no hypothesis has yet been clearly expressed to direct the enquiry.

This leads on to a consideration of the type of report that will eventually be written. Coleman and Briggs et al (2002) suggest that, for example, a storytelling or evaluative study sits more comfortably with research issues or problems rather than a research hypothesis. With the former it is more likely that as an outcome a more focused enquiry will be forthcoming. It is the research issue, as identified by Coleman and Briggs et al (2002), that matches closely the enquiry outlined in this research.

3.4.3 Documentary Research

Some researchers regard documentary research as a fourth approach worthy of consideration. It is considered to be an indirect technique, rather than a direct one. By this it is meant that instead of directly observing, or interviewing, or getting some one to complete a questionnaire for the enquiry, use is made of something produced for another purpose. Krippendorff (1980) defines documentary (content) analysis as:

a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context (p.21).

Documents or artefacts are primarily written documents; although films and video recordings, pictures and drawings can be included. Robson (1993) aligns documentary analysis with structured observation and cites the case of a structured observation being carried out on a video recording of an event observed. When documents are the only source of data it is most likely to be used in research into something in the past. Stemming from this are two disadvantages according to Robson (1993):

the documents have either been written for a different purpose, and it is difficult or impossible to allow for the biases or distortions that are
introduced, and as with other non-experimental approaches, it is very
difficult to assess casual relationships (p.280).

The usefulness of this technique is more apparent in conjunction with other
techniques. As a secondary or supplementary method, documentary analysis can
provide a longitudinal dimension to an enquiry and also act to triangulate findings.
In this research such an approach would not provide sufficient evidence at this early
stage of the development of NPQH.

3.5 Research Techniques

There are a number of research techniques that are recognised as tools to follow
through the various research approaches. In this section consideration is given to
observation, questionnaires, interviews and diaries.

3.5.1 Observation as a Research Technique

Earlier in this chapter direct reference was made to observation within the case
study paradigm. Two broad forms of observation have emerged for research,
namely structured and unstructured. In educational research structured observation
has been used frequently in studies of the classroom. With a structured observation
the researcher sets out to observe only specific types of behaviour. Johnson (1994)
warns of the observer's perceptions being distorted by their own needs and values.

Johnson (1994) also defines unstructured observation as a systematic and planned
activity that casts its net wider than structured observations. It is particularly
suitable for monitoring the behaviour of a group session, or the regular meeting of a
group of people. The limitations of this approach are mainly in respect of the
observer, the time involved in collecting information, the collection of what can best
be described as superfluous information, and the need for correctness, accuracy and
consistency in the way the information is collected. All of which are sufficiently
contextual reasons for not approaching this research through observation.
3.5.2 Questionnaires as a Research Technique

A common research tool is the questionnaire. Its effective use comes about by:

1. ensuring that it is clear and comprehensible;
2. is in the hands of the appropriate respondent;
3. motivates the respondent to complete and return;
4. arrangements for the questionnaire return are effective.

(Johnson 1994, p.38)

It empowers the respondent in a number of ways; in particular they have the control over when to do it and when to return it, or not as the case may be. Johnson (1994) sees the main feature of a questionnaire as:

in essence a research tool that is in the hands of the respondent, and is completed by him or her (p.37).

Evans (1984, p.49), referring to questionnaires, said that “the only qualifications needed for success are the ability to think clearly and to ask plain questions in simple unambiguous terms.” The language of questions must be closely associated with the language a respondent uses regularly. The use of professional or technical terms is likely to be interpreted with greater precision than is the case with ordinary everyday language. Therefore the design of a questionnaire needs to ensure:

the respondent understands the questions and that it is relevant to his/her knowledge, experience and expertise (Johnson 1994, p.39).

Coleman and Briggs et al (2002) stress the importance of question selection and precision wording. Each question must be necessary. Respondents must be able to answer the question on the spot and not be offended by the wording or assumption. Again, Bell reminds the researcher to keep in mind “what is it you are trying to find out?” By applying a series of tests the researcher is more likely to eliminate any imprecisions or errors. Coleman and Briggs et al (2002) suggest:
Are any of the questions ambiguous or imprecise, or do they contain any assumptions?
Do any questions require memory or knowledge which respondents may not have before they can be answered?
Does the questionnaire contain any double, leading, presuming, offensive or sensitive questions? (p.164)

All research methods require some form of piloting before being launched through which it can be seen whether the research needs are being met by the information asked for. By trying out the questionnaire on respondents similar disposed to those in the target population, amendments and improvements can be made prior to the main research survey. An advantage of a pilot run is of particular worth when open-ended questions reveal a range of answers. Somehow these varied responses need to be categorised and sorted for analysis purpose. Early indication of the likely responses also enables an open question posed to the respondent to be turned into a closed one for the researcher. In the author's research, pilot responses to an open question about the impact of the training on respondent's current role in school, revealed that responses could be categorised into a few broad ones.

3.5.3 Interviewing as a Research Technique

Asking questions is an important line of enquiry. Using an interview technique is a conversation with a purpose. The kind of conversation that becomes an interview is one:

initiated by the interviewer focused by him on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction or explanation.

(Cohen and Manion 1989, p.307)

An interview is a flexible way of finding things out. Face to face interviews offer opportunities to follow up interesting responses and get beneath initial responses. Non-verbal cues can give support to the verbal ones although the reverse can be equally true. Consistency is the underlying principle for a structured interview and this is in part achieved by standardising the interview schedule, approach and language used. With the semi-structured interview the interviewer has a set
schedule of questions but is able to modify the order depending upon the responses of the interviewee, or to include additional ones. This type of interview is most likely to be used in small-scale research, where the emphasis is on gaining the cooperation of a limited number of interviewees, rather than ensuring that the information they give can be tabulated. Unstructured interviews roam freely and require great skill and are a preferred method of researchers in the interpretive paradigm.

Group or team interviews are equally challenging to the researcher and are subject to the dynamics of group interactions and the undue prominence of an articulate or vociferous minority. Whereas interviews by telephone are normally one to one they are subjected to other difficulties such as: time, technology and being impersonal.

A semi-structured interview is one most favoured by educational researchers as it allows respondents to ‘express themselves at length, but offers enough shape to prevent aimless rambling,’ (Coleman and Briggs et al, 2002).

It is important to negotiate access for interviews and by their very nature they are time consuming and can make unreasonable demands on interviewees.

An adaptation of the interview techniques is described by Johnson (1994) as a specialised interview. Unlike semi-structured interviews they do not necessarily cover the same ground with each interviewee. The aim is to acquire complementary information that supports other data from other sources. With these specialised interviews it is the researcher-as-interviewer who is the research tool rather than the interview itself (Johnson 1994). Their greatest value is in exploratory work, such as case studies, where the boundaries and parameters of the topic are not clearly defined.

The single most important quality for an interviewer in all styles of interviewing is rapport:

the interviewer must establish and maintain a socially acceptable relationship with the interviewee, while still fulfilling the aims of the
interview to acquire individualised information relevant to the research (p.49).

Open questions are by far the most difficult to record in structured interviews and yet in unstructured or specialised interviews they are the norm and give the respondent freedom to express themselves in their own words. The use of a tape recorder seems the most sensible way of recording the interview but this can lead to many hours of transcription and checking. The advantages of open questions are:

they are flexible, they allow the interviewer to probe so that he may go into more depth, or clear up misunderstandings; they enable the interviewer to test the limits of the respondents knowledge. Open ended situations can also result in unexpected or unanticipated answers which may suggest hitherto unthought of relationships or hypotheses. (Cohen and Manion 1994, p.277)

For the researcher some kind of coding is required with open questions, the main purpose of which is to enable similar individual responses to be classified into a small number of groups. It is important to avoid loss of information. With this technique and with skilled probing more can usually be obtained, making classification easier.

There are many other approaches to interviewing including group interviews and telephone ones. Robson (1993) recognises the difficulty in achieving a rapport through telephone interviewers and having visual clues as the stimulus for responses, but sees advantages through a higher response rate and low cost in terms of time, effort and money, especially if the sample is geographically dispersed. One suggestion is to use the random digit dialling approach.

There remains the important element of confidentiality. Interviews may cover sensitive ground and, without privacy, few people are likely to be frank. The researcher needs to give consideration to the location for interviews. Coleman and Briggs et al (2002) recommend posing the question ‘given the nature of the interview, what location makes most sense?’ An advantage of the interview
technique is that it provides a further opportunity for the researcher to follow up and explore issues raised through a survey.

3.5.4 Records and Diaries as a Research Technique

Diaries may be regarded as, 'a kind of self-administered questionnaire,' (Robson 1993, p.254). Given that the assessment and training associated with NPQH on average will take a candidate at least a year to complete, a structured diary, although a valuable source of information regarding this qualification, would be of little assistance to the researcher within the timescale for this research. Secondly, a diary would be of limited value, in that the NPQH process occupies a small proportion of a candidate's professional life.

3.6 Research approach adopted.

The three areas of enquiry that are of particular interest to the researcher are:

1. If one of the objectives of the qualification is to achieve better school leaders, can NPQH provide the leadership and management skills necessary to achieve strategic direction and vision for a school?
2. Can the skills of school leadership and management be met through a qualification that relies heavily on demonstration of competences?
3. What has been the impact of NPQH on a candidate’s current school, and will it change under new formulation of NPQH?

The first question relates to the impact of NPQH on the professional and personal development of candidates. Two of the potential techniques that could be used, observation and diary analysis would be likely to elongate the enquiry beyond a reasonable timescale. In addition the proportion of a candidates professional and personal life that is devoted to NPQH is small, and hence evidence from observing a candidate could not necessarily be attributed to the training that had been received. This equally applies to diary records.
The two principal types of observation - participant observation and non-participant observation - are more likely to be effective over a period of time. With this enquiry observation would need to cover not only training events but also observation of the NPQH candidate operating in their school. As Johnson (1994) points out, much superfluous information can be collected this way and such an approach is subject to inconsistency in its use. In the enquiry neither types of observation are an appropriate research technique to use.

With a diary analysis the same weakness of elongating the research period can be levelled as the training for NPQH can take place over a period of three years. The diary approach is best used for holistic 'role' studies rather than as in this case, a study of aspects of an individual's professional life, a view supported by Robson (1993).

### 3.6.1 Research Design

As a result of the factors outlined in the previous discussion, the author has decided to adopt a combination of a survey with semi-structured interviews for this study. Although a multi layered research approach is attractive, the researcher believes adopting this approach enables diverse techniques to be used for both qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Limited time available to a part time researcher and the manageability of a survey and its analysis are overriding reasons for following this approach. However, overriding everything else was the fact that NPQH candidates were dispersed across the UK and not easily accessible other than through communication from a distance. Through a selection process follow up interviews with a discrete number of candidates would be possible, even though some travelling would be involved. The researcher ruled out the use of telephone interviews on the grounds that they are impersonal and can be subject to technological problems, preferring the face-to-face contact with respondents.

Although a major limitation of this approach is one of scientific rigour (Johnson, 1994). Glaser and Strauss (1967) believe that emerging data is an acceptable way to determine ‘grounded’ theory. By adopting this approach, documentary analysis is complemented by the research techniques of structured questionnaires and semi-
structured interviews. All candidates, and their respective headteachers, were sent a questionnaire in September 1998. One question invited respondents to indicate whether they would be willing to participate in a follow up interview. From the resulting responses, pairs of candidates and headteachers were selected for interviews. The complementarities of this approach, questionnaire evidence that is quantifiable and qualitative comments from interviews, reflects the view held by Salomon (1991, p.11) on quantitative and qualitative approaches to research in schools, 'as applicable to simple studies and more complex environments'.

In this way the researcher believes that consistency can be more readily achieved and subjectivity reduced to a minimum. This is justified by the fact that there is a recognised population - the NPQH candidates. There are four thousand candidates who are at various stages in the NPQH process. Application of sampling techniques to the group that commenced in 1997 could in fact be the whole population as it was relatively small, and thereby be subjected to standard statistical analysis. As Johnson (1994) suggests, breadth of coverage and generalisability are important and therefore a relatively small number of candidates, as in this case the whole population, lends itself well to the survey approach.

It is important to recognise that qualitative data is useful in supplementing and illustrating quantitative data obtained from a survey. However, when qualitative data is the major aspect of the research, then detailed attention needs to be given to the data’s analysis. Miles and Huberman (1984) and Yin (1989) have sought to achieve a rigour in the analysis of qualitative data. The techniques for analysis have been set out by Miles and Huberman (1984, chapter 3) in a set of formats for data reduction and display. They are, of course, tools and need to be used flexibly. Use of a matrix to display data is widely recommended by Miles and Huberman (1984), the most common one being the two dimensional matrix. Considerable data reduction can take place through this approach, leaving the researcher with a picture of data collected in one place.

In order to overcome the issues of external validity, a concern raised by Robson (1993), the survey must appeal to the respondents, be of interest to them, and one which they believe is worthy of completing. With use of selected follow up
strategies to the survey, such as structured or semi-structured interviews, the danger of weak 'external validity' can be minimised.

3.6.2 Ethics and confidentiality of research

Ethical guidelines for research have been drawn up by The British Educational Research Association (BERA, 1988a and 1992) in that:

all educational research should be conducted within an ethic of respect for persons, respect for knowledge, respect for democratic values, and respect for the quality of educational research.

These guidelines set out the responsibilities for the research profession and for participants in a research study. The collection and analysis of data has been central to this research. And therefore adherence to the guidelines to avoid any falsification, fabrication or the misrepresentation of evidence, data or findings has been of significant importance. In writing the conclusion for this research great care will be taken to ensure that other researchers will understand the outcomes.

Particular attention was given to ensuring that all participants in this research were made aware of their right to be informed about the aims, purposes and likely publication of the findings. Their anonymity would be preserved at all stages. All participants gave their consent to be involved and for findings to be published. The report will be published according to the University of Leicester guidelines.

3.7 The Research

The first cohort of candidates for the NPQH began their assessment and training in September 1997. Within the Eastern region some 270 candidates, 142 from Primary Schools, 119 from Secondary Schools, seven from Special Schools and 2 candidates not from a school but were working with a local authority, were accepted for assessment and training. This is a substantial population from which a wide range of responses from candidates working in a variety of schools could be forthcoming.
It was the researcher's intention to study this population as the candidates represented one of the 10 designated regions for NPQH.

Early indications from the Regional Assessment and Training Centre managers were that their support would be forthcoming should the researcher proceed with a questionnaire and interview research methodology. However, permission to contact candidates was refused by the Regional Centre in August 1998. This decision was based on the advice they had received from the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), which appeared to discourage research of any kind associated with NPQH other than that initiated by themselves. A secondary reason, and one more legitimate than the first, is the added pressure placed on candidates with a questionnaire and follow up interview. An approach to another Region, although initially more receptive to the research topic, considered that the advice from the TTA could not be ignored. This region, however, agreed for the questionnaire to be piloted with their candidates.

An attempt to secure access to a bigger cohort was made by the researcher through a direct contact to the TTA. Their initial response was very positive and interested in the nature of the research. However, they were not prepared to sanction access to candidates, saying that their own research programme already placed demands on candidates.

The final alternative involved the candidates within the researcher's own local education authority (LEA). Each LEA is responsible for the selection of candidates suitable for beginning training for NPQH. By focusing on the entire cohort from within the LEA the researcher believes that the size would be sufficiently large to provide a valid evidence base and be of benefit to the LEA. All candidates attended the regional centre. Although the size of the cohort would be substantially smaller than that originally envisaged it would be a unique population. The population would be too small to warrant statistical analysis techniques to be used. Because of the small population the opportunity would exist to explore in depth aspects of the qualification as articulated in the research questions, through the questionnaire and follow up interviews to both the NPQH candidates and their headteachers. This
approach would also reduce the difficulties of ensuring external validity referred to by Robson (1993.)

The enquiry included broad questions such as:

'Tell me about your experiences on NPQH?'

This may uncover whether the experiences were different for candidates from small and large schools, primary and other phases in education? Was there variation in the approaches adopted by different trainers? Did the assessment process reveal areas for further training and development?

Another question was:

'What has been the reaction in your school to this training?'

Here the opportunity existed to examine whether there had been benefits arising from a candidate’s involvement in NPQH? The question could also assess the attitude of headteachers to the NPQH training.

A third area for scrutiny was:

'In what way can the LEA help potential candidates to prepare themselves for this?'
3.7.1 Data Collection Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot survey</td>
<td>Distributed to 10 candidates and headteachers July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysed July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final survey</td>
<td>Distributed to research population in September 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysed October November 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates and headteachers identified for interview</td>
<td>Invitation sent October 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews undertaken</td>
<td>December 1998 and January 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview drafts written and returned to candidates and headteachers</td>
<td>January February 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received back February 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview write up completed</td>
<td>February March 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Data Collection Schedule

By adopting this cohort in one LEA as the research population there would be every chance to interest respondents and engage them further in the research through a follow up interview.

LEAs have in the past been responsible for providing appropriate training and development for aspiring teachers to leadership and management positions. What could be learnt from the NPQH process that would influence future in service training for aspiring heads as well as serving headteachers would be of interest to an LEA.

These questions also allow the candidate and his/her current headteacher the opportunity to consider a range of related issues that were of a secondary nature to the focus on NPQH, particularly those that affected the school directly. The issue for the researcher is to obtain evidence that is largely tangential to the main focus, redirecting responses to the set questions in order to ensure consistency of approach to all being interviewed.

This restricted cohort size and location, would produce evidence that might not reflect the experiences gained in other regions and areas of the country. The
researcher is mindful that any conclusions drawn from the research would need to be interpreted in context.

3.7.2 Sampling

The first cohort of NPQH candidates from the author’s LEA comprised 21 from the primary phase and 11 from the secondary phase. There were no candidates from special schools, and one from outside a school situation (see table 3.2). All these candidates were included in the research, a 100% sample. The distribution of candidates was representative of Cambridgeshire, including both urban and rural areas, an important feature in survey coverage according to Johnson (1994). Within the cohort were a number of candidates who were from the City of Peterborough, which from April 1998 became a unitary authority, no longer part of Cambridgeshire County Council. The candidates in the sample were representative of the range of schools that exist within the LEA. Questionnaires were distributed in October 1998.

The size of the primary schools ranged from 100 pupils to 502 pupils, and secondary schools from 641 pupils to 1841 pupils. Given the range of school type and their size, the researcher believes the outcomes will be of benefit to the LEA as part of its own quality assurance procedures and in informing the professional development programme the LEA establishes for its senior professionals in schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Non School)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Type of School
3.7.3 The Survey

The research questions suggested the need for two questionnaires, one for NPQH candidates and a second for the headteachers of the schools in which the candidate was currently working. The design of both questionnaires used the closed question approach. The language used in questions is all-important and, because this research was solely directed at educationalists, it was appropriate to use the language of the profession, thus avoiding any ambiguity that can arise with the use of more common everyday language.

Given the subjectivity of research it was essential that NPQH respondents were able to express their views to particular questions without too much restriction. By providing this opportunity the author hoped to gain the interest of respondents in the research. This was done through supplementary open questions to the main question theme. For quantitative information the tick box design was proposed, as this would enable the researcher to use the responses to make comparison between candidates from different phases of education and by gender. The also provided the opportunity to apply limited statistical analysis techniques to the data. Verification of qualitative and quantitative data obtained is an important aspect of research; therefore the data received via the headteachers' questionnaires would act as a check on the factual information given by candidates.

The qualitative information produced by both questionnaires would prove to be vital in determining real perceptions of the experiences candidates were going through. This would be equally true for respondent headteachers, whose perceptions would not necessarily coincide with those expressed by candidates. To cope with qualitative responses the researcher used a basic form of coding initially to collate responses that appeared to be expressing similar views.

3.7.4 Pilot Study

Before commencing the fieldwork, a questionnaire (appendix A) was designed and piloted through an arrangement with one of the other regional centres. The initial draft included a column on each page for respondents to comment directly opposite
a question. This was intended to encourage respondents to make comments immediately, rather than wait until they had completed the questionnaire and then writing a summative evaluation of the questionnaire.

Ten NPQH candidates were selected, two from each of the region’s satellite centres, covering the various educational phases. The candidate’s respective headteachers were also circulated with a pilot questionnaire. Although the response was not high, (under one third in both the NPQH candidate and headteacher categories), sufficient returns were received with comments and suggestions that could be incorporated into the final questionnaire design. Given that the cohort of candidates was from the researcher’s own LEA it was decided not to use the responses from the pilot in any other part of data collection or analysis process, as the response had been small.

With the questionnaire to teachers in the pilot, one such comment recommended the addition of ‘part time’ category to the number of years a candidate had been teaching. A second comment referred to the question:

“When does the training take place?”

The respondent suggested an additional category of ‘holiday time’ to that question.

The responses by pilot headteachers did not recommend any changes to the questions or aspects covered.

Generally responses depicted a balance between factual data and those questions which allowed the respondents to voice their own opinion. In respect of the latter it was evident that responses fell into a few broad categories, and ones that could be suitable for any quantitative analysis. The greatest impact of the pilot run for this research revealed errors in spelling, language, question formation, order and relevance. Questionnaire presentation and attractiveness, although not openly criticised in the pilot, was improved to be more respondent friendly. As the pilot study produced few responses it is not reported separately, however, the revised questionnaire incorporated the suggested changes and was issued in September 1998.
3.7.5 The Research Instrument

A stamped addressed reply envelope was issued to both candidates and headteachers as is customary in carrying out research that involves potential respondents devoting time to completing and returning a questionnaire. Accompanying the questionnaire was a personally written letter to each candidate and his/her headteacher explaining the focus of the research, stressing confidentiality, but also offering at a later date the opportunity for the outcomes to be shared with respondents. In addition to the questionnaire and letter from the researcher, two letters of endorsement were attached. In this way respondents would know of the legitimacy of the researcher and the request being made, the usefulness of the outcomes for the LEA and potential benefits to themselves from any feedback once the research was completed.

3.7.6 Questionnaire to candidates

Preparation for Headship - The NPQH

Questionnaire to be completed by teachers who are participating in the first cohort of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) and commenced training in Autumn term 1997.

Please complete each of the following questions by ticking the appropriate box. If you are unable to complete a question for any reason, please add an explanatory note in the space provided.

Thank you

Section A - Personal and School details

1. Gender
   - Male □
   - Female □

2. Age
   - under 26 □
   - 26 - 30 □
   - 31 - 35 □
   - 36 - 40 □
   - 41 - 45 □
   - 46 - 50 □
   - Over 50 □
3. Phase of teaching trained for:

- Primary □
- Middle □
- Secondary □
- Other □

4. What qualifications do you currently have?

- Teachers Certificate □
- Advanced Diploma □
- First Degree(s) □
- MBA □
- Higher Degree(s) □
- Others (please specify) .................................................................

5(a) Type of school currently employed in?

- Primary □
- Middle □
- Secondary □
- Other □

(b) Please specify designated age range of school

6. Current position held in school/organisation?

- Deputy Head □
- Assistant Teacher CPS+2 □
- Senior Teacher □
- Assistant Teacher CPS+3 □
- Assistant Teacher CPS □
- Assistant Teacher CPS+4 □
- Assistant Teacher CPS +1 □
- Other (please specify) .................................................................

7. Number of years of teaching?

(a) Full time teaching?

- Under 5 □
- 6-10 □
- 11-15 □
- 16-20 □
- 21-25 □
- over 25 □

(b) Part time teaching?

- Under 5 □
- 6-10 □
- 11-15 □
- 16-20 □
- 21-25 □
- over 25 □
Section B - NPQH details

8. How were you selected for training?
   (Select one of the following)

   (a) Recommendation □  (c) By application □
       by LEA

   (b) Recommendation □  (d) By application and
       by Head interview

9(a) Did you receive any help and guidance in making the application?
   Yes □  No □

(b) If yes, from whom did you receive this help and guidance?  (Please specify)

10(a) Have you undertaken the Needs Assessment?  Yes □  No □
   When did you do this?  July 1997 □  November 1997 □

(b) August 1997 □  December 1997 □
    September 1997 □  Other dates □
    October 1997 □

(c) If not, please explain why you have not undertaken the assessment.

(d) Is it your intention to continue with the qualification?  Yes □  No □
    If no, please specify why not ...

11(a) With which of the 12 consortia have you arranged to undergo the assessment
     and training?  (Please specify)

(b) If more than one, please identify separately

   (a) Compulsory Module only (Strategic leadership and Accountability)

   (b) Module on Teaching and Learning

   (c) Module on Leading and Managing Staff
(d) Module on Efficient and Effective Management of Staff

(e) Assessment related to each Module only

(f) Final Assessment only

13. How long do you propose to take to achieve the qualification?

1 year □ 2 years □ 3 years □

Section C - NPQH Training

14(a) When has the training taken place?

- Weekdays school term: Yes □ No □
- Weekdays holiday time: Yes □ No □
- Weekends school term: Yes □ No □
- Weekends holiday time: Yes □ No □

(b) If training has taken place during weekdays in the school term please specify the day and whether it is the same day on each occasion.

15. Please state how much time per week, on average, you are devoting to studying for this qualification.

a) within the school day (pupil day)?

- Less than 6 hours: □
- 6 - 10 hours: □
- 11 - 15 hours: □
- 16 - 20 hours: □
- More than 20 hours: □

b) outside the school day?

- Less than 6 hours: □
- 6 - 10 hours: □
- 11 - 15 hours: □
- 16 - 20 hours: □
- More than 20 hours: □

i) Management task

ii) Curriculum task
iii) Research/Reading task

iv) Other

17(a) Did any of these require the agreement or assistance of someone else?  Yes □ No □

17(b) If yes please specify (eg head of department)

18(a) Have your current responsibilities or role been modified in any way to assist with the identified training needs?  Yes □ No □

18(b) If yes please describe the modification

19. Please explain what impact, if any, you think your application for NPQH and subsequent training has had on:
   (a) The school/organisation? (eg time out of school, absence from teaching commitment, the need for supply cover)

   (b) Headteacher/colleagues? (eg additional work load)

20. Have you noticed any benefits/impact as a result of the training you have had on:
   (a) The school/organisation

21. As a result of the training so far, are you better equipped to provide for the school:
   (i) Self management?  Yes □ No □
   (ii) Strategic direction?  Yes □ No □
   (iii) Monitoring and evaluation?  Yes □ No □
   (iv) An articulated vision?  Yes □ No □
   (v) Leadership and management?  Yes □ No □
Overall do you think the school has benefited from the process? Yes □ No □
If yes please specify ........................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................

Section D - Follow Up Work

22(a) Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview on this questionnaire at a mutually agreeable time and place? Yes □ No □

22(b) If yes please provide a contact telephone number:
Area Code: .............. Telephone Number: .............................................

3.7.7 Questionnaire to Headteachers

Preparation for Headship - The NPQH

Questionnaire to be completed by the headteachers of schools / institutions which have a teacher participating in the first cohort of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) who commenced training in Autumn term 1997.

If there is more than one applicant from your school please complete a separate form for each one.

Please complete each of the following questions by ticking the appropriate box. If you are unable to complete a question for any reason, please add an explanatory note in the space provided.

Thank you.

Section A - The Applicants' Personal Details and Details of the School/Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male □</th>
<th>Female □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>under 26 □</td>
<td>41 - 45 □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30 □</td>
<td>46 - 50 □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 35 □</td>
<td>Over 50 □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40 □</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
3. Type of School

Primary □ Middle □ Secondary □

Special (please specify) ........................................................................

Other ......................................................................................................

Not a school............................................................................................

4. Current position held by the applicant in the school / institution:

Deputy Head □ Assistant Teacher □

Senior Teacher □ Assistant Teacher □

Assistant Teacher CPS □ Assistant Teacher □

Assistant Teacher CPS + 1 □

Other (please specify) ............................................................................

5. Number of years the applicant has been in the school/ institution:

(a) Full time teaching?

Under 5 □ 16-20 □

6-10 □ 21-25 □

11-15 □ over 25 □

(b) Part time teaching?

Under 5 □ 16 - 20 □

6 - 10 □ 21 - 25 □

11 - 15 □ over 25 □

Section B - NPQH details

6. How was the applicant selected for training? (Select one of the following)

□ Recommendation by LEA

□ Recommendation by Head

□ Other

By application

By application and interview
7(a) Did you receive any help and guidance to judge the applicant’s suitability for making an application?  

Yes □ No □

7(b) If yes, from whom did you receive this support and guidance?  
(Please specify)

.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................

8(a) Has the applicant undertaken the Needs Assessment?  

Yes □ No □

8(b) When did they do this?  

July 1997 □ November 1997 □

August 1997 □ December 1997 □

September 1997 □ Other dates □

October 1997 □

9. Please explain briefly those aspects from each module for which the applicant’s Needs Assessment identified a need for further training.  

If none please tick here □

Module on Strategic Leadership and Accountability
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................

Module on Teaching and Learning
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................

Module on Leading and Managing Staff
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................

Module on Efficient and Effective Management of Staff
.........................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................

Assessment related to each Module only □

Final Assessment only □

10. How long is the applicant proposing to take to achieve the qualification?  

1 year □ 2 years □ 3 years □
Section C - NPQH Training

11(a) Has any of the applicant's training taken place in school time?
   Yes □ No □

   Day time school term  Yes □ No □

   Evening time school term  Yes □ No □

11(b) If training has taken place in daytime school term please specify the day and whether it is the same day on each occasion:

12. Please state how much time per week, on average, is the applicant studying for this qualification within the school day (pupil day):

   Less than 6 hours □ 16 - 20 hours □

   6 - 10 hours □ more than 20 □ hours

   11 - 15 hours □

13(a) Has the school contributed any financial support to the applicant's training?

   Yes □ No □

13(b) If yes, please specify the amount and from what source:

   Amount: £

   Source:

   ........................................

   ........................................

   ........................................

14. Please describe briefly below the types of school-based activities the applicant has undertaken as an assessed piece of work.

   Management task

   ........................................

   Curriculum task

   ........................................

   Research/Reading task

   ........................................

   Other tasks ........................................
15(a) Did any of these require your agreement/ assistance?  
Yes □  No □

15(b) If yes please specify

16(a) Have you needed to adjust the current responsibilities or role of the applicant in order to assist with their identified training needs?  
Yes □  No □

16(b) If yes, please specify:

17. Please explain what impact, if any, you think the applicant’s application for NPQH and subsequent training has had on:
   (a) The school / organisation e.g. time out of school, absence from teaching commitment, the need for supply cover?

16(b) If yes, please specify:

17. Please explain what impact, if any, you think the applicant’s application for NPQH and subsequent training has had on:
   (b) You / colleagues? e.g. additional work load?

18(a) Have you noticed any improvements within the school as a result of the applicant’s study for NPQH?  
Yes □  No □

18(b) If yes, please specify

19. Please explain below how the applicants’ training has impacted on, or been of benefit to:
   (a) The applicant as a person

18(b) If yes, please specify

19. Please explain below how the applicants’ training has impacted on, or been of benefit to:
   (b) The school/organisation

18(b) If yes, please specify

19. Please explain below how the applicants’ training has impacted on, or been of benefit to:
   (c) You/colleagues/others

18(b) If yes, please specify

19. Please explain below how the applicants’ training has impacted on, or been of benefit to:
   (d) The way the applicant performs their role

18(b) If yes, please specify
(e) Do you think the applicant is better equipped to provide for the school:
   (i) Self management? Yes □ No □
   (ii) Strategic direction? Yes □ No □
   (iii) Monitoring and evaluation? Yes □ No □
   (iv) An articulated vision? Yes □ No □
   (v) Leadership and management? Yes □ No □

20(a) Do you perceive the need to make changes to their roles to provide them with opportunities to work in other areas of the school/organisation? Yes □ No □

20(b) If yes, please specify

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

21(a) Overall do you think the school has benefited from the process? Yes □ No □

21(b) If yes, please specify

________________________________________________________________________

Section D - Follow Up Work

22(a) Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview on this questionnaire at a mutually agreeable time and place? Yes □ No □

22(b) If yes please provide a contact telephone number:

Area Code:  ................ Telephone Number  ................

3.8 Follow up Interviews

Respondents to the questionnaires were invited to indicate their willingness to take part in a follow up interview of approximately 45 minutes. Twenty seven participants indicated their willingness to be involved with this part of the research. Such interviews would only be of value to the researcher if both the NPQH candidate and their respective headteacher were willing to participate. This requirement to interview both a candidate and their respective headteacher offered the opportunity for the researcher to substantiate comments made by either party and to ensure that the issue of triangulation was addressed. Of the 27, 8 natural
pairs were available. Given the relatively small population used in this research, this number of potential interviews seemed acceptable for a part time researcher.

Face to face semi-structured interviews were preferred to other styles, such as telephone interviews. Agreement was reached whereby the NPQH candidate and their headteacher would be interviewed separately. All respondents chosen for follow up interviews worked within reasonable travelling distance from the researcher's base. These interviews are reported in chapter 5. The decision was to interview all 8 pairs (6 primary and 2 secondary) during the months of December 1998 and January 1999.

The interview schedule used a number of predetermined questions which were designed to elicit further information from candidates and headteachers, but also to provide amplification to the answers they had given to the supplementary questions. For example NPQH candidates were asked:

"if the tasks they chose to do were taken from the school development plan or were derived for the sake of NPQH?"

Two further questions tackled what might be perceived as benefits to the candidates and their current school from NPQH. A final question sought to ascertain whether candidates believed their own leadership and management skills had improved.

One of the questions put to the headteacher focussed on one of the objectives for the qualification that of achieving better quality school leaders. Headteachers were asked:

"What impact the assessment and training programme had had on the professional and personal development of the candidate?"

This was followed up by supplementary questions that were designed to assess the impact the training and assessment had on the candidate in terms of the other objectives of the qualification, namely, vision, raising standards of achievement,
monitoring and evaluating a school's development, setting a strategic direction for a school, leading and managing the candidates' own school in due course.

The second prong to the questions to the headteachers focused deliberately on the impact the NPQH programme had on the candidates' current school. Questions like:

-'Has the NPQH training had a detrimental or positive effect on the school, colleagues and the headteacher?' and 'Are there noticeable improvements within the school as a result of the training and the tasks undertaken by the candidate?'

and were headteachers able to

-'identify any changes in the direction of the school as a result of candidate's NPQH training?'

The general thrust of the questioning was indicated to the interviewees in a letter confirming the agreed date and time for the interviews. All interviews were carried out in accordance with the process set out in the letter and the schedule of pre-set questions, and recorded in note form by the researcher. This method was preferred to tape recording the interview purely on the grounds of ease of managing the transcriptions.

To ensure the accuracy of the reported views emanating from the interviews and the recorded notes, each interviewee was sent a written draft of the conversation for them to check and correct if necessary. Amendments were received from two people, one an NPQH candidate and the other a headteacher. Their amendments were subsequently included in the redrafted statements. Both received the written amended version. No further comments were received from either candidates or headteachers.

Chapters 4 and 5 respectively deal with the findings from the questionnaires and the responses from the semi-structured interviews.
3.9 Summary

It is clear from the research questions identified at the start of this enquiry that measuring the impact of training and benefits to an organisation and candidates is limited by the time available for a part time researcher. As a result the case study approach, embracing questionnaires and semi-structured interviews was chosen to be the most appropriate. Due to circumstances beyond the immediate control of the researcher, the population for the enquiry was small from the start and resulted in an even smaller sample for follow up interviews. The effect of the size of the population and the sample on the outcomes is addressed in a later chapter.
Chapter 4:

Presentation of the research findings from the survey of NPQH candidates and their respective headteachers
4.1 Introduction

The National Professional Qualification for Headteachers (NPQH) was introduced by the government in the Autumn of 1997 for aspiring headteachers who were deemed ready for training for headship. Likely candidates had make an application, usually through the local education authority (LEA), if they wished to receive funding to support their application for training at one of the regional centres. Ten centres were established throughout the England and an eleventh centre enabled candidates to undertake the training by distance learning.

As indicated in the previous chapter the population to be researched was the first cohort of NPQH candidates from one LEA in the Eastern Region, who commenced their assessment and training during the Autumn of 1997. Questionnaires were sent to all the candidates and their respective headteachers, with two exceptions. One candidate had left a school to join the LEA in a different role, another had become the acting head of the school and there was no headteacher to make a response. The distribution and returns are illustrated in the following tables 4.1 and 4.2:

4.2 Presentation of Survey Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPQH Candidates</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires sent</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires returned</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 - NPQH candidates

Twenty One Candidates responded, representing a 66% return.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteachers</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires sent</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires returned</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 – Headteachers
Fifteen headteachers responded, representing a 50% return.

Telephone calls were received from two candidates and two headteachers with apologies for not responding. Two candidates had withdrawn from the qualification and a further candidate had moved to a headship.

4.2 Responses from candidates

4.2.1 Gender and age of candidates

The first question ascertained the gender split of candidates. Cohort one involved twice as many female candidates as men. This is illustrated in table 4.3 and figure 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 - Gender

The age profile produced by question two illustrated that 17(81%) of the candidates were aged 41 or over and, of these, 6 (28.6%) were aged 46 and over. 2 candidates were over the age of 50. One man was below the age of 36. A similar proportion, male to female, appears to be reflected across the various age categories. These are illustrated in table 4.4 and figure 4.2

Figure 4.1

The age profile produced by question two illustrated that 17(81%) of the candidates were aged 41 or over and, of these, 6 (28.6%) were aged 46 and over. 2 candidates were over the age of 50. One man was below the age of 36. A similar proportion, male to female, appears to be reflected across the various age categories. These are illustrated in table 4.4 and figure 4.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male/Male %</th>
<th>Female/Female %</th>
<th>Total/Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;26</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2 (14.2)</td>
<td>1 (14.3)</td>
<td>3 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>6 (42.6)</td>
<td>3 (42.9)</td>
<td>9 (42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>4 (28.4)</td>
<td>2 (28.6)</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>1 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (14.3)</td>
<td>2 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14 (100.0)</td>
<td>7 (100.0)</td>
<td>21 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 - Age

Figure 4.2

4.2.2 Education phase and qualifications

Question three asked candidates about the phase of education that they were initially trained for. Table 4.5 and figure 4.3 illustrate this information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase trained for</th>
<th>Number/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>11 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 – Phase of Training
Question four looked at the qualifications candidates possessed. 6 respondents had a teaching certificate and no first or higher degree. The question also asked candidates about not only initial qualifications such as teachers’ certificate, but also subsequently gained qualifications such as MA and MBAs. Tables 4.6 and figure 4.4 illustrate the breakdown of qualifications possessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Qualification</th>
<th>Number/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Certificate</td>
<td>10 (27.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree</td>
<td>15 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree</td>
<td>3 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Cert/Diploma</td>
<td>2 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 - Qualifications
In the other category, qualifications included PGCEs, Certificates in Professional Studies, Associate of the Drama Board and Diploma in Educational Management.

### 4.2.3 Current employment and length of service

Question 5 requested information on candidates' current employment. All 21 were in a school, and full time, the breakdown is illustrated in table 4.7 and figure 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Number/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13 (61.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>8 (38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 – Type of School
Comparing this information with table 4.5 it is clear that 2 candidates were currently teaching in phases different from which they trained for. Table 4.8 illustrates this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching in primary</th>
<th>Teaching in secondary/other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained for primary/middle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained for secondary/other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 – Phase Trained for

Part of the advice given to LEAs, in selecting candidates for NPQH, was that the recommendation should bear in mind a candidate's readiness for training for headship. By this it was inferred that a candidate's selection should not be considered solely on their current position, responsibility or qualifications. Question 6 examined the current positions held by candidates and these are displayed in table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Number/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
<td>19 (90.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass. Teacher CPS</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass. Teacher CPS +1</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass. Teacher CPS +2</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass. Teacher CPS +3</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass. Teacher CPS +4</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 – Position Held

There is a clear indication that 19 (91%) of the candidates within cohort one were deputy heads, and therefore potentially strong candidates for headship. One candidate had resigned from the position of deputy headship and was re-employed as a 0.6 CPS assistant teacher, with no additional post of responsibility. The other candidate had moved from a deputy headteacher position to an advisory position within the LEA - but generally they are all in schools. Another of the candidates, an experienced teacher, but with no allowance, was in a small school. The other candidate was employed within the local advisory service.
The last question in section A examined the candidate’s length of teaching careers. It was reasonable to presume that some teachers may have been in a part time post at some stage in their career, and female. This is illustrated in table 4.10 and figure 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>% Full time</th>
<th>% Part time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 25</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 – Years of Teaching

The two interesting features from these tables are that two candidates have less than 10 years and that two others have greater than 25 years experience. Five full time (24%) candidates at some stage were on part time contracts. Further analysis of these candidates indicates that they were female, primary trained and currently working in the primary phase. The vast majority of candidates were deputy heads with one candidate on the basic teaching scale. The other candidate was currently an acting headteacher.

4.3 Selection and the needs assessment process

This section looked at the details of the selection process and the needs assessment component of NPQH, the centre chosen and the outcomes for each individual.
candidate in terms of their identified training needs. The selection of candidates in this LEA followed the recommended procedure laid down by the TTA. For candidates this meant completing an application form by the date set and for the LEA to manage the selection process. Question 8 was designed to ascertain whether candidates were recommended or advised to apply by the LEA or headteacher or candidates did so on their own volition. The findings are illustrated in table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How selected for training?</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended by LEA to apply</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended by head to apply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application and interview</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 – How Selected for Training

In this first round it appears that the LEA did not identify suitable candidates to apply and only one headteacher suggested that the candidate should make an application. Six candidates stated that they had an interview with their local school inspector prior to submitting the application to the LEA. This largely took place following the application and was carried out by the assessment centres.

With respect to the advice and support candidates received prior to their application only three indicated that they had received any form of help (see table 4.12). One of these 3 had applied to be part of the original pilot, but had been rejected. They were aware of the requirements for submitting an application. The other two replied that help came from their respective headteachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Help or guidance given?</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 – Help Given

By the time candidates received this questionnaire all had undertaken their needs assessment. The timing of this varied and this is illustrated in table 4.13.
The number of candidates who undertook their needs assessment during the Autumn term 1997 reflects on the Regional Centre’s inability to cope at the start of this qualification process in July 1997. It is clear that some candidates had a considerable wait between application and assessment.

Candidates were also asked whether, as a result of the needs assessment process, any of them were not continuing with the qualification? Three of the respondents indicated that they were not. The reason quoted from one candidate: subsequently left the profession altogether so as to improve their quality of life!

Another rejected the training on the grounds of ill health. The third respondent cited the enormous workload that was impinging on home life and so withdrew from the process. All three have been included in the data analysis as they completed the questionnaire.

In respect of the Regional Centre chosen, question 11, two candidates chose outside their natural region, but another candidate opted to undertake the needs assessment through a centre and the subsequent training through the distance-learning provider.

### 4.3.1 Needs identified through the assessment process

Question 12 asked candidates to outline the further training that was identified they required as a result of the needs assessment process. The question was broken down into the four training modules and the final assessment to allow candidates to indicate those training needs. Part of question 12 looked at the first module – Leadership and Accountability. This was compulsory for all candidates.
4.3.2. Module on Leadership and Management

Comments expressed by candidates about this module were:

*I need to know more about the broader level of legal/bureaucratic expectations of headship*

Compulsory for all. I had no weaknesses identified. It is an opportunity to extend sound knowledge and skills.

No choice. I was advised to apply for all so that the money would be assured. Frankly that was a cop out!

Other comments included I need to:

Articulate my vision.

Develop strategic leadership – knowledge, understanding. Accountability.

One candidate replied that the form (questionnaire) did not have the space to write everything that they had identified they needed for this module. It would appear from the comments received, that not all respondents had their needs for this module clearly identified.

4.3.3 Module on Teaching and Learning

In respect of this module (question 12 part b), four candidates were assessed as in need of no further training and could be assessed straight away. Those candidates that required further training had identified the following aspects:

Further work on appraisal/monitoring and evaluation.

Because of my late entry to the profession it was identified that I needed to complete this module in full.
Although I was assessed at grade 2, I needed to develop effective community links.

More work on monitoring and links with industry were identified as my shortcomings.

The connection between those areas for development appear to be somewhat tangential to the module itself. However, taking a broad interpretation it is easy to see that developing industrial links or community links can support curriculum development especially in the field of vocational education, but other links appear to teaching and learning are less obvious.

4.3.4 Module on Leading and managing staff

With respect to the module on staff, (question 12 part c), four candidates were able to move to assessment only, whereas the others all needed to undertaken further training. The comments ranged from:

*I need to get up to date.*

*I need to work on the areas of staff development and discipline.*

*It was suggested that I do this module I think because I was fairly modest about my own experience.*

If only four candidates met the criteria for this module it is surprising that the comments given are so vague. One candidate opted to do this module by choice following the needs assessment process, but no reason was stated.

4.3.5 Module on Efficient and Effective Deployment of Staff and Resources

This module (question 12 part d) raised further developmental issues for candidates to work on for example:
The level of response from candidates to this question offers very little insight into what were the identified needs and the reason why a candidate needed to undertake this module. One candidate identified they had a weakness in this area and so had opted to take this module to reinforce their own experience. Overall it appears that candidates weaknesses or areas for development were identified, but it raises a very important question as to how were these needs met through the training provided?

4.3.6 Assessment

The response to question 12 (part e) identified that all candidates needed to complete one or more modules and therefore undertake the assessment associated with the modules. One candidate reported:

Having completed the compulsory module I decided to take another year to do the tasks and assessments.

No candidate was assessed as in need of the final assessment only (question 12 part f).

In response to Question 13 - only 3 candidates planned to complete the qualification in one year, with 13 (62%) in two years and the remainder in 3 years.

