

Title: Reading between the lines: The consequences of performativity for the professional development of educators in schools in England.

Ewan Ingleby (e.ingleby@tees.ac.uk)

Conference paper delivered at the IPDA (International Professional Development Association) conference, at The Vale of Glamorgan, Wales, 24-25th November 2017.

Abstract

Focus

This paper considers the findings of research funded by ‘Innovate UK’ on the organisational culture of schools in England. The consequences of ‘results driven’ targets for CPD are explored in developing a key theme of this year’s conference: the complexity of professional learning.

Research approach/innovation

The research comes from a mixed methods study (survey, focus-group and interview data). The research participants are head teachers and school business managers from primary and secondary schools in England. The presentation of key aspects of schools’ organisational culture in England in 2017 is innovative and original.

Key findings and significance

The findings reveal that an emphasis on ‘targets’ and ‘performance’ results in fewer opportunities to think about the curriculum and professional development in ways that are innovative and creative. The paper applies the work of Bernstein (2000), Gibb (1987) and Vermunt (2016) in exploring the consequences for professional development.

Introduction

This paper reports on the research findings of a funded project in education that was completed at Teesside University through 2016-2017. The research explores the organisational culture of selected primary and secondary schools in England. The research project is framed by a background of financial pressure facing schools in England in 2016-2017. Good financial health in schools is critical to good business management and to good outcomes for pupils. However, the Department for Education estimates that schools have to save £1.3 billion in procurement spending and £1.7 billion in workforce spending by 2019-2020. This implies that there is a 8% reduction in per-pupil funding for mainstream schools between 2014-2015 and 2019-2020 (National Audit Office, 2016). The question was raised whether all schools have the capacity and / or skills to manage these reductions in their funding as effectively as they could.

Therefore, a competition was funded by Department for Education (DfE) to find innovative and practical new ways to engage and enable schools to become more financially efficient, healthy and sustainable. The application written by SF Software Ltd. and Teesside University, in cooperation with the Association of School and College leaders (ASCL), was one of the two winners of this competition and received funding to work out their original proposal. The project proposed to develop a Virtual Learning Platform prototype to support the improvement of financial health within schools and enable them to save 2% efficiency savings year on year. The research in this paper reports on key findings into the organisational culture of schools in England.

The research context

The research project is framed by a background that draws attention to the financial pressures that schools in England are facing today (www.academytoday.co.uk; www.ascl.org.uk; www.nao.org.uk; www.insidegovernment.co.uk; www.tes.com). A combined survey by ATL (the Association of Teachers and Lecturers) and the NUT (National Teachers Union) in 2017 has identified that funding pressures have forced schools to resort to new ways of raising money. This survey revealed that 44% of schools ‘rent out’ school buildings and one-sixth of schools now ask parents for money (www.tes.com). In the survey of 1,200 teachers, support staff, and heads, 76% of staff said that their budget had been cut this year. 93% of the respondents said that they were ‘pessimistic’ about their school’s funding over the next three years. 71% of the secondary school respondents said that their school had cut teaching posts and 50% of the total number of respondents revealed that they have had to increase class sizes. The survey also revealed that 41% of schools have had to cut their SEN (Special Educational Needs) provision. The statements by the respondents reveal the challenges to funding schools in England in 2017. In the survey, a primary teacher from Essex stated that: ‘over the last two years, the ethos of the school has changed from being based on a family atmosphere to being driven by cost-cutting’ (www.tes.com).

Another teacher referred to having to teach a ‘master class’ of 64 pupils (www.tes.com). According to the survey, schools are being forced to go to increasing lengths to raise money to cope with funding shortfalls. Almost half (49%) of the respondents said their school has asked parents to pay for items to help their child’s education, including textbooks or art and design materials (www.tes.com). 14 of these respondents said that their school asks for over £20 a month. The survey was published on the first day of ATL’s annual conference in Liverpool, in April 2017, where five motions on the subject of funding are to be debated. Mary Bousted, ATL’s general secretary, warned that: ‘unless the government finds more

money for schools and fast, today's school children will have severely limited choices' (www.tes.com). Kevin Courtney, from the NUT, criticised the government by saying that: 'our government must invest in our country and invest in our children' (www.tes.com). The TES (Times Educational Supplement) noted that a DfE (Department for Education) spokeswoman responded to this particular sector challenge by saying: 'the government has protected the core schools budget in real terms since 2010, with school funding at its highest level on record at almost £41 billion in 2017-18 – and that is set to rise, as pupil numbers rise over the next two years, to £42 billion by 2019-20' (www.tes.com). Despite this statement, the pressure on school budgets appears to be a key educational challenge in 2017.

