Learning for leadership: leadership challenges and learning outcomes in the national school leadership program

Kjell Atle Halvorsen and Siw Skrøvset

Kjell Atle Halvorsen

Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

kjell.halvorsen@plu.ntnu.no

Siw Skrøvset

University of Tromsø

siw.skrovset@uit.no

The article presents leadership challenges and learning outcomes reported by Norwegian school leaders who have taken part in the NTNU school leadership program commissioned by The Norwegian Directorate for Education. Students identify the following predominant challenges: defining their role as leaders, leading school development, and developing collective school cultures. The article concludes that the program develops more confident school leaders by providing students with a theoretical framework for leadership in schools, while strengthening their relationship-building capacities. The need to bring school leadership closer to the classroom is also emphasized. The facilitation of student learning is the essence of school leadership.

Keywords: school leadership, leadership training and learning, school leadership challenges, instructional leadership

Introduction

The quality of school leadership has a significant effect on the quality of schools, and the quality of school leadership can be enhanced through education. These are two of the core assumptions in Government White Paper no 31 (2007–2008), *Quality in Schooling*, which introduced the idea of a national training program for school leaders in Norway. The training program was launched in 2009 by the Norwegian Directorate for Education. The Norwegian University of Science and Technology joined the program as a provider in collaboration with universities and university colleges comprising the NTNU School Leadership Network in 2010. Recently employed head teachers with no formal leadership training constitute the primary target group of the program.

Both the authors of this article have significant roles to play in the implementation of the program. The overriding questions lurking at the back of our minds are the following: *Does the program work? How does the program contribute to the strengthening of leadership in Norwegian schools?* These are the questions that motivated this study, where we discuss

leadership challenges and learning outcomes as conceptualized by a student cohort comprising 57 students in two groups, one based in Trondheim, the other in Tromsø. We approached our empirical material with the following two research questions:

- *How do the school leaders taking part in the national program for school leadership conceptualize their leadership challenges?*
- *How do they describe their learning outcomes after participating in the program?*

Leadership Theory

Leadership can be defined as the process of influencing others to act in ways that support the core objectives of an organization (Robinson, 2011). The core activity of schools is facilitating student learning.

Furthermore, leadership is increasingly described as a social practice (Mintzberg, 2009; Spillane, 2006). It is as much about doing things together with colleagues and making colleagues act together for the benefit of the student, as it is about planning and thinking. According to Mintzberg (2009) and Mintzberg and Westley (2001), leadership practice is a complex concept constituted by art, craft, and science. Mintzberg's concepts *art*, *craft*, and *science* correspond in a broad sense to *seeing*, *doing,* and *thinking*. In order to act appropriately as a school leader, you need to *see* and *think* as well. Science, or *thinking first* (Mintzberg & Westley, 2001), represents a rational approach informed by theory and research and is associated with planning, verbal expression, and facts. *Art*, or *seeing first* (Mintzberg & Westley, 2001), is associated with visioning, imagining, and ideas, suggesting that sometimes our actions are driven more by intuition than by reason. We have all experienced sudden and intuitive insights apparently coming from nowhere. They are probably tacitly informed by years of practical and theoretical experience, and filtered through preferences, which may be socially acquired or rooted in our genealogy. *Craft*, or *doing first,* is what we resort to when neither science nor art provides viable solutions to our challenges. Then competent practitioners experiment, try out things to see how they work, evaluate, and learn from experience.

According to Mintzberg and Westley (2001) all three approaches have strengths and weaknesses:

Thinking first works best when the issue is clear, the data reliable and the world structured; […]. Seeing first is necessary when many elements have to be combined into creative solutions and when commitment to those solutions is key. […] Doing first is preferred when the situation is novel and confusing, and things need to be worked out. (Mintzberg & Westley, 2001, p. 93).

«Leaders are different, and those who favor thinking are people who cherish facts, those who favor seeing cherish ideas and those who favor doing cherish experiences.» (Mintzberg & Westley, 2001, p. 91) Mintzberg and Westley (2001) emphasize the advantages of combining all three approaches.