4.4 The training

This section dealt with the training programme associated with NPQH. Through Question 14 candidates were asked to indicate when they undertook training. Table 4.14 shows that the majority of sessions took place on weekdays and weekends during term time and responses indicated that almost always the training took place on the same day each time.
When did the training take place?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays term time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays holiday time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends term time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends holiday time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 – Training Time

The amount of time individual candidates were devoting to the qualification was the subject of question 15. The two parts to the question asked candidates to identify the time they spent within the school day, and the time spent outside the school, working on the qualification. Their responses are displayed in table 4.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent on training?</th>
<th>Within the school day</th>
<th>Outside the school day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 6 hours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 – Time Spent Training

Without exception all candidates indicated that they spent under 6 hours in the school week on activities associated with NPQH throughout the first year. Outside the school day more variation existed with the majority spending again less than 6 hours per week. No candidate volunteered the total amount of time they had spent on NPQH; although it is evident from the returns that two candidate spent on average over 20 hours per week. It would be interesting to know why the two who spent more than 20 hours felt they needed to do so.

4.4.1 The tasks and activities chosen

Question 16 asked candidates to identify the types of school based activities they undertook as pieces of work to be assessed under each module of the qualification. For the leadership and management module (question 16 part 1), candidates identified the following areas in which they would formulate an activity for this module:
monitoring teaching and learning
curriculum co-ordinator files
articulating a vision for the school
target setting
developing a 5 year action plan for information technology
playground improvement
build the OFSTED action plan and implement it
school involvement in industry
monitoring the effective use of assessment
Basic Skills quality mark
evaluation of value added data and SAT results

One candidate commented that the activities were not module specific and could be appropriate to more than one.

A similar approach was adopted for the curriculum module (question 16 part ii). Candidates identified the tasks they would be undertaking, including:

writing and implementing a scheme of work
report on the development of the literacy hour
baseline assessment introduction
developing and monitoring system for spelling
Special Educational Needs
look at the early years curriculum in the light of OFSTED and produce an action plan
teaching and learning in information technology
report to the governing body on performance in modern languages
evaluation of the delivery of key skills
whole school improvement - in particular improved academic success, action plan towards this and cross-curriculum focus on teaching / learning / revision.

Question 16 (part iii) asked candidates whether any of the tasks/activities were of a research/reading kind. Their responses included:
data collection and analysis techniques
only those reading activities set by the tutors
value added methods
target setting
positive behaviour project

The final part to question 16 asked candidates to identify other tasks that they planned to undertake and that would be submitted for assessment, these included presentations, particularly to the governing body and staff. The topics ranged from:

presentation on vision and values
a presentation about vision in relation to school leadership
presentation about literacy and/or numeracy and/or ICT

The majority gained the support of the headteacher prior to commencing the task/activity, the focus of question 17, but for some tasks chosen by candidates this was not necessary, except where other staff were involved, and their agreement was sought first. One candidate obtained witness statements once they had completed the task/activity.

The extent to which the candidates' current role enabled them to undertake certain tasks/activities was the subject of question 18. In specific terms the question was seeking to establish whether any candidate had to have a change in responsibilities. 14% of the candidates needed a modification of their job descriptions to provide the necessary experience and opportunity to gain knowledge in aspects of school management. This included:

more access to governing body meetings
greater involvement in the strategic direction of the school
opportunity to be involved in staff appointments
attendance at finance meetings of the governing body

All of these candidates were from the primary phase. One candidate commented that their head had not given him/her the opportunity to talk about NPQH, and did
not look at any of the assignments. This candidate spoke critically of the fact that they were ‘very much on their own’. They also stated that they ‘had no job description and had no appraisal interview both of which made it difficult for them to identify their training and development needs, and to seek help and guidance from their headteacher about the application for NPQH’.

4.4.2 Impact on the school

The next question asked candidates to assess the impact, if any, their preparation for the qualification had on the school/organisation (question 19 a). The responses drew the following comments:

Need for days out and supply teaching for my class. Initial year supply cover not adequately funded so the school has to top up.

Teaching reception children was unsettling to them with me being out in the Autumn term.

Dates for training often too close, unsettling to the class I teach.

I have stopped the training because as deputy head in a small school I wasn’t getting enough time to do my job.

I am lucky in that I have non-contact time to work with my head on learning to manage a school.

Term time courses have led to absence from the classroom and therefore supply cover. Weekend/holiday work has led to less available time for class preparation.

Insufficient funding.

No negative impact but it prepared me positively for taking over the headship this year.
Has had an effect on our INSET budget.

I have not taken anything from the INSET budget so the effect in school should have been negligible!

Disruption to the timetable has occurred.

Inevitable impact on teaching commitment when absent. However, biggest impact is additional stress, especially during the holiday time.

The most frequent response expressed by these candidates has been the impact on their teaching commitment and the classes they teach. For primary teachers, with no non-contact time, absence from their class is unavoidable and therefore more noticeable. The disruption to a school’s timetable for one candidate was obviously an issue and may have been as a result of the lateness of knowing whether they had been accepted for training. The issue of funding for NPQH training is currently at the discretion of the LEA. At least three candidates raised this as a concern.

4.4.3 Impact on headteacher and colleagues

The second part to question 19 asked candidates to assess whether there had been any impact on the headteacher or their colleagues. This revealed the following comments:

* time for the head to read my assignments and then complete witness statements.*

* good impact, has fed into the school’s management structure.*

* my head and I work together one day a week on management issues.*

* Because he has been seconded for 2 terms I have become the acting head.*

* Headteacher has had to rearrange the SDP priorities to allow my work to proceed.*
Senior teacher has had to take over the cover arrangements in my absence.

I don’t think my colleagues see it as additional work. We tend to share so much.

This question has revealed no significant impact apart from a few reassigned responsibilities to other colleagues. The level of involvement of headteachers with the candidate is an interesting aside.

4.4.4 Benefits to the school

Question 20(a) was designed to ascertain whether there were benefits for the school from the training the candidate was undertaking for the qualification. This revealed the following responses:

work resulted in curriculum files being established, target setting highlighted as a need.

I am more efficient as a deputy head.

yes, mainly because I set out to ensure the tasks undertaken fitted into the needs of the SDP and school as a whole.

Not really. Teaching head, not responsive to what was happening on the course.

Yes - my influence and leadership skills have impacted on some areas (those which the head does not delegate).

The headteacher and I made earlier starts on target setting and teacher appraisal due to aspects of the course. Both had an impact on the school.

No, it would have gone ahead anyway.
Yes, the tasks were directly relevant to my work in school and I have felt positively prepared for headship.

Yes, strategic timing and planning improved. Ideas and sharing good practice have helped practice. Increase in confidence in writing and presentations.

What I did, yes, but that I would have done anyway. The only difference was the need to write it up which was fairly pointless (though it might be used as evidence for OFSTED).

There are a number of benefits to the school that are common to the candidates. Largely, the tasks undertaken were relevant to the school’s development, and as a consequence those targets were achieved. A small number of candidates recorded no impact. There is clear evidence that tasks undertaken by candidates aligned well with the issues identified by a school in its development plan.

4.4.5 What was the impact on the headteachers and colleagues?

Question 20(b) was designed to assess the impact on the headteacher and colleagues. This drew the following comments:

*Improved dialogue between colleagues. More focus at SMT.*

*Professional debate has been good.*

*It has brought in the opinions of a wide range of people from the caretaker to chair of governor.*

*Not really, I just had more to do on top of the normal workload.*

*The staff with whom I work closely - everyone except the head and her two favourite teachers.*
Outside agencies.

I am able to support the head more and colleagues. Greater awareness of the Head's role.

She (the head) has put up with my moaning - actually I think she is crosser than I am about the whole process!

Challenge to the headteacher, inspiration to others.

Apart from one comment, most candidates recorded improved professional dialogue and debate between colleagues. The last comment would suggest that the candidate had been inspired by the training and this was noticeable by colleagues. Overall a favourable impact is recorded.

4.4.6 What was the impact on the candidates?

Having asked candidates about the impact of the training on the school/organisation and their headteachers and colleagues, Question 21 asked them to assess whether they were better equipped to provide for the school in any of the five key areas. The responses received are contained in table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better equipped to provide for the school?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Direction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate vision</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 – Five Key Areas

Of notable interest is, in all but two categories, candidates generally expressed the view that they were better placed to support their school. It is not surprising that self-management was not considered as area where much development had
occurred. This in part is due to their current high-level self-management skills from holding posts of responsibility.

4.4.7 The benefits for the school

The final question of this section asked candidates to assess overall whether the school had benefited from the NPQH process, and what were their own personal benefits. Two thirds, (67%) indicated that there had been benefits to the school. Their additional comments to this question suggest a range of feelings about the benefits to the school and in respect of the whole process:

- Not really - I would have done the tasks set anyway.

- I am more efficient, informed, and reflective as a result.

- I am more knowledgeable and informed.

- I am more confident. I am able to take a more active role in the long term development of the school. My self-management has improved and I have been given the total responsibility for certain areas of development.

- There have been benefits in the areas over which I do have some control - strategic planning, action planning, monitoring of others' work, evaluation of plans' effectiveness.

- Some important initiatives - such as reading provision, and the teaching of maths, were put in place. They would have been postponed due to work overload if not for this course - but it has benefited the school.

- I am better equipped to manage and lead the school.

- I have felt more confident that I know the requirements of the job and some of what I prepared has directly influenced my work with governors, teachers
and others, such as the PTA. Sharing ideas with other colleagues. Refreshed deputy head.

I am now focusing on essential matters and leaving maintenance tasks to others.

As the only deputy I now have a wide management role. I feel able to take on the role of the Principal.

In contrast to the above fairly positive statements two candidates expressed opposite views:

I do resent spending my weekends training and would like to see less weekend dates in modules. I also believe that funded study leave would enable candidates to cope better with a heavy workload from NPQH as well as a demanding job as deputy head.

I was very disillusioned with competence based assessment and an overwhelming workload with no non-contact time. I now work for the LEA in an administrative role—far less money but a life for me and my family.

It is clear that these last two candidates viewed the increased workload from studying for NPQH as an unacceptable burden alongside their daily work. The majority of respondents recorded increased self-confidence, knowledge and skills to operate at the strategic level. It is interesting to note that after a relatively short span of time one candidate felt better equipped to manage and lead the school. This may be due to the fact that they had assumed the position of acting headteacher for the school during their training programme. In the main most of the candidates gave a more detailed response to this question than many others. Again this may be a factor of confidence or related to the training they had experienced to date.
4.4.8 Follow up interviews

The final question to the candidates asked about their willingness to participate in a follow up interview on the questionnaire. 11 (52%) of the cohort agreed to take part.

4.5 Candidate information

Questions in section A mainly dealt with information regarding the candidates. It is interesting to note that of the 15 returns received from headteachers all of the candidates were deputy heads in those schools. One headteacher reported that the candidate from their school gained a headship within two terms of starting the qualification.

4.5.1 Details of the NPQH qualification

Section B of the headteachers’ questionnaire examined details of NPQH. Question 6 dealt with the selection for training. The responses are shown in table 4.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How selected for training</th>
<th>Number/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended by LEA</td>
<td>2 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended by head</td>
<td>2 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By application</td>
<td>4 (26.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By application and interview</td>
<td>7 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 – How Selected

This clearly shows that the majority of candidates took it upon themselves to make the application and that only 4 had some kind of recommendation either from their headteacher or the LEA. These figures differ from those given in the responses received from candidates (table 4.11).

It was important to establish whether headteachers were guided in judging a candidate’s suitability for NPQH. Responses to question 7 indicate that only 2 of the 14 headteachers received guidance and this was from their LEA.
At the time of this questionnaire all headteachers indicated that the candidates had undertaken their needs assessment (Question 8). The timing of the needs assessment depicted by the responses from headteachers shows a similar picture to the one from candidates (table 4.13).

Two headteachers were unable to provide the date of this part of the NPQH process.

4.5.2 Issues identified through Needs Assessment

Headteachers were asked in question 9 the areas which had been identified through the candidates’ needs assessment that needed to be. For the module on Strategic Leadership and Accountability. Their responses included:

- Broader level of legal/bureaucratic expectations of headship
- Target setting
- Expounding vision perceived as an area for development.

For the module on teaching and learning two headteachers revealed that their candidate required further training, namely:

- Appraisal/monitoring and evaluation of teaching and learning
- Training across the whole area.

Under the leadership and management of staff module more candidates required further training. These included:

- Opportunities to develop competence
- Managing staff (two candidates)
- Whole module as a weakness.

For the module associated with efficient and effective management of resources, respondents included aspects such as:
Interpersonal skills
Recruitment
Expenditure – overseeing school budget
General up-skilling in this area.

Many headteachers indicated that some kind of training or preparation for the assessment part of the process was needed for candidates, if they were to achieve individual modules.

No headteacher indicated that a candidate would achieve the qualification in one year (question 10), (candidates response was 3 expected to complete in one year). 53% expected them to achieve it within two years (candidates response 65%). Three headteachers did not know the time span their candidate had chosen for completing the training.

4.5.3 The Training for NPQH and Funding

Questions in Section C concentrated on the training associated with NPQH. In question 11, the timing of the training, two thirds (66%) of the headteachers indicated that it took place in school time, largely during the day and occasionally in the evenings (see table 4.18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the training taken place in</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School time?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime school term?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening time school term?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 – When Training Took Place

A corollary to this question asked headteachers to indicate whether the training occurred on the same day each time. The response from all was that it was a different day each time. This does not tally with the candidates’ response of same day each time but is not a significant point of disagreement or value.
Question 12 asked headteachers to identify the hours the applicant was taking to study for the qualification within the pupil day over the first year. Table 4.19 depicts this information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours spent within the school week on NPQH.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 6 hours</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 – Hours Spent

Four headteachers were unable to quantify the time involved.

With regard to financial support headteachers were asked to identify if a contribution had been made from school budgets (including the funds allocated to schools for training and INSET). Responses to question 13 (part a) revealed that in one third of the cases school budgets were used for support. The amount of money allocated where specified in the responses is given in table 4.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional funding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£2000 and LEA Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£350 and INSET budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified amount from the INSET budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250 and school effectiveness fund money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100 approximate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 - Funding
In the majority of cases there was no financial support from the schools. Three headteachers were unable to quantify the financial arrangements; one headteacher assuming that all was paid for through the specific NPQH grant.

4.5.4 The tasks and activities undertaken by candidates

With Question 14 the intention was to have identified the types of school-based activities the candidates were undertaking for the assessed pieces of work. The areas/topics for the module on Management Tasks covered:

- Monitoring teaching and learning
- Curriculum co-ordinator files
- Vision for the school
- Presentation to governors ‘what is a good school’
- Audit of premises, curriculum areas (IT, literacy, spelling)
- Organisation of staff and resources
- OFSTED action plan presentation to governors
- Analysis of assessment results
- Action plan on reading
- Overseeing the Quality Mark
- Raising standards initiative
- Review of ICT across the curriculum
- School improvement through Heads of Department

For the Curriculum Task the activities varied from:

- Writing schemes of work
- Report on the development of the literacy hour
- Auditing History – feedback to governors
- Language work. Collecting information about the teaching of spelling throughout the school.
- Developing a policy for ICT and scheme of work
- Implementation of the OFSTED action plan
- Assessment overall leading to target setting


Home study policy – review and rewrite
Review of ICT across the curriculum
School improvement through Heads of Department

The Research Reading Task brought a range of activities, namely:

Looking at data
Report to governors on target setting
Looking at Maths strategies
Interviews/presentations to governors, staff and caretaker
OFSTED findings for ICT – national data
Facilities development. Arts review group
Behaviour projects

Other Tasks chosen by candidates covered:

Reporting to governors
OFSTED action plan
Budget/finance with bursar
Effect of working January to May as a result of SATs

Question 15 asked what agreement or help did candidates require to tackle their chosen activity. Answers revealed that 12 (80%) of the headteachers were involved with agreeing the assignments candidates would undertake. This included:

Help with software for data analysis
Worked together on co-ordinators file. Access and preparation for governors
Meetings. Access to documentation policies etc.
Involvement of governors
Adjustment to timetables - planning
All management tasks identified in question 14
Discussion over the priorities and timescale for OFSTED action plan
Discussion and bouncing off ideas
Two specific responses stated:

*We agreed on tasks which would enhance the development of those areas of the college work which were part of his remit as Deputy (Curriculum).*

*I gave agreement for all.*

Both responses seemed to be supportive of the candidate, and came from headteachers who valued being involved.

4.5.5 The need for changes to candidates' responsibilities

It was reasonable to assume that some adjustment to individual responsibilities might be necessary in order to meet their identified training needs. The response received to question 16 indicates that this was not the case for any of the 15 headteachers. However, as a result of undergoing some of the training (Question 20), some changes were deemed to be desirable. This is reported later in this later chapter.

4.6 The impact of the training on the school organisation

The next phase of the questioning in this section was designed to assess whether the training being undertaken had an impact on the headteachers' school as an organisation.

Responses revealed the following views:

*Class affected by teacher absence – supply cover not always easy.*

*Insufficient funding for absence in year 1.*

*Concerned that the amount of work expected puts extra pressure and stress on an already hardworking member of staff.*

*Amount of work reduced school deputy role in other areas.*

*Financial = small school, limited budget*

*Has not created any difficulties*
Disruptive in terms of time out of school re teaching commitment but also as role of deputy – leaving school light in terms of management. Inevitably time out requires some cover and some delay of tasks which would normally be done.

Undoubtedly the training impacted on the school as an organisation. The above comments reveal how little scope exists within a school to manage a structural change, such as the absence of a senior colleague. Tasks and responsibilities in a school are not easily reassigned on a short-term basis. Funding only supply teacher costs does not assist a school with any reassignment of tasks.

4.6.1 The impact of the training on headteachers and colleagues

The second part of question 17 relates to impact on the headteachers’ themselves or colleagues. The responses suggest that little impact had been experienced in most schools

None or minimal (7 responses)
Positive – new vision and enthusiasm especially valuable in post OFSTED period.
One of the senior teachers has had to take over cover arrangements
My personal workload has increased.

Generally speaking headteachers’ responses revealed little impact from the training. It is pertinent to remember that most candidates were at the early stage of NPQH when this survey was undertaken, and therefore the impact may well be different after a longer period.

4.6.2 Improvements within the school

Although the candidates had barely been involved with the qualification for 12 months, question 18 asked whether any improvements within the school were apparent as a result of the applicant’s involvement with NPQH. 8 (50%) indicated that there had been some kind of improvement registered, and in the following ways:
Curriculum co-ordinator files completed
Greater awareness of target setting
Experience of running meetings
Making presentations
Preparing others for middle management
Deputy developed as an individual
Improvement in the deputy role may be coincidental but the depth of knowledge and grasp of current issues is impressive.
New home study policy in place
The senior management team has benefited from the understanding and information provided by the applicant. Governors have also gained similarly.

These recorded improvements within the school are equally spread between improvement relating to school functions and personal effectiveness, such as giving presentation. In contrast to these a number of respondents, just under 50%, reported:

No – too early.
No – too short a time to judge.
No – due to OFSTED we were doing most of the tasks anyway.
Difficult to quantify. I simply regarded anything as beneficial to the individual as helpful to the school, especially when the person is already highly committed.
None – he was perfectly able anyway!

These latter comments suggest that improvements often take a longer period of time to manifest themselves. The last comment may lend weight to the argument for different approaches to gaining NPQH, a view expressed in a later chapter.

4.6.3 Impact of the applicant's training on the applicant

Question 19 was designed to assess the impact on/or benefit the applicant’s training may have had. Impact on the candidate included:
Much greater awareness of the issues.
Leadership qualities have grown significantly.
More awareness of the Head's role.
Focused his thinking and some of his responses.
Made her a little more sceptical.
Deputy is now questioning career role.
She has had the opportunity to think through a variety of aspects of her management role.
He is more confident in making decision.
He is more able to handle and process conflict, more able to inspire.
Enriched his theoretical perspective on educational issues.
It has only provided him with greater stress.
Exhausted!

Apart from the final comment, headteachers recorded many noticeable developments in the candidates, the emphasis being on self-confidence, and on developing leadership qualities such as conflict resolution.

4.6.4 Impact on the school as an organisation

Question 19 part b asked how NPQH had impacted on or benefited the school. The responses included:

Kept us on our toes about the latest requirements eg risk assessment reports.
ICT is now well organised.
The applicant already had commitment but it has heightened through the assignments undertaken.
A stronger more cohesive SMT despite new additions over the past 12 months.
Taken initiatives we needed developing and put them as priorities.
Reform of the development planning process.
She is more confident and assertive.
May have meant that my very good deputy will be leaving shortly.
These responses reflect a very positive view. There is clear evidence of the impact on aspects of school life that are attributable to candidates' NPQH training.

4.6.5 Benefit to the candidates themselves and other colleagues

Part c of question 19 asked respondents to reflect on the benefit to themselves and other colleagues. General comments included:

- Contribution to literacy
- Monitoring and evaluating teaching
- Co-ordinator's enhanced role
- Developing middle management role
- Awareness of heads' perspective

More specific responses included:

- She is supportive both to myself and colleagues. The course has given greater awareness.
- The strong pastoral leadership and understanding of personnel issues has impacted on staff at all levels.
- Made me think more widely and with new vision.
- The candidate has offered us new perspectives, schemes of working, new challenges to our thinking about the school.
- I have been closely involved with the candidate as they work their way through.

These headteachers' responses clearly indicate that they are beginning to witness benefits to the candidates from the NPQH training.

4.6.6 Impact on candidates' role and performance

The impact on the way the applicants performs their role was the focus of question 19 part d. Responses included:
She has a much greater awareness of issues.
Her leadership qualities have grown.
Greater efficiency in her working.
Much more informed as a result of this course.
It has broadened her understanding of the management role.
He is more reflective, confident, decisive and sensitive to alternative viewpoints.
He has deeper thoughts, has added value and a clearer focus.
He is open minded to proposals – but often reaches his own judgement!

One respondent replied that there had been no discernible impact. Another remarked that:

Always a good deputy – remains so, and the training up is rather an academic exercise making no noticeable difference to the excellent work previously done.

Overall a positive view has been expressed by headteachers as to the impact on the candidates’ ability to perform their role within the school. Greater self-awareness and confidence, and better informed and reflective colleagues fit comfortably with the purpose of NPQH training.

4.6.7 Better equipped people to provide for the school

The final part to question 19 asked whether the applicant was better equipped to provide for the school in the five key areas of headship. Responses received are depicted in table 4.21.
Table 4.21 - Five Key Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Self Management</th>
<th>b) Strategic Direction</th>
<th>c) Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>d) An Articulated Vision</th>
<th>e) Leadership and Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 (46.7)</td>
<td>8 (53.3)</td>
<td>9 (60.0)</td>
<td>8 (53.3)</td>
<td>7 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4 (26.7)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
<td>15 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately two thirds of the headteachers responding to the issue indicated that the candidates were better equipped. 75% recognised that the candidate's monitoring and evaluation skills had improved, whereas 42% of the respondents indicated that leadership and management skills had not.