The challenges to school funding are also part of the broader context of educational challenges in schools in England. This is revealed by Selwyn (2011, cited in Ingleby 2015) who draws attention to some of the ambitious educational policies of the Coalition and Conservative governments in England from 2010. These policies have included reforming the examination system and increasing the number of academy schools (Ingleby 2015). In this background contextualisation of education in England, some of the challenges that are present in the English education system are revealed by exemplifying the consequences of the introduction of academy schools in England.

The academy schools are grounded in what Selwyn (2011, 365, cited in Ingleby 2015) refers to as 'an ambition of absence'. As opposed to championing the merits of aligning schools to local authority control, the academy schools are based on encouraging self-regulation (Machin and Veroit 2011). There is a palpable sense that almost anything is possible within the academy (or 'free' schools). The schools will ideally regulate their own finances but Machin and Veroit (2011, 2) refer to the 'controversy' surrounding the introduction of academy schools in England since 2002. These schools are 'independent, non-selective, state funded' and 'outside the control of local authorities' (Machin and Veroit 2011, 2). The

schools are managed by an independent team of sponsors. The sponsors of the schools ensure that their management is delegated to a largely self-appointed set of governors. Machin and Vernoit (2011, 2) note that an academy usually has around 13 governors with seven typically appointed by the sponsor. The ‘controversy’ surrounding the academy schools can be traced back to this independent arrangement of sponsors. Who are the sponsors? What are they trying to achieve? What sort of curriculum is being introduced? In attempting to promote independence with regards to the curriculum and the financial running of these schools, a number of questions have been asked by academic commentators about these schools. The academics who have explored the consequences of the introduction of these schools in England include Clarke 2014; but also Ball 2010; Caldwell and Harris 2008; Glatter 2013; Greary and Scott 2014; Gunter 2011; Hatcher 2011; Machin and Salvanes 2010; Machin and Vernoit 2011; and McCrone, Southcott and George 2011. The ‘loose’ arrangement of the academy system appears to enable the possibility of the emergence of radical and even threatening curricula (Clarke 2014). As well as a risk of academy schools enabling religious extremism (Clarke 2014), academic researchers have commented on the shifting responsibilities that are made manifest within the academy schools (Gunter 2011). This reveals some of the challenges for us as when are working within the education sector in England. There are pressures on budgets, but some of the policy responses with regards to school education in England appear to have exacerbated the challenges that are being experienced.

In exemplifying this argument, the research that has been completed on academy schools in England outlines that this form of school does allow more autonomy and flexible governance, owing to the changed school structure (Ball 2010; Caldwell and Harris 2008; Glatter 2013; Greary and Scott 2014; Gunter 2011; Hatcher 2011; Machin and Salvanes 2010; Machin and Vernoit 2011; and McCrone, Southcott and George 2011). The gradual emergence of

academy schools in England since 2002 has, however proved controversial. Their autonomy enables them to have the potential to influence areas of the curriculum such as developing employability skills in young people (Machin and Veroit 2011). On the other side of the debate are the critics of the academy schools who outline that autonomy can exacerbate segregation in society (Ball 2010; Clarke 2014). Machin and Veroit (2011) reveal some of the educational consequences of the autonomy of the academy schools in England. It is argued that academy schools are able to ‘sharply increase the quality of their pupil intake’ because of this autonomy (Machin and Veroit 2011, 45). This is particularly pronounced in schools that converted to academy status in the early years following their introduction in England in 2002. The consequences for the schools that are not academies are not however, necessarily ‘obvious’. The presence of a new form of school can actually provide ‘significant beneficial effects’ for the schools that are not academies (Machin and Veroit 2011, 46). The argument runs that a new form of competitor school provides incentives for the schools that are not academies. This can lead to improvements in their educational performance. Machin and Veroit’s (2011) findings help to explain why academy schools in England have increased in number since their introduction in 2002. Their autonomy is perceived to be beneficial by some of the educational policymakers in England.