Mintzberg (2009, p. 215) also highlights the social aspects of managing. Managers who try to do it alone fail to tap the potential of their staff, «especially among thinking people.» In the *Successful School Leadership* study, Møller and colleagues found that collaboration and team efforts characterized leadership in Norwegian and Swedish schools, where leadership was

typically carried out by formally designated leaders as well as by teachers and students (Møller et al., 2005). In this respect, Norwegian and Swedish schools differed significantly from others.

Our understanding of school leadership is to a large extent based on Mintzberg (2009) and Robinson (2011). We see leadership as a complex social activity comprising art, craft, and science that cannot be fully learned in the classroom. School leadership must include strong instructional elements in order to affect the core activities of schools in a positive way. We now outline briefly the school leadership program that our students have completed.

Course design

According to the first report from the national evaluation team

[…] the Norwegian program for school leaders shares some common characteristics of modern training programs for school leaders, building on national standards and goals, prioritizing the core tasks of schools, and a mode of operation with room for personal development and closeness to practical school leadership. The program is not related to one single theory of leadership, but draws on empirical research about what leads to effective school leadership. (Lysø, Stensaker, Aamodt & Mjøen, 2011)

Our program is action oriented, knowledge and value based, and covers the following four main themes: *school organization, leading for learning, school in society,* and *the role of the head teacher*. Figure 1 illustrates our conceptualization of the various learning spaces with the main actors and learning activities involved in our program. We meet the students for seven three-day on-campus seminars with instructional plenaries, plenary and group discussions, individual and group supervision, and skill-based exercises. Between seminars, student–student and student–faculty communication is largely mediated by the learning management platform, e-mail and telephone. Students work on written assignments, give each other feedback on such assignments and receive feedback from fellow students and faculty. All students are organized in permanent groups of 8–10 students, one faculty member being assigned as permanent supervisor to each group throughout the course. The 30-credit course is delivered over three semesters and constitutes the equivalent of one semester (half year) full-time study.

Table 1: Learning spaces in the national school leadership program

Learning spaces	Actors	Activities
Instructional plenaries	Students and instructor	Actionable knowledge
Groups	8–10 students and 1 permanent supervisor	Group interactions
		Supervision
		face-to-face and online
		feedback on texts
Workplace	Student, school owner, colleagues, students and parents	Testing out
		peer feedback

Table 1: Learning spaces in the national school leadership program

Learning spaces	Actors	Activities
Individual supervision	Student and supervisor	Tutoring and guidance
		face-to-face and online
		Working with texts
Self study	Student	Literature study, reflection, writing, training

Method

In order to answer the research questions we presented at the outset, we first analyzed one of the four texts the students had submitted for the final portfolio assessment, called *Searching for my leadership profile.* In this particular paper, the students were asked to analyze the context that they exercise their leadership in, the values that underpin it, and the challenges they face in the light of theories they had been exposed to during the course. They were also asked to discuss how they would tackle these challenges. Furthermore, they were encouraged to be specific about any consequences their participation in the program might have had on the development of their leadership profiles and practices. The 57 student papers were analyzed with a grounded theory approach (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Open coding was first undertaken with a view to finding statements where the students conceptualize their leadership challenges and learning outcomes. These statements were subsequently categorized. In our presentation of findings, we let two students speak on behalf of their fellow students, since their views were representative of the majority of the student cohort.

The analysis of the student papers was supplemented with an analysis of the anonymous summative student evaluations undertaken at the termination of the course. The following two open questions in this evaluation were relevant to our analysis:

- *How has your participation in the national school leadership program affected your development as a school leader?*
- *How has your participation in the national school leadership program contributed to changes in your school/workplace?*

35 out of 57 students responded to the questionnaire, yielding a response rate of 61. The student responses to these questions were subjected to the same kind of analysis as the student papers. Statements about leadership challenges and learning outcomes were pinpointed and categorized.

Coding and categorization enabled the construction of the following three main categories for leadership challenges: *leadership role, school development,* and *school culture.*

With respect to learning outcomes, we constructed the following six categories: *leadership theory*, *self-awareness*, *network*, *priorities*, *reflection*, and *motivation for leadership.*

This study is based on self-reports. When our students reported improvements and developments in their leadership practices, we had to take their word for it.

Leadership challenges

Inexperienced school leaders with little or no formal leadership training are the primary target group for the national school leadership program. In spite of differences with respect to age, and academic, social, and workplace backgrounds, they share many of the same basic leadership challenges, and they all have ambitions to become more confident leaders, personally as well as professionally.