As a result of their experience so far headteachers were asked whether there was a need to modify candidates' roles in order to provide opportunities for work in other areas of the school/organisation. One fifth of the respondents in Question 20 saw the need for changes. One other respondent was uncertain. The remainder said no.

Of those where changes were likely the reasons given were:

- The candidate from September will have a class responsibility for 50% of the week, thus allowing her much greater freedom to be involved with aspects identified in question 19.

- To help with the next module of finance and budgeting.

- There is an annual review of SMT roles. This allows opportunities for broader team understanding, partnership working. It allows individuals to exploit areas of inexperience.
Other comments received in response to Question 20 were:

*As Deputy the candidate would have been encouraged to take a whole school brief in all areas anyway.*

*No. It has changed because of my secondment. He is now acting head.*

*As a recycled deputy (second deputy headship) he was more than capable on appointment.*

None of the recorded responses suggest that major changes to a candidate’s role are required in order to fulfil the requirements of NPQH. The indicated modifications can be considered as natural changes to evolving roles and changing school circumstances.

4.6.8 The overall benefits

The final question in this section, Question 21, asked respondent headteachers to assess overall whether the schools had benefited from the process to-date. The response is illustrated in table 4.22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number/percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 – Overall Benefits

The accompanying comments to this question included:

*The applicant has a greater awareness of leadership, curriculum and management issues, of classroom observation techniques, of teacher appraisal, the wider issues of school management and the national debate. More access to Head’s responsibilities.*
Small schools particularly benefit from external stimulus from someone attending such a course, but it has the added problem of putting the extra pressure on that person’s workload, as there is not the scope for delegation. The example set by the candidate is encouraging to others – the relevance of the training to ongoing duties is noticed and beneficial.

Due to exceptional qualities of person no obvious benefit gained.

Nothing to add to question 19. With me being out for the year NPQH has shown governors and staff a commitment to furthering his professional development.

Slightly under 50% of headteachers recorded evidence of positive benefits to the school, and these having been achieved in a very short period of time. These responses largely reflect benefits to the individual candidate, and as a consequence, these have impacted on the school and its functions.

4.7 Section D - follow up interviews

In this section headteachers were asked to indicate their willingness to participate in follow-up interviews. Ten (67%) replied yes. These, together with the interviews with candidates, are the subject of the next chapter.

4.8 Summary

This chapter has covered the fieldwork undertaken through questionnaires to candidates and their respective headteachers. Section A of each questionnaire covered basic information about candidates and their current position in the school. There was a direct relationship between the two sets of returns. It is interesting to note that the returns from headteachers were those where the candidate was a deputy head. There is strong correlation between the views expressed by both in respect of the selection and initial assessment process, and factual information, although a few headteachers were unaware of the outcomes from the initial assessment. Responses to questions relating to NPQH training and module tasks and activities indicated that not all headteachers were completely familiar with this aspect of the qualification. When asked about the impact the training had had on candidates and the school, the main difference arose between the responses from the headteachers
with candidates in different phases of education. It would appear that secondary headteachers were more critical and had not witnessed any perceivable benefits. This difference of view will be explored in a later chapter.
Chapter 5:

Presentation of the research findings from the semi structured interviews with NPQH candidates and their respective Headteachers
Presentation of the research findings from the semi structured interviews with NPQH candidates and their respective Headteachers

5.1 Introduction

Candidates and their respective headteachers were invited through their questionnaires to indicate their willingness to take part in a follow up interview. Sixteen (76%) candidates and eleven (67%) headteachers agreed to take part in the post survey interviews.

The research questions required fieldwork (interviews) designed in such a way as to maximise information available from the cohort about the NPQH and its impact. The candidate’s headteacher would provide the substantiating evidence for both the questions and also provide another perspective on the qualification and its associated processes. Essentially this meant that any subsequent interviews needed both the candidate and their headteacher to participate. Out of the number of candidates and headteachers willing to be interviewed a total of eight pairings were identified. This represented 25% of the total number of questionnaires sent out to both candidates and headteachers. This was 36% of the returns from candidates, and 53% of the returns from headteachers.

5.1.1 Interview design

Following the receipt of questionnaires the choice of interviewees were initially made. Each member of the eight pairs received a letter thanking them for completing the questionnaire and at the same time outlining the nature of the interview and the focus of this part of the research. The letter requested convenient dates and times when both of them would be available. The interviews were scheduled to be carried out in-between December 1998 and January 1999. All interviews were completed by mid January 1999.

Each interview focused on two of the research questions, namely:

The impact the assessment and training has on the professional and personal
development of the applicant (research question 1)

The impact the current formulation of NPQH has had on the applicant’s school (research question 3).

Each aspect was explored through a number of pre-designed questions as well as naturally occurring ones following the candidate’s responses. For applicants the pre-designed ones for research question 1 were attempting to elicit information on whether an applicant is:

1. more able to articulate the vision for their current school, including raising standards of achievement
2. more able to distinguish between processes of evaluation, monitoring and review and use them effectively in support of their school’s development
3. more able to provide the strategic direction to achieve an aspect of the vision for their school
4. better equipped to lead and manage their own school in due course
5. better equipped personally to manage themselves in the headship role

The pre-designed questions for research question 3 attempted to elicit more about the impact on the school:

1. has the training for NPQH had a good or detrimental effect on the school, their colleagues and the head teacher?
2. how have these effects manifested themselves?
3. has the school been a beneficiary of the overall process or not?

The interview schedules are included in appendix (B)

The next part of this chapter reports on the interviews with candidates and responses are grouped under the pre-designed questions. Candidates were offered the opportunity to share any other views at the end of this interview and all such responses were noted.
For the headteachers the pre-designed questions were similar to the ones posed to applicants and this was intentional. The need to acquire additional information from the head of the school was self evident in respect of research question 3 - as a result of the training undertaken by the candidate through NPQH:

a. is there evidence of change in the strategic development of the school?

b. has the candidate’s accountability to various people in the school changed: colleagues, parents, governors.?

c. are there noticeable improvements within the school?

The second part of this chapter reports on the headteachers’ responses under the pre-designed questions. Again the opportunity for headteachers to add additional comments was offered and all such responses were noted.

5.2 Interviews with candidates

5.2.1 Question one - In selecting tasks for assessment, were they identified specially for NPQH or were these part of the School Development Plan, or were they independent of both?

The purpose of this question was firstly to ascertain the range of activities embarked upon and secondly whether they were devised to meet the requirements of the qualification or not. In this way it was possible to gauge whether the candidate was developing new skills and knowledge purely for the purpose of the qualification, or whether the school would be a direct beneficiary, because of the tasks chosen, or for other reasons. To aid the analysis the responses received are recorded under specific themes in table 5.1:
Table 5.1 – Themes Chosen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes Chosen</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Development Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED Action Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum – Literacy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum – ICT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Modern Languages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Year 11 performance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Quality Mark in Basic Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target setting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with governors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 The school development plan – SDP:

Three candidates undertook tasks that had been identified within their school’s development plan. The following quotes exemplify their choice:

*More or less what I was doing anyway with the job description and the SDP. Preparation for OFSTED and the subsequent action plan did offer tasks that could be used for NPQH compulsory module. Finance was chosen for one other task - was useful. Post OFSTED monitoring, leading staff. (Primary Deputy)*

*Mostly part of the SDP, although the main task to do with leadership and management was based on my experience at school. Tasks used:– the literacy hour, monitoring of the curriculum coordinators’ files, evaluating them, target setting (Primary Deputy)*
Tasks very much linked to the SDP and the needs of the school at the time. If they didn't match totally with the demands of the course, small modifications were made so they did. One of the tasks fitted nicely into our concern about literacy in the school and revealed that year 5 were considerably behind expectation prompting changes for them in year 6. (Primary Deputy)

It is not surprising that literacy featured prominently as all primary schools embarked upon the literacy hour in September 1998. Other tasks chosen were relevant to the role most deputy heads are expected to play, increasingly the one of monitoring performance.

5.2.3 The OFSTED action plan:

By September 1998 all primary schools had been through an OFSTED inspection, and it is not surprising that several of the schools in the sample were at the action plan stage. Therefore it would be likely that a deputy head would be a lead person for an activity. Five of the candidates had some involvement in the OFSTED action plan. The following quotes from four of the them depict the aspects they covered:

* I choose ICT as one of the tasks as this was likely to be an action point from the OFSTED. The hardest thing about the course is not having long enough time to see through something the school needed. OFSTED really delayed my start on the course. There was no way the school would have coped with me on the course and OFSTED. (Primary Deputy)

* OFSTED action plan. I was given the task to produce the plan and present to governors, also to SMT and the staff. (Primary Deputy)

* For the compulsory module most assignments came out of our OFSTED action plan which I had to deliver as the headteacher commenced a secondment immediately following the inspection. I became acting head, needed to build the action plan and report to governors. It nicely fell into
the remit for the compulsory module. (Primary Deputy).

All assignments were selected by me. They represent some material gained from other sources. ICT was a particular issue as it was a study across several curriculum areas. It drew heavily on an LEA inspection following on from OFSTED. It was an action point. (Secondary Deputy)

These selected quotes emphasise the important role given to deputy heads in leading on the key issues arising from OFSTED action plans, including ICT. The deputy responsible for the entire action plan spoke at length about the enormity of the task given to him. He felt it was well tailored for the assigned management and curriculum tasks

5.2.4 The Curriculum:

It is interesting that many primary phase candidates selected tasks associated with the issues of literacy, numeracy and ICT, as quoted under the SDP and OFSTED action plan headings. Five candidates made specific reference to aspects of the curriculum, as the following four quotes indicate:

Tasks chosen in consultation with the head. I started in November 1997 before I came to this school. Knew little about the Primary Quality Mark, agreed this to be a target for me to achieve as deputy and as a task for NPQH. Was supported with this. The QM features in this so the two tasks fall nicely together and as well as being parts of my role are appropriate for NPQH. (Primary Deputy)

The next module I have chosen to do is on effective learning. This is part of my work as Deputy. (Primary Deputy)

Another was a study of Modern Foreign Languages, improving performance in a particular area of the school. We were concerned about results, and needed to demonstrate to governors the impact of the investment made had not been fully worthwhile. Each task was associated
with a real situation in the College. I may have had to shape the task to fit the NPQH criteria. (Secondary Deputy)

The tasks chosen were things I wanted to do here in the school. Twisted the tasks to fit the course requirements. They had to be what was needed for the school. Literacy/numeracy and other suggestions were not appropriate at that moment in the College. (Secondary Deputy)

The above quotes emphasise the specific as well as the whole school curriculum leadership role expected of deputies.

The following additional quote represents an example of where a candidate undertook a task not necessarily associated with the curriculum or the school’s SDP:

For one assignment I chose to look at mentoring of year 11 pupils in order to raise their performance at GCSE. I failed this one and am told because it was not analytical enough, no consideration of outcomes. They had not sat the exams so how could I do that! (Secondary Deputy).

In choosing such an assignment, the candidate may well have risked not achieving a pass grade, a potential area of weakness if an assignment does not completely match the criteria laid down by the Assessment Centre, then the candidate runs the risk of failure.

5.2.5 General matters:

Two of the candidates spoke of their desire to use the tasks to support their own role development as well as tackling pressing school issues:

Generally I tried to fit round what was going on in school. The second task in the L&M module had restricted choice and an impossible timescale to deliver the task; therefore I opted for the literacy hour. (Primary Deputy)
My situation here is very different to most primary deputy heads. I only teach four days and the other is spent working with Peter on the management of the school. I have had an action plan for learning to be a head. He is a mentor for new heads so has been able to provide my professional development. As a deputy I have had a lot of freedom and ‘in house training’, has had a huge impact on me, not all deputies are as fortunate. (Primary Deputy)

The evidence from these two candidates is that individual experience and current work requirements may not be considered alongside the assessment criteria, when considering the suitability of an assignment. Any conclusion on the rigidity of the assessment criteria may be premature at this stage, but a degree of flexibility and individuality would appear to be appropriate.

5.3 Question two - Has your headteacher taken an active role in the choice of tasks and in ongoing support of these tasks?

Through this question it was the intention to ascertain how closely involved headteachers had become in the tasks chosen and the level of support they had given to candidates. Table 5.2 depicts the responses given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headteacher Involvement</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly involved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly involved</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited support</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 – Headteacher Involvement

5.3.1 Headteacher’s support:

Although not always involved with the choice of task, six out of the eight headteachers played a considerable supporting role to candidates, especially with
unfamiliar areas of management, as the quotes below indicate. This is significant as it demonstrates headteachers’ taking a specific role in the professional development of the candidate.

Not in the choice of the tasks. Helped out with the finance one with advice on spreadsheets. Showed interest, but not in the detail. (Primary Deputy)

Head not directly involved with the choice of task - agreement needed. Head has seen final reports and made comments. Needed to agree release time other than attendance at the course. Head has been closely involved with two of the tasks namely the curriculum coordinators file and target setting. (Primary Deputy)

Usually in discussion with the head about what I wanted to do. Not difficult to convince her of this. There was always follow up with what I was doing, forming reports. One report was used to help set the school’s targets in English and maths. With other tasks a similar approach was adopted. We discussed them. I did the work, formed a report and presented it to staff and governors. She basically trusted me to do this. I suppose the head has allowed me to get on with it, to experiment, take a leading role. (Primary Deputy)

Negotiated with her the tasks. (Secondary Deputy)

These comments indicate a close involvement by headteachers in the work being undertaken for the qualification. The depth of involvement appears to be related to whether the tasks were perceived to be relevant to wider whole school issues, that may well have been part of the SDP or OFSTED action plan.

5.3.2 Course demands – time management:

The issue of finding time to discuss tasks and the outcome from the work undertaken was raised in a number of interviews. The following quote exemplifies the pressure that exists on senior managers in schools today:
Difficult because of OFSTED. It came in the middle of the module. With the best will in the world there was little time to discuss anything else. I had little time to do the tasks - not a major issue at the time. Yes she was supportive with my application and has been throughout. The head read the ICT action plan and read the synopsis I produced for the governors. In the ideal world would have made time to discuss much more with the head. (Primary Deputy)

As far as NPQH is concerned, he has not really been directly involved because he was absent at the start. With the latest module I expect there will be discussion and I may use him to read completed tasks if I feel it worthwhile. It is not high on our agenda given the changes about to happen here (Primary Deputy)

5.3.3 Secondary candidates headteacher involvement:

The two secondary candidates revealed quite different approaches by their respective headteachers. One fulfilling the obligatory part – acting as a witness to the tasks being achieved, the other clearly involved with the empowerment of a deputy and closely monitoring the outcomes, as these quotes suggest:

Showed the final reports to the head, who had to fulfill the witness role for the course. Because I did most of the assignments during the holiday times I really did not involve the Warden very much. She did read all of them, but made no comments as such. She is a very strong leader. Good role model, particularly with working practices and approaches. A practical role model for any type of school. I would find a weak leader very frustrating. She has empowered me to do much. Has also prevented me from becoming too arrogant! She has the vision for the school. Clearly distinguishes between the role as a deputy and deputising. It is a team approach. Supportive to the head. I believe she is appreciative of what I do. (Secondary Deputy)
Carole has been very supportive. Shares my frustration about the course, about my failing the assignment, not having the supportive tutorial from the start. We moan together. She has reassured me that it is not me, but I am going to need a lot of counselling to get through it. Part of me wants to pack it in, another part to stick at it despite my scepticism. I have shared what I am doing with the head, little comment, used as a sounding board. (Secondary Deputy)

Question two has produced comments to support the close role that a candidate’s senior manager, in these cases headteachers, can play in the process. Where there has been agreement with the chosen tasks, a candidate has been able to make gains in knowledge and skills, and schools have been the beneficiary of the effort.

5.4 Question three - If there have been benefits to the school/colleagues, how have you assessed this?

The purpose of this question was to assess whether any benefits had accrued and what evidence existed to support that claim. A range of comments were given which broadly can be categorised into perceived and non perceived benefits, as depicted in table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To school/college</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No perceived benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 - Benefits to the school

5.4.1 Perceived benefits:

I believe that there have been benefits for children and other team members. Curriculum co-ordinators have benefited from this. Talking to people, boosting people’s confidence. Gained a lot from talking with others on the course - how they would deal with the same problem, especially
when things get bogged down. Other ways to approach it. (Primary Deputy)

There have been benefits. After each assignment a presentation has been made either to staff or governors. There have been changes. Physical ones as well as thinking. Pupil data is now stored together in one place. One task relating to IT has resulted in a 4 year action plan to purchase equipment. We were told that we could use evidence from previous activities we had undertaken. But I found this very difficult to do because the evidence was often not in the form required. (Primary Deputy)

Colleagues know I am on the course. They have respect, they know this is a training ground for me to become a head. It is an intense school. Colleagues do come to me, ask my advice, my opinion. I am able to bring some of my NPQH training to bear on matters and issues, management systems. Back up with demonstrations. Use of a range of strategies to do certain things. The Head is very involved in the hidden curriculum so I have had to do more of the other things and this has involved working closely with staff. (Primary Deputy)

However several comments reported the opposite.

5.3.2 No perceived benefits:

Cannot pinpoint any direct results, other than it has made me more clear about what I was doing. School takes up so much time it really has been difficult to fit in the assignments.

No, there has been little benefit to colleagues. (Primary Deputy)

Not really as the way the head here sees the deputy, much of what is happening, the mechanisms were in place before NPQH. My role covered much of that. (Primary Deputy)

No benefits for the school, only partially in that one or two colleagues were
given extra responsibilities, but then this really was due to Peter's secondment. (Primary Deputy)

I would like to think so but really there have not been any, because most of the things would have been done anyway. (Secondary Deputy)

The following comment from a secondary deputy reveals a possible weakness in the current NPQH structure:

Hard to say for certain. If the assignments had been set up as school based projects there might have been greater involvement of other colleagues and consequently some benefit to them. But these things would have been achieved anyway without NPQH. I would want to say that the course has prepared me for this year as acting head. Set me up in many ways. I do feel prepared for certain kinds of activity that I might have not been aware of before. (Secondary Deputy)

The evidence supplied in response to question three indicates that, certainly in the primary phase, much may be gained from the close linkage of tasks to current activities within a school. Assessing benefits is not an easy science, and in the case of many tasks a period of time needs to evolve before any judgement can sensibly be made. Should benefits be other than to the candidate themselves is a good question and the focus of the fourth question asked. On balance the overall perception from these interviews supports the view that the benefits to the school have been few.

5.4 Question four - If there have been benefits to you? What are they?

With this question candidates were invited to reflect on their personal development that resulted from the tasks they had undertaken. The majority of candidates spoke enthusiastically about the benefits and impact upon themselves - table 5.4
### Table 5.4 – Benefits to Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to Candidate</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting other aspiring heads</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No benefit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4.1 Benefits – gains in terms of personal and professional development:

*More confident talking at meetings, making presentations. People are not consciously aware that I am participating in NPQH.* (Primary Deputy)

*The benefits to me have been that I am much clearer in organising myself. Being clear about what I really want. Pushed to set down and think more deeply. Becoming more informed about school issues. Keeping up to date by reading what comes into school etc. Taking time out to do this, to plan for the future. Confirming what I want to do is OK by others. What I am doing is acceptable. It has reassured me that I can do the job of headship. I now have a corporate vision - a direction. Able to think that way.* (Primary Deputy)

*Any arrogance I had has been dispersed through the assessment process.* (Secondary Deputy)

*Pulling together. There may be other benefits. I have the knowledge and expertise for headship. Confidence endorsement. I doubt whether I have learnt many new things, some I expected. Specific things have come through the papers issued for reading e.g. appraisal. I have been able to pass this on to others, as appraisal will become an important matter for colleagues. School self reviews and target setting are two other areas that I have become more knowledgeable in. More for me than the school.* (Secondary Deputy)
If anything it is that I need to express more of "my" view, not the "we" view. But then I believe in teamwork and team achievement. The recent task on budget cuts was too rigid. We've been through this here, so I know exactly the options that need to be considered. I am not certain that course tutors know enough about the reality of this to judge outcomes. It is also a very negative image of the job to set, as a task, a 7% budget cut. (Secondary Deputy)

5.4.2 Benefits – meeting other aspiring headteachers:

The benefits to me have been in the meeting of other people on the course and an excellent tutor. Stimulation, questions posed. I did not mind going on Saturdays or on a Bank holiday. Intellectual discussion was good, how other schools approached situations. The group gelled well together. All supportive of each other. Links with a deputy of a large primary school has been interesting to quiz his management style. (Primary Deputy)

Meeting people from other places. Sharing good ideas and practices. Sharing problems knowing that others have the same circumstances, same environment. Not being alone, networking, exchanging Email addresses. The group have formed a good training partnership, social mix. (Primary Deputy)

One primary deputy very clearly indicated that the course had little impact in the way they performed their job as a deputy. Another deputy expressed the view that some aspects were a waste of time. This was a minority view, but perhaps the most telling comment came from a fellow primary deputy who articulated his view by saying:

The dilemma for me is where to go from here. I have had headship interviews. I have a personal life too. There has been pressure to apply for headships during the course. The assignments have been quite a burden. I was thinking of packing it in, the course, but the head and governors have persuaded me to continue. I feel I might finish it, but it is lovely not to have
the pressure of it at the moment as I am delaying the next module until the Autumn.

This deputy expressed an opinion that many others intimated throughout the interviews, a concern for the burden of work on top of already heavy professional responsibilities. This issue is addressed in the final chapter. Although this same deputy recognised there had been some good points:

There have been benefits from attending the course, meeting others, sharing ideas. The training has been good. (Primary Deputy)

5.5 Question five – leadership and management skills

The final pre-designed question focussed on one of the key aspects of the NPQH qualification - leadership and management skills. Had these improved and if so in what ways? All eight candidates stated that their leadership and management had improved.

The responses from six candidates can be categorised into personal skills/confidence and those more associated with their professional role.

5.5.1 Personal confidence - speaking, leading, organisation:

I am more confident as a leader, especially doing presentations in public. Perhaps going into other people's classrooms as an observer, making judgements, looking at pupils work etc. (Primary Deputy)

Yes. More confident in speaking at meetings. Strategies for handling difficult situations, NPQH does a lot of assessment. First module did not give strategies to use, rather assessed what you knew already or had done. Recent modules have given practical strategies about styles of management, looking at alternatives. Team building exercise very useful; the qualities needed. (Primary Deputy)
I am more confident in myself. Do feel that I can speak in public with authority, not so woolly as I used to be. I can focus on issues think more clearly. Can take responsibility. Can structure the ways of doing things. No problem with leading teams. Knowledge of procedures has been cleared up. Will help the interview technique, answering questions.

(Primary Deputy)

Yes these have improved. I am better at presentations - to governors, leading a discussion group. I have the confidence to be more confident!