In a wider critique of the forces influencing education in England, Urban (2009) argues that there is an absence of educational philosophy across the sector. There is neither a Rudolf Steiner nor a Maria Montessori informing English educational contexts. Instead, a void is filled with initiatives that are based on political and socio-economic imperatives. The academy schools are one such example of an educational initiative that is influenced by political philosophy. This reveals some of the challenges existing within schools in England today and the financial pressures on schools that have been revealed in 2017 draw attention to

a sector of education that is in need of help and support. The research in this project is based on this principle of seeking to be helpful and developmental to schools in England.

Methodology

The research team undertook a mixed methods research approach, relying on a qualitative research approach through focus groups and interviews, alongside quantitative research utilised in the form of online and paper-based pilot surveys. Later work, undertaken by the software development team involved wireframe testing and user feedback, which further involved the original participants in the focus groups and interview process. The aim of the methodology was to support and facilitate engagement and response during a short-term project phase.

Participants

Schools that were previously contacted by 'SF Software', a computer company based in the north-east of England, were asked to participate voluntarily. Moreover, 108 students studying the MA in Education at Teesside University who are currently working as teachers were also asked to participate in this part of the project (total number of participants completing this part of the project by November 2017=157).

Design and distribution of the survey

The structure of the survey was based on the recent published survey by the Association of School and College leaders (ASCL) (ASCL School Leaders Survey, 2016) ¹ and the questions in the survey were based on the work of Coffield (2006) and Gibb (1993). The survey aimed to explore the four following themes in schools:

1. Are schools in England driven by results?
2. Is there an awareness of 'enterprise education'?
3. Is there a keen focus on pastoral development?
4. Is a hierarchical leadership structure 'the norm' in schools in England?

¹ https://www.ascl.org.uk//index.cfm?originalUrl=news-and-views/news_news-detail.survey-shows-school-budget-concerns-have-reached-crisis-levels.html

The survey can be found in Appendix A and the link to this survey was sent to approximately 800 schools. A total of 157 participants completed the survey by November 2017 (58 teachers; 50 teaching assistants; 21 school business managers; 8 headteachers; 4 assistant headteachers; 4 chair of governors; 4 directors of operations; 3 deputy headteachers; 2 school chief executive officers; 2 finance directors; and 1 vice principal).

Data analysis

All questions were analysed with descriptive statistics.

Focus Groups and Interviews

The qualitative research approach for this project was in the form of focus groups and, later, interviews. Both methods were applied in order to draw out insights around core themes of the research project: financial health in schools; schools' organisational culture and leadership; and notions of gamification and engagement with digital technology. The team designed and structured its approach using a hybridized research model that was underpinned by participatory approaches to draw out personal and professional perspectives through a group and individual sharing process (Baum et al. 2006; Hamari, Kovisto, and Sarsa, 2014; Kim et al. 2015). Insights that helped shape the questions and themes during the focus groups were also drawn from a preliminary group interview conducted in October 2016 (see Appendix B). Participatory techniques (Baum *et al.*, 2006) supported and enabled focus group participation and responsiveness during the research phase of this project and were undertaken during the later interviews as well. Participatory Action Research (PAR) is an umbrella term covering a variety of participatory approaches to action-oriented research. Rauch et al. (2014, 1) define PAR as 'researchers and participants working together to examine a problematic situation or action to change it for the better'. For decades, an advocacy for participatory approaches has been poised against the traditional hierarchy of relationships between the researched and researchers and research and action (Reason and

Bradbury-Huang, 2013). The emphasis is placed on the process being cyclical in nature. As Rauch et al. (2014, 1) argue: ‘researchers and participants identify an issue or situation in need of a change; they then initiate research that draws on capabilities and assets to precipitate relevant action. Both researchers and participants reflect on, and learn from, this action’. PAR has been used in professional settings to good effect, and as noted by Rauch et al. (2014, 8) ‘action research has been adopted across a range of professions as a means of enhancing professional development through reflection and research informed change’.

