Chapter 8
The Theory of Pedagogical Leadership: Enhancing High-Quality Education

Elina Fonsén and Tapio Lahtero

Abstract In this chapter, we introduce the pedagogical leadership theory of Finnish scholars Fonsén and Lahtero and provide ideas and tools to enhance understanding about the foundation of pedagogical leadership in the background of high-quality comprehensive education and early childhood education.

Dimensions that influence the success of pedagogical leadership are Value, Context, Organisational culture, Professionalism and Management of substance. From the viewpoint of the principal's work, it is also essential to examine one of the organisational culture's sub-cultures, leadership culture. The work of principal constitutes many tasks and duties, which can be defined as the indirect and direct pedagogical leadership using the idea of the broad-based pedagogical leadership. The four aspects of human capital that leaders need for pedagogical leadership are: The dimensions of increased knowledge, awareness of the quality of the implemented pedagogy, Skills to lead development, and Ability to argue for pedagogy.

In addition, we introduce Leadership competence model for leading pedagogy and curriculum implementation, and model for early childhood education teachers' professional development towards pedagogical leadership.

Keywords Early childhood education · Comprehensive education · Pedagogical leadership · Finnish education

E. Fonsén (✉)
Department of Education, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

Department of Education, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
e-mail: elina.k.fonsen@jyu.fi

T. Lahtero
Training Schools, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
e-mail: tapio.lahtero@helsinki.fi

Introduction

Both comprehensive education and early childhood education are an important part of the lifelong learning path in the Finnish educational system. Under the Finnish Parliament, the Ministry of Education and Culture provides support and guidance by preparing the legislation, providing curricula and organising the state's funding of educational services. The directing system makes Finnish education rather equal for all children, and they have the subjective right to obtain early childhood education as well as comprehensive education with equal programmes.

Finnish educational system is considered high quality, yet development areas can be found. For example, leadership training is not well established, and the skills of principals and ECE centre directors vary (Finnish Government, 2021). In this chapter, our aim is to clarify the concept of pedagogical leadership which we consider the core function when leading an educational organisation. Based on our previous studies of pedagogical leadership, we introduce the dimensions on which pedagogical leadