Thinking and acting both locally and globally: new issues for teacher education

Tony Townsend

School of Education, University of Glasgow, UK

Abstract

Over the course of education's history, there have been four key shifts in the way in which education has been seen and organised. These are identified as Thinking and Acting Individually, Thinking and Acting Locally, Thinking Nationally and Acting Locally, and Thinking Internationally and Acting Locally. Each shift has seen a new set of imperatives for schools and teacher education. These changes now seem to be coming more frequently and the paper argues that, since we still have not achieved a quality education for all students, one further shift is needed, to Thinking and Acting both Globally and Locally. Such a move has implications for educational policy, and for both school and classroom practice. In turn, this shift identifies implications for the education of teachers and school leaders. The paper identifies what some of these changes might be and what teacher education needs to do to prepare teachers and school leaders for an increasingly complex future.

Introduction

When educating teachers for an increasingly complex and rapidly changing world, one simple way to open their eyes is to ask the question 'What can a 15-year-old do or experience today that you could not do when you were 15?' Given a few minutes to think about this, they will come up with a series of responses such as 'iPhones', 'Facebook', 'laptop computers' and so on. It is clear that teachers recognise that there has been substantial change in the types of technology available to young people today, most of which we as adults feel less comfortable about than they do. However, when they are probed further, they come to recognise that it is not just technology that has changed, but pretty much everything else too, some of it on the back of technology, but other things not so. Consider changes in the past 20 years for the environment, employment, relationships, health and wealth, in society, safety, culture, communication, and even the values demonstrated by society's leaders. We could argue that virtually everything has changed and that children today think, act and understand things differently from how their parents did. At a recent conference in Dubai, Baroness Susan Greenfield made the point that by the end of their primary school years, students have spent substantially less time in school than they have in

their local communities and, to an even lesser extent, online or in front of their computers (Greenfield 2010). If this is the case, then how important will school be in comparison to other forms of learning that students undertake? How many new ways to learn are there now, than when we were in school? Yet, when we look at the way in which we educate them, how much has changed?

This paper wishes to make the argument that, since so much in our lives has changed, it is appropriate that we look at what teachers need to do in order to prepare young people for the modern world, with its increasingly complex and rapidly changing future, and in turn what we need to organise in teacher education in order to prepare teachers to do this.

The changing nature of education

To establish a rationale for doing this, two quotations can be seen as proposing a way forward. First, Drucker (1993, 1) argued:

Every few hundred years in western history there occurs a sharp transformation. We cross ... a divide. Within a few short decades society rearranges itself, its world view; its basic values; its social and political structure; its arts; its key institutions. Fifty years later, there appears a new world ... we are currently living through such a transformation.

Drucker talks about societal transformation, of the type identified by the changes listed above. However, Drucker uses words like 'every few hundred years' and 'fifty years later', which suggest a sort of relaxed approach to change, where something that happens when one is a child permeates its way through society so that by the time we turn 50, we have all come to accept the change as being part of life.

Toffler (1971, 12), on the other hand, suggests that this relaxed approach to change has collapsed:

I coined the term 'future shock' to describe the shattering stress and disorientation that we induce in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time.

He called it that feeling of 'vague, continuous anxiety', something that I am sure many people in teacher education can relate to at the moment. The interesting thing about the Toffler statement is that 40 years later, the world is changing even more rapidly than in Toffler's time. The movement from email to Facebook to YouTube to text messaging to Twitter can be measured in months, not years. Facebook, now with over 500 million subscribers, was only conceived in 2003.

However, if we put the Drucker and Toffler statements together we gain an understanding that the world around us goes through substantial transformations, each of

which makes us see the world differently, and that these transformations seem to be happening more and more frequently. In Townsend (2009), I argued that Drucker was talking about a principle similar to that first proposed by Rogers (1962):

... to describe the diffusion of innovations, where the S-curve described the number of people accepting an innovation over a period of time. New products or innovations were first accepted by a few 'early adopters', followed by the 'early majority', the 'late majority' and then the 'laggards'. Cumulatively, when graphed, the proportions of the population that have accepted the innovation over time form an S-curve. (Townsend 2009, 356)

Rogers' early work was later used by others (e.g. see Handy 1994; Phillips 2008) to describe how change progresses, and how new technologies replace others over time, but it is also a useful model for looking at how education has progressed over the course of history. Just as Drucker identified transformations (in relation to other aspects of society) over time, we have changed the way in which we think about schooling, even though the way we practise schooling does not seem to have changed significantly. These changes, when considered on a global scale, can be likened to an S-curve, as first one community or society adopts the new way of thinking, then others follow over time.

The first S-curve in education, *Thinking and Acting Individually* (Townsend 2009, 356–7), lasted from the time when education was first conceived until around the 1870s. Here, very few people were educated to the level that we would demand today. Most people were not educated at all, except by their parents. But then communities started to take responsibility for educating their populations. This occurred differently in different places, as well as in different decades, and could be associated with the move from an agrarian society to an industrialised one. So in some small countries a national system was instituted, in other places it was through a state system or school districts, counties or provinces, and in yet other places, churches took responsibility for education, and many of these systems are still in existence today. This was the second S-curve in education, *Thinking and Acting Locally* (Townsend 2009, 357), when most people (at least in the western countries) received some education and many of those people had education to a fairly high level. This lasted for about 100 years.