PAR is designed as an adaptable process, shaped around the dynamics of the group and research questions to be explained. As Rauch et al. (2014, 1) explain: ‘Together [the researchers and participants] develop context-specific methods to facilitate these cycles’. This approach works particularly well within notions of user engagement, gamification, and professional and personal view and values, where a key element is the social construction of knowledge. By engaging potential end users in developing insights into the research process, this achieves one of the primary goals of PAR: initiating and sustaining relationships that are sustained beyond the project design phase itself (Maiter et al. 2008). The research phase of the project will then rely on active engagement with participants during the interview and focus group and will use a combination of structured interviews and unstructured group discussions to generate feedback to be applied during the design phase and later validated and further explored during a subsequent focus group later in the research cycle. In the case of this project, the principles of PAR were designed to work ideally where the participants were guided and supported to generate insights (research), the designers then implement and consider design features based on this input (action), and the subsequent focus group activity allows for both reflection and further action (through the tool prototyping process); further action takes place through testing and providing feedback to designers (wire framing) following the next focus group.

Designing focus groups

The original scope of the project was to conduct a series of three focus groups with one cohort of school leaders (primarily school business managers) over the research lifecycle (between November 2016 and March 2017), with the suggestion that the first two focus groups would allow for an exploration of issues and testing of games-related ideas and the final focus group-type activity would likely consist of prototype testing and feedback facilitated over the telephone with software developers.

Once the project was launched, however, a decision was made early in the project cycle to expand the scope of the focus group work to include not only the perspectives of School Business Managers (SBMs) but to also seek out the perspective of headteachers. The rationale was that the adoption and championing of any financial efficiency digital platform could benefit from the input and backing from across school leadership, and from headteachers in particular. The plan was, with input from ASCL (Association of School and College Leaders) during the project launch meeting in August 2016, to engage and invite headteachers (HTs) to participate in a 'Heads only' focus group during the same month as the original focus group with SBMs. The decision was also taken to host the HT focus group in a location in the south of England (originally in Leicester, but later scheduled for Stevenage), whilst holding the original SBM meeting in the north (in Darlington, at Teesside University's The Forge facilities). This, it was proposed, would allow for a more diverse range of perspectives from as many types of roles, schools and colleges and demographic ranges as possible across the five-month research period range. Unfortunately, despite repeated efforts between October 2016 and February 2017, the focus group series for the headteachers did not occur.

Focus groups were designed to take place across the research phase of the project, namely in November 2016 and February 2017. For the SBM (school business managers) focus group,

there were seven participants from the Northwest, Northeast, and Midlands.² There were two (n.=2) male participants and five (n=.5) female participants. The participants' experience varied from a few years of work in the educational sector to decades of service. At least two participants mentioned having transitioned from work in other financially facing sectors into education, having come from accountancy and banking. We had participants from all levels of primary and secondary education represented. All of the participants came from either academy or local authority funded schools. For the second focus group, held in February 2017, the work aimed to continue exploring related themes with the same seven participants who were invited to attend, though unfortunately one (female) was unable to attend due to illness. This meant the group comprised of four (n.4) female participants and two (n.2) male participants.

The first focus group explored the following themes with a session-based structure. The first three sessions were a traditional focus group format, whilst the final one was an interactive, participant observation session:

- The **first session**: 'leadership and organisational culture'
- The **second session**: 'exploring financial health and its barriers'
- The **third session**: 'digital technologies and social media'
- The **final session was an interactive play session**: 'exploring perceptions of play and games'

During the second focus group, the structure was designed along similar lines to the first focus group, though it also included a hybrid presentation-focus group format (second session):

² During the second focus group, one SBM was unable to attend due to illness, so the total number of participants for SBM focus group 2 was six.

- The **first session:** ‘leadership and organisational culture revisited’
- The **second session:** a presentation, ‘envisioning the virtual learning environment platform’ followed by a short session to facilitate reaction
- The **third session:** ‘a response to the presentation’ and ‘digital technologies and social media’³
- The **fourth session was an interactive play session:** ‘further exploring collaborative play’
- The **fifth session:** was a discussion in response to the play and earlier sessions

Methods used

A standard focus group methodological approach was utilised during the first three focus group sessions. These sessions had a facilitator and scribe and all sessions were recorded. A participatory observant approach was applied for the final sessions, where facilitators and observers mingled and interacted with participants; the session also included a follow-up, recorded discussion with facilitators and observers to reflect on the session. All focus group sessions were recorded and later transcribed for coding purposes.

