



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Inspecting school social quality

Assessing and improving school effectiveness in the social domain

Dijkstra, A.B.; Daas, R.; de la Motte, P.I.; Ehren, M.

DOI

[10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v16-i4-1640](https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v16-i4-1640)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Journal of Social Science Education

License

CC BY-SA

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dijkstra, A. B., Daas, R., de la Motte, P. I., & Ehren, M. (2017). Inspecting school social quality: Assessing and improving school effectiveness in the social domain. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 16(4), 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v16-i4-1640>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Anne Bert Dijkstra, Remmert Daas, Per Ingvar De la Motte, Melanie Ehren

Inspecting School Social Quality: Assessing and Improving School Effectiveness in the Social Domain

- School inspections can take different approaches to evaluating school social quality.
- This paper discusses three distinct models of approach: a process model, a school improvement model and an output model.
- Each of the models serves different mechanisms for effective school inspection.
- The paper presents a school effectiveness model of social outcomes of schools.

Purpose: School inspection of school social quality is, in contrast to inspection in the cognitive domain, still in its early phase of development. While schools are shown to affect social outcomes, the interplay of mechanisms makes it difficult to isolate the effect of the school. This paper aims to evaluate different approaches to inspecting school social quality.

Methodology: Based on a school effectiveness model, we consider what aspects could be taken into consideration to evaluate school social quality.

Findings and implications: Using insights from inspection of cognitive outcomes, we present three ideal-type models of inspection, focusing on outcomes, school improvement, or process. There is as of yet no clear best approach to inspecting school social quality, as inspection of school quality can influence school performance in a range of ways. Implications of the described models and possible strengths and weaknesses are discussed.

Keywords:

School inspection, social outcomes, school quality, school effectiveness, quality assurance

1 Introduction

Ideas about the role of government in educational quality assurance (i.e. school inspections) mainly appear to involve the qualification function. For a long time, the extent to which education succeeds in realizing its socialization function was underplayed in many countries. In recent years attention has increasingly shifted

towards the 'social outcomes of education'. In comparison to research into the effectiveness of schools in promoting academic achievement, which has a long robust tradition (cf. Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008; Hattie, 2009; Townsend, 2007), research into school effectiveness and social outcomes is in its childhood. Correspondingly, most current school effectiveness research focuses on teaching and learning in relation to academic achievement. We still know little about what the focus of evaluation and assessment of school effectiveness should be in relation to social outcomes of education. Does the knowledge we have about educational supervision and school improvement (Ehren, 2016) in the area of academic achievement also apply to the social domain, or does effective assessment of social quality require a different approach?

At the same time, the increasing focus on social outcomes of education means national inspectorates of education are faced with the challenge how to incorporate these outcomes in their assessment of educational quality. In other words: is it possible to measure the outcomes in this domain in relation to the quality of schools? And can school inspectors assess the effectiveness of schools' efforts in this area? A number of inspectorates has already included (aspects of) social outcomes in their assessment schemes (cf. Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014). This paper aims to conceptualize different methods of evaluation of social quality in education, and offers an overview of different models for inspecting social outcomes of schools.

We use the term 'social outcomes' to refer to various benefits of education in the social and (in particular) societal spheres of life. At the individual level, social

Anne Bert Dijkstra is Program Director of the Education and Social Cohesion Program at the Inspectorate of Education in the Netherlands, and professor of Supervision and effects of Socialization in Education at the University of Amsterdam. His academic research focuses on school effectiveness and social outcomes of education.

Email: a.b.dijkstra@uva.nl.

Remmert Daas is PhD Candidate at the Department of Child Development and Education at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands. His research focuses on the development of citizenship competences and assessment of social outcomes of education.

Email: r.j.m.daas@uva.nl.

Per Ingvar de la Motte is former Director of Education at the Swedish Schools Inspectorate.

Email: peringvar.delamotte@gmail.com.

Melanie Ehren is Head of the research center for Educational Evaluation and Accountability, and Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Policy and Society, Institute of Education, University College London. Her research focuses on standards-based school reform, accountability systems and effects of school inspections on school improvement.

Email: m.ehren@ucl.ac.uk.



outcomes of education are considered in this study to consist of the social and civic competences that students develop. We define social quality as those aspects of school quality that are primarily relevant to promoting such competences. These include aspects of teaching and learning, pedagogical characteristics, the school climate and the characteristics of the school as a social community. This study addresses school inspections and social outcomes of education and aims to contribute to answering two questions: *Is it possible to measure school effectiveness in the area of social outcomes?* And *How can inspections strengthen school improvement in this area?*

2 Social outcomes of education

Almost two decades ago, the OECD (2001) published *The Well-being of Nations*, a study whose core message was that education is not only of great economic significance but also contributes to the well-being of countries and governments should focus not only on the production of human capital but also on social capital. The study marked a trend which had begun earlier as a result of developments like uneasiness about the erosion of social cohesion and the ensuing attention being paid to the issue by policy makers, and growing scientific interest in the concept of social capital. Social cohesion and social capital are closely related. Social cohesion refers to the extent to which social structures affect people's behaviors and the extent to which behaviors and attitudes contribute to the perpetuation of social structures, norms and trust (Dijkstra & Peschar, 2003). Social capital is defined as 'networks together with shared norms, values and understanding that facilitate co-operation within or among groups' (OECD, 2001), which means that social capital is highly dependent on social cohesion and vice versa. Social capital facilitates collective action and contributes to the functioning of democratic institutions, and participation in institutions of civil society is related to a higher degree of social trust and involvement in public issues (cf. Putnam, 1993).

The importance of promoting social cohesion and the role of education in this respect is acknowledged and stimulated by many parties. The OECD (2001) underlines the importance of social cohesion and an interest in the development of 'key competences for a successful life and a well-functioning society' (Rychen & Salganik, 2003). Inspired by concerns about civic involvement, increasing intolerance and other developments, in 2002 the Council of Europe acknowledged the importance of 'Education for Democratic Citizenship' and activities aimed at stimulating it, such as the formulation of competences to be pursued by education. Many countries have included citizenship education in their (formal or informal) curricula (Eurydice, 2005, 2017). Within the scope of the Lisbon ambitions, in 2000 the European Union not only formulated goals for strengthening a knowledge-based economy but also for strengthening social cohesion and promoting active citizenship. This initiative built on earlier action programmes to strengthen learning for active citizenship (cf. European

Commission, 1998). In 2006, the EU included interpersonal, intercultural, social, civic and other competences in its framework of key competences (cf. Gordon et al., 2009; Halász & Michel, 2011).

Large scale studies of civic outcomes of education have shown differences between countries and school in students' civic competences (e.g. Schulz et al., 2010, 2017). The 1999 Civic Education (CIVED) study, for instance, showed educational practices to play an important role in preparing students for citizenship in 28 countries (Torney-Purta et al., 2001), as did the latest International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (Schulz et al., 2017) in illustrating the importance of school factors, like an open school climate. These studies also showed differences between countries in the relative contribution made by schools, suggesting differences in educational practice, management and policy. Based on analysis of the 2009 International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS), Isac et al. (2011) showed student citizenship outcomes are influenced by factors at country, school and student level and concluded that a school effectiveness model of citizenship education should take a multitude of factors into account.

3 School effectiveness and social outcomes

To answer whether school effectiveness in social outcomes can be assessed, we start from a general model of school effectiveness. Models of school effectiveness typically consider four components: input, process, output and context. These include levels of school organization and management, teacher and/or classroom level and the level of individual student performance and background (cf. Scheerens & Creemers, 1989). The model presented in Figure 1 offers a global conceptual framework, indicating the main school factors related to the social outcomes of education (Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014). As a result of the modest empirical status of the knowledge about effective schooling in the social domain, the model—based on assumptions taken from general effective school models and comparable to citizenship models suggested before (cf. Maslowski et al., 2009; Scheerens, 2011; Isac et al., 2013)—should primarily be understood as a heuristic device.

In light of this conceptualization, we define *output* as social outcomes of education; i.e. its individual and collective benefits for interpersonal interaction in the social and societal spheres of life. This concerns direct outcomes in the form of competences acquired through education and indirect outcomes produced by the effect on other domains of life (Dijkstra, 2012). Outcomes are a primary indication of school quality in the social domain. The underlying philosophy is that, in the end, education is not only about the processes taking place, but also whether teaching and learning lead to the results pursued: students achieving the intended learning objectives in the form of acquired knowledge, attitudes and skills. From this perspective, the quality of education is made visible by the educational outcomes. Depending on one's vision of the contribution that is expected of education, conditions may be imposed, for example the possibility



of distinguishing the contribution of the school from the influence of other factors. Schools are part of the social context in which students develop, and it might not be realistic to expect education to solve social problems. Although schools are undoubtedly confronted with both the resources and constraints in the socioeconomic and socio-cultural context of the student population, and are expected to contribute to student development also—or even: especially—in the face of disadvantages and risks, their capability to do so is not without limitations. Because of the significance of the successful acquisition of knowledge, attitudes and skills, the outcomes of the process of learning are nevertheless a primary indication of the school’s quality in the social domain.