By the 1970s and 1980s, the burgeoning Asian economies created concern for the old western powers, typified by reports such as *A nation at risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983) in the USA, where education was first identified as

being of economic value as well as of social importance. We started to hear new terminology, such as 'national goals', 'national curriculum' and 'national testing', designed to adopt a more standardised approach to education across diverse state or district systems. Federal governments (in the UK, the USA and Australia, for instance) started to make demands of the local education systems that all students be educated to the levels required. With technological changes the opportunities to employ large numbers of people in factories or other manual labour (the industrial age) was diminishing and the need for a highly skilled workforce (the knowledge age) changed again the way in which we looked at education. There was an expectation that all schools would turn out well-qualified graduates to support the national economy, and many governments did this by placing much more responsibility at the site of the individual school, instead of at the system level. The third S-curve, to *Think Nationally and Act Locally*, had begun (Townsend 2009, 358).

Hedley Beare (1997) described these shifts in educational thinking by using what he calls metaphors for education, and these are helpful in terms of identifying when the major shifts came about. From the dawn of time until the 1870s education operated on the 'pre-industrial metaphor' where education was 'for the few and the privileged' (Beare 1997, 4–5). Then until the 1980s 'the industrial metaphor' existed, where 'the factory-production metaphor [was] applied to schooling' (Beare 1997, 5–6) and was the dominant way in which education was seen and managed by 'bureaucracies which characterised factory production'. Finally, Beare (1997, 9–13) argued that in the late 1980s we entered a time of the 'post-industrial metaphor' where 'enterprise' became 'the favoured way of explaining how education operates' and 'schools are being talked of as if they are private businesses or enterprises'.

The three S-curves in Townsend align themselves fairly well with Beare's terminology, but by the mid-1990s, before the national view of education had really had much time to mature, the advent of TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) started to create a new level of discussion. When this was joined by PISA, the OECD's Program for International Student Assessment, which by 2009 tested in countries that made up 89% of the world's economy, these international comparisons led to the fourth S-curve, *Thinking Internationally and Acting Locally* (Townsend 2009, 358–9). Now, although international comparisons were being used and countries were sharing knowledge about curriculum, pedagogy and the administration of schools, individual schools were still seen as the locus of change.

During this fourth wave, the dominant metaphor (if we continue to use Beare's terminology) could be identified as accountability, and the mechanism by which many governments have instituted this is through the use of education as a market. Just as the rest of the world has accepted the idea of a global market, the education market has been constructed using the same underlying principles, those of privatisation, competition and choice. Whether tacitly or not, governments, especially those in the west, seem to have accepted that they cannot afford to educate everyone to high levels of skill (despite the rhetoric that this is what is needed) and have adopted the rather facile approach of supporting private enterprise practices as the means of achieving this goal. Put simply (perhaps crudely), western governments are saying 'If you don't like the school you are in, go to another one. If the government system can't provide for you, there is a private school that will'. This has allowed governments to keep education budgets within what they consider to be reasonable bounds, based on other increasing demands for funding (from a rapidly ageing and an increasingly overweight population of 'seniors' and those who will soon join them, on the one hand, to the burgeoning budget for terrorism surveillance on the other), but this has been done by shifting the cost of education from governments to individual families and one outcome seems to be an increasing gap between those who do well and those who struggle at school.

What we can say is that there is ample evidence that student achievement has been hard to shift, even after all of the reforms that have occurred in recent times. In the USA, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) test scores for reading have been virtually unchanged, despite over 40 years of educational reform efforts. There is some evidence that the gap between the socially advantaged and the socially disadvantaged has closed a little, but this has been confined to the elementary years of school. By the time students reach high school the level of performance is the same as it was in the 1970s. Despite all of the resources and reform efforts that have occurred since the 1980s after the *Nation at risk* report, overall achievement is much the same as it has always been.

We have moved from a time where we had individual teachers working with one or more students, through the development of classrooms, schools and school systems, to a time where national authorities have taken an interest in local school systems and where global comparisons have directed some of the policies promoted by those systems. We have moved through what Beare called the pre-industrial, the industrial

and the post-industrial metaphors of education and we currently use what I call the accountability metaphor of education, where the market and choice programmes have been put in place as a means of promoting education for all. However, still we have not achieved a universal system of quality education. Townsend (1998, 248) argued: We have conquered the challenge of moving from a quality education system for a few people to having a quality education system for most people. Our challenge now is to move from having a quality education system for most people to having a quality education system for all people.