Analysis conducted

The focus group data was transcribed and initially coded according to areas primarily related to setting/context; defining the situation; respondent perspective; and approaches to people/objects. From this four major thematic areas have emerged: culture/organisational elements; technology/design features; financial health/perceptions; and gamification/social media insights or feedback. Participant observation techniques were used to document and reflect on play session activity.

³ This session was expanded to include four software staff.

Headteacher interviews

The original headteacher (HT) focus group was planned for mid-November 2016, but due to poor numbers and a last minute drop-outs of participants, the event was rescheduled for January 10, 2017. It was again postponed for similar reasons to February 1, 2017, though that third attempt (despite an initial contact sent to almost 20,000 schools and further direct calls from the research team to over 300 schools in the Stevenage area) was also cancelled due to last minute drop-outs by participants (due to pressing commitments in their own schools or colleges). As a result, it became clear that the HT focus group would not work in its originally proposed format and the decision was made to conduct a series of phone interviews with the HTs who had originally expressed an interest in attending.

It appeared that whilst a number of HTs (up to 9 at one point) were interested in supporting the research project, their school and leadership commitments made it hard to attend an entire day. They did appear far more available and willing to participate in 1-hour phone interviews, however.

The interview participants (n=6) are all school or school-facing leaders in a variety of roles: headteachers, a deputy headteacher (who is about to become a headteacher) and a director of operations at an 11-school Academies Trust. One is a recently retired (late 2016) headteacher. All the participants were males and they had at least 15 years of experience working within or alongside a school setting. All the participants noted that the school to which they were currently affiliated was not the first school within which they had worked or been affiliated with in a professional, teaching, or school leadership capacity. With the exception of one participant, all the participants began their work in schools as teachers and members of the academic staff. Four of the participants worked in schools or colleges located in the southern region of England, whilst the fifth worked in a setting located in the northwest of England, and the sixth worked in a school in the northeast of England.

Running parallel to the topics covered in the focus groups, the themes primarily explored were:

- Organisational culture and leadership qualities
- Financial health
- Digital technology and technological outlook
- Games, play and gamification

Methods used

Due to challenges in convening the focus group due to insufficient numbers, the decision was made to approach each HT to participate in 1-hour phone interviews. Six of the seven originally recruited participants agreed to undertake a phone interview. The interviews were designed to be exploratory in nature, with the participants being asked a series of general questions aimed at exploring key themes: organisational culture and leadership; financial health of their respective school or college; digital technology and social media; and gamification. Due to these being phone interviews there was no way to recreate the play session that took place during the SBM focus group, but a few select questions were raised to explore values, outlooks, and experiences relating to games and gamification.

Analysis conducted


The interview data was transcribed and coded according to areas primarily related to setting/context; defining the situation; respondent perspective; and approaches to people/objects. The emerging theses were consistent with the SBM focus group: culture/organisational elements; technology/design features; financial health/perceptions; and gamification/social media insights or feedback.


Key Findings

The research has identified the following key findings:


1. Primary and secondary statutory schools in England are overly driven by targets.
2. Primary and secondary statutory schools in England have anachronistic leadership structures.
3. An absence of 'enterprising education' results from an over-emphasis being placed on achieving results.
4. Tensions exist in the management arrangements in schools between head teachers and school business managers.
5. An ideal solution to managing budgets is investment coupled with the development of a collaborative virtual learning environment to help manage budgets across school settings.

The following bar-charts present a summary of the statistical data from the survey:






Enterprise education



Management structure



Concluding discussion

The findings reveal that within schools in England in 2017, there is an obsession with results and a lack of emphasis is being placed on ‘enterprising’ (or creative) education. School structures in an organisational sense are not regarded to be important in their own right, but instead, pastoral welfare is regarded as being a crucial remit of primary and secondary schools in England. The findings link to the work of the Scottish philosopher Robin Downie. In the work of Downie and Randall (1999), the argument is developed that the power of the medical profession has dominated understandings of education. Interest in ‘Asclepius’, the Greek god of healing has diminished and there is instead, an obsession with ‘Hippocrates’, the famous physician. Hippocrates is associated with the mantra that ‘treatment ‘A’ can cure illness ‘B’’. In contrast, Asclepius is associated with more complex processes of healing that are similar to what Schwandt (2005, cited in Urban 2009) refers to as ‘the messiness of human life’. This paradigm view, of ‘solving problems’ is centrally located within an obsession over the achievement of results. An emphasis is placed on data and measurement to the detriment of the real human factors that influence educational processes. This sounds similar to what can happen with professional development. As Kennedy (2005) argues, not all forms of professional development appear to be ‘transformative’. If ‘measurement’ dominates schools’ organisational cultures in Hippocratic ways, it is less likely that there will be an emphasis placed upon reflection, as this cannot be measured. Asclepius is associated with the gleaming eyes of serpents. There was a belief that the healing process was based on looking beyond yourself and into the eyes of what is external to the self. This belief is not based on numbers and quantifying. The philosophy is mysterious and vague as it is not exact. The recent Channel 4 programme ‘Educating Greater Manchester’ revealed the complexity of education and professional development. The educational experiences in this television programme could not be captured through numbers. The teachers appeared to be there for

their students and for each other. Like Asclepius, healing occurred through looking into the eyes of others and making a connection. There was no television evidence that ‘treatment A’ was ‘curing condition B’ in this educational context.

The research findings also link to the work of Bernstein (2000) and his interesting phrase that so many of our educational problems stem from ‘the dislocation between the trivium and the quadrivium’. Bernstein (2000) reflects on the tension that exists within education in the West and argues that the curriculum is a combination of Christian and Greek influences. The Trivium (rhetoric, grammar, logic) can appear to be at odds with the Quadrivium (arithmetic, astronomy, geometry and music). Bernstein (2000) argues that what is subjective and impressionistic may be associated with the Trivium and that the objective scientific world can be seen as a representation of the Quadrivium. In schools in England in 2017, the triumph of the Quadrivium is evident. There is a wish to measure and define that is based on successful examination results. Surely things can be done differently? Vermunt (2016) argues that we ought to use research findings in education in ways that are similar to the ‘black boxes’ of aeroplanes. The collection of ‘hidden conversations’ within research studies like this project reveal what is happening ‘as it is’ as opposed to what exists ‘after the fact’. I hope that the research in this project has an impact beyond a parochial level and within this international conference.

References

- Academy Today: <http://www.academytoday.co.uk>. Accessed 12th of April 2017.
- Ball, S. 2010. New class inequalities in education. Why education policy may be looking in the wrong place! Education policy, civil society and social class. " *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 30 (3-4), pp. 155-166.
- Baum, F., MacDougall, C., & Smith, D. 2006. Participatory action research. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 60 (10), 854–857.
- Bernstein, B., 2000. *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Caldwell, B.J. and J. Harris. 2008. *Why not the best schools?* Camberwell: Acer Press.
- Clarke, P. 2014. *Report into allegations concerning Birmingham schools arising from 'Trojan Horse' letter*. London: HMSO.
- Coffield, F. 2006. From the decade of enterprise culture to the decade of the TECs. *British Journal of Education and Work*, 4 (1), 59-78.
- Downie, R., and F. Randall. 1999. *Palliative care ethics: a companion for all specialities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibb, A. A. 1987. Enterprise culture- its meaning and implications for education and training. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 11 (2), 2-38.
- Glatter, R. 2012. Persistent preoccupations: The rise and rise of school accountability in England. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 40 (5), 559-575.
- Gunter, H. 2011. *Leadership and the reform of education*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Greary, T. and Scott. J. 2014. *Conflicts of interest in academy sponsorship arrangements. a report for the education select committee*. London: Institute of Education.
- Hamari, J., Koivisto, J. and Sarsa, H.(2014). 'Does gamification work?A literature review of empirical studies on gamification.' In: *2014 47th Hawaii international conference on system science*. [online] Waikoloa, Hawaii. Available at: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?arnumber=6758978>. Last accessed April 25, 2017.
- Hatcher, R. 2011. Local government against local democracy: a case study. In: Gunter, H. (ed.) *The state and education policy: the academy programme*, London: Bloomsbury, pp.39-52.
- Ingleby, E. 2015. The impact of changing policies about technology on the professional development needs of early years educators in England. *Professional Development in Education*, 41 (1), 144-158.
- Inside Government: <http://www.insidegovernment.co.uk>. Accessed 12th of April 2017.
- Kennedy, A., 2005. Models of cpd: a framework for analysis. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 31 (2), 235-250.
- Machin, S. and K. Salvanes. 2010. *Valuing school quality via school choice reform*. London: Centre for the Economics of Education.
- Machin, S. and J. Veroit. 2011. *Changing school autonomy: academy schools and their introduction to England's education*. London: Centre For The Economics of Education.
- Maiter, S., Simich, L., Jacobson, N., and Wise, J. 2008. Reciprocity: An ethic for community-based participatory action research, *Action Research*, vol. 6 (3): 305-325.
- McCrone, T., C. Southcott, N. George. 2011. *Governance models in schools: local government education and children's services*. Slough: NFER.
- National Audit Office: <http://www.nao.org.uk>. Accessed 12th of April 2017.
- Rauch, F., Schuster, A, and Stern, T, eds. 2014. *Promoting change through action research*.
- Reason, P. and Bradbury-Huang, H. 2013. *The sage handbook of action research: participative inquiry and practice*. London: SAGE.
- Rotterdam, NLD: Sense Publishers, 2014. ProQuest ebrary. Web. Last accessed April 25, 2017.
- Selwyn, N. 2011. The place of technology in the Conservative-Liberal Democrat education agenda: an ambition of absence?. *Educational Review*, 63 (4), 395-408.
- Tes Global Limited: <http://www.tes.com>. Accessed 12th of April 2017.
- Urban, M., 2009. Strategies for change: rethinking professional development to meet the challenges of diversity in the early years profession. In: *IPDA conference*. [online]