Various indicators can be used to measure schools’ social outcomes. Social and citizenship outcomes at the individual level can be assessed by measuring students’ competences, or components like knowledge, skills or attitudes, and aggregated to the school level these measures indicate the school’s quality and room for improvement. To a certain extent, students’ behavior both inside and outside of schools can also be an outcome of school efforts. Although not offering a direct measure of competences, behavioral intentions (such as intentions to vote) can also be regarded as social outcomes (cf. Schulz et al., 2008).




Figure 1: School effectiveness model of social outcomes (Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014, p.46)

School quality is not only assessed on the basis of outcomes. The factors *input* and *process*, like the quality of the curriculum or the teaching and learning process are also relevant to the school’s social quality. School and classroom climate (including social safety) and the pedagogical quality of the school (including aspects like school ethos) are not only in themselves goals to be pursued, but also beneficial to the school’s social outcomes (cf. Geboers et al., 2013). This is also true for the quality of the curriculum content – for example in the form of subject matter introducing the students to aspects of history, heritage, identity and culture. Both high-quality processes and provision have an additional value because they contribute to better student performance.

To realize the social goals of education, the educational *context* can have both beneficial and inhibiting effects. As indicated before, the composition of the student population is a relevant factor to take into account. Correspondence between the home environment and the school also play a role, most notably where the school’s goals in the social domain are not supported by the parents or the community around the school.

Although the above is not meant to offer an exhaustive overview of factors explaining differences in social quality of schools (e.g. Dijkstra et al., 2015; Geboers et

al., 2013; Isac et al., 2013) and our understanding of school effectiveness in the social domain is still limited, it does give an impression of the factors to be taken into account in the assessment of the effectiveness of schools in this respect. Effective teaching becomes possible particularly where there is a fit between the goals the school is pursuing in the social and civic domain and the resources available to achieve these goals. Empirical knowledge about the influence of aspects of quality on the acquisition of social competences is still scarce, which means that, for the time being, models of school effectiveness and inspections will mainly be based on a more general understanding of school quality and school improvement.

Having thusfar argued that assessing school effectiveness in the social domain should include context, input, process and output factors, we now turn to the question of how school inspections can contribute to accountability and improvement in the social domain. Since the research linking school inspection to the social outcomes of schools is scarce (cf. Ehren, 2016; Scheerens, 2005) we can also make deductions from the results of research of school inspections in the cognitive domain (for overviews: Ehren, 2016; Klerks, 2013; Nelson & Ehren, 2014; OECD, 2013). We build on knowledge available about the mechanisms operating in the inspection of the core

curriculum and the impact of inspections on school improvement and cognitive student outcomes to outline the assumptions of effective inspections in the social domain. School inspection is effective when it evaluates the quality of education in the social domain and facilitates schools to improve the characteristics of effective teaching that are conditional to students' mastery of social competences (e.g. through inspection feedback, publication of results, standard setting, support and sanctions), when it informs parents and the public about the school's quality, and when it is relevant for accountability (cf. Ehren, 2016; Karsten et al., 2010).

Little is known about the factors that make schools effective in the social domain (cf. Dijkstra, 2012). Although a general sketch can be given of the factors that may be assumed to have a bearing on educational quality in the social domain, empirical knowledge of the effects of these factors and their interplay is limited (f e.g. Geboers et al., 2013; Schuitema, Ten Dam & Veugelers, 2008; Solomon, Watson & Battisch, 2012). Not only is this knowledge required for a useful cost-benefit analysis (to what extent is a substantial contribution of school inspections to expect?) but also to identify areas where successful intervention is possible. From the perspective of efficiency it is worthwhile to have school inspections focus on the factors where schools can make a contribution, for example objectives that are susceptible to influence through education and outcomes that contribute to collective social benefits in the long term.

School inspections in the cognitive domain have an impact on the improvement of schools, schools' self-evaluations and ultimately student outcomes in maths and literacy through the feedback during inspection visits and in inspection reports, the setting of expectations through standards and the publication of inspection results and actions of stakeholders, and consequences of school inspections (cf. Ehren, 2016; Klerks, 2013). So far, inspections in the social domain have a different setup. Standardized tests to measure student achievement are widespread in the cognitive domain, but in the assessment of school quality, instruments for measuring social competences play a modest role (cf. Daas et al., 2016). Maths and literacy are often the core focus of teaching and learning in schools, and over the last decades social quality and social competences of students have recurrently been mentioned as deserving more attention (cf. Scheerens, 2011; Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014).

The lack of knowledge about what constitutes good social quality of schools and how it contributes to the social competences of students means that little is known about the relative importance of the various indicators in the effectiveness model. The need for a better understanding of impact, validity and reliability of these indicators also means that school inspections thus far primarily focus on evaluation in the form of elucidation, performance feedback and benchmarking, and adopt a modest approach to high-stakes incentives. On the other hand, particularly because there is little available knowledge, school inspections may render important contributions in the form of systematic assess-

ments of teaching and learning and the information this provides about effective methods of teaching. Comparative knowledge of different school practices through the exchange of knowledge and identification of good practices can play an important role in this respect.