(Primary Deputy)

I am an organised person but the course has helped me to prioritise a lot more. Present job a difficult one - full time teaching with little release time. Have to do everything plus NPQH. Feel a better manager. The 4 D strategy is helpful. Talking to others, sharing processes and policies has been very useful. (Primary Deputy)

I suspect there has been an improvement, but it is very difficult to quantify this, I think NPQH formalised what I was doing in school. I am clearer about what I think; I can talk better, express myself. Feedback from my assignments indicated that I was thinking like a head. I was acting head at the time. I think what I am doing here has influenced NPQH rather than the other way round. (Primary Deputy)

Perhaps the above quotes indicate a lack of opportunity given to deputy heads to develop the skills of public speaking, leading meetings and even dealing with difficult situations. Is this a symptom of the role, or an issue of time, or more of an issue regarding the role perception of a deputy head? NPQH, once achieved, is a qualification supporting a candidate's application for headship; they have met the national standard for headship. Prior to application a candidate needs to be able to demonstrate to a selection panel (if application is through an LEA), their readiness for training for headship, not readiness for headship!
5.5.2 Personal – educational vision:

The headteacher is the leading professional in the school and as such is expected to work with the governing body to provide the vision, leadership and direction for a school. Articulating a personal vision of education is a pre requisite in the application for training. For one secondary deputy developing a personal vision was clear early on in their career:

*The key thing has been emphasis on vision. Has reaffirmed my views that I gained early on in my career. The importance of having a vision. The course has opened my eyes as to what the TTA priorities are. I thought it would be very technical and less philosophical, but this has not been the case. I believe yes at the leadership end not so much with the management side. Endorsed what I suppose I believe in.* (Secondary Deputy)

As with every other question posed not all candidates were complimentary about the leadership and management module. Responses included:

*Not really. The course has not taken the opportunities to develop these aspects, these skills. Mine have developed through other ways. I've worked with a number of heads. They have been role models in their own significant way.* (Secondary Deputy)

*Compulsory module a lot of work, very hard to fit in on top of the job. Resented having to give up Saturdays following a very busy week and the need to use Sundays to prepare for the forthcoming one. Feeling tired especially at this time of the year. Did not enjoy this module. Changes came from the TTA after a piece of work was completed. Book lists were late in coming. Trainers were new to it, one step ahead. Recent module has been very enjoyable; trainers knew what they were doing. I am sure it will get better and the trainers will become better. The timescale needs to be more realistic.* (Primary Deputy)

The last comment revisits the difficulties experienced with the introduction of a
new course. The extent to which candidates in the first cohort have been guinea pigs will be considered in the next chapter.

5.5.3 Additional comments raised during interviews

It was appropriate to allow each candidate to give additional reflections on NPQH, and what follows are a selection of comments made and issues raised, firstly picking up the theme raised at the end of the last section.

5.6 Personal feedback and communication issues:

There has been little feedback through the process. I don't have a fully developed view of my performance. I really would have appreciated more ongoing discussion and feedback. (Secondary deputy)

The frustrating thing has been the lack of communication from the centre. The tutors not being sure of what is going on and telling us. Information keeps changing, assignments have changed, structure of the course has changed. We are guinea pigs. We hear the next course has changed so where does it place this one in terms of credibility? (Primary Deputy)

The introduction of the fast track has devalued the work we have done. I am really not certain whether to proceed or not. (Primary Deputy)

My interview experiences suggest that governors know very little about this qualification. (Primary Deputy)

I inquired last Friday about next term's course, because I had not heard from the centre. I am told there will be no module because of the pressure on us! (Primary Deputy)

The strength of feeling about communication and course changes must surely be issues to be addressed by the DfEE in any revision of the course? It is also of
concern that candidates feel a sense of devaluation, given the introduction of the fast track route.

5.6.1 Suggested changes to the course structure:

Evaluation is an effective mechanism for determining areas for further development and change. Candidates were offered the opportunity to reflect on the course structure and to identify aspects that would benefit from change. Two candidates expressed the following views:

"I would like to see changes. If the planning was better it would help me plan my time, to know in advance when I need to work, be out of school. Saturdays do put a strain on you. I would prefer holiday times for the day courses." (Primary Deputy)

"I am not against the training of future heads - it was needed. I know I need to do this. I was not negative at the start, but I am now. I think it needs to be more along the line of the GNVQ model. Seeing you in school, in context, actually working in the school. It must be based on a practical model. The assignment planning the appointment of a member of staff was done without reference to the good materials given. The structure of that particular assessment was inappropriate, it was too removed from the completion of the assignment - a discussion, a month later, on something done in timed circumstances and not seen since!" (Secondary Deputy)

These concerns need to be addressed in any revision of the course structure and delivery mechanism and clearly relate to the communication issues mentioned above.

5.6.2 Course demands alongside a full time job:

Another frequently mentioned issue was the additional demands of the course on top of the demands of a candidate's full time job. Three candidates spoke openly about this:
It is not impossible to do NPQH and the job as a deputy head. Assignments were largely completed during the holidays. Much of the work already existed in some form or other. Quality of training has been variable. Group gelled after the compulsory module. Training both phases together has not worked. Dominated by the secondary people who obviously have more specialised experience in some aspects. Not really enjoyed the course. (Primary Deputy)

Tremendous workload for a full time teaching deputy. I am seriously thinking about whether I want to be a head. I believe I can do this. It is a challenge. The fast track approach appeals to me. I wish it had been possible when I started. The goal posts have continuously changed. I don’t know if there is another assessment day. We have been guinea pigs, even for the trainers who are only able to plan a few days ahead of us. (Primary Deputy)

Having been an acting head I worry about 1) Do I need the money from headship? 2) Do I want the hassle? I am quite happy as a deputy because of the imminent changes here. There is a crisis looming in headship. Am I going to be backed into a corner if I get this qualification? Will I be expected to go for headship? Governors will be looking for the qualification especially from 2002. If I do complete does the qualification have a shelf life. What if I decide 10 years on to apply for headship, will the qualification still have value? (Primary Deputy)

The demands placed upon senior members of staff in a school are severe and is it warranted to add more to achieve the next generation of headteachers? There is a strong record of further professional development by teachers through Master’s degree courses. Such courses are equally demanding, require candidates to attend lectures, carry out assignments and research work, and in some cases there is a terminal examination. Notably most teachers funded their own attendance! Complaints about such courses will exist, but may not reach the same pitch and have the same publicity as NPQH. Why? The latter is by personal choice, whereas
the former has been publicised as the requirement for headship. This will be revisited in the next chapter.

5.6.3 The training:

NPQH is based on the national standards for headship and this in itself will restrict content. The quality of trainers is key to the success of any taught course, perhaps particularly when the course has tightly defined criteria. Their ability to interpret criteria and to expose candidates to a range of experiences is all the more important. Views on the training provided by centres were not actively sought in this research. However, the quotes below speaks positively of the trainers from one centre:

_The training has been good. Trainers have selected work, probably not as TTA would have wanted, but it has made it less mechanistic than is the case, so I am told, in other regions. Less use of OHTs, a more humane approach. It is about meeting the national standards, showing evidence against these standards, tick box syndrome. I don't like this approach personally. You know devising evidence in this way trivialises the process, mechanistic, an assemblage of parts, no real assessment of you in action. This criterion referenced/standards approach is unsatisfactory._ (Secondary Deputy)

_There have been benefits from attending the course, meeting others, sharing ideas. The training has been good._ (Primary Deputy)

Three final comments expressed by candidates through the interview process probably reflect the depth of feeling of the views held about the qualification, the process and its on going development:

_I am quite positive about it all. I have enjoyed it._ (Primary Deputy)
But the good things have been the trainers, meeting others, cross phase
groups, seeing people working at a different level of activity. (Secondary
Deputy)

Some bits of the course have been very good. Why do we need heads?
Where you are taking a school? Especially your vision, this is vital. Many
people are disillusioned in headship positions. Objected to weekends being
used for training. The practicalities of headship have not been covered in
the training. In reality it cannot do this. (Primary Deputy)

5.6.4 Criticisms concerning the qualification:

At this early stage of the interviews, candidates from the secondary phase were
keen to express strongly their views on the qualification, the assignments and the
feedback process. Although primary candidates did make reference to these
matters, no one expressed views with the same strength of feeling as that of the
secondary candidates:

From the start I was sceptical about the course. But I threw myself into the
group work, have made positive contributions and kept the group talking,
given measured inputs from my experience. Even turning up on Saturdays
in a suit because we were being assessed on dress. (Secondary Deputy)

I don't believe we have not been treated unfairly just because we were the
first group to start NPQH. (Secondary Deputy)

I am not arrogant. I do not know it all. But there is little that I have not
heard before. Of course there are things I need to know more about in
headship but they have not come through the course, except doing the risk
assessment assignment, a relatively minor part of the course. (Secondary
Deputy)

The fact that I had no indication that I was not meeting the requirements
has really annoyed me. Angered me. Why no tutorials to help. A TTA
This is my major criticism of the course, the lack of guidance as one works through an assignment. The fact that I had a tutorial after failing the module where I was shown what was wrong, rubs salt into the wound. This is not an academic qualification. (Secondary Deputy)

The reason for this strength of feeling from secondary candidates may well reflect their experience of with other in service training courses, teaching and learning approaches used, or perhaps their overall scepticism with the need to gain a qualification before achieving headship?

The one comment from a primary deputy that supports this view is:

I am sceptical about the course and whether it will make me a better head. Having recently heard about the fast track approach for those close to headship I am really questioning what have we been doing over the past few months, is there any value in it. (Primary Deputy)

The introduction of a 'fast track' arrangement arose as an issue in the latter part of some of the interviews. This is commented on later in this chapter.

5.7 Interviews with Headteachers

Interviews with the candidates' headteacher were an essential component of the enquiry. Through such interviews not only would substantiation be achieved for the candidates' evidence, but also respondent triangulation would be achieved.

5.7.1 Question one – choice of task

The first question to headteachers referred to the tasks the candidate has undertaken. Were they devised solely for the benefit of the training, or would they have been carried out anyway? All headteachers stated that the tasks were in someway associated with the school' development plan, although some tasks were not, these being more personal to the candidate and the requirements of NPQH. Table 5.5 summarises this information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme/task</th>
<th>Number choosing theme/task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School based within SDP</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED prep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSTED Action Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 – Themes and Tasks

Responses were very detailed and quotes have been organized under specific subheadings.

5.7.2 The school's SDP and /or the OFSTED action plan:

All of the headteachers regarded the tasks chosen by candidates as either relating directly to the school’s development plan or the OFSTED action plan. Their involvement was largely peripheral; although in one case the headteacher with the candidate decided to ensure that the needs of the school acted as the focus for tasks. In this case the candidate may have disadvantaged themselves, if the exact nature of the task was not sufficiently co-terminus with the module criteria. Where tasks were directly linked to the SDP, headteacher involvement was more prominent. The following extracts from the interviews exemplify this:

*Most had already been started in one form or another either as part of her job or the SDP or related to OFSTED. Therefore less impact in the school. Some things tackled at a different rate due to the training. Assessment and monitoring needed to be sorted; systems established so became linked to the course. (Primary Headteacher)*
The main task for my deputy was to negotiate the OFSTED Action Plan. Mike was not in the school when OFSTED came. The task required negotiation and then to deliver to the governing body the plan. This needed to be done well given our GB! The presentation had to be convincing. It also required ongoing monitoring. As the deputy was not part of the OFSTED process he could be objective. Critical initiative. It reduced the stress on me as the head. He impressed the GB with his public speaking, presentation and ownership of the process. (Primary Headteacher)

Most of the tasks needed doing. Some had been neglected e.g. policy on staff development. Inspired me to do something about it. Highly relevant to the school. Literacy had been done in the school so a good one to do. Role of curriculum coordinators/staff development. (Primary Headteacher)

Jill was doing most of it anyway. It was work we had to do. It was extensive. Seemed appropriate for NPQH. Jill had the responsibility of the OFSTED action plan during my secondment November to July, writing and implementing the plan. Others were day-to-day matters about the school. (Primary Headteacher)

Preparation for OFSTED put heavy demands on Anne. The deputy in a small school has a lot to do. In hindsight for the school and for Anne it was not the right time. When she applied it was the right time, but circumstances changed rapidly in that summer term. One of the assignments came as a result of OFSTED – ICT. (Primary Headteacher)

Because tasks have been linked to SDP I have been involved in the choice their development and reporting to staff and governors. (Primary Headteacher)

NPQH acted as a catalyst for us at the school. All were real ones. Focused and all in the development plan. OFSTED action plan also identified issues for us. Some of the tasks were specific, others, Ron was creative and designed assignments around what were his responsibilities.
These were all beneficial to school. He is very good at writing these kinds of things. Some colleagues would find this more difficult to do. The home study assignment arose out of our work with parents as co-educators. It fitted one of the NPQH tasks. The resulting outcome was excellent established good practice. It demonstrated how NPQH became a way to get things done. (Secondary Headteacher)

We decided to subvert the course and anything submitted had to be what we wanted for the school and what Brian wanted. Of course we made sure that there was no disadvantage in doing this. Tasks were related to SDP matters, such as targeting children, working with heads of departments, embedding new staff into the ways of the school. (Secondary Headteacher)

It is evident from these quotes that headteachers saw the potential of linking assignments to actions within the OFSTED action plan. By doing so both the requirements of NPQH and OFSTED would be met. It is not surprising that many other assignments were constructed around issues identified in a school’s SDP. There appears to be no evidence that assignments were chosen solely for the purpose of NPQH.

5.7.3 Teaching and learning:

The module that linked closely with teaching and learning became the focus for three candidates’ assignments. This was not necessarily a direct result of the need under NPQH. Headteachers in these schools had built into their deputy’s responsibilities an oversight of teaching and learning. One of the candidates worked on a specific subject that had been identified through the OFSTED process.

Another task was on teaching and learning. She spoke to the person who advised her on her needs so to make sure it was in line with the requirements of NPQH. (Primary Headteacher)

Mike had already launched into these before he came to the school. The tasks were closely aligned to his job description and the activities
associated with a deputy head. Assessment was one. (Primary Headteacher)

ICT was identified by OFSTED. We did need to work on this, it was part of her role anyway. She produced a report that went to governors. Useful to her. (Primary Headteacher)

It is not surprising that the opportunity to develop the role of the deputy was considered as a legitimate target for NPQH tasks. Aspects such as literacy, ICT and other curricular and assessment are often within the remit of deputy heads, particularly in primary schools.

5.8 Question two – Were headteachers involved in any way with the development of the task, e.g. in an advisory or mentoring capacity?

With this question the intention was to extract more precisely the involvement of headteachers, the specific role they played, if any. Table 5.6 depicts the main ways headteachers expressed the way they were involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role played by headteacher</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion only</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed tasks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenting on the tasks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting role</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Advisory role</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring role</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 – Headteacher’s Role

The following quotes distinguish between a supporting role, a mentoring role and a professional advisory role:
5.8.1 Supporting role:

If I had a less experienced deputy I am sure it would be greater. I was involved with an assignment to do with finance I tend to scan through her work. Not critical to that extent. I think I knew on most occasions what she would write. (Primary Headteacher)

My role has been one of information, reflecting on the completed tasks and commentating critically on them. I do not see myself acting as a mentor. (Primary Headteacher)

Not really, only in the way we have discussed the issues we needed to do here. (Primary Headteacher)

It was not surprising to find positive quotes from headteachers regarding the supporting role they have undertaken with the candidates. The last comment may not be an accurate reflection on that headteacher's involvement overall, but purely on agreeing an assignment's focus.

Another headteacher preferred to define the candidate as 'an extension of the headteacher'. The headteacher went on to say:

We complement each other. I trust him and have done so from early on. He has taken over responsibility in my absence. This has strengthened through the course. Absolute confidence in him, whatever happens. An example last week demonstrated David's ability to cope with a difficult situation, he handled it correctly and I was informed. (Primary Headteacher)

The relationship between a headteacher and deputy is critical to the functioning of a school. Obviously this headteacher had considerable confidence in the candidate prior to the course, and that confidence has been enhanced as a result of it.
5.8.2 Professional advisory role:

As the leading professional in a school it would be reasonable to assume that a headteacher might well consider acting as the candidate’s adviser, especially on school related matters, advising on assignment tasks for example. Not all headteachers saw that as their role, but the following two comments are interesting, because they show the extent of support:

Yes, I am interested in what he is doing. I needed to be mindful of the school. It has to be in the interest of the school, therefore my response has been - ‘That seems like a good idea, lets sit down and discuss it’. It is about checks and balances. I have recommended adjustments. I am particularly critical of written text and the quality of the English used, grammar. He has taken the advice given. The process could be quite threatening to some less experienced heads. Chair of governors has also seen some of the work Mike has completed. (Primary Headteacher)

I have talked through with him the assignments, not formally. I have read them all. I am not a mentor. In some ways it has been good. Some heads would have attempted to direct matters - control the development, even hinder it. I suppose I checked the tasks, made sure that they were done. I also had to produce the witness statement. (Secondary Headteacher)

The headteachers quoted above clearly wished to be engaged with the process and felt a certain expectation on them to provide advice and guidance. These headteachers would therefore be able to fulfil the witness endorsement needed.

5.8.3 Mentoring role:

It is not surprising that several headteachers were more comfortable with a mentoring role, a view expressed during the interviews, although not overtly carried out. Two headteachers openly described their role as a mentoring one:
I have felt and shared his frustration. Tried to stay calm to mentor him through this period. It seems that the course tutors have no idea about managing a school. The structure of the course is built like a vocational qualification - NVQ. But, it is not. Theoretical knowledge is not related to specific activities associated with headship. Brian needs to develop in certain ways - management, personnel matters, budgeting. Course does not deal with this. I have had to help here so has the Bursar. (Secondary Headteacher)

More as a mentor really. I did see the assignments and had to complete the witness statements. (Primary Headteacher)

The potential of the mentoring role is exemplified by these two quotes and is revisited in the final chapter. Although only two headteachers refer directly to mentoring, in all the interviews the mentoring notion was apparent, though not openly referred to as mentoring. It is likely that in a primary school the headteacher will be the professional adviser, taking the responsibility for professional development of staff including the deputy. In a secondary school such a similar role is performed by the deputy themselves for other staff. The head is the obvious person to carry out that role for the deputy. The relationship between a candidate and their headteacher may well be the determining factor to the role the headteacher plays in the NPQH process.

5.9 Question three - Were there any benefits to the school?

The third question was concerned with identifying whether there had been any benefits to the school from the candidates' involvement in NPQH? Table 5.7 depicts the responses received.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to the school</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased skills in specific areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas from other people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific tasks completed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to the headteacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More enthusiasm/focused</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 – Benefits to the School

All headteachers made specific reference to benefits to the school, but four of them expressed some negative views.

5.9.1 Perceived benefits:

*Some benefits. Extra skills through the assessment and monitoring work. Ideas from other people, discussions. This did bring in some new ideas.*
*(Primary Headteacher)*

*Agreed that the tasks had to be of benefit to both candidate and the school - practical applications in the school. School based developed out of need. One task was to research into how spelling was taught through the school.*
*(Primary Headteacher)*

*Benefits to me the head, have been several. Conversations with me as a result of the course tasks; provocative and challenging. Made me think about these issues, awoke in me concern. Nicky is more instructive and persuasive at meetings e.g. the target setting tasks. She gave a well-informed talk to governors on this, may have been a bit confusing to them but it is a difficult subject. Gave an authoritative talk on the role of subject coordinators - vision of where we should be going. She is now interviewing*
subject coordinators in release time, setting targets with them that are worthwhile. (Primary Headteacher)

He already possessed many of the qualities for headship. The course has enabled him to focus on himself and those aspects he needed to develop. One of the issues for him was jumping in with both feet! The course has helped him to face up to the fact that the head has other considerations than the children in the class they are teaching. There are wider issues.

Course has been considering things that he would not have had much experience with - budget, different aspects of working with governors, internal management of the school. Working with staff has been more focused, he is inspired. (Primary Headteacher)

Great enthusiasm - post OFSTED - rallied the troops, coupled with the knowledge and the theoretical perspectives he has picked up from NPQH, the reading he had done, the debates and the discussion he has had with colleagues. An outcome has been the ability to 'smooth out the creases', to deal with negative criticisms from staff. He has also learnt to hold onto his point of view. To respect the views/opinions of others, learning how to come out of it without creating hostility. (Primary Headteacher)

The assignment about home study arrangement is one where there were benefits to the school. We were quite woolly on some issues and through NPQH we have acted. Hopefully the next OFSTED will take note of what we have done and how we did it. (Secondary Headteacher)

Those quotes illustrate the enormity of the benefits to the schools as perceived by headteachers. It was not surprising that intermingled with them are the benefits that are personal to a candidate. It is particularly noteworthy, that in the case of a primary deputy, the course has been able to provide insight into areas outside their experience.
5.9.2 No perceived benefits:

Not really, except the ICT. Given the prevailing factors here I am not surprised that there have been few benefits. (Primary Headteacher)

I cannot see any benefit, because she came with lots of the qualities I expected in a deputy head. She has gained experience by working with me, gained confidence with the acting headship responsibility. Really NPQH is incidental. (Primary Headteacher)

In another way he needed to show to governors that he was capable of running a school. That he was committed. I am not certain that this happened really, he underplayed this part. (Secondary Headteacher)

Really there has been no benefit to the school at all. I can say that the course and the outcomes so far have knocked his confidence. Failing one assignment has been devastating for him. He is very tired. He has given up Saturdays, evenings. It has not been fulfilling for him. A wasted opportunity. (Secondary Headteacher)

These four, largely negative views may well be a factor of the length of time the candidate had been a deputy headteacher. Starting the NPQH course well into a deputy headship may produce a conflict between experience gained from just doing the job of a deputy and the requirements of the course.

Overall it would appear that most schools gained benefit form NPQH. Of course it was difficult to completely divorce from the school’s benefits those of the candidates. It was also evident that headteachers themselves have benefited from their deputy’s NPQH training.
5.10 Question four – Assessing the benefits on the candidate and on colleagues.

It is important to know whether headteachers were able to assess the impact the training had on the candidate, and on their colleagues. This was the focus of the fourth question. All headteachers expressed a view and most referred to significant benefits to the candidates but few perceived any benefits to the candidates’ colleagues.