Birmingham, UK. Available at: http://ipda.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Strategies-for-change_MathiasUrban.pdf. Last accessed April 25, 2017.

Vermunt, J.D., 2016. Keynote address. Paper presented at the IPDA conference, 25-26 November, Stirling, UK.

The Association of School and College Leaders: <http://www.ascl.org.uk>. Accessed 12th of April 2017.

Appendix A: Survey

Which of the following statements do you ‘strongly agree with’, ‘agree with’, ‘neither agree nor disagree with’, ‘disagree with’, or ‘strongly disagree with’? Please tick your preference in relation to your school’s priority areas below.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree/disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
A key priority in the school is its strong pastoral focus and an emphasis is placed on meeting the needs of the students and other individuals who are associated with the school.					
A key priority in the school is its emphasis on ‘enterprise education’- in other words, the school encourages ‘different and not just conventional thinking’ (Guildford 1967; Raven 1985).					
A key priority in the school is a continual emphasis on examination and assessment results.					
A key priority in the school is to maintain a hierarchical organisation and management structure.					
The financial health of the school is good.					

Question 2:

Please rank the importance of the following to your school in numerical order (with 1 as 'most important' through to 4 as 'least important', using each number only once).

	Rank
Successful examination/assessment results	
The pastoral welfare of everyone associated with the school	
The importance of enterprise education	
The school's management structure	

Question 3:

Please state whether the following statements apply to your school.

	Yes	No
Does a strong pastoral focus make a positive contribution to your school's organisational culture?		
Does enterprise education make a positive contribution to your school's organisational culture?		
Does a continual emphasis on examination/assessment results make a positive contribution to your school's organisational culture?		
Does a hierarchical organisation and management structure make a positive contribution to your school's organisational culture?		

Appendix B: Focus Group

Session 1: Organisational culture

Introduction

1. Tell us a bit about your school—what is it like?
2. How would you describe its culture and leadership style?

Exploration

3. What do you think has particularly contributed to this culture and leadership style?
4. How do you feel about its culture?
5. How do you feel about the leadership style?
6. Do you think there are any aspects to the culture and leadership that make doing some things easier/better? If so, what are they?
7. Do you think there are any that make it harder to get some things done? If so, what are they?

Conclusion

8. If there anything you would like to share about your thoughts on culture and leadership?

Session 2: Financial health and barriers

Introduction

1. How would you describe the financial health of your school?

Exploration

2. Please share examples of any innovative approaches to improving your financial health undertaken by your school.
3. Does your school use any digital financial management tools? If so, what are they?
4. Do you and your colleagues find it easy or challenging to deal with the budget/financial matters at your school? Why do you think that is?
5. Can you identify any barriers to adopting new techniques that might help you improve your financial health, such as bake sales, sponsorships, fundraisers, crowdfunding?
Where do you think that is coming from?

Conclusion

6. Are there any other thoughts you would like to share on financial health?