The open coding of the student papers and summative evaluations enabled the construction of three main categories relating to leadership challenges: *leadership role, school development* and *school culture.*

Leadership role

In spite of gaining considerable insights with regard to their personal strengths and weaknesses, many of our students experienced a lack of confidence with regard to their leadership mandate and the manner in which to deal with it in situations of conflicting expectations and demands from subordinates as well as superiors. As a consequence, their need to develop their personal leadership roles and become more confident leaders was predominant.

This is how Eva, a recently appointed principal at a small countryside elementary school, describes the start of a normal day in her workplace:

Coming to work at 7.30 in the morning I drop by the kindergarten, say good morning to a couple of early-bird teachers and hello to some students. Then I settle down at my desk with an open office door to check the phone and e-mail, primarily for sick leave messages. [Finding] substitute teachers have first priority in the morning, then availability. Leader availability is important to students and teachers. I try to drop by a few classrooms in the morning because I have to know what is going on. How else can I give teachers guidance, – without knowing what they're doing in the classrooms and how they communicate with the students? And besides, leadership is essentially about building relations, and then you just have to meet people, students as well as teachers.

Two predominant themes can be derived from this passage. First, what Eva describes is a complex social situation that taxes her relational capacities in different ways: she relates informally to colleagues and students in kindergarten and school on her way to the office where she checks on and follows up sick leave messages before making herself professionally available to colleagues and students in the classrooms. Second, we notice Eva's motivation to involve herself in classroom activities of leadership in the classrooms, where the core activities of any school take place. Our analysis reveals strong ambitions among a majority of our students to bring instructional leadership closer to the classrooms in order to influence the learning of the students more strongly. They conceive of instructional leadership as a relational activity in ways that reflect Robinson's (2011) concept of student-centered leadership.

School development

Subject to the shifting priorities of different political regimes, schools are under constant pressure to improve their facilitation of student learning. During the last 20 years or so, school leaders and teachers have been expected to pursue and utilize more effective methods in teaching and learning, apply new technologies, introduce basic skills in all subjects on all levels, and develop their schools into learning organizations. School leaders are expected to initiate and manage a plethora of development programs. Prioritizing, planning, and managing development programs in school environments often dominated by individualistic colleagues who have always enjoyed a strong degree of job autonomy is felt to be particularly challenging by our students. Under such circumstances, their uncertainties with regard to leadership identity and mandate easily become acute.

Hanna, one of our students, puts it like this:

I started as a principal at Riverside school in August 2009. I had then been a teacher for ten years. Riverside was located in a new building, since the old school had been torn down the same summer. Today we have about 90 students and 16 members of staff. In May 2010 the local government decided to close down the school from the autumn of 2014. The teachers don't see the point and want to carry on like they used to.

This was my situation when I started my school leadership training. The program has focused on me and my own role as a principal, which I like a lot!

One of my main challenges is to deal with school development in this situation. What are my options as a school head? My boss, the local municipality director, expects me to implement new national action plans but he hasn't told me how. The teachers don't see the point and want to carry on like they used to.

Hanna's situation is not unique. 10 out of 26 students in the Tromsø group were working at schools that had recently either been merged with other schools or were to be closed down or merged. Even so, as principals they were expected to carry on with school development. Interestingly, those who were facing closure shared leadership challenges and ambitions with colleagues who were not facing such threats. The insecure position of the schools did not seem to affect their ambitions to carry on with development projects. However, the challenges they were facing were augmented by the situation of the schools. Building collective school cultures was felt to be particularly demanding.

School culture

In order to meet public demands for constant improvements in student learning, leaders have become increasingly aware of the need to alter the individualistic cultures that have dominated many schools until now. Thus it is not surprising that the third main leadership challenge category in our material is «Building collective school cultures», that is, cultures where the entire staff adheres to the same basic values and works toward a common goal. This is how Hanna sees the complexities of this challenge and the effects of the program on her as a leader: «When it comes to school development, I have learned that we have to involve the whole staff and develop shared goals. I have come a long way, and it takes time, but now I feel that Riverside school is on the right track.»

We now address our second research question: *How do our students describe their learning outcomes after participating in the program?*

Learning outcomes

The list of learning outcomes that follows has been taken from Eva's portfolio paper, and so have the quotations, if not specified otherwise. Eva concludes her paper with a six-point summary of what she has gained from attending the school leadership program. We choose Eva's list as a framework for discussing the learning outcomes of the national school leadership program as the students have described them in portfolio texts and the summative course evaluation. We find Eva's points to be representative of the sentiments of the student cohort, although her account is the most comprehensive

Leadership theory

«My theoretical knowledge about leadership has been enhanced considerably.»

Like the great majority of her fellow students, Eva finds the theoretical material that she has been exposed to during the course highly relevant to her job. As Dreyfus has pointed out, there is no expertise without theory *and* practical experience (Tiller, 2006). Trained as a teacher, like most principals in Norway, Eva has had very little exposure to leadership theory and training as part of her formal education. Leadership as a field of study still has low priority in Norwegian teacher training. Eva's practical experience is mostly that of the teacher, which includes considerable relevant leadership practice even if it will have to be translated from a classroom to a whole school setting.

Both Hanna and Eva emphasize the significance of the theoretical insight they have gained during the program because it builds self-confidence. So do 30 of the 37 students who responded to the summative assessment questionnaire. Hanna put it like this:

Working with theories about people's comfort zones, double loop learning, reflection, and appreciative leadership has made me more confident. And I consider relationship building to be one of the «tools» that I use most frequently. I have learned that I can't blame others, but have to take responsibility for my own actions and behavior. I do this in several ways. For instance, I ask my teachers how they see my role as a principal. And we have become so much better at giving positive feedback to each other. This gives me energy and motivation to go on as a principal. I am on my way to become an appreciative principal, and I have a lot of plans regarding how to continue this work.

In the summative evaluation, 23 out of 37 respondents pointed out that they felt more confident as leaders. Theoretical insight breeds self-confidence. So does enhanced self-awareness, a point that Eva also shares with many of her fellow students.

Self-awareness

«I am more conscious of my own strengths and weaknesses as a leader.»

This is a typical statement in the student papers as well as in the summative evaluations. Jung's Type Index was a significant element in the course, which made the students more aware not only of themselves as individuals with personal priorities, strengths, and weaknesses, but also of the variety of personalities they encounter among fellow students and colleagues.

Furthermore, at the very first assembly, the students were asked to observe their fellow group members in order to report back to them on three positive characteristics that they had noticed during the first three days of meeting with them. At the end of the course, we exposed them to the similar, but more challenging, «magical mirror» exercise, where group members left the group but remained within listening distance behind a screen while the rest of the group commented on their leadership strengths and weaknesses, as they saw them. Returning to the group, they were encouraged to respond to what they had heard. Students found this a challenging but gratifying experience that enhanced their knowledge of themselves and their fellow group members. Through exercises such as these, we aim to strengthen their genuine relationship building capacity, a core capacity in any leadership practice.

One of the students typically described the usefulness of the JTI thus: «The JTI was useful, and since I tend to be an extrovert, I am more aware of my (too) quick decisions. I now think a bit more before I act.»

Network

«I have acquired a network of colleagues and experts.»

Many of our students come from small countryside schools where the principal may be the only person with formal, sometimes part-time, leadership responsibilities. Furthermore, the schools in the municipality may be few and far between. It is also a fact that the capacity and competence to handle educational issues on the local government level has been reduced during the last 25 years. One accumulated effect of this development is a widespread feeling of loneliness among principals. They have nowhere to turn for support in handling the complex everyday challenges of school leadership. Consequently, they value the opportunity to get together for discussions with colleagues in similar circumstances, as well as experts from the universities and colleges involved in the program. The group deliberations sometimes become quite intimate. One of the students expressed it thus: «I have discussed things with this group that I have not taken up with anybody else, ever.»

Priorities

«A better overview of the field of school leadership makes it easier to prioritize.»