5.10.1 Benefits to candidates

Has been helpful to her. Through the monitoring and evaluation she has undertaken she is more sensitive to individual needs. Difficult to say whether the skills learnt are as a direct result of NPQH. Where areas of need were identified there is evidence of benefit to the school and herself. (Primary Headteacher)

He has always been popular within the school. He has status; he is respected for what he says. He thinks more. You can see him thinking in staff meetings now, whereas before he used to say his piece. The thought processes are evident. There is considerable pressure on him. He is a very strong character, depth of resourcefulness. The pressure has been more noticeable in the last 18 months. (Primary Headteacher)

Yes, it has made her be more general than before - partly NPQH and other events and especially through her time as acting head. We must remember the national context in which NPQH was introduced, a qualification that would be compulsory by 2002. I think both she and I perceived something different to what is now in place. What we have is quite different. This fast track approach is demoralising to people like her who have set aside 3 years to achieve the qualification. There is a crisis in recruiting for senior positions and this is backing up right through to promoted posts such as coordinators. (Primary Headteacher)
He is very keen on NGFL and ICT. He has taken the staff with him on this and this has happened as a result of his acquired skills in working with colleagues, leading teams. They have benefited from this. (Primary Headteacher)

She started in September 1997. The school was upside down with building work and with 50% of the staff being new. OFSTED was coming in January. This was not the appropriate time for Anne to begin NPQH. We didn’t discuss this as I had recommended her to do the course. She was looking for headship and areas in which she could improve. (Primary Headteacher)

Impact on colleagues not evident, but she is better informed in staff meetings. Makes a valuable input to curriculum committee. (Primary Headteacher)

These comments contrast with those below, where it would appear that headteachers assessed little evidence of impact, particularly on colleagues. This in contrast to the impact on the candidates, where Headteachers generally assessed benefits to them, personally and professionally. In their assessment two headteachers remarked on the pressure on the candidate and in one case the demoralising effect of the ‘fast track’ approach that has become available since these candidates embarked on the course.

5.10.2 Personal benefits:

Four headteachers were able to identify benefits to the candidates personally. This quote re-emphasises that the timing of the introduction of NPQH may well have been unfortunate for some candidates

Two other issues that you ought to know about. He does not suffer fools gladly. The course has confirmed in him his ability to run a school. He is a team person. Works through the middle management tier including non-teaching staff. The other is about keeping up to date in the widest sense.
Wider reading, other than the TES. He now has a wider view of education.
(Secondary Headteacher)

Those with considerable experience may well assume they have developed the knowledge and skills required for headship. On the other hand having current up to date knowledge of education, phase specific, was vital for any leading professional and cannot necessarily be found just from reading the professional journals.

5.10.3 Benefits to colleagues

Of particular interest was whether there was any impact on colleagues as a result of training of an individual. Was there likely to be more impact in a small school than a large secondary one? At the time of this research the following quotes would seem to suggest that there was little evidence of benefit to colleagues:

Not noticeable on colleagues really, but I am sure there has been. Some things filter through. Inter personal skills needed developing. Anne was aware of this. Initial application for headship and from the interviews identified this as an aspect in need of development. This has improved in her. (Primary Headteacher)

On colleagues very little impact, only where it related directly to the development plan. The management group might have realised that this was the way to get things done that the school had either deferred or put off? (Secondary Headteacher)

The following comments from secondary headteachers were critical of aspects of the training. Both headteachers clearly identified frustrations and, in one case, supports the demoralisation argument articulated by a primary headteacher earlier. This latter comment may be an aggregation of the negative views and feelings expressed by the candidate throughout the process to date.
There have been some negative things though. Time commitment has been dire. Holiday time working. Has been a strain on his personal life and his family. Out of school has not been a problem, but it is another call on his time. This latter I see as professional development and it would have happened in some form or another anyway. He has been irritated by some of the oral assessment. Does not enjoy having to justify his responses. This aspect should have been covered by tutors. (Secondary Headteacher)

Only frustration and a demoralised deputy head. Wrong type of course. What should have happened is that it should have been reflective. The assessment should have identified the areas for development and then addressed them. Consideration of a number of strategies for solving a problem, dealing with an issue. What routes are appropriate? Access to people with different experiences of solving problem, reflecting on these to come to a conclusion of the most appropriate way forward. Candidates need confidence to look for information that can help. (Secondary Headteacher)

The second of the two comments identifies one type of weakness in the course construction. Clearly this headteacher believed that the course was constrained by its criteria and was unable to respond to the areas that need developing by the candidate. The headteacher went on to suggest that pooling of experience and ideas for problem solving would be beneficial. These views about the constraints imposed by the course criteria echo those of the candidates, and are explored further in the next chapter.

Leading naturally on from question four, and the impact on candidates and colleagues, was whether the school has changed? This was the focus of question five.

5.11 Question Five - Was it possible to say whether the school had changed as a result of NPQH?

This question evoked a range of responses. Although all headteachers expressed
little evidence of impact on the school, there were examples where change could be associated with candidates work for NPQH. Table 5.8 depicts this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the school changed?</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to say/too early to evaluate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School more focused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target setting improved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of pupil performance has improved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 – Has the school changed?

Three headteachers emphatically said there had been no impact at all. Others were more circumspect and did not know whether the impact was linked directly to NPQH.

*Difficult to say if I am honest. Things are changing at this school very fast. So cannot be sure that this is directly related to NPQH. She has been instrumental in many initiatives, cannot say it is as a result of NPQH. She is ready for headship, now!* (Primary Headteacher)

*Not really any hard evidence other than with the curriculum coordinators through their review.* (Primary Headteacher)

*The school has become more focussed. He has made me aware of the need to be more precise, to set targets and time limit on things.* (Primary Headteacher)

*No. There of course have been changes but not attributable to NPQH.* (Primary Headteacher)

*It is difficult to say. A lot of things have happened over the past two years. NPQH may have contributed to them.* (Secondary Headteacher)
There were two examples quoted that were directly related to NPQH, namely ICT and assessment:

- Again, not really, except the work on ICT. It had to happen anyway. I believe courses do assist with change and no doubt other changes will have a connection with the course Anne is on. (Primary Headteacher)

- Particularly in respect of assessment and the Primary Quality mark. The school now has a full set of statistics to support target setting in Maths. A large evidence base has been constructed to underpin the approach to the development of basic skills. (Primary Headteacher)

5.12 Question six - Leadership and Management skills

The final question asked headteachers to comment on whether, as a result of NPQH, the candidate had developed better leadership and management skills? Again the responses were varied, four headteachers perceived developments in some aspects of leadership and management. One headteacher placed the development more in management than leadership. Four of the responses were positive and indicated where the skills had been developed:

- Yes. Better leadership and management skills. Governors ‘Curriculum Committee’, valuable input made by her. (Primary Headteacher)

- Yes. He has developed, because he is more focused. Does not waste time on unimportant issues. (Primary Headteacher)

- Yes, they have a bit. She has a wider knowledge now it is focusing on headship. Good ideas have come from the course. You come to headship from a deputy position and there is a significant gap to be bridged. The way this school operated means we work together as a team. I teach a class so am aware of all the pressures they are under. It would be different in a bigger school. (Primary Headteacher)
Yes. A combination of the two really. He has lost some of the brashness he came with. (Secondary Headteacher)

A further two responses from headteachers provide considered evaluation and a depth of insight into the professional development of deputy heads, including the time they had been involved with NPQH.

Incidental if any from NPQH. But from discussions with people on the course she has gained more confidence, she is more aware of her own abilities and skills in comparison with other people. She has in this school plenty of opportunities way beyond most other people, these have been:

1. through my secondment
2. she already had great ability and skill
3. through my philosophy and planning, preparing her for headship

The management of this school requires a deputy to act like a head. (Primary Headteacher)

She already had good leadership skills; that is part of her. The course has enabled her to focus on aspects of good leadership, maybe help her to develop the areas where a perceived weakness was identified. A broader range of strategies to solve problems. Helped to think around the issues about headship, discuss issues about the role. She was one of the first a guinea pig. The course itself has evolved over the time and might be quite different next time. (Primary Headteacher)

The next two quotes from secondary headteachers were somewhat critical of the NPQH process:

More management than leadership. I am not aware that he has covered anything to do with effective leadership. Again this is a weakness. NPQH does not distinguish clearly the difference between leadership and
management. The course has been too task centred. There is a need for a process that assesses personal skills. (Secondary Headteacher)

There are a number of issues that arise from this approach to training future headteachers. It will probably take three years to put in place a system that links the work of the proposed National College for School Leaders, the General Teaching Council and TTA. It has got to address middle management and the linkage to headship training, NPQH, HEADLAMP and LPSH. The place and value of career deputies in the structure. The need to see differently the training requirements for primary and secondary headteachers. It has to be coherent, a spine of continuous professional development. And governors must be made aware. At the moment they are underplayed in the current structure. I expect a regional model will emerge, with kite marked training programmes, awarding bodies all linking to the central College. (Secondary Headteacher)

The final quote in this section speaks with concern about the impact on the candidate, again reinforcing the perceived lack of sensitivity the NPQH process had engendered.

I think it has damaged him. Little gains. Loss of confidence in the course. Tutorial guidance should have been on going, to explain what he should have done with assignments. (Secondary Headteacher)

5.13 Other issues raised at interview

Each headteacher was offered the opportunity to offer other views on NPQH. The range of responses concerned the raison d'être of the course, specific aspects of the assessment and training process, and the lack of headteacher involvement. The first quote challenges the rationale behind the qualification:

Worry about creating a layer of qualifications that are not necessarily available to others.
Impact the qualification may have on employment prospects for existing heads without the qualification. The serving heads' qualification is small compared with NPQH.

Time out has an impact on the children, the class and the teacher themselves having to pick up work afterwards. This is extra pressure on already dedicated teachers. There are teachers who are leaving the profession because of the workload. Impact on recruitment at the levels of deputy head and headship are low. Few men in primary.

This second comment raises a number of issues, but the reference to a candidate with three years experience benefiting from the course, is worthy of further comment in the next chapter:

Anne has enjoyed the discussions with other colleagues, meeting and sharing ideas. The fact that the course was new and many changes kept occurring was frustrating, and I didn't know much about the course as a whole so could not do any more than support and encourage. Did report through my report to governors (Anne's progress). It is a good idea, Deputies with 3 years experience will benefit from the course. Supply cover was not fully met. Had to use the INSET money to provide an additional day for Anne. Did not mind as it was for her professional development. (Primary Headteacher)

One headteacher had serious reservations about NPQH because of its impact on the school:

Release time for deputies when they are teaching full time. Impact on class when they are released for normal duties and other work and now NPQH. Absence noticeable by pupils and parents. Have tried to offset this by using the same supply teacher. From September 1999 we will have the deputy in a job share of 50%. (Primary Headteacher)
Another headteacher spoke of the frequent changes to the course bringing anxiety to the candidate. For another two the concerns were:

*My reservations have increased since the beginning. The original assessment suggested a one-year course for David. But the goal posts were moved, some things he was asked to do changed. The timescale for some activities were too short. There was a feeling in him that he couldn’t be sure of what would happen next, what he would have to do to be successful, modifying assignments. Anxiety grew. He has enjoyed the course I know that.* (Primary Headteacher)

Other headteachers were specific in their criticisms and comments. The first two refer to headteacher involvement in the course:

*Heads should be involved in NPQH. Would have been useful to have had a shared morning built into the start of the course. Would have given an overview, shown ways in which heads could be helpful and how the course was going to develop. Governors do need to know what is going on. Here they know it is part of her professional development. Quality of the trainers causes me some concern also.* (Primary Headteacher)

*No funding for him. The other school had spent it, ¾ days owing. Amount of work expected for a full time deputy, family man etc. Much better if there was release time built into the course and funded appropriately. As a head I knew very little about it. Should have be involved somewhere. Need to know what is going on.* (Secondary Headteacher)

These next two comments provide an intriguing insight into the views held by headteachers:

*The needs assessment process really has not achieved what it was set up to do. It identified that June needed to do further training. I challenge this. I recognised in her advanced skill/abilities early on in her deputy headship. I did not expect her to have to go through such an intensive programme to*
achieve the qualification. The basic module has not extended her knowledge and skills. People like June needed a different experience. Perhaps a more detailed discussion on strategies, aspects of headship. (Primary Headteacher)

I said earlier that there is a crisis in recruitment. (Primary Headteacher)

This headteacher expressed grave concerns about initiatives such as NPQH and the new 'super grade' teacher, and their likely impact on retention and recruitment of teachers.

It would be easy to forget the role headteachers play in the development of future headteachers. The next two quotes lend weight to the argument for greater involvement of a candidate's headteacher early on in the process:

**The professional development of June is a responsibility I take very seriously. It is my job to advise her. But I have to be honest I doubt whether she wants headship now. She would make an excellent head. She has seen what it does to existing heads, the additional stress. It is not salary any more that people are interested in, nor the challenges of headship. It is security in their position, a life outside.** (Primary Headteacher)

**The course seems to be seeing headship as a convergent activity. It is not, it is very divergent and that's why they (the candidates) need to consider a range of ways/strategies in order to decide which is the most appropriate in this case. Diversity of ways. Heads have to exercise flexibility.** (Secondary Headteacher)

This final comment is a timely reminder of the complex role of headship. Can NPQH effectively train and prepare the next generation of headteachers? This is an issue that will be discussed in the next chapter, where the outcomes from both sets of interviews are discussed alongside the findings from the questionnaires and insights from the literature.
5.14 General comments

The next quotation illustrates how quickly circumstances can change in a school, and that events are not always planned:

*She was thrown into acting headship at a very early point in her deputy headship, not the kind of experience to be able to just do things, instead of reference to me. Some things were referred to me but the majority June got on with them and did them the way I wanted them to be done. We talked regularly. I had so much confidence in her; I needed to reassure her that what she planned to do was fine.* (Primary Headteacher)

This quote reflects the personal concern several headteachers had for the candidate and illustrates the attempts to match tasks to their professional development needs. On a practical note one headteacher reflected on the impact the candidate’s absence had on their class and the subsequent impact on the candidate:

*Training times meant she was out for day, lots of things happened here, it did affect her class. Frustrating really. We did talk about the course. She felt very stressed by it.*

A secondary headteacher concluded her interview by revisiting the concern about the involvement of a candidate’s school, headteacher and governing body:

*Heads were not aware of what was expected. This is a weakness. When people embark on such a course it would have been simple to arrange an awareness-raising session for heads. Accessing information or evidence might be difficult for candidates in some schools. You know it can be hard for a deputy to gain access if the head is unwilling. It should not be. I am aware that there are several matters that are problematic with the course.*
5.15 Summary

This chapter has examined the interview findings from both candidates and their respective headteachers. There are a considerable number of positive comments from both sets of interviewees. Professional development and school development are entwined, and it would appear that in several cases progress has been achieved against the set agendas of NPQH and the school development plan. It is clear that a concern exists with the mechanistic way the course has been structured and the rigidity of the process. The impact on schools, headteachers and colleagues is less clear. Distinguishing between the effect of NPQH and normal school developments is very difficult. Alongside this individual candidates and headteachers have spoken of personal concerns about the course. This will be addressed in chapter six.
Chapter 6:

Analysis of the research findings from the survey and interviews
Analysis of the research findings from the survey and interviews

6.1. Introduction

The purpose of this research was to explore the impact that the national training programme of NPQH has had on candidates, their colleagues and their current school. Of equal importance and interest is whether such training has had an impact on the leadership and management of these schools and ultimately on the standards being achieved by pupils.

The three main research questions to be addressed in this study were:

1. If one of the objectives of the qualification is to achieve better school leaders can NPQH provide the leadership and management skills necessary to achieve strategic direction and vision for a school?
2. Can the skills of school leadership and management be met through a qualification that relies heavily on demonstration of competences?
3. What has been the impact of NPQH on a candidate’s current school and will it change under new formulation of NPQH?

The more generalized comments from both candidates and headteachers provided some insight into the impact NPQH training and assessment has on candidates and their views concerning leadership and management.

6.2. Research Question 1

Analysis of the outcomes from the questionnaire and semi structured interviews provided evidence for this question and are substantiated through the literature search of chapter two.

6.2.1. Age, gender and experience

The survey findings revealed the ratio of female to male candidates was 2:1. This fact is supported by the ratio of primary to secondary schools in the UK which is
broadly four to one and that a high proportion of teachers in primary schools are female.

This is further endorsed from the survey in that 13 of the female candidates were currently working in the primary phase, with one in secondary, although this particular candidate was on secondment to the LEA at the time of this research.

The survey sample revealed that the majority of male candidates 13 (over 90%) were older than 36, with one candidate (7.1%) below 36. However, for female candidates the age profile is more evenly spread, but with no one below 35, and only one candidate below 40. The majority of female candidates 6 (85.7%) were under 50. Two candidates, one female and one male were over 50. This situation may well reflect on the length of time it takes a teacher to move along the promotion routes in both phases of education. Additionally, it may be that female teachers leave promotion to a later stage in their working life.

Associated with the last comment was the level of experience a candidate had gained before embarking upon NPQH. Virtually all candidates held the position of deputy head. The length of service spread between six to 25 years. Surprisingly a third of the candidates had over 21 years experience, the majority being female. The greater proportion of both male and female candidates (over 47%) had experience ranging from 11 to 20 years. No secondary candidate had less that 11 years experience, whereas those with less than 11 years experience were female and from the primary phase.

The little evidence in this research on gender and age related experience is taken from recent research by Bolam (1997) into the Investors in People initiative, where he found that professional development was dependent upon employers and schools encouraging people to develop and improve as an integral part of their job. As early as 1990 Morgan pointed out the responsibility of LEAs to establish a policy for dealing with the professional development needs of individuals, taking into account age, qualification, gender, ethnicity and job experience.
The School Management Task Force in 1989 was given the remit by the Secretary of State to assist LEAs to establish practical strategies for ensuring that adequate training and development was made available to headteachers and senior staff. Their report in 1990 made it clear that without support and training, future headteachers would be ill prepared to manage the competing demands of local autonomy and national demands.

The NPQH has been designed for candidates aspiring to headship and for those ready for training. NPQH would prepare them for that role. The favoured mode of delivery, the components of assessment of need, training and development, is commented on later in this chapter. However, the demands of the NPQH model on candidates, as revealed by the sample survey and interviews, has proved in some cases to be too demanding of the candidate’s own time and to the detriment of their personal and professional life. Without exception candidates revealed that they spent less than six hours per week during the school working day on associated NPQH tasks. Outside of school 11(55%) candidates spent less than six hours, six (30%) spent between six and 10 hours and two (10%) of candidates indicated that they spent in excess of 20 hours. Attendance at weekend courses and the need to complete assignments during the school holiday periods, were cited by candidates as very demanding, in excess of 20 hours per week was the experience of two candidates.

An experienced secondary deputy head, fulfilling a multiple role in a large comprehensive school, discovered that failure with an assignment brought with it resentment and criticism of the lack of underpinning tutorial structure for NPQH. He remarked:

‘It is not as if the task was out of my experience! It was not. But being told that I had not met task objectives just rubbed salt in the wound. I thought NPQH was not an academic qualification but one that took into consideration one’s experience?’ (Secondary deputy)

This remark reaffirms the view expressed by many candidates and headteachers interviewed that the assessment of a task outcome did not take sufficient cognisance
of the candidates’ school and its management processes. Maybe if headteachers had been more openly involved in the training such dissatisfaction could have been avoided.

6.2.2. Personal development of candidates

It is not easy to distinguish between professional and personal development, as clearly the two can be closely entwined. Development at the professional level—skills, knowledge and understanding invariably will impact on a person’s personal development. The impact NPQH training had on candidates’ personal development featured was mixed. The responses from candidates revealed very little. However, in contrast the views from headteachers intimated that they had seen signs of development, as a professional and in their role performance. A few passing references were made to their personal development, such as ‘more confident and assertive’, ‘SMT is stronger and more cohesive’, and ‘has enriched his theoretical perspective of educational issues’, ‘more able to handle conflict and inspire’ were two further comments, lending support to candidates personal growth. One headteacher of a small primary school revealed that NPQH had made their candidate focus on himself and those aspects that needed developing. This headteacher went further and indicated that the candidate needed to ‘recognize the breadth of headship’. However, these generally positive perceptions were countered by negative ones from two headteachers, ‘it has only provided him with more stress’ and ‘he is exhausted!’, ‘now that he is the acting head he is getting the training on the job’.

This latter point raised by a headteacher, is one that Mumford (1989) believes managers often see as preferable to the various forms of planned management development. Mumford argues for formal management development to be improved but that a balance be struck between the formal and the informal on the job training.

When interviewed several candidates referred to their increase in confidence to manage new situations; handle conflict, lead meetings, and expressing their view on matters. Two candidates spoke of their desire to use tasks to support their own development. In particular one of these candidates was already working through an
action plan of personal development with their headteacher overseeing that development.

The demands of the course meant a loss of personal time and in some cases adversely affected their preparation time for the coming week's teaching. These comments largely came from candidates in the primary phase – 'it is a tremendous workload for a full time teaching deputy'. One candidate, who was considering whether to be a head after all, strongly underlined this point! Another expressed concern over the shelf life of the qualification and whether in ten years time it would have validity in a headship application. But frequently, candidates raised the issue of lack of feedback from the training and assessment centre, the changing structure of the course, tutors being one step ahead of them, as another candidate referred to the long period between completion of the task and receiving an assessment.

For one candidate the introduction of the 'fast track' scheme to NPQH diminished the value of the work already undertaken. This view was endorsed by the headteacher who witnessed demoralization in their deputy. This same headteacher went on to state that with the severe difficulty in recruiting people to senior posts, changes to the process would de-motivate rather than stimulate interest in the qualification. Another candidate regretted that the fast track scheme had not been available to them.

Another headteacher interviewed expressed serious reservations about NPQH, the changing assignment brief, timescales being too short, goal posts moving and the introduction of the fast track scheme at a time when these first cohort candidates had barely got going.

It is interesting to note that teachers often undertake additional professional development in their own time. Why then was NPQH being viewed by aspiring headteachers with a degree of scepticism? Is it because it will become compulsory at some time in the future? Is it because, as a qualification it has no currency value outside the profession, whereas higher degrees, and more recently the MBA, would appear to have? It is well known the TTA was hostile to what universities offered,
seeing the training and development opportunities being heavily academically weighted. With the current difficulties facing governing bodies in appointing headteachers it would seem making NPQH compulsory may not widen the choice in the short term available to them. As Arkin (1999) writing in the TES summarised the problem with the qualification is it was aimed at mainly deputy heads who are under too much pressure to undertake such intensive study. Hence the emergence of the fast track model. To the credit of the TTA, the creation of different pathways to match the different stages of a candidate’s development should be seen as a positive move.

6.3. Research Question 2

The skills of leadership and management under NPQH are very much associated with the competence paradigm that has grown up from the ‘assessment centre’ movement in England and Wales. In the UK assessment centres have tended to analyse the abilities of individual against a competence matrix relating to the job. In the USA centres have tended to examine competencies related to personal qualities. The influence of the assessment centre movement on the TTA was most apparent from the establishment of ‘Regional Assessment Centres’ for the NPQH qualification. Thus had the NPQH qualification, before its reformulation, become mandatory in line with its projected timescale, then these centres would have become the ‘gate keepers’ of access to the higher echelons of the teaching profession.