Thirty years ago Minzey (1981) argued that previous educational reform was similar to rearranging the toys in the toy box, when what we really needed was a whole new box. It could be argued that we now need to move to a new S-curve, where we close in on universal quality education, where every single student has a successful school experience, but to do this we need to think about schooling differently. The next S-curve could be to *Think and Act both Locally and Globally* (Townsend 2009, 363) with the metaphor for education changing from accountability, which clearly has not worked, to responsibility, where we do what is necessary to deliver a quality education to the world's population. Here, the recognition is that for true education to occur, we cannot have education for the few who are rich and privileged (pre-industrial), we cannot see schools as factories (post-industrial) or businesses (enterprise), and we cannot expect the market to solve our problems (accountability), but we must instead see education as a global experience, where people work together for the betterment of themselves, each other, the local community and the planet as a whole. To do this the focus must become universal. All people must succeed.

Townsend (2009, 364) suggests that this will mean we have to do things in a different way:

... we have to move beyond accountability, which is simply a counting and sorting process, and seems to mostly have been designed to enable politicians to report things to communities in slick sound bites and with little or no analysis, and towards responsibility, where we need to respond to the needs and circumstances of the young people we serve and have an internal motivation to improve schools, not because it makes us look better, but because it is the right thing to do for the young people we interact with. Under these circumstances communities, and governments, accept that it is both their legal and moral responsibility to ensure that all people within their communities are given the educational provision required to enable them to achieve their full potential as global citizens.

There are implications in moving towards thinking and acting both locally and globally at the policy level, for school and classroom practice and consequently for the training of both teachers and school leaders. These levels incorporate how we structure education at the system level, and how leadership and classroom practices need to change in schools (which affects curriculum, pedagogy and assessment). This leads to new understanding of how to educate both teachers and school leaders.

I wish to use the rest of this article to focus only on how thinking and acting both locally and globally will impact on teachers and, consequently, on how we might need to adjust teacher education to ensure that we have the teachers we need to take us forward. Some of the other issues can be found in more detail in Townsend (2009).

Teachers and teacher education

As educational policies will shape a new way of thinking about educational structures, and leadership and classroom practices, it is worth looking at how thinking and acting both locally and globally might change educational policy. Table 1 provides some tentative thoughts of change at the policy level and how this will change the way in which schools are run. The two columns on the left indicate my view of how we think about schools and how this thinking is currently being practised. The right-hand column provides an alternative practice that might be considered in the future.

To establish this way of thinking we need to consider what I have called the Core-Plus Curriculum (Townsend 1994, 119–23), which ensures that both:

The CORE areas, those areas identified by the state as being so important that every child should learn and know them, AND The PLUS areas, those areas identified by the school community as being important to their children, are given the time, attention and resources necessary for those skills, attitudes and knowledge to be planned for, learned and evaluated.

At the system level, this leads to an understanding that for us to be successful, we need to support all schools to be successful and, clearly, the market model does not subscribe to this understanding unless we adopt a new model of 'market' based on interest rather than financial ability to purchase 'quality'. At the school level, rather than hoarding best practice and using it to compete for more, or better, students, schools would share best practice to ensure that communities would receive the quality of education that they need. Government policies will reflect the view that they accept their legal and moral responsibility to deliver a quality education to every

child, so the best choice for a parent is to send their child to their local school, especially in the primary school years. Parental choice is also acceptable at secondary level when schools have been able to specialise (technology, the arts, the hard sciences), focusing attention and resources on their area of speciality, and parents and students can then be content in the knowledge that they will receive a good grounding in the basic skills, together with an opportunity to focus on their area of interest that has been well resourced and supported.

Table 1. Changing the way education is structured.

Current thinking	Current action	Alternative
Thinking Globally	Acting Locally	Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally
<i>For education policy</i>		
Recognition that the world has changed quite substantially since the development of schools. World's best practice needs to be conducted if education systems are to keep up with these changes.	Education systems use what they have learned from other systems, adapting what they have learned to the local circumstances. International comparative data are used to drive local school improvement. Increasingly schools compete with other schools for students and funds, which limits the level of sharing that occurs.	There is a reassessment of the purpose and delivery of education in a rapidly changing world. There is recognition that education need not be a competitive process, but instead world's best practice should be freely shared for the benefit of all. The available technology is utilised to ensure that research-supported knowledge and skill are translated into practice.
<i>For the school level</i>		
Recognition that the level of success of an individual school is a complex mixture of the characteristics of the students, families and local community on the one hand and the skills, values and development of the teachers and school leaders on the other.	Self-managing systems of education provide opportunities for the individual schools and their communities to respond in unique ways to the directives and guidelines laid down by the system. Schools compete for students.	Recognition that not all school communities are able to operate at the level required for universal student success. Systems establish mechanisms where highly capable schools and individuals provide support to those less capable as a means of improving the system as a whole.

Source: Townsend 2009, 366.

As well as changes at the policy and school level, there must be change in what happens in the classroom, if we are to achieve our aim of universal success for all students. However, if young people's learning is the end goal, we need to reconsider what this means in a rapidly changing, globalised world. Wang, Haertel, and Walberg

(1993/1994, 74–9) identified 28 specific characteristics of a learning-oriented school, grouped into six categories. The top five characteristics in order of importance to student learning are:

- (1) classroom management
- (2) metacognitive processes
- (3) cognitive processes
- (4) home environment/parental support
- (5) student/teacher social interactions.

The greatest factors in student learning are the student themselves and what happens in the classroom. These results were more recently confirmed by Hattie (2007), whose meta-analysis confirmed that around 50% of the variation in student achievement can be tracked back to the student (items 2, 3 and 4 above) and around 30% of the variation comes from what teachers do (items 1 and 5), with the most important single factor being the quality and consistency of feedback given by the teacher to the student. If we look at the top five elements above that contribute to student learning, it becomes obvious that what happens in the classroom, the home and the community is critical to an individual student reaching his or her potential. The student's ability to learn, the way in which the classroom is organised and managed, and the relationships between student, teacher and parent are the keys to learning. The past decade has seen massive changes at the state and school levels by various restructuring activities, but only recently have we tried to change what happens in classrooms. Yet, as Ashenden (1994, 13) argues: The greatest single weakness in these reforms is that they stop at the classroom door. The classroom is the student's workplace. It is, in essence, a 19th-century workplace – much more humane and interesting but recognisably the same place. It is an inefficient and inequitable producer of the old basics and simply incompatible with the new.

If we are concerned about helping students to learn, then there are three major issues for educators. The first is having an appropriate curriculum for a rapidly changing world, the second is to ensure that the pedagogy we use can engage every student in this curriculum and enable them to build a positive relationship to learning, so that they can become a lifelong learner, and the third is the way in which we assess the level of success. Table 2 provides some indicators of where we are now and where we might want to be.

If we accept the premise that to improve student achievement, changes must be made in curriculum, engagement and relationships, and measuring success, then perhaps the greatest task in the future is to manage the changes that are necessary in

the hearts and minds of teachers, since it is here that true improvement in student learning lies. Thus we have implications for how teachers must adapt to promote positive learning for all students. We must move individual teachers past competence and into a position of capability. Cairns (1998, 1) argued, 'Modern teachers need to be developed as capable which is seen as moving "beyond" initial competencies. The Capable Teacher is what we should be seeking to develop, encourage and honour as the hallmark of our profession'.

Table 2. Changing classroom practice.

Current thinking	Current action	Alternative
Thinking Globally	Acting Locally	Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally
<i>For curriculum</i>		
Recognition that in the international market, students need to have high levels of education in order to be successfully employed. All students should complete a full school programme.	Strong focus on those elements of curriculum associated with preparing them for further education, including the basic skills and a set of socially acceptable values.	Recognition that not all students will go on to university and that other skills are necessary for those that will not. As well as the academic programme, schools will cater for those who wish to go into the world of work or other types of activity.
<i>For pedagogy</i>		
Classroom effectiveness is more important than school effectiveness when it comes to student achievement. Better qualified and more committed teachers lead to higher levels of student achievement.	Strong focus on teaching to the test, especially for students who are struggling. Most teacher professional development focuses on basic skills and 'proven techniques' of imparting them.	Recognition that a recipe approach to teaching will not lead to success for all students. Teachers are given the skills to build strong relationships with students and make the curriculum relevant through a variety of different teaching techniques.
<i>For assessment</i>		
Recognition that being internationally competitive involves understanding how well students are learning in comparison to others, both locally and globally.	Strong focus on those elements of the curriculum that are easily measured and are likely to be part of an international testing programme. This has led to a higher value being given to some subjects than to others.	Recognition that to be a fully functioning human being takes more than a particular score on a standardised test. As well as 'valuing what we measure', steps are taken to ensure that we learn to measure other human skills that are equally valued.

Source: Townsend 2009, 368.

Currently, there is strong recognition, through the school effectiveness research, that student achievement is more varied within a school than across schools, so having excellent teachers in each classroom is the key to universal success. Table 3 provides some thoughts on how this might be interpreted at the moment and how we might need to adjust this into the future.

Table 3. Changing the way teaching is conceived.

Current thinking	Current action	Alternative
Thinking Globally	Acting Locally	Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally
<i>For teachers</i>		
Recognition that teachers are the most important factor in student learning, apart from the students themselves. An effective school has more effective classrooms and teachers than a school that is less effective.	Teachers face more and more pressure to achieve student outcomes. Strong focus on improving the quality of teaching through competency approaches. Teachers are expected to have specific measurable skills and to focus on those elements of the curriculum that are likely to boost student outcomes.	Recognition that a student who does not enjoy being at school and is afraid or unhappy in the classroom will not perform well and that in times of rapid change teachers need skills for the future rather than those learned in the past. Teachers need to establish the capabilities required to have strong positive relationships and teach in ways that will build student confidence in themselves to be successful learners. This involves understanding different cultures in an increasingly mobile world.

This would mean that we need to consider new strategies for working with teachers in the field, to ensure that building relationships and focusing on a broader range of outcomes occurs in classrooms. At the moment, the curriculum is almost entirely focused on those students who are likely to end up going on to higher education. However, in many societies there are increasing numbers of young people who are called NEETS in Scotland – ‘Not in Employment, Education or Training’. If we are to make sure that all students in schools, both currently and in the future, are given an optimum chance of finding their way in adult society, then current teachers need to adjust what they do. In turn, new ways of considering the role of teachers have implications for teacher education as well as for those currently in the field (Table 4).