Some schools take pride in an exaggerated variety of change projects (Fullan, 2001)**,** others suffer from the related «kangaroo syndrome,**»** (Tiller, 1990), the former indicating a tendency in some schools to take on too many «priorities» at the same time, the latter a lack of tenacity in staying with development projects long enough for them to have significant and sustainable effects. Neither strategy has proved to be particularly successful. It is one of the tough duties of a school head to prioritize between all the good intentions in top-down government-initiated action programs and bottom-up initiatives taken by colleagues. The idea is not to change as much as possible, at the same time (Fullan, 2001). Several of our students maintain that the program has increased their awareness of the need to say «NO!» even to ideas that may be sound enough in themselves. Furthermore, they have developed a vocabulary and a knowledge base that enable them to define a common direction for the development of their school, to prioritize accordingly, and to argue for the choices they have made in a convincing way.

Reflection

«The course has enhanced my reflective capacity.»

Through studies of theory and research, written assignments, and group discussions, the preconceptions of the students have been challenged, and in a number of cases, modified. In many cases, they also find support for their own thinking about leadership and school development. Through reflection on action (Schøn, 1987), they have developed actionable knowledge of opportunities inherent in their role as well as their own potential for leadership. Their «toolbox» has been replenished and their repertoire expanded, allowing many of them to become more confident leaders.

Motivation for leadership

«The course has strengthened my motivation for leadership.»

School leaders have a demanding job. Facing complex everyday challenges, many of them receive little support from their municipalities and their own staff. In the smallest and most remote communities, they may, in fact, *be* the municipality in school matters. In 2009, one in four schools had no leadership position other than that of the principal, one in two had an inspector in addition to the principal, one in four had an assistant principal, and one in four had one or more heads of department (Vibe & Evensen, 2009). Consequently, the loneliness and isolation felt by many school leaders is well founded. It certainly challenges their motivation for the job, which they may not have gone very actively for in the first place. Throughout the course, the students develop their understanding of the importance of the job they are doing, to the students, their colleagues, and the community. The competence that they develop during the course corroborates this sense of significance to strengthen their motivation for leadership. At the end of the first course, one of the students admitted rather bluntly: «If it had not been for this course, I would not have been a principal today.»

Concluding discussion

We have conceptualized school leadership as a complex social activity comprising art, craft, and science, requiring strong instructional elements in order to cater to the particular needs of schools. According to Mintzberg (2009), school leadership cannot be fully learned in schools. This makes it all the more important to ask the question that prompted this study: *How does the program contribute to the strengthening of leadership in Norwegian schools?*

We have seen that most students highlight challenges related to exercising instructional leadership and developing collective school environments. In accordance with Robinson (2011), we understand instructional leadership as relational leadership aimed at improving classroom practices. Evidently, instructional leadership has a potential for improvement in Norwegian schools. The TALIS report shows that Norwegian teachers rarely receive feedback from their leaders, who are seldom present in the classrooms (Vibe, Aamodt, & Carlsten, 2009). Instructional leadership implies relational competence, that is, knowing how to relate to well-educated, independent colleagues with strong traditions of autonomy in the workplace, mastering constructive feedback without interpreting it as «competence betrayal», the opposite of trust. According to Hargreaves (2002), this is potentially one of the strongest sources of negative emotions among teachers. Appropriate feedback requires and combines theory, consciousness, tools, and experience.

Developing collective school cultures is one of the major challenges faced by our school leadership students. There is ample evidence that schools with collective cultures handle development and improvement programs better than schools with individualistic cultures (Dahl, Klewe, & Skov, 2003; Dufour & Marzano, 2011; Fullan, 2007). Furthermore, systems thinkers argue that improving the quality of individual schools must be aligned with policies on the local, district, and state levels. It is not enough to build capacity and establish collaborative cultures in individual schools. This must be organized «within and across three levels: the school and the community, district, and state» (Fullan, 2007, p. 152).

Introducing stronger instructional leadership and more collaborative cultures in schools where professional autonomy has been a core value requires changes that easily foster opposition. Many of our students find it difficult to lead development in traditional schools where teachers prefer to carry on working the way they are used to. They often describe teachers as traditional; reluctant to implement new plans from the local or the national authorities. Working with organizational theory, focusing on structure and culture, and concepts such as *comfort zones* and *learning zones* (Irgens, 2007*)*, they have acquired a new vocabulary and a new professional identity. Endowed with tools to think with and tools to act with, they have become more competent and confident school leaders, more conscious of their own strengths and weaknesses. With analytical concepts such as *the five-step model for learning* (Irgens, 2007) and *single and double loop learning* (Argyris, 1977), they are better equipped to deal with organizational changes in their workplaces. In the final, summative assessment, two thirds of the respondents point out that they have become more confident leaders. Nearly 90 percent of them emphasize the extensive knowledge building through access to relevant theory and research as a major effect of their participation in the course.