6.3.1 Demonstrating competence

A second emerging theme was the nature of the tasks that candidates undertook as part of NPQH. Although the specific categories of NPQH were:

- strategic leadership and accountability
- teaching and learning
- leading and managing staff
- efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources
The evidence collected through the survey and interviews largely provided evidence on all modules, but as the first module was compulsory for all candidates it provided the greatest range of responses. To successfully complete this module candidates needed to be able to demonstrate that they met the national standards for headteachers, these relate to the key areas of headship, namely: strategic direction and development of a school and accountability. The tasks chosen by candidates largely reflected the issues considered by the school to be important and were in their school development plan. Of greater significance is that virtually all the tasks chosen had a direct bearing on the drive to raise educational standards. It would appear that the high priority given by a school to this influenced the choice of task undertaken by candidates.

The accountability by schools to the community in respect of the level of pupils’ achievement at the age of 7, 11, 14, 16 and 18 has become the major focus over the last few years. A school’s position in league tables and other data that is available to the general public has encouraged headteachers to focus largely on raising standards of attainment. This was very noticeable with candidates who chose the task of evaluating value added data and the school’s results in national tests. The purpose of their choice was to devise strategies for improving standards of attainment at the key stages.

Several candidates undertook writing an OFSTED action plan or a task associated with it. OFSTED inspections require a school to formulate the action it is going to take into a plan, within forty working days of the report being published. These candidates all reported that either task enabled them to could demonstrate strategic leadership skills. However, other tasks chosen by candidates reinforced the position that they were chosen firstly because of the significance to the school and only secondly to meet the requirements of NPQH module.

To demonstrate an educational vision for the school in which they worked was difficult for a candidate given that they were not the headteacher. The reality of this exercise was that it could only be a theoretical one. Such a task raised many concerns and opened up the possibility of a challenge to the headteacher of the school, or to others with leadership and management responsibilities.
In other modules candidates' choice of tasks varied and reflected the issues facing individual schools. It was very evident that candidates chose tasks that were either within their remit and job description or were clearly defined in the OFSTED action plan or the school's development plan. This view was endorsed by one headteacher who admitted that they (the head and the candidate) had subverted the course and tasks were chosen that would be beneficial to the school.

This suggests that the development of aspiring headteachers is all about demonstrating competence to meet the criteria for a given task. There is no doubt that the training and development of personnel in industry and commerce has influenced the move to competence-based training and development in educational management.

Candidates, when asked for their response to the question whether they were better equipped to provide for the school in any of the five key areas of headship, reported positively that this was the case, the exception being self management, where eight (38%) felt they were not and two (9.5%) did not give a response. In the view of the headteachers, approximately half indicated that the candidates were better equipped to provide for the school in one or more of the key areas. Headteachers also recorded that nine (60%) of candidates were better skilled at monitoring and evaluation, and eight (53.3%) in their candidates' leadership and management skills.

When interviewed the candidates found it difficult to be articulate about their own professional development and learning arising from the training. Views such as 'better at formulating their view' and 'confirming what they were doing was acceptable to others' or that 'their view did matter' were expressed. The latter comment followed on from one candidate expressing enjoyment at meeting with other professionals, sharing ideas and problems. Another candidate received confirmation that his/her thinking was more in tune with that of a headteacher than previously. In contrast to this two other candidates referred to the training as 'being a waste of time', 'having no impact on the way they undertook their role'.

Such comments could align themselves with the view that the competence model is morally repugnant as it denies notion of professional autonomy, a view shared by
Ribbons (1990). Ecclestone (1994) argues that the development of competence-based education and training was symptomatic of wider changes with regard to post compulsory education, even to the point where professional autonomy was being undermined by 'bureaucratic surveillance'.

Several headteachers referred to some benefits from the training to the professional development of candidates, such as:

*leadership qualities have grown significantly*

*more informed in staff meetings, wider knowledge, it is focusing on headship*

But headteachers were uncertain whether these were a direct result of NPQH! That mere competence on its own is insufficient for a school leader.

However, as Lumby (1995) cogently expressed there needs to be a tangible link between the competence approach to development and the one that builds concepts and skills. More generally it is argued that the competence model in educational learning is an inappropriate and reductivist model of learning which is both inadequate educationally and philosophically. Bridges (1996), an erstwhile supporter of competence-based systems, conceded that philosophical the competence movement is inadequate and is only defensible provided 'a more generic and cognitively laden concept of personal and professional competence' was found.

Although the term 'competence' has not itself been employed in the development of NPQH and as Glatter (1997) suggests the 'narrow atomistic and bureaucratic' methods linked with functional competence movement 'have been avoided. Brundett (2000) believes questions remain whether NPQH has moved 'beyond the reductivist elements of the competence paradigm' and that educational programmes should be more reflective developing the higher order cognitive abilities that will be required in increasingly complex world of educational leadership.
It is heartening that headteachers were able to identify changes in candidate’s skills, knowledge and understanding in some of the key areas of headship. In particular two candidates were placed in an acting role whilst their incumbent headteacher was on secondment. Although neither suggested NPQH was the sole source for producing change, there was a recognition that in some way the opportunities afforded by NPQH, training and assignments, helped to narrow the gap between deputy headship and headship.

The analysis of the findings from the survey revealed that candidates expressed considerable confidence with two of the five areas tackled under NPQH, namely ‘strategic direction’ 18 (85.7%) and ‘articulating a vision’ 17 (80.1%) respectively. On the other hand headteachers believed that about half of the candidates were better equipped in these areas. In respect of ‘leadership and management’, another of the key areas 17 (80.1%) of the candidates generally felt they were more confident leaders and managers, a view not entirely shared by their respective headteachers with only eight (53.3%) agreeing with that diagnosis. Such comments as ‘too early to say’ and, ‘the course is to constrained by its criteria’ suggest that being a better leader or manager is not a simple matter of attending a training course.

Candidates were generally enthusiastic and frequently expressed views about their growth, for example: in confidence, better informed, more reflective, able to focus on essential issues, more confident in speaking at meetings, presentations. One candidate referred to the training as ‘reaffirming their educational views gained earlier on in their career’. In the main most headteachers interviewed were more positive about the impact of training and that they developed better leadership and management skills, comments such as: ‘the knowledge gap has been reduced’, ‘she thinks more like a headteacher’, he has lost some of his brashness’. But a number of the headteachers were not so sure, and two were quite critical of the NPQH process being able to develop improved leadership skills.

One headteacher recorded that as a result of NPQH, they had been a beneficiary of the course themselves, in that they were more focused on what they had to do as a head, and gave the example of target setting.
6.4. Research Question 3

There is considerably less evidence to test the effect of the new formulation of NPQH on a candidate's school. However, in respect of earlier configuration both candidates and headteachers speak of benefits to the school and to colleagues. Most candidates describe the greatest impact on and benefit to their school was through the tasks they undertook, particularly if the tasks were associated with the school's development plan. The benefit lay in the achievement of an activity written in the school development plan and not completing the task purely for NPQH. Candidates spoke of being more knowledgeable and informed, having greater confidence. Many of the candidates referred to the adverse affect their absence had had on their school and on fulfilling their role. The number of days that the teachers' class had a supply teacher was unsettling to the pupils. One candidate from a small primary school had ceased the training, as the impact of the training had been so substantial to prevent them from fulfilling their role in school. Another candidate countered this by describing the value of being able to have time with the headteacher to discuss educational matters. One candidate felt they had been well prepared for the acting role they were currently undertaking.

The issue of insufficient funding for the course was a concern for several candidates and that school funds had been used to subsidize the course. This is no longer an issue with the centralisation of the application and assessment process. The encroachment of the course into personal time was resented by several candidates.

There were several examples of benefits accruing to the school. One candidate described himself as being 'more efficient', 'better equipped' to manage and lead the school, whilst another felt they had been 'positively prepared for headship'. Other candidates spoke about important initiatives being completed because of chosen NPQH assignments, and therefore benefiting the school. Another, who had broadened their management role, stated 'they were confident to take on a headship role'.

Headteachers in general, were more positive about the benefits to the school than the candidates. They describe activities within the school development plan being
completed, a range of neglected tasks such as a policy on staff development being written. The headteachers who were more closely involved in the choice of tasks candidates undertook, and who actively supported the candidate, were more able to identify benefits to the school. Other comments referred to deputies being developed as individuals and benefits accruing in senior management team meetings. Improved depth of knowledge and grasp of current issues was cited by one headteacher about their deputy head. Another headteacher praised the deputy for the way he had 'rallied the troops' prior to an OFSTED inspection. One headteacher remarked that the OFSTED inspection had identified that on some issues the school was quite woolly and that through NPQH they had acted and made improvements.

On a different theme a number of headteachers perceived benefits to themselves that debates with their deputy were at a higher level, and that new ideas had been stimulated. One head stated, 'it made me think about these issues, awoke in me a concern'.

Only a small number of candidates said that there had been no benefits at all. Disillusionment with competence based assessment and workload with no non-contact time led to one candidate leaving teaching. Headteachers stated that there had been impact on the school organization, adversely in some respects. The loss of a senior colleague left the school deficient in terms of management, and in one case increased the workload of the headteacher. Tasks were often delayed and extra pressure was placed on other members of staff. Another headteacher remarked that any benefit that could be associated with NPQH was hidden, as it was an effective school already. The issue of insufficient funding to cover supply teacher costs when the candidate was out of school was of serious concern to headteachers from primary schools.

6.4.1. The role of the headteacher

An outcome from both the survey and interviews was evidence of the part headteachers played in supporting and advising candidates with NPQH. An early question to both candidates and headteachers was about their involvement in the
choice of assignments undertaken. The majority of candidates gained the support of their respective headteacher prior to commencing the task. The survey revealed that three (14%) of the candidates needed to modify their job description in order to gain experience and knowledge of an aspect of school management. Two common areas were, greater involvement with governors and staff appointments. In one case a candidate reported that they had no support from their headteacher at all. Most candidates referred to regular discussion with their headteachers about the assignments. Six (28.6%) candidates reported that their headteacher played a considerable supporting role, especially with unfamiliar areas of management.

Few headteachers received any guidance regarding NPQH from regional centres, and only two (13%) recorded receiving information from the LEA. Several reflected of the need for candidates to be given more training in respect of the assessment process. In respect of funding one third of headteachers reported that the school budget had supplemented the financial support received from the government grant, and this raised issues about funding other colleagues to undertake professional development, being fair to all.

Headteachers were very clear that the tasks chosen by candidates were all largely associated with the school’s development plan and that they had been influential in the choice. Two (13%) of headteachers recorded that they valued being involved. However, this view was more readily expressed when the headteachers were interviewed. They openly admitted that NPQH was too good an opportunity to link tasks to the activities the school had planned and needed doing.

The two (9.5%) candidates from secondary schools interviewed revealed a closer working relationship with the headteacher had developed, one through the NPQH tasks and through reading the final reports; the other headteacher supporting the candidate through the trauma of failing an assignment.

Headteachers generally viewed their involvement as offering advice and encouragement to the choice of assignments. Several saw this as an opportunity for assigning tasks written in the school development plan or OFSTED action to the NPQH candidate. Interview evidence closely supports this view and that the level
of involvement of the headteacher is likely to be directly proportional to whether the tasks were perceived as part of wider whole school issues or ones that appeared in the school’s development plan.

Relatively very few headteachers considered they had a formal role in the NPQH process. Those who did were interested in what the candidate was doing, offered advice and gave time to discussing the assignments. When asked to describe their role, two actually used the term ‘mentoring’. In most other interviews the notion of mentoring was apparent, although not specifically articulated. Headteachers appeared to be comfortable with this role, and such comments as: ‘sharing his frustrations’, ‘talking through issues raised at the training’, ‘offering advice on the next step with an assignment’, ‘reading assignments’ and ‘talking about their next career move’, underpinned the quality of the professional relationship that existed between the headteacher and candidate.

In respect of NPQH there was no defined role for headteachers of the school from which candidates came. In fact, it was possible for a headteacher not to actively engage in anything to do with NPQH, other than in writing a witness statement. From the survey and interviews undertaken for this research, there was evidence to suggest that headteachers would have liked to become more involved. In many cases they did and used the opportunity to enhance the professional relationship with their candidate.

It is clear that the TTA did not see the need for a role for headteachers in NPQH, or on the wider front of providing a mentoring system alongside the assessment and training programme. It is reasonable to assume that if such a scheme had been in place the criticisms and frustrations experienced by candidates, might well have been adverted or at least reduced. Under the new formulation every candidate will undertake school-based assessments linked to school improvement. This becomes a contractual professional development and training plan and is agreed with the headteacher. All school-based assessment tasks will be rooted in the candidate’s current work and improving practice in the school, and thereby be less demanding in time. By implication headteachers will be more closely involved with the candidates.
training and development; although being the candidate's mentor is not considered per se.

6.5. General comments about preparation for School Leadership and the NPQH

In the State of Florida in the United States potential headteachers must complete an 'on the job training' component to demonstrate competence with the State's 19 principal competencies, before receiving their certification. Similar developments have occurred in other states, and the Interstate Consortium has derived six standards for school leadership. With so many competences to be assessed in NPQH, Gunter (1997) is not surprised that it risks establishing a heavy bureaucratic apparatus that would be counterproductive.

Few candidates spoke enthusiastically about NPQH in developing them professionally, where as some programmes, such as those found in the US and Singapore, include some kind of placement or internship. Participants in one such model in the US rated very highly their six-week internship, the hands on experience augmented the theory-based programme. In Singapore the internship bears similarities with that operating in the US, but the significant difference lies in the mentor – protégé relationship, and the protégé working in the mentor's school for the practicum.

The experiences of potential school leaders in other countries generally are positive. The in-built mentor – protégé arrangement in Singapore, or the internship model in the US, where practical application is part of a two-year programme through a placement in a school. In both cases the role of universities is seen as an essential element in the development of school leaders.

According to Peel (1996) evaluating the internship programme offered in Singapore, participants found this created the strongest link between theory and real-life experience. Participants also rated highly the mentor system. They were challenged by their mentors and they were able to challenge current educational leadership processes. Bush and Chew (1999) were able to draw similar conclusions about the
highly structured mentor – protégé scheme in Singapore, which was underpinned by the link to a facilitator from the National Institute of Education.

The mentoring process features more strongly in the leadership programmes that operate in other countries. In Singapore it is an essential element and begins when the protégé is attached to the mentors’ school and on a full time basis. Critical to this programme is the choice of mentor, acceptance by the school of having a mentee on site working alongside the headteacher. Evidence from research by Coleman (1996) revealed that many pairs had formed life-long friendships. In several states in the US mentoring has been mandated, and is the centrepiece of programmes of support for new principals. In both cases the choice of mentor is critical. Mentors are selected and would normally be from a different school to the candidate. Not every headteacher would necessarily be a good mentor. The experience gained from the UK mentoring programme of the early nineties was as a bolt on activity associated with headteacher induction. It was not part of any training or preparation programme for headship. Mentors were from different establishments; although the matching of mentors with mentees was given careful consideration by the regional consortia.

6.6. Additional Comments

Through both the survey and interview stages of this research, candidates and headteachers were able to offer additional comments. The many comments received provided some evidence for some of the supplementary questions that arose to each of the main research questions.

However it was expressed by some of the candidates interviewed that the standards were on the narrow side and that classroom issues had been given minimal consideration. One secondary phase candidate was very critical of the apparent disregard of the individuality of a school, in that an assignment chosen about building the school budget was heavily criticized and rejected because the outcome was a deficit budget (an illegal action for a school), where as in reality the school had little choice that year but to spend more than it received. The candidate was most displeased and annoyed to fail that particular module on the grounds that he
had not fulfilled the objectives of the assignment. Bolam (1997) indicated that the TTA consultation process revealed that these areas were broadly acceptable to the key protagonists - professional associations, higher education, school governors and LEAs the key protagonists. Likewise the 28 tasks in the sub division of these areas were not considered inappropriate either by candidates, headteachers or other educationalists. But what was revealed by candidates and some of the headteachers was the perceived lack of ability of the NPQH programme to train and assess candidates accurately in these tasks.

The survey of candidates also revealed very little additional evidence, with the issue of time being the main source of complaint. One candidate withdrew from the training and subsequently is no longer teaching. Of the other candidates interviewed the majority expressed positive remarks about the training received; expressing the most useful aspects being, 'meeting new colleagues', 'sharing good ideas and practices'. One candidate found the mix of the various phases of education unhelpful, experiencing domination by secondary colleagues. The overall view expressed by candidates was that the training had been good; although it was clear that trainers were often only a page ahead! The severest criticism of the programme was about the lack of communication and feedback to candidates during the training and after submitting assignments. Assignments kept changing, and the assessment criteria were unclear. One candidate believed the course to be 'too removed from reality' and that it would be 'better to have a closer link to the role they perform in school'. This candidate also questioned the recent experience the trainers had of working in schools. It is arguable that using trainers from outside of education would reduce the insularity of developing teachers, and in particular future school leaders.

The survey revealed that headteachers had little to add about the training. Those interviewed expressed a range of concerns, including a challenge as to the rationale behind the NPQH qualification. There was general concern over the way the NPQH was evolving and frequent changes that occurred including the introduction of the 'fast track scheme'. There was particular concern expressed with regard to release time for candidates from primary schools, and the additional costs to the school in release time and supply cover. Two headteachers regretted the lack of their own
involvement in NPQH and described the model as deficient in key aspects, ignoring
the potential of headteachers as leading professionals to assist with diagnosis and
training future headteachers through the daily life of the school.

Thorpe (1998) commenting on her experience with NPQH (second cohort) remarked:

One of the most time consuming aspects of the course is the compilation of
the file evidence. This time instead of lengthy written explanations of
examples which met those 'headship competences' I have to show actual
evidence of work done, it is however time consuming and it makes me feel I
am jumping through the required hopes rather than advancing my
understanding of management. (Thorpe 1998 p.53)

These sentiments were expressed virtually by all of the candidates in the survey and
endorsed by all of the headteachers. Thorpe (1998) goes on to say that he feels out
of step with the general positive comments that NPQH has generated in written
articles and evaluations from course participants. A feeling that was very much
shared by the candidates and their headteachers throughout this enquiry.

6.7. Summary

Much of the evidence gained from the survey is corroborated from the answers
received through the semi-structured interviews. Perceptions by the candidates and
their respective headteachers do differ; although on aspects of the NPQH structure
and processes there is more agreement, and frequently it was less complimentary.
This predominantly competence-based model of training future headteachers would
appear to have a number of deficiencies and in the view of some candidates
unacceptable as the main paradigm for school leadership training and preparation.
Attacks on the competence movement per se are cogent and would seem to be
unremitting and just maybe a disguised attack on the model favoured by
Government? However, there is strong evidence from observers of education
management development to move beyond the competence -based model and adopt
more reflective practices.
Opportunities have been missed by not linking more closely theory on leadership and management with some kind of internship underpinned by a more overt mentoring scheme, the over reliance on a competence based model which is not used elsewhere with senior managers, the lack of a role for the candidates’ headteacher, although this may well create large variations in quality and concern about the ability of the candidates’ headteacher to fulfil a supporting role. Any revisions to NPQH, such as the fast track scheme and more school centred tasks, must not undervalue current processes and candidates’ achievements.

It is with regret that both the Eastern Region Training and Assessment Centre and the Teacher Training Agency refused permission to the researcher to undertake a wide trawl of candidates across the region or within the country. However, the researcher is indebted to the Director of the West Midlands Training and Development Centre for allowing the pilot survey to be trailed with candidates and headteachers in that region.
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Conclusion: Discussion of findings and recommendations

7.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to draw together the findings from this research. In constructing the conclusions an evaluation of the research has been undertaken and its contribution to the knowledge base on training prospective headteachers. Finally this chapter identifies possible directions for further research in this field.

7.2. General Conclusions

Chapter 6 undertook an analysis and synthesis of the evidence obtained from the survey undertaken with candidates and their respective headteachers (chapter 4), and the follow up semi structured interviews (chapter 5). Discussion in Chapter 6 of the research questions revealed differences in the perception of NPQH but also strong agreement about its structure and process was evident.

The National Standards for headship include 12 areas of knowledge and understanding that a headteacher should have and in addition there are a number of skills and attributes that they are expected to display, namely:

1. Leadership skills, attributes and professional competence: the ability to lead and manage people to work as individuals and as a team towards a common goal.

2. Decision making skills: the ability to investigate, solve problems and make decisions

3. Communication skills: the ability to make points clearly and understand the views of others

4. Self-management: the ability to plan time effectively and to organise oneself well.)

(TTA National Standards for headship 1997, p.4)

The National Professional Qualification for Headship was introduced in 1995 with an underlying core structure around five ‘key areas of headship’, designed to cover
the National Standards. There was no suggestion from candidates or their headteachers either from the survey or interviews, that the five areas, namely:

- strategic direction and development of the school;
- teaching and learning;
- leading and managing staff;
- efficient and effective deployment of staff and resources
- accountability;

(TTA National Standards for Headteachers1998, p.1)

were either inappropriate or did not fairly represent the main elements of the role of a headteacher, although these were not necessarily as neatly compartmentalised as would appear, but linked in strategic and pedagogical ways.

It is the underpinning skills and attributes that have largely been examined through the NPQH training programme. For example, the assignment of one candidate was to look at ways in which standards of attainment could be improved. Comparing the school’s performance against national benchmark data enabled the candidate to obtain the school’s ‘added value’ measure, and thereby establish targets for improvement. In another case a candidate undertook to prepare a school for a pending OFSTED inspection. This candidate was able to demonstrate their effectiveness as a leader and manager. But other candidates chose assignments that could easily be submitted under more than one module.

Candidates took part in discussions, made presentations to their colleagues in the group and, therefore, some of the skills and attributes were demonstrated by them through the seminar sessions. But it is evident that in general these skills and attributes are not easily demonstrated outside the school environment. It remains the case that a despite the avoidance of the term competence in the guidance and rhetoric concerning NPQH, its structure, until recently, remains heavily tasked orientated. Candidates have been expected to demonstrate competence. This in part explains the disgruntlement expressed by candidates and in the case of the secondary deputy headteacher the anger at the disregard of the reality in schools.
The obsession with reviewing everything through the Assessment Centres, further bureaucratisation of educational management training, and the potential for these centres becoming gatekeepers to headship, may well have been avoided by the reformulation of the qualification structure.

The mentoring process or a candidate working in the mentor’s school, components found in other training programmes of other countries, were not considered to be an essential aspect to be included in NPQH. The structure relied heavily on tutors forming some kind of relationship with the candidate. However, this largely manifested itself into an assessor role, judging competence as demonstrated through tasks completed. The deliberate disengagement of headteachers from any part of the process has been seen as a major error, one that can only be measured in terms of contempt the Government had for headteachers and the teaching profession to manage its own succession. The additional opportunities to assess a candidate’s skills and abilities within their work place has been given greater prominence in the new structure and is to be welcomed. Sadly, again mentoring as a significant component once again is not a significant feature.