Making teachers more flexible, adaptable and professional becomes a challenge

for teacher educators. The model for developing capable teachers (Cairns 1998) is a combination of three intertwined elements:

- ability (describes both competence and capacity)
- values (the ideals that govern the use of ability)
- self-efficacy (the way people judge their capability to carry out actions effectively).

Table 4. Changing teacher preparation.

Current thinking	Current action	Alternative
Thinking Globally	Acting Locally	Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally
<i>For teacher preparation</i>		
Recognition that teachers will teach in classrooms that will contain students from all over the world, or alternatively may be trained in one country and end up teaching in another country for most of their career. Teachers will be teaching for a future in which rapid and complex change continues.	Multiculturalism is taught in teacher education programmes, but the strong focus on having all students reach the identified state or national standards means that most of the time is spent on the basic skills. Teacher education programmes are largely competency-based approaches to teacher development, responding to state-determined standards for teacher competence.	Recognition that all students need to be literate and numerate, but this will only happen if teachers can form strong relationships between the student, the teacher, the curriculum and other students, who may come from substantially different backgrounds. Teacher education programmes should focus on expanding the range of teacher capabilities, beyond delivering the basic curriculum, to enable them to face an unknown and increasingly globalised future. Teacher education students should be encouraged to have an international teaching experience as part of their teaching practicum.

The challenge becomes clear. To improve teachers' abilities we need to focus our attention on their initial training and their ongoing professional development, particularly in the areas identified above, curriculum, relationships and assessment. To improve teachers' values we need to focus on developing and passing on the notion of teacher professionalism and what that means in a rapidly changing world. To improve teachers' self-efficacy we need to provide teachers with the ability to believe in themselves. Just as we need to change the beliefs and understandings of students if we want them to improve their level of learning, we also need to change the beliefs and understandings of teachers to manage this process. Essentially, for every student to improve their level of achievement, then every teacher must believe that every student has the capability

to learn and must have the understanding of how best to promote that. It is either one or the other of these factors that seems to be missing for many teachers and this currently curtails changes in student achievement. The teacher education imperative of the future is to move towards a universal set of beliefs and understandings on the part of teachers that will lead to positive outcomes and relationships for every student.

Creemers and Kyriakides (in press) provide a substantial analysis of what the teacher effectiveness research has demonstrated makes a difference to student achievement, which can be categorised into the quantity of academic activity, the form and quality of lessons, and classroom climate. However, they identify some deficiencies of previous research, including the narrowness of the curriculum being focused on (basic skills) and the fact that new theories of teaching and learning are better able to identify quality teaching. They also recognise that impacts on student learning are multilevel in nature (student, classroom, school and system) and have developed a dynamic model of educational effectiveness that focuses mostly on the roles of the two main actors (student and teacher), but recognises the influence of what happens at the school and system levels on this interaction. Perhaps a model such as this might help future teachers to understand not only the specific activities that they are in control of that make a difference to student learning (listed as orientation, structuring, questioning, teaching-modelling, applications, management of time, teacher role in making the classroom a learning environment and classroom assessment, with each factor being defined and measured using five dimensions: frequency, focus, stage, quality and differentiation), but also develop this approach so as to consider a range of teaching strategies (direct instruction, constructivism approach) that will provide the framework for student learning.

School leadership

If we are to be successful in our attempt to achieve universal student success, then we also need to consider the way in which school leaders go about the task of leading and what implications this has for the preparation of school leaders. Table 5 provides some thoughts on how such changes might fit into the concept of thinking and acting both locally and globally.

The research is unequivocal that leaders can have a powerful, if indirect, influence on student achievement (Leithwood and Jantzi 2000) because of the strong influence that leaders have on the quality of teaching (Fullan 2001; Sergiovanni 2001).

However, there are two components for school leaders to consider when we move

towards Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally. The first of these refers to the enormity of the task they have and the need to share leadership within the school, and the second is the way in which leaders need to think and behave strategically if they are to move the school forward.

Table 5. Changing our understanding of school leadership.

Current thinking	Current action	Alternative
Thinking Globally	Acting Locally	Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally
<i>For school leaders</i>		
International recognition that the role of the school leader is becoming increasingly important in establishing the conditions for high levels of student learning. Leaders now have to respond to rapidly changing economic, social and environmental conditions.	Strong focus on those elements of management that promote instructional leadership, including the need to understand the law, finance, policy, data analysis and personnel development.	Recognition that an outstanding leader relies upon the people that he or she works with and that managing the school can only be successful if team leadership and relationship skills are also developed. Leaders think and act strategically to distribute their leadership within the school and to develop a focus on learning for all aspects of school activity.

Source: adapted from Townsend 2009, 372.

In terms of the first of these issues, it is simply no longer possible for a single person to be responsible for all the activities that are contained within the concept of an effective, modern school. Townsend and Bogotch (2008, 225) report on the changing structure of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE), which all school leaders must pass to gain certification and which therefore directs the activities of leadership preparation programmes:

Of the 91 specific skills identified as part of the new statewide FELE examination, 44 of them (48%) refer to a knowledge and understanding of state or federal legislature ... It is telling that all of the skills under Vision focus more on communication of the vision than actually developing one, that the two skills under Diversity involve following the law and state communications and that only two skills under Decision-Making Strategies make any mention of leadership at all.