Our data suggest that using theory-based reflections on workplace challenges, along with enhanced self-insight and acceptance of human diversity, has produced more confident school leadership. Many of the students have been inspired to prioritize instructional rather than transactional (Bass, 1991) and instrumental (Irgens, 2013) leadership. Thus, they attempt to lead in ways that work (Mintzberg, 2009) by focusing on leadership functions significant to student learning. Furthermore, the introduction of *appreciative leadership* (Ghaye, 2008; Skrøvset & Tiller, 2011), a relational, positive, and constructivist approach to leadership, has underpinned the message that leading is ultimately about relating to other people. Working on the JTI, taking part in individual and group reflections, and sharing their own insights and experiences with other leaders are all vital activities in our program. They counteract the feeling of loneliness and the temptation to quit school leadership for good. «Without the program and the seminars, I would have quit my job as a principal by now,» a young principal admitted.

In our program we have endeavored to maintain a reflective as well as a pragmatic approach to theory, linking course content to the workplace challenges that our students have to grapple with. However, we focus more on «leadership tools» than we normally do in academic programs. We also take more advantage of the JTI personality test. Student appreciation indicates that this has been worthwhile. The success so far, as we see it, has to do with the combination of theory and practice, or, as one of the students wrote: «In the first seminar we were given a toolbox, which suited me well! Throughout the program I have slowly realized that tools are all right, but that it takes theoretical competence to understand, choose and use the right tool.»

We conclude our discussion by considering our findings in the light of our conception of school leadership as derived from Robinson and Mintzberg: Leadership as a complex, relational activity comprising art, craft, and science that cannot fully be learned in the classroom, and school leadership as involving strong instructional elements in order to affect the core activities of schools in a positive way.

In training programs such as the one presented in this article, providers always have a simple but somewhat frightening question at the back of their minds: Does it work? Student feedback indicates that it does. In spite of Mintzberg's strong reminder that leadership cannot be learned in the classroom, our students maintain that actionable leadership knowledge can be acquired in classroom situations. In the eyes of our students, the «science» and «craft» aspects of leadership can, to a large extent, be learned, and «science» seems to have inspired «craft» to produce more competent and confident leadership. By providing tools to think with and tools to act with, the knowledge base developed through participation in the program has helped produce leaders determined to lead in ways that work.

We have primarily focused on the *science* and *craft* aspects of leadership. The art dimension has not been dealt with to the same degree. Art, a more imaginative approach to the complex challenges faced by our students, is essential when many elements have to be combined into creative solutions and when commitment to those solutions is paramount (Mintzberg & Wesley, 2001). School leaders face such situations regularly and it is in these situations that their ability to «see» right is brought to the test. Such situations can hardly be reproduced in classrooms, where role-plays, simulations, and related techniques will remain bleak replicas of reality. Their «artistic abilities» and their capacity as «seers» will be brought out in real life situations, which we have not had access to.

We have reason to conclude that the leadership training has had positive effects on our students as leaders. According to their own testimonies, they have acquired relevant knowledge and relational trust. Both are fundamental prerequisites for handling the complexities of school leadership. Applying relevant knowledge, building relational trust, and solving complex problems are the three capabilities supporting the five leadership dimensions highlighted by Robinson (2011). How these outcomes materialize in the turmoil of their daily leadership practices is more uncertain. How robust are their learning outcomes when the pressure and inspiration from faculty and fellow students is no longer there, and everyday problems have to be solved? One weakness of our program is related to the art dimension; another is our inability to intervene in the context where our students exercise their leadership. The former we can deal with ourselves by adjusting the focus of the program. The latter is more problematic, because it requires a major reorientation of the national program. It is our belief, however, that confident school leaders with tools to think with and tools to act with will do a better job for their schools than leaders who have not been thus equipped.

Literature

Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, (September–October 1977), 115–125.