If we assume that effective supervision in the social domain should fulfill one or more of the accountability, school improvement and consumer information functions (cf. Karsten et al., 2010), the above allows us to infer the building blocks for the organization of school inspections of social quality that are listed below. To do so, we formulate assumptions about the intended state of the subject (i.e. the desired situation), what should be done to achieve that situation, through which processes will outcomes be affected and under which conditions are these processes expected to operate (cf. Donaldson, 2007). Because a detailed account of a program theory falls outside the scope of this contribution (cf. Ehren, 2016), the discussion is limited to a brief sketch of the main elements (for examples of detailed accounts of school inspection in the social domain see Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014).

Accountability. Accountability concerns providing an insight into the extent to which the intended goal (and the level of effectiveness) is achieved. Although there may be differences due to the nature of the goal, the desired situation contains information about the provision, process and/or results of teaching. The outcome could for example be the scores on a standardized social skills test. Collection of such data requires objective measurement methods and criteria for school-independent assessment. Essentially, accountability in the social domain focuses on an understanding of the results of education in the form of social and civic competences of students. Depending on the goal, it may also encompass the quality of the educational process (including pedagogical behavior and school climate) and curriculum content.

School improvement. School inspections for school improvement aim to provide information for improving the quality of teaching in such a way that the school is able and willing to undertake the activities required. The school's willingness to take action may be based on internal incentives (e.g. the belief that improvement is necessary and feasible) and/or external incentives (e.g. receiving support for school development or avoiding damage to the school's reputation). When internal incentives predominate, it is important that supervision contributes to convincing teachers and school managers that the school's social quality can be improved and helps them understand how. This requires information-rich evaluations providing insights into the processes of teaching and learning. It is also necessary that the school recognizes itself in the information and feedback and buys in to the inspection findings.

Consumer information. Supervision aimed at informing parents about quality in the social domain should primarily provide data about the extent to which the teaching fits their expectations and goals. Parents, for example, will be interested in the school's social climate,

the social, societal, religious and/or moral goals pursued by the school and the way in which it achieves these goals. The provision of school indicators can influence parents' school choice (cf. Waslander, Pater & Van der Weide, 2010). Pedagogic quality and school climate are thus important elements in consumer information.

Although the weights attached to these goals through inspections might differ across national contexts, in practice the functions of school improvement, consumer information and accountability will often be combined. Effective supervision in the social domain will then include:

- A coherent system of standards: clear standards that give a good insight into the goals to be pursued and the various components of social quality;
- Outcome indicators: knowledge of the students' social and civic competences as an indicator of educational outcomes, with a view to accountability and providing incentives for quality improvement;
- Insight into curriculum content and teaching process: knowledge of the quality of teaching and learning, particularly as a means to provide an insight into options for educational improvement;
- Ownership of the school: involvement of school management and teachers in the quality assessment in such a way that they can own the results and are willing and able to work with them;
- Insight into pedagogical quality and school climate: knowledge that parents can understand and is relevant to their situation, so that they can make choices that best fit the developmental needs and characteristics of their children.

Depending on the weights of these components, the combination of i) standards directing the efforts made by schools; ii) information required for educational improvement; iii) incentives for school improvement (including, for example, public information about the quality of schools) and; iv) dissemination of the results, provides the mechanisms that lead to quality and stimulate school improvement.

Because it makes the social quality and the results of the school in this domain more visible, supervision not only provides more knowledge about options for quality improvement but is also expected to make it more relevant, acknowledging the—usually unintended—one side emphasis on academic achievement effects and broadening the scope of school inspections (cf. De Wolf & Janssens, 2007). Because social quality becomes a more prominent element of the school's public profile, reputation effects are likely to occur that will stimulate schools to improve their quality. As the meaning attached to social quality increases, so will its visibility and status, and this will have a positive effect on the allocation of resources within the school.

4 Towards models of school inspections in the social domain

The foregoing shows that inspection of school social quality can serve a number of functions, and can focus on a range of aspects of teaching and learning. When we

look beyond this variety and pay attention to the key components in various assessment systems, three models can be distinguished, based on Dijkstra and De la Motte (2014). These should be understood as 'ideal-type models' based on variation in central characteristics of the focus of school inspections (what is the subject of assessment and what criteria are applied?) and the purpose of inspection (what does assessment aim to achieve?), in order to analyze the different mechanisms and features of systems of school inspection when it comes to social quality. The ideal-type models should primarily be understood as heuristic devices, and comprise a *process model*, a *school improvement model* and an *output model*.