In Australia, the Australian Council for Educational Leaders has just released a draft Leadership Capability Framework (ACEL n.d.), with three major sets of imperatives for school leaders:

- leads self for learning
- leads others for learning
- leads the organisation for learning

Within these three imperatives, there are 11 different capabilities and 34 separate indicators to enable school leaders to map their own level of performance, within a rubric for each indicator that specifies a level of performance identified as:

- influencing within and beyond classroom
- influencing within and beyond team
- influencing within and beyond school
- influencing within and globally beyond school

It is interesting to note the differences between these two sets of expectations. Clearly, in Florida, the state government's expectations are strongly focused on within-state activity (the need to know laws and policies), whereas in Australia, the national professional association for school leaders sees the task of the leader as moving beyond the school and even beyond state and national borders. Clearly, in both cases, there is a need to spread the load.

There are many terms that have been used to describe the process whereby leadership within a school is spread from the school leader to others in the school, including distributed leadership (Gronn 2000, 2002; Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond 2001, 2004), shared leadership (Lambert 2002), democratic leadership (Starratt 2001; Møller 2002) and team leadership or teacher leadership (Little 1990; Barth 1999). The critical leadership skill in the establishment of a broader leadership base is the way in which the school leader builds capacity for leadership in other people. In this way the first focus of thinking and acting both locally and globally from a leadership perspective is the building of capacity for leadership in others and establishing relationships that will allow this to develop. Again, there is a substantial body of research in the literature that focuses on this topic (Lambert 1998; Harris and Lambert 2001; Hopkins and Jackson 2001), but it is the central focus of the school leader, principal or headteacher, and the vision that they have, that will be crucial to this exercise. There is a number of possible views of what school leadership of the future, giving these rapidly changing conditions, might encompass, especially if we are to focus on Thinking and Acting both Locally and Globally, which will involve everything from consideration of individual students right through to ways in which school leadership might contribute to the ongoing health of the planet itself. There are different leadership

possibilities discussed in the literature such as deep leadership (Hargreaves 2006), sustainable leadership (Hargreaves and Fink 2006) and regenerative leadership (Hardman 2009), all of which focus on leadership behaviours. Hargreaves (2006, 2) argues that:

Deep leadership means redesigning education so that, through a culture of personalisation and co-construction with shared leadership, the school secures deep experience, deep support and deep learning for all its students. Deep leadership establishes strategies for organising the staff and the school in ways that develop the capacity to achieve the transformation of full personalisation for students. It involves focusing all the efforts of the school on the task of learning and increasing the capabilities of the teachers and others involved in this effort, to do so.

Hargreaves and Fink (2007, 3) argued for the need to develop sustainable leadership in schools:

Sustainable leadership matters, spreads and lasts. It is a shared responsibility, that does not unduly deplete human or financial resources, and that cares for and avoids exerting negative damage on the surrounding educational and community environment. Sustainable leadership has an activist engagement with the forces that affect it, and builds an educational environment of organizational diversity that promotes cross-fertilization of good ideas and successful practices in communities of shared learning and development. In this instance, sustainability considers the preservation of good practice once it is established.

However, Hardman (2009) suggests that sustainability is no longer enough. He considers that we are already in a position of 'overshoot'. If we look at the global environment, we could argue that where we are now, environmentally, economically and socially, is not sustainable. In other words, sustaining the position we are in now is not going to lead to the type of world that we desire. Hardman (2009, 273) argues we can be:

... no longer satisfied with fostering environmental, social, and economic sustainability as the ultimate objective in business, education, community, or any other form of human activity. The growing evidence of overshoot and collapse of natural and social systems indicated the need to adopt strategic approaches that went beyond sustainability.

Hardman (2009, 272) outlines his concept of regenerative leadership in the following way:

Whereas sustainability is defined colloquially ... as 'doing what you are doing so that you can keep on doing what you're doing', regenerative leadership can be said to be about putting back more than we took out, and doing it in entirely new ways unconditioned by prior assumptions.

The process starts with the leader's personal value system incorporating sustainability values, developing behaviours based on these values, and then working with others to develop the sustainability mindset and establishing group behaviours based on these values. This process becomes a continuous cycle of activity over time as both individually and collectively, the group moves towards more sustainable approaches, and eventually to the point where the overshoot issue starts to be addressed in a positive way.

If leaders truly are going to serve their school in the future, the current inequity of services and outcomes for a substantial proportion of the school population, and the current situation of a system with too many expectations and too few resources, must change. To do this leaders will need to be courageous, will need to challenge authority and may need to be subversive (Macbeath 2008, 124). This can only happen by sharing the load, locally, nationally and internationally.