Bass, B.M. (1991). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Retrieved July 4th, 2013 from:
strandtheory.org/images/From_transactional_to_transformational_-_Bass.pdf

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research. Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dahl, T., Klewe, L. & Skov, P. (2003). *En skole i bevægelse: evaluering af satsning på kvalitetsudvikling i den norske grundskole.* København: Danmarks Pædagogiske Universitets Forlag.

Dufour, R. & Marzano, R.J. (2011). *Leaders of learning. How district, school, and classroom leaders improve student achievement*. Bloomington: Solution Tree Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th edition). London: Routledge.

Ghaye, T. (2008). *Building the reflective healthcare organisation.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Government White Paper no 13 (2007–2008). *Quality in schooling.* Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research.

Hargreaves, A. (2002). Teaching and betrayal. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice,* 8(3/4), 393–407.

Irgens, E.J. (2007). *Profesjon og organisasjon*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Irgens, E.J. (2013). Utvikling av ledelsesformer i skolen. In G. Engvik [et al.] (ed.), *Klasseledelse – for elevenes læring* (p. 21–39). Trondheim: Akademika forlag.

Jung Type Indicator. (n.d.). Retrieved January 15th, 2012 from: www.psytech.no/downloads/reports/JTIReport.pdf

Lillejord, S. (2011). Kunsten å være rektor. In J. Møller & E. Ottesen (ed.)*, Rektor som leder og sjef. Om styring, ledelse og kunnskapsutvikling i skolen*, (p. 284–301). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Lysø, I.H., Stensaker, B., Aamodt, P.O. & Mjøen, K. (2011). *Ledet til ledelse. Delrapport 1 fra Evaluering av den nasjonale rektorutdanningen.* NIFU/NTNU Samfunnsforskning.

Mintzberg, H. & Westley, F. (2001). Decision making: It's not what you think. *MIT Sloan Management Review* (spring 2001). Retrieved January 15th, 2012 from dspace.ist.utl.pt/bitstream/2295/705928/1/2001_Mintzberg%20and%20westley%20Decision%20Making.pdf.

Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing*. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.

Møller, J., Eggen, A., Fuglestad, O.L., Langfeldt, G., Presthus, A.M., Skrøvset, S., … Vedøy, G. (2005). Successful school leadership – The Norwegian case. *Journal of Educational Administration, 43*(6), 584–594.

Robinson, V. (2009). Fit for a purpose. An educationally relevant account of distributed leadership. In A. Harris (ed.), *Distributed leadership. Studies in educational leadership 7* (p. 219–240). London: Springer.

Robinson, V. (2011). *Student-centred leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schøn, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Skrøvset, S. & Tiller, T. (2011). *Verdsettende ledelse*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.

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

Tiller, T. (1990). *Kenguruskolen*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Tiller, T. (2006). *Aksjonslæring – forskende partnerskap i skolen*. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget.

Vibe, N. & Evensen, M. (2009). *Spørsmål til skole-Norge 2009. Resultater og analyser fra Utdanningsdirektoratets spørreundersøkelse blant skoler og skoleeiere* (Rapport 45/2009). Oslo: NIFU STEP.

Vibe, N., Aamodt, P.O. & Carlsten, T.C. (2009). *Å være ungdomsskolelærer i Norge. Resultater fra OECDs internasjonale studie av undervisning og læring (TALIS).* Oslo: NIFU STEP.

Norsk sammendrag Læring for ledelse – lederutfordringer og læringsutbytte i den nasjonale rektorutdanningen

Artikkelen presenterer ledelsesutfordringer og læringsutbytte slik disse blir beskrevet av norske skoleledere som har gjennomført den nasjonale rektorutdanningen ved NTNU. Utdanningen har blitt gjennomført på oppdrag fra Utdanningsdirektoratet. Studentene peker på utfordringer knyttet til å forstå og utøve rektorrollen, lede skoleutvikling og utvikle kollektive skolekulturer. Artikkelen konkluderer med at den nasjonale rektorutdanningen utvikler tryggere ledere ved å gi deltakerne et teoretisk rammeverk for skoleledelse og ved å styrke deres relasjonskompetanse. Behovet for å bringe skoleledelse nærmere klasserommet blir også understreket. Å legge til rette for elevenes læring er kjernen i enhver skoleledelse.

Nøkkelord: skoleledelse, skolelederutdanning, skolelederutfordringer, ledelse for læring