The *process model* emphasizes (assessing) the quality of teaching and learning, covering aspects like curriculum content, the ways in which teaching and learning takes place and relevant constraints. The principle underlying the process model is that the way in which teaching and learning occurs should be central to the assessment of school effectiveness. This notion may be based on the idea that alternative approaches are less suitable or lacking, or that the quality of the teaching processes within schools is a better indicator of quality than indicators of student performance. From this perspective, school climate is central to the process of teaching social outcomes, and play an important part in assessing schools' social quality. The main quality aspects in this approach are the quality of educational content (including the extent to which the curriculum meets national requirements as formulated in education legislation), the quality of its design (such as the inclusion of clear learning objectives, the included subjects and the educational program over the years), the classroom and school climate and the quality of the social context in which teaching and learning take place. Although attention to outcomes is not necessarily absent, student results primarily play a role as a point of reference for structuring and adjusting curriculum content and level. Examples include measuring how satisfied students, parents and other stakeholders are with the results of teaching and learning, measuring student well-being, or using such measures for risk assessment, for instance as indications of poor school climate.

The process model presupposes standards on the basis of which the quality of teaching and learning can be assessed. These standards can be based on national legislation if the requirements stipulated are sufficiently specific to determine content and quality. If standards are based on learning objectives set by the school, the emphasis will be on the quality of the process, that is, on the question whether the school indeed teaches the content it claims to offer. In this context, it is less important whether this complies with external expectations and or with what is seen as desirable from a broad societal perspective. Another interpretation of the process approach focuses on the quality of the school as a social community and places emphasis on school climate, student well-being and the pedagogical quality of the teachers. In this case standards are primarily



determined by the satisfaction of those involved, including the external stakeholders. This means that contextual factors—for example student background characteristics and school diversity—play an important role in assessing whether the school’s educational quality is satisfactory.

Assessment of educational quality based on the quality of aspects of educational process generally requires more intensive data collection—e.g. school and classroom observations, interviews and document analysis—due to the scope of the areas to be included and limited possibilities for deriving valid generalizations from a limited number of observations.

The *school improvement model* focuses on the contribution school inspections can make to school quality. Taking the school improvement model as the starting point focuses school inspection on the areas where improvement can be achieved and promotes school ownership of the improvement process.

Apart from provision and process factors (e.g. the quality of teaching and learning), the conditions for school improvement also play a substantial role in the school improvement model. These concern the school’s capacity for improvement, which includes an understanding of its situation, the ability to perform self-evaluations, sufficiently developed quality assurance processes and the managerial skills of school management and school authority. The importance of school ownership may consist of involvement of teachers and management in data collection and data analysis, understanding of the situation and background of the assessments and acceptance of these assessments. The school improvement model will usually focus on the development of teaching and the quality of processes and – provided minimum output requirements are met – use performance information to guide the process of school development instead of regarding it as an outcome of the school inspection.

Organizing school inspections so that they promote school improvement also affects the organization of inspections. Usually, this will mean that forms of self-evaluation will take a prominent place within the inspections. This may concern collecting and analyzing information about the school on the basis of external standards and assessments based on evaluations performed by the school or peers with the help of external standards but also the setting of standards by the school and evaluations based on these standards. In the latter variant, the role of the inspectorate changes towards validating the school’s assessments and taking a more active role in the event of risks, incidents and situations in which self-evaluation is insufficient.

The setting of standards plays a less important role in the school improvement model. The impact of external standards is less great due to the importance of school ownership and the relevance attached to the school using methods for promoting involvement in and understanding of its own situation. It is likely that there will be variation in the way in which assessments are made because schools can collect and interpret their

own data. This is not just an incidental effect but an intentional goal and will become even more prominent in situations where the school also formulates its own standards. The school’s autonomy decreases the normative effect of school inspections since it presupposes a reduction of external control. A possible limitation is the reduced comparability of the outcomes of inspection. As opportunities for performing school specific assessment increase, variations in the way in which these assessments are made will also increase. This variation however, also increases the chance that ‘real’ differences between schools will not be identified. The limitations caused by the loss of standards at the supra-school level (as is also the case in the process model) – less impact due to a reduced role of the normative effect of school inspections and reduced identification of differences between schools – may thus play a role in this model too.

The broad scope of the school improvement model, which can involve input, process, and outcome factors as well as the schools’ quality assurance, presupposes relatively intensive forms of inspection that may include document analysis, interviews, observations and verification of the school’s self-evaluations, depending on the weight given to self-evaluation and its validation in the inspection process.