One of the keys to doing this is for school leaders to adopt what Hamel and Prahalad (1989) call strategic intent, comprising three factors:

- A sense of direction: In many organisations staff do not share a sense of purpose above and beyond the short-term unit performance, because most organisations are overmanaged and under-led. Strategic intent provides clarity about ends, but is unspecific about means.
- A sense of discovery: Strategic intent offers staff an enticing spectacle of a new destination. It is broad enough to leave room for considerable experimentation in how to reach the destination. It constrains the 'where' but not the 'how', so creativity is unbridled.
- A sense of destiny: The goal must be worthwhile to command the respect and allegiance of all the staff.

Strategic intent must stimulate the passion that the staff can make a real difference. It represents an ambition that stretches beyond current resources and capabilities.

(Hamel and Prahalad 1989, in Hargreaves 2006, 6)

The need to regenerate what is happening in schools leads to a more complex approach to school leadership than just 'managing' schools. Bogotch and Townsend (2008, 1) argue that true leadership is artistry, the place where the 'what' and the 'how' of school leadership come together. We have seen above that Florida seems to have spent most of its energy focusing on the 'what' of school leadership, whereas Australia seems to have established concerns about developing the 'how' as well, but may have established a profile much greater than what we can reasonably expect a single school leader to be able to achieve.

However, the real challenge facing the providers of educational leadership programmes is managing the development of leaders who can be 'Influencing within and globally beyond school'(ACEL) but at the same time preparing managers who are increasingly expected to deliver on state-initiated mandates and requirements (e.g. Florida).

Perhaps Hardman's (2009) regenerative leadership model may help us here. In order to change the mindset and the behaviour of those we are working with, we first need to change the mindset and behaviour of ourselves. Part of this approach may be to expand our own view of what leadership is and entails. Researching educational leadership seems to focus more on the local and perhaps needs to embrace the global. The research literature and the leadership practices used by faculty in the USA mostly emanate from the USA. On the other hand, UK faculty use mostly UK research and leadership practices. Perhaps the best instance of how this operates is the major focus on instructional leadership in the USA and the somewhat different focus on leadership for learning in the UK. Macbeath and Townsend (in press) argue:

It may appear at first sight that there is little conceptual daylight between instructional leadership in the various forms described here, and leadership for learning. Both are informed by the same, or similar, bodies of evidence and it is easy to assume that they mean the same. Yet these surface similarities perhaps conceal more than they reveal and it is worth exploring a little deeper the assumptions these two closely related ideas contain.

Although there seems to be little daylight between the two, Macbeath and Townsend try to establish what the differences are:

Whereas much of the instructional leadership literature reduces learning to 'outcomes', leadership for learning embraces a much wider, developmental view of learning. Nor is its focus exclusively on student achievement. It sees things through a wide angle lens,

embracing professional, organisational and leadership learning. It understands the vitality of their interconnections and the climate they create for exploration, inquiry and creativity. Its concern is for all those who are part of a learning community. So here we have two different traditions, focusing on two different aspects of leadership. Yet, each has much to share with the other, and so too the rest of the world has much to share with both.

The same could be said of teacher education in general. Although there have been strong movements in recent years to a more international approach to research, with organisations such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the University's Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) on the US side of the Atlantic, and the British Educational Research Association (BERA) and the British Educational Leadership and Management and Administration Society (BELMAS) on the other, now reaching out to international researchers, there is still some way to go. Still, the majority of papers delivered at such conferences, and the majority of publications emerging from these countries, use mostly local research to make their arguments. This is understandable, because the focus of government policies is inevitably local, but short-sighted, because some of the best approaches to education may not come from the 'home' country (and in fact, may not be written in English in the first place).

In many cases, it is individual researchers, who read what those from other countries write, who choose to visit other places for joint research or other educational opportunities, and who actively seek out a wider understanding of education with all its global complexities, who will lead the way. They know the benefits of such activity and must encourage others to be involved.

The way forward is for these international travellers in teacher education departments to recognise the value of what using the world as a library might do, both locally and globally, and to show the value of this to those we work with and those we teach. As a simple first step, consider the reference list used in any teacher education class. If more than 75% of the references are made up of people from one's own country, there is a need to start the process of broadening students' reading. A quick Google search will provide a plethora of websites that will document what is happening at ministerial level, department level, the research level and in many cases school level, that could be used as a starting point for discussions about what is happening (and how to change it) in one's own country. Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010)

document an educational leadership department's journey to move from a collection of individual researchers with some international interests to a department where thinking globally became the norm.

If we choose to revitalise teacher education programmes, and through this revitalise the education of teachers and school leaders of the future, we cannot keep doing what we have always done in the past. We can hope for, but cannot expect, our students to make the changes because they are so busy just trying to do what they do best, teach students or lead schools. Collectively, it is the teacher education lecturers and professors who must lead the way. It is our task to show our teacher education students that there is a world of possibilities and in doing so, we will generate much more than we take away.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on a keynote speech given at the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers at Hinckley on 12 November 2010.

References

- ACEL. n.d. *Leadership capability framework*. Sydney: Australian Council for Educational Leadership.
- Ashenden, D. 1994. An odd couple? Social justice performance indicators. A public lecture sponsored by the Victorian State Board of Education, Melbourne, Australia.
- Barth, R.S. 1999. *The teacher leader*. Providence, RI: The Rhode Island Foundation.
- Beare, H. 1997. Enterprise: The new metaphor for schooling in a post-industrial society. In *The primary school in changing times: The Australian experience*, ed. T. Townsend. London: Routledge.
- Bogotch, I., and P. Maslin-Ostrowski 2010. Internationalizing educational leadership: How a university department jumps the curve from local to international. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46: 210–40.
- Bogotch, I., and T. Townsend. 2008. What are the essential leadership questions in a rapidly changing world? In *The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers*, ed. T. Townsend, and I. Bogotch, 3–16. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Cairns, L. 1998. The capable teacher: The challenge for the 21st century. Paper presented at the 28th Annual Conference, Australian Teacher Education Association, Melbourne.

- Creemers, B.P.M., and L. Kyriakides. In press. Using educational effectiveness research to improve the quality of teaching practice. In *International handbook on teacher and school development*, ed. C. Day. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Drucker, Peter F. 1993. *The ecological vision: reflections on the American condition*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Fullan, M. 2001. *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Greenfield, S. 2010. Developing UAE citizens for the modern world: The human/technology balance. Keynote paper at the Education Competitiveness Conference, November 2010, Dubai.
- Gronn, P. 2000. Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration* 28: 317–38.
- Gronn, P. 2002. Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* 13: 423–51.
- Hamel, G., and C. Prahalad. 1989. Strategic intent. *Harvard Business School Review* 67: 63–76.
- Handy, Charles. 1994. *The age of paradox*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hardman, J. 2009. Regenerative leadership: An integral theory for transforming people and organizations for sustainability in business, education, and community. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.
- Hargreaves, A., and D. Fink. 2006. *Sustainable leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Hargreaves, D. 2006. *A new shape for schooling: Deep leadership 1*. London: Specialist Schools and Academies Trust.
- Harris, A., and L. Lambert. 2001. *Building leadership capacity for school*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Hattie, J. 2007. Developing potentials for learning: Evidence, assessment, and progress. EARLI Biennial Conference, Budapest, Hungary. http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/education/staff/j.hattie/j.hattie_home.cfm
- Hopkins, D., and D. Jackson. 2001. Building the capacity for leading and learning. In *Effective leadership for school improvement*, ed. A. Harris, C. Day, D. Hopkins, M. Hadfield, A. Hargreaves and C. Chapman, 84–99. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Lambert, L. 1998. *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lambert, L. 2002. A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership* 59, no. 8: 37–40.

- Leithwood, K., and D. Janzti. 2000. The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration* 38, no. 2: 112–29.
- Little, J.W. 1990. The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record* 91: 509–36.
- MacBeath, J. 2008. Leadership moments: How to lead. In *The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers*, ed. T. Townsend and I. Bogotch, 119–34. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- MacBeath, J., and T. Townsend. In press. Thinking and acting both locally and globally: What do we know now and how do we continue to improve? In *International handbook on leadership for learning*, ed. T. Townsend and J. Macbeath. New York: Springer.
- Minzey, J.D. 1981. Community education and community schools. An address at the State College of Victoria, Frankston, Australia.
- Møller, J. 2002. Democratic leadership in an age of managerial accountability. In *Democratic learning: The challenge to school effectiveness*, eds J. MacBeath and L. Moos, 151–63. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Phillips, W. 2008. The 'S' curve. <http://www.qm2.org/mbriefs/scurve.html> (accessed July 23, 2008).
- PISA. 2006. *Science competencies for tomorrow's world*. Paris: OECD.
- Rogers, E.M. 1962/2003. *Diffusion of innovations*. Cambridge, MA: The Free Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. 2001. *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Spillane, J.P., R. Halverson, and J.B. Diamond. 2001. Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher* 30, no. 3: 23–8.
- Spillane, J.P., R. Halverson, and J.B. Diamond. 2004. Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36, no. 1: 3–34.
- Starratt, R. 2001. Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: An oxymoron or ironic possibility? In *The ethical dimension of school leadership*, ed. P. Begley and O. Johansson. Boston, MA: Kluwer Press.
- Toffler, A. 1971. *Future shock*. London: Pan.
- Townsend, T. 1994. *Effective schooling for the community*. London: Routledge.
- Townsend, T. 1998. The primary school of the future: Third world or third millennium? In *The primary school in changing times: The Australian experience*, ed. T. Townsend, 235–47. London: Routledge.

- Townsend, T. 2009. Third millennium leaders: Thinking and acting both locally and globally. *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 8: 355–79.
- Townsend, T., and I. Bogotch. 2008. Conclusion: 'What' plus 'how' equals 'whow'. In *The elusive what and the problematic how: The essential leadership questions for school leaders and educational researchers*, ed. T. Townsend and I. Bogotch, 215–30. Rotterdam: SensePublishers.
- Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). 1995, 1999, 2003. <http://nces.ed.gov/timss/index.asp> (accessed August 19, 2010).
- Wang, M.C., G.D. Haertel, and H.J. Walberg. 1993/1994. What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership* (Winter): 74–9.