The limited evidence from this research does not provide any real insight into whether the knowledge areas, skills and attributes have been effectively covered in the short period the candidates in the research had been working on the qualification. What was identified is that the professional and personal development of a candidate are closely entwined and often become meshed. It would be reasonable to expect that as a result of some professional training and development a candidate would be enhanced personally. Headteachers spoke the more enthusiastically about a candidates’ increased confidence, and they being more able to contribute to the leadership and management of a school. However, in contrast the two secondary headteachers detected little change in either professional or personal development of the candidate. This would suggest that tasks undertaken were in themselves insufficiently challenging, were not developmental. Both candidates confirmed that they had chosen tasks within their expected job function. With a higher involvement of headteachers in constructing the training and development programme for a candidate, the opportunity to explore news aspects would be greater.
It was very evident that candidates disliked the demands NPQH made on their personal time and in a few cases seriously affected their professional work. It is quite bizarre that, so early on in the first round of the qualification, an announcement of a fast track approach was to be introduced - Government response to early experience of NPQH candidates. It is not surprising that this was greeted by some candidates and headteachers with disdain. However, candidates fared well with two of the five areas tackled under the qualification – 'strategic direction' and 'articulating a vision', a view supported by over half of the headteachers.

Research question three sought to measure the impact the qualification had on the aspirant’s current school. The substantial evidence gathered revealed a number of issues of concern largely associated with personal workload. The impact of the absence of a senior member of staff featured frequently in the interviews of headteachers. The issue of funding of the qualification being a drain on school resources was consistently aired. However, the evidence also revealed that actually it is very difficult to associate any changes taking place in a school solely with NPQH. In general headteachers regretted their lack of any formalised involvement in the qualification, although several did undertake to mentor their candidate and read assignments and in one secondary headteacher’s case supporting the deputy through failing an assignment.

The evidence unexpectedly revealed the impact the qualification had on one of the headteachers. This headteacher perceived that he/she had become more focused in their work; that discussions with their candidate (a deputy head) had been enhanced, and that senior management meetings were greatly improved as a result of the qualification.

Whether any of the changes to NPQH, fast track and the new reformulation will impact more or less on the candidate’s school is open to further research. With the apparent greater involvement of headteachers in the process there is the potential for ensuring tasks are well suited to both the school and the candidate, can be rooted in school improvement and hence by implication raise standards of achievement.
7.3. **Retrospective evaluation of the research**

This research was undertaken at the end of the first year of the introduction of the National Professional Qualification for Headship. The response to the pilot survey was disappointing and did not provide convincing evidence of how the questionnaire could be improved. Minor matters about style and clarity were welcomed and incorporated in the survey instrument used. The restrictions imposed on the researcher, after the piloting of the survey, with regard to access to candidates, substantially reduced the size of the potential database, and therefore most of the data collected is susceptible to wide variation when converted to percentage form. For example 1 candidate out of 32 candidates within the cohort represented approximately 3%. This was substantially increased to 5% as only 21 candidates returned the survey. An even smaller number of headteachers returned the survey increasing the percentage proportion of one headteacher to 7%. If access had been possible to the whole of the Eastern Region or to another Region then it is clear that not only would the survey have been issued to a larger cohort of candidates and selected interviews would have been greater in number, but comparisons would have been possible between candidates from different regions across the country. An example of this would have been the ability to compare the age profile of candidates, gender and phase of education. With a larger database many other aspects of the survey would have been open to comparison, such as choice of assignments by candidates where there would be considerable overlap with tasks relating to school development planning and improvement, target setting, OFSTED preparation and action planning.

It was established from the start that interviews would only be undertaken with candidates and their respective headteacher if the headteacher had agreed to do so and had completed the survey in the first place. With only eight pairs formed the substantive evidence base was finally very small. All of the above created limitations that would severely restrict any generalizations that might be forthcoming. Once again a wider database would have enabled the researcher to generalize the findings with more confidence.
As stated previously one of the objectives of the national professional qualification is to achieve better quality school leaders. It is obvious that this can only be assessed when an NPQH candidate achieves the role of headteacher. Demonstrating competence Woodruffe (1993) suggests, ‘does not signify good leadership or management, nor does it delineate between levels of ability in accomplishing a task’. It is but a component of management and good leaders may also be competent managers.

Of the three research questions, question three, valid as it is, was the most likely one to reveal the least. But, its potential to influence school improvement is significant. Where as question one produced a wide range of responses that has led the researcher to conclude that a more refined survey instrument would reveal greater insight into the impact the training and assessment had on the early NPQH candidates.

Question three had the potential to reveal considerable insight into the impact a national training and assessment programme had on a school, its headteacher and colleagues, school development and improvement. There is no doubt that considerable evidence was subsumed in the recorded interviews of the headteachers; although the limited time allocated to the semi structured interviews was insufficient to develop their views. It is also important to note that the training and development programme was little more than twelve months old and therefore discernable impact on any aspect of school life or personnel would likely to be early perceptions rather than anything substantive. Had the timing of the interviews been twelve months later one would expect headteachers to be recording areas where impact had occurred.

7.4. New directions for further research

Since the introduction of the National Professional Qualification for Headship in 1997 and its launch in 1998, a number of criticisms have been levelled at the qualification, such as the huge amount of paper generated and the didactic nature of the training, to name but two. The main criticism according to Tomlinson (2001) was associated with the previous learning and experience not being acknowledged
by the assessment and training centres. The TTA refused candidates from going
direct to the assessment tasks, insisting that they complete module one.

The qualification has passed from the TTA to the newly created National College
for School Leadership. Following a review one of the changes has been the
introduction of a fast track route for experienced candidates.

In its new reformulation there are three routes to the qualification, namely:

Route 1 – Access: This is for teachers with relatively little
management experience.

Route 2 – Development: This is the core programme.

Route 3 – Fast-Track: This is for candidates who are very close to
headship.

Candidates embarking on route one will complete a four Access Modules:

- Planning and Implementation
- Raising Achievement
- Working with People
- Managing Resources

These modules will be accessed online – distant learning and through two face-to-
face training days. Candidates will expect to undertake these modules largely in
their own time over a few months. A self-assessment process will be used to see if
a candidate is ready to pass on to phase two of the qualification.

Route two candidates undergo four days of face-to-face training focusing on aspects
such as:

- Strategic Planning and Implementation
- Strategies for raising Achievement at a Whole School Level
- Working with People Strategically
- Strategic Management of resources
But the most significant change for candidates is that in this phase of the qualification they undertake a school improvement project and make three visits to high quality schools. Candidates also are expected to complete the on line self study distant learning units.

Whichever route is followed candidates undertake an induction day and a two day residential. In between a tutor from the Regional centre visits the school, initially to establish a training and development plan and towards the end of the development phase to assess progress with the training and development plan and the school improvement project undertaken. There is a compulsory final assessment day for all candidates. It is anticipated that the qualification is completed within one year and that a maximum of 12.5 days of supply cover is available.

Within this model there are a number of ways in which a candidate’s headteacher will be involved - at the initial meeting with the tutor to determine the training and development plan, and while the candidate is undertaking a school improvement project. Does this mean that the headteacher is more likely to act as a mentor to the candidate or become more involved with support throughout the programme or monitoring the training plan? These are potential areas for further research. However, given that the programme is expected to be completed in twelve months, it would be difficult to assess any impact the programme might have on the school or the candidate’s colleagues.

Given that some 4000 candidates have graduated with the qualification, an area of interest and possible research would be an extension to question 1 of this research – when the aspirant head achieves headship will the school be better led as a result of NPQH?

Within the reformulated model considerable weight is attached to the use of self-assessment as a means by which a candidate can determine whether they need to undertake the access modules. In other parts of the programme there is no on going assessment and thereby a candidate will have to resort to the support group meetings or the tutor helpline. Will this be an effective model? Question three of this research found little evidence to relate the training and development received
through NPQH with improvement in the candidate’s current school. However, this has huge potential for schools, particularly in the very small schools and also the large ones where they may have several candidates studying for the qualification. It would be surprising if the Government did not expect improvement to arise as an outcome of the reformulated NPQH.

Finally an area of concern and interest is the status of the qualification. As stated at the start of this research if the main objective of the National Professional Qualification for Headship is to achieve better school leaders, and whilst the qualification is non mandatory, will headship appointing bodies view the qualification as an essential attribute for a candidate to make it to the shortlist, or will it become just another qualification to add to a curriculum vitae?
Dear

As part of my doctoral research I am undertaking research into aspects of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH). In particular I am focusing on three issues, namely:

1. the impact the assessment and training has on the professional and personal development of applicants,
2. the impact the training and assessment process has on the leadership and management of the school where the successful applicant becomes the headteacher,
3. the impact the training and assessment process has on the applicant's current school.

I would be extremely grateful if you would complete the enclosed pilot questionnaire and return it to me by Wednesday July 16th at the latest. I would appreciate any comments on the structure of the questionnaire, the questions themselves and any suggestions for change before drafting the final questionnaire. A similar questionnaire has been sent to your headteacher.

All information received will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be shredded once the final report has been completed.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely

David Lee
Appendix A

Preparation for Headship - The NPQH

Questionnaire to be completed by teachers who are participating in the first cohort of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) and commenced training in Autumn term 1997.

Please complete each of the following questions by ticking the appropriate box. If you are unable to complete a question for any reason, please add an explanatory note in the space provided.

Thank you

Section A - Personal and School details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 26</td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Phase of teaching trained for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What qualifications do you currently have?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Certificate</td>
<td>Advanced Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree(s)</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(a) Type of school currently employed in?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Please specify designated age range of school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Current position held in school/organisation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
<td>Assistant Teacher CPS+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Assistant Teacher CPS+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teacher CPS</td>
<td>Assistant Teacher CPS+4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teacher CPS + 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of years of teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Full time teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section B - NPQH details

8. How were you selected for training?  
(Select one of the following)

(a) Recommendation by LEA
(b) Recommendation by Head
(c) By application
(d) By application and interview

9(a) Did you receive any help and guidance in making the application?  
Yes □ No □

(b) If yes, from whom did you receive this help and guidance?  
(Please specify)

10(a) Have you undertaken the Needs Assessment?  
Yes □ No □

(b) When did you do this?  
July 1997 □ November 1997 □
August 1997 □ December 1997 □
September 1997 □ Other dates □
October 1997 □

(c) If not, please explain why you have not undertaken the assessment.

(d) Is it your intention to continue with the qualification?  
Yes □ No □

If no, please specify why not ...

11(a) With which of the 12 consortia have you arranged to undergo the assessment and training?  
(Please specify)

(b) If more than one, please identify separately

12. Please explain briefly those aspects from each module for which the Needs Assessment identified a need for further training.  
If none, please tick here: □

(a) Compulsory Module only (Strategic leadership and Accountability)

(b) Module on Teaching and Learning
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(c) Module on Leading and Managing Staff
(d) Module on Efficient and Effective Management of Staff
(e) Assessment related to each Module only
(f) Final Assessment only

13. How long do you propose to take to achieve the qualification?

1 year □ 2 years □ 3 years □

Section C - NPQH Training

14(a) When has the training taken place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekdays school term</th>
<th>Yes □ No □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays holiday time</td>
<td>Yes □ No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends school term</td>
<td>Yes □ No □</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends holiday time</td>
<td>Yes □ No □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If training has taken place during weekdays in the school term please specify the day and whether it is the same day on each occasion.

15. Please state how much time per week, on average, you are devoting to studying for this qualification.

a) within the school day (pupil day)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 6 hours</th>
<th>6 - 10 hours</th>
<th>11 - 15 hours</th>
<th>16 - 20 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) outside the school day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 6 hours</th>
<th>6 - 10 hours</th>
<th>11 - 15 hours</th>
<th>16 - 20 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please describe briefly the types of school based activities you have undertaken as an assessed piece of work in respect of the modules?

i) Management task

ii) Curriculum task

iii) Research/Reading task

iv) Other

17(a) Did any of these require the agreement or assistance of someone else?

Yes □ No □
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17(b) If yes please specify (e.g. head of department)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

18(a) Have your current responsibilities or role been modified in any way to assist with the identified training needs?  Yes □ No □

18(b) If yes please describe the modification

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

19. Please explain what impact, if any, you think your application for NPQH and subsequent training has had on:

(a) The school/organisation? (e.g. time out of school, absence from teaching commitment, the need for supply cover)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

(b) Headteacher/colleagues? (e.g. additional work load)

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

20. Have you noticed any benefits/impact as a result of the training you have had on:

(a) The school/ organisation

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

(b) Headteacher/colleagues/others

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

21. As a result of the training so far, are you better equipped to provide for the school:

(i) Self management? Yes □ No □

(ii) Strategic direction? Yes □ No □

(iii) Monitoring and evaluation? Yes □ No □

(iv) An articulated vision? Yes □ No □

(v) Leadership and management? Yes □ No □

Overall do you think the school has benefited from the process? Yes □ No □

If yes please specify

____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Section D - Follow Up Work

22(a) Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview on this questionnaire at a mutually agreeable time and place?  Yes □ No □

22(b) If yes please provide a contact telephone number:

Area Code: .................. Telephone Number: ...............
Appendix A

The information given in this questionnaire and through any subsequent interview will be treated in confidence and only used as part of the research evidence for the doctoral thesis.

Thank you very much for taking time to complete this questionnaire

David Lee

Please return this questionnaire to me using the stamped and addressed envelope provided:

by

Wednesday July 16th 1998 at the latest

Preparation for Headship - The NPQH

Questionnaire to be completed by the headteachers of schools/ institutions which have a teacher participating in the first cohort of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH) who commenced training in Autumn term 1997.

If there is more than one applicant from your school please complete a separate form for each one.

Please complete each of the following questions by ticking the appropriate box. If you are unable to complete a question for any reason, please add an explanatory note in the space provided.

Thank you.

Section A - The Applicants’ Personal Details and Details of the School/ Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>under 26</td>
<td>41 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>46 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Current position held by the applicant in the school/ institution:

Deputy Head | Assistant Teacher CPS+2 |
Senior Teacher | Assistant Teacher CPS+3 |
Assistant Teacher CPS | Assistant Teacher CPS+4 |
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Assistant Teacher CPS + 1 □

Other (please specify) ..................................................................................................................

5. Number of years the applicant has been in the school/institution:
   (a) Full time teaching?
       Under 5 □  6-10 □  11-15 □
       16-20 □  21-25 □  over 25 □
   (b) Part time teaching?
       Under 5 □  6 - 10 □  11 - 15 □
       16 - 20 □  21 - 25 □  over 25 □

Section B - NPQH details

6. How was the applicant selected for training? (Select one of the following)
   □ Recommendation by □ By application
     LEA
   □ Recommendation by □ By application and interview
     Head
   □ Other

7(a) Did you receive any help and guidance to judge the applicant’s suitability for making an
     application?
     Yes □ No □

7(b) If yes, from whom did you receive this support and guidance? (Please specify)

8(a) Has the applicant undertaken the Needs Assessment?
     Yes □ No □

8(b) When did they do this?
     July 1997 □ November 1997 □
     August 1997 □ December 1997 □
     September 1997 □ Other dates □
     October 1997 □

9. Please explain briefly those aspects from each module for which the applicant’s Needs Assessment identified a need for further training.

Module on Strategic Leadership and Accountability

Module on Teaching and Learning

..................................................................................................................

235
Appendix A

Module on Leading and Managing Staff

Module on Efficient and Effective Management of Staff

Assessment related to each Module only

Final Assessment only

10. How long is the applicant proposing to take to achieve the qualification?

1 year □ 2 years □ 3 years □

Section C - NPQH Training

11(a) Has any of the applicant's training taken place in school time?

Day time school term Yes □ No □

Evening time school term Yes □ No □

11(b) If training has taken place in daytime school term please specify the day and whether it is the same day on each occasion:

12. Please state how much time per week, on average, is the applicant studying for this qualification within the school day (pupil day):

Less than 6 hours □ 16 - 20 hours □

6 - 10 hours □ more than 20 hours □

11 - 15 hours □

13(a) Has the school contributed any financial support to the applicant's training?

Yes □ No □

13(b) If yes, please specify the amount and from what source:

Amount: £

Source:

14. Please describe briefly below the types of school-based activities the applicant has undertaken as an assessed piece of work.

Management task

Curriculum task

Research/Reading task

236
Appendix A

Other tasks

15(a) Did any of these require your agreement/assistance? Yes □ No □

15(b) If yes please specify

16(a) Have you needed to adjust the current responsibilities or role of the applicant in order to assist with their identified training needs? Yes □ No □

16(b) If yes, please specify

17. Please explain what impact, if any, you think the applicant’s application for NPQH and subsequent training has had on:
   (a) The school/organisation, e.g. time out of school, absence from teaching commitment, the need for supply cover?
   (b) Your colleagues? eg additional work load?

18(a) Have you noticed any improvements within the school as a result of the applicant’s study for NPQH? Yes □ No □

18(b) If yes, please specify

19. Please explain below how the applicants’ training has impacted on, or been of benefit to:
   (a) The applicant as a person
   (b) The school/organisation
   (c) You/colleagues/others
   (e) The way the applicant performs their role
   (f) Do you think the applicant is better equipped to provide for the school:
      (i) Self management? Yes □ No □
      (ii) Strategic direction? Yes □ No □
      (iii) Monitoring and evaluation? Yes □ No □
      (iv) An articulated vision? Yes □ No □
      (v) Leadership and management? Yes □ No □

20(a) Do you perceive the need to make changes to their roles to provide them with opportunities to work in other areas of the school/organisation? Yes □ No □
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20(b) If yes, please specify
........................................................................................................

21(a) Overall do you think the school has benefited from the process? Yes □ No □

21(b) If yes, please specify
........................................................................................................

Section D - Follow Up Work

22(a) Would you be willing to participate in a follow up interview on this questionnaire at a mutually agreeable time and place? Yes □ No □

22(b) If yes please provide a contact telephone number:
Area Code: ............... Telephone Number ...............................................

The information given in this questionnaire and through any subsequent interview will be treated in confidence and only used as part of the research evidence for the doctoral thesis.

Thank you very much for taking time to complete this questionnaire.

David Lee

Please return this questionnaire to me using the stamped and addressed envelope provided:

by

Wednesday July 16th 1998 at the latest
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Dear Colleague

The National Professional Qualification for Headship - NPQH

NPQH is now well established in the Eastern region and many Cambridgeshire teachers have commenced their assessment and training. Part of my doctoral thesis is enquiring into aspects of NPQH — the impact of the training on candidates and schools. To do so requires me to obtain information directly from candidates and headteachers. This I intend to do by questionnaire and selected follow up interviews.

There is potential for mutual benefit from this research to the LEA and therefore I am delighted to have their full endorsement.

Whilst completion of questionnaires and other requests from researchers is entirely optional, I do hope you are able to give me your support.

Yours sincerely,

David Lee
Projects Officer
QA Division
Dear Colleague

Doctoral Research by Mr David Lee

David Lee from Cambridgeshire Education Department is undertaking research for a Doctorate of Education with the University of Leicester. I am his supervisor for the thesis which relates to aspects of NPQH. I should be most grateful if you would agree to participate in this research which is likely to be very important in terms of the satisfactory completion of Mr Lee's thesis and also to provide valuable feedback in respect of the impact of NPQH within Cambridgeshire.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like any further information before deciding whether to take part.

Yours sincerely

Director

EM DU

University of Leicester School of Education
Head of School Tom Whiteside
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24 Pearson Close Milton
Cambridge
CB4 6YS
September 28th 1998

Tel Home 01223 862350
Work 01223 717560

Dear

As part of my doctoral research I am undertaking an enquiry into aspects of the National Professional Qualification for Headship (NPQH). In particular I am focusing on three issues, namely:

1 if one of the objectives of NPQH is to achieve better quality school leaders, what impact will the assessment and training have on professional and personal development of applicants?
2 what impact will the training and assessment process have on the leadership and management of the school where the successful applicant becomes the headteacher?
3 what impact will the training and assessment process have on the applicant’s current school?

I would be extremely grateful if you find time to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me by Monday October 9th at the latest. I would also appreciate any additional comments you may care to make. A similar questionnaire has been sent to one of the first NPQH candidates.

Like all pieces of research it is important to be able substantiate findings and therefore I am asking whether you would be prepared to agree to a short follow up interview in November, please see end of questionnaire for details.

Accompanying this letter are two statements which I hope you will accept as a testimonials of the research work I am undertaking.

All information received will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be shredded once the final report has been completed. Outcomes that are of particular interest to Cambridgeshire colleagues will be made available as soon as the report has been accepted by the University of Leicester.

Thank you in anticipation of your co-operation.

Yours sincerely

David Lee
Dear

Questionnaire regarding NPQH

May I thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire on NPQH. I very much appreciate the detail you have given.

I am also delighted that you have agreed to a follow up interview. These will be brief, no longer than 45 minutes.

I intend to carry out these interviews sometime later this term and usually after school. However, I will be pleased to accommodate a more convenient time for you and your headteacher if you prefer it.

Please would you indicate on the attached pro-forma times convenient to you both and return it to me at Castle Court.

With very many thanks for your help.

Yours sincerely

David Lee
Projects Officer
Quality Assurance Division
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Interview Schedule

Focus of the enquiry

1. If one of the objectives of this qualification, is to achieve better quality school leaders, what impact will the assessment and training have on the professional and personal development of the candidate? This poses a number of supplementary questions which directly refer to the training and assessment. As a result will candidates be:

   i. able to articulate the vision for their current school to include raising standards of achievement?
   ii. able to distinguish between the processes of evaluation, monitoring and review and use them effectively in support of their school’s development?
   iii. able to provide the strategic direction to achieve an aspect of the vision for their school?
   iv. better equipped to lead and manage their own school in due course?
   v. better equipped personally to manage themselves in the headship role?

2. What impact will the NPQH training and assessment processes have on the aspiring head’s current school? This question relates to the potential problems for the applicant’s school whilst they are under going the training and assessment. A series of supplementary questions arise, namely:

   i. Has the training for NPQH had a good or detrimental effect on the school, their colleagues and the head teacher?
   ii. How have these effects manifested themselves?
   iii. Has the school been a beneficiary of the process or not?
   iv. Are there noticeable improvements within the school as a result of the training and research that will be undertaken by the aspiring head?
   v. Is there evidence of change in the strategic development of the school?
   vi. Has the candidate’s accountability to various people in the school changed; colleagues, parents, governors?

Question for the candidates

In selecting tasks to do were they identified specially for NPQH or were they part of the SDP?

Has your headteacher taken an active role in the choice of tasks and in ongoing support of these tasks?
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If there have been benefits to the school/colleagues, how have you assessed this?

If there have been benefits to you, how have you assessed this?

As a result of NPQH have your leadership and management skills improved? If so in what way?

Other issues

How have you been able to assess these benefits? What are they?

Is it possible to say whether the school has changed as a result of NPQH?

How have you been able to assess the impact/benefit the training has had on the candidate, and on colleagues?

As a result of NPQH has the candidate developed better leadership and management skills?

Other issues:
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