The school improvement model offers opportunities for accepting the outcomes of quality assessment by the school, and the motivation to work towards school improvement based on these outcomes. Another advantage is the validity of assessments: because external norms and their application in the specific situation of the school play a less important role, the assessments will usually fit the school’s situation. Where the school improvement model leads to schools formulating meaningful standards, it will also be less hampered by a limitation of the other two models, namely the scarcity of clear external standards in the social domains of education. For similar reasons, the school improvement model could be an effective tool for improving educational quality.

The *output model* assesses the social quality of schools primarily on what the students have learned. The underlying principle is that what primarily matters is students successfully acquiring social and civic competences. Several outcomes have already been mentioned: through assessment of students’ competences; through evaluating well-being and school safety indicators; and by assessing student behavior or intentions.

Measurements of student satisfaction and well-being can be regarded as indicators of both process or outcomes. In practice, however, these measurements are mostly limited to determining risks or problems in the social environment rather than assessing the average social skills of students. Using measurements of social competences or measurements of social safety has the advantage – especially when compared to the other models – that relatively little effort is needed to gather the necessary information. Another advantage is that it is relatively easy to apply standards based on a clear



reference point (e.g. national benchmarks). A limiting factor is the interpretation of the data, especially if the findings are used to assess the effectiveness of the school. Such assessment assumes that the influence of the school can be distinguished from other factors affecting social competences of students, such as family and peer effects. Although approaches that measure the school's 'added value' might not be feasible in the short run, there are several options for assessments based on test results. Benchmark approaches comparing the results of a school to those of other schools in similar situations, or comparing results of the same school over time can be used for this purpose.

School inspections based on an output approach offer opportunities for addressing the social quality of schools through monitoring, in which outcomes are used as indicators of possible deficiencies in the quality of the school (a signal that improvement is required) and on the basis of which further assessment can be carried out. This approach offers opportunities for systemic assessment of educational quality aimed at understanding potential weaknesses and strengths of schools or educational systems. A limitation of the output approach is whether it provides detailed information about school processes that are relevant and useable for school improvement.

Throughout each of the three models described above, inspections can employ a range of strategies and mechanisms to influence schools. Table 1 compares the main features of the three inspection models in relation to the appropriate mechanisms (Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014), which we will briefly explain below.

Setting clear standards & acceptance of findings. One of the mechanisms leading to inspections contributing to higher quality is the formulation of standards that provide schools with guidelines for the organization of teaching and learning. Output-oriented models in particular have this characteristic because of the usually specific (often quantitative) nature of output measures. This also applies to the process model, although to a lesser extent because of the more general nature of teaching quality indicators. The process and output models also provide for clear standards. Examples are quantitative criteria (e.g. the percentage of students with higher than average scores on a nation-wide citizenship knowledge test) and the degree to which the curriculum realizes statutory requirements about content. Because the school improvement model doesn't make much assumptions about these points, this model provides fewer guidelines in the form of external standards. This means that standards (as chosen by the school) might be more relevant to the school, but also that there is less opportunity for central control than in the output model, and less insight into the results and functioning of the school system.

Focus on learning & focus on results. There are clear differences between the models in terms of the weight given to provision and process factors and results as the principles underlying school inspections. Provision and process are central to the school improvement and pro-

cess models. Results play a limited role in the process model, play a limited role in the output model, and the school improvement model assumes the middle ground. Because of the great variation in classroom practices that may be used to realize the social goals of education, the school improvement and the process models are best suited to accommodate variations in types of teaching and learning. The output model allows for a more systemic evaluation of students' learning outcomes.

Self-evaluation, sense of ownership & guidelines for improvement. Involvement of the school (e.g. in the weight attached to self-evaluation and the relevance of school ownership) plays an important role in the school improvement model. Inspections focusing on these aspects provide opportunities for building on the context, vision and culture of the school. In the externally oriented output model, elements such as self-evaluation and ownership play a secondary role. Process-oriented inspections assume the middle position in this respect too: although the inspection process (most of which takes place in the school) stimulates the school's involvement, the assessment is based on external, school-independent standards. Since process indicators can provide more tangible support for schools than outcome indicators, these can be considered more susceptible for self-evaluation or improvement.

Administrative burden on schools, inspectorate activities & risk assessment. The place of provision and process factors within school inspections also have an impact on the resources required of the schools and the inspectorate to implement assessments. As teaching and learning assume a more central position within the assessment, relatively labor-intensive instruments such as lesson observations, interviews and document analysis are used more often. This applies most to the school improvement model (in which schools are given opportunity for collecting and analyzing data and thus makes less use of standardized assessment methods) and – albeit to a lesser extent – to the process model (in which external standards allow for more standardized assessment methods). Due to the more standardized nature of the data required in output model, this also means that risk-targeted supervision is particularly feasible here because the data offer a more standardized assessment over schools.

Consequences & focus on compliance. As external standards become more important and more specified, it becomes easier to impose consequences on schools for insufficient quality. As standards become clearer, it becomes easier to assess whether a school conforms to the standard and there will be less reason to dispute the assessment, which will strengthen the acceptance of findings and implications (especially regarding negative evaluations or even sanctions). Clearer standards, as assumed in the output model for example, will increase the likelihood of inspections leading to (positive or negative) implications as a driver for change. Where a process model is more directed at the teaching approach, and therefore compliance, the output model focuses more on



outcomes allowing for corresponding incentives or consequences.

Table 1: Ideal-type assessment models of school effectiveness in the social domain (Dijkstra & De la Motte, 2014, p.185)

	<i>school improvement model</i>	<i>process model</i>	<i>output model</i>
standard setting	.	□	▪
clear standards	.	□	▪
acceptance of findings by schools	▪	□	.
focus on compliance	.	▪	□
consequences for schools	.	□	▪
focus on learning	▪	▪	.
focus on results	□	.	▪
self-evaluation by schools	▪	□	.
sense of school ownership	▪	.	.
guidelines for improvement	▪	□	.
administrative burden on schools	▪	□	.
intensity of inspectorate activities			
– interviews with stakeholders in/around the school	▪	□	.
– school and classroom observations	▪	□	.
– document analysis	▪	□	.
– achievement tests and student questionnaires	.	□	▪
– desk analysis	▪	▪	□
suitable for risk-assessment	.	.	▪

Characteristic of assessment model: ▪ major □ partial ◌ minor / none

5 Conclusion

The models presented allow for a more detailed answer to the central questions of this study: *Is it possible to measure school effectiveness in the area of socialization, social competences and citizenship education?* and *How can school inspections strengthen school improvement in this area?* The preceding discussion shows that several answers may be given and that several approaches to school inspection can be distinguished on the basis of the position taken in these two dimensions. Thus, there are various answers to the question how inspections can be organized in the social domain – and various results to be expected – depending on the priorities chosen. These answers may be summarized by using the three models described above; once again, we should stress that these are ideal-typical models that offer an insight into possible approaches. In the actual practice, combinations – with different weights given to the various elements – will usually be found.

- *Output model.* In this approach to inspection, output in the social domain is the central issue. The focus is on assessing quality as reflected in the extent to which education realizes its intended goals. As Table 1 shows, this approach is characterized by a primarily external orientation: the impact

of inspections mainly results from setting clear quality standards combined with a focus on the results of education and external improvement incentives. Characteristics of this approach are a relatively extensive inspection practice placing only a minor burden on the school, a central role for result indicators and limited attention for the teaching program and process as long as the school meets output standards. The external orientation of this model implies a relatively restricted ownership of the evaluation process by the school, which has to conform to external standards. The assessments do not necessarily indicate how improvement may be realized. The result can be pictured as a report card rather than a roadmap.

- *School improvement model.* In many respects, the school improvement model offers the opposite perspective. It focuses on a school-oriented approach to social quality. The ideas and practices of the school are an important starting point for determining both goals and standards and the way in which the quality of education is assessed. The effects of supervision are not so much achieved by external setting of standards and attention for their realization but by focusing on the process of education. In this approach, the primary mechanism is a dialogue about the quality of teaching and learning. The orientation on the school's internal processes broadens the support base for the inspection results and increases the motivation for school improvement. The school improvement model presupposes a relatively intensive effort made by the school and the inspection. Because unambiguous standards are lacking in this model, it provides only a limited insight into what results are achieved at school and school system level.

- *Process model.* A process-oriented approach to social quality is also mainly external in orientation but focuses more on the quality of teaching and learning than on results. Although external standard setting is again the primary mechanism underlying the inspections, its effect is less strong because of the variety of educational practices schools can use to achieve the social goals of education. In other words, the coercive power of standards is smaller. Because the inspection assessments primarily target the way in which the educational process satisfies external standards, compliance with the standards plays an important role and inspections will focus on the extent to which elements of curriculum and learning process satisfy quality demands. Inspection is directed at evaluating and improving the teaching and learning process, and thereby at the processes taking place in the school and classroom. The evaluation of provision and process factors makes this a relatively labor-intensive form of inspection for both schools and inspectorate.

The choice for an appropriate form of inspection will in practice only partially be inspired by considerations concerning the effectiveness of inspections on social quality. Its embedding within the general approach to inspection, the legislative context and implicit assumptions about the effect of inspection models often play a substantial role. However, the above shows that when choosing a supervision approach, it is wise to take into account the mechanisms within the various forms of inspection and the effects these may produce.



References

- Creemers, B.P.M. & Kyriakides, L. (2008). *The dynamics of educational effectiveness. A contribution to policy, practice and theory in contemporary schools*. London: Routledge.
- Daas, R., Dam, G. ten, & Dijkstra, A.B. (2016). Contemplating modes of assessing citizenship competences. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 51, 88-95.
- Dijkstra, A.B. (2012). *Sociale opbrengsten van onderwijs* [Social outcomes of education]. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers University of Amsterdam.
- Dijkstra, A.B., & De la Motte, P.I. (Eds.). (2014). *Social outcomes of education: The assessment of social outcomes and school improvement through school inspections*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Dijkstra, A.B., Geijssel, F., Ledoux, G., Veen, I. van der, & Dam, G. ten (2015). Effects of school quality, school citizenship policy, and student body composition on the acquisition of citizenship competences in the final year of primary education. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 26(4), 524-553.
- Dijkstra, A.B., & Peschar, J.L. (2003). Social capital in education. Theoretical issues and empirical knowledge in attainment research. In: C.A. Torres & A. Antikainen (Eds.), *The international handbook on the sociology of education* (pp. 58-81). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Donaldson, S. (2007). *Program theory-driven evaluation science. Strategies and applications*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ehren, M. (Ed.). (2016). *Methods and modalities of effective school inspections*. London: Springer.
- European Commission (1998). *Education and active citizenship in the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Union.
- Eurydice (2005). *Citizenship education at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice.
- Eurydice (2017). *Citizenship education at school in Europe*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Geboers, E., Geijssel, F., Admiraal, W., & Dam, G. ten (2013). Review of the effects of citizenship education. *Educational Research Review*, 9, 158-173.
- Gordon, J. et al. (2009). *Key competences in Europe. Opening doors for lifelong learners across the school curriculum and teacher education*. Warsaw: CASE Center for Social and Economic Research.
- Halasz, G., & Michel, A. (2011). Key competences in Europe: Interpretation, policy formulation and implementation. *European Journal of Education*, 46(3), 289-306.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning. A synthesis of over 800 meta-analysis relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Isac, M.M., Maslowski, R., Creemers, B., & Werf, G. van der (2013). The contribution of schooling to secondary-school students' citizenship outcomes across countries. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. DOI: 10.1080/09243453.2012.751035.
- Karsten, S., Visscher, A.J., Dijkstra, A.B. & Veenstra, R. (2010). Towards standards for the publication of performance indicators in the public sector: The case of schools. *Public Administration. An International Quarterly*, 88(1), 90-112.
- Klerks, M. (2013). *The effect of school inspections. A systematic review*. Utrecht: Inspectorate for Youth Care.
- Maslowski, R., Breit, H., Eckensberger, L. & Scheerens, J. (2009). A conceptual framework on informal learning of active citizenship competencies. In: J. Scheerens (Ed.), *Informal learning of active citizenship at school*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Nelson, R., & Ehren, M. (2014). *Review and synthesis of evidence on the (mechanisms of) impact of school inspections*. Enschede: University of Twente.
- OECD (2001). *The well-being of nations. The role of human and social capital*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD (2013). *Synergies for better learning. An international perspective on evaluation and assessment*. Paris: OECD.
- Putnam, R.D. (1993). *Making democracy work. Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rychen, D.S. & Salganik, L.H. (Eds.). (2003). *Key competencies for a successful life and a well-functioning society*. Cambridge: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Scheerens, J. (2005). Rethinking societal functions of education, implications for outcome and process indicators. In: J. Scheerens et al., *Positioning and validating the supervision framework*. Enschede: Universiteit Twente.
- Scheerens, J. (2011). Indicators on informal learning for active citizenship at school. *Educational assessment, evaluation and accountability*, 23(3), 201-222.
- Scheerens, J. & Creemers, B. (1989). Conceptualizing school effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13, 691-706.
- Schuitema, J., Dam, G. ten, & Veugelers, W. (2008). Teaching strategies for moral education: A review. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40, 69-89.
- Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., Ainley, J., Losito, B., & Kerr, D. (2008). *International civic and citizenship education study: Assessment framework*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower secondary school students in 38 countries*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., & Friedman, T. (2017). *Becoming citizens in a changing world. IEA International civic and citizenship education study 2016. International report*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Battistich, V. (2001). Teaching and schooling effects on moral / prosocial development. In: V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. Washington DC: AERA.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries. Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Townsend, T. (ed.) (2007). *The international handbook of school effectiveness and improvement*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Waslander, S., Pater, C., & Weide, M. van der (2010). *Markets in education: An analytical review of empirical research on market mechanisms in education, OECD Education Working Papers, No. 52*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Wolf, I. de, & Janssens, F.J.G. (2007). Effects and side effects of inspections and accountability in education. An overview of empirical studies. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*(3), 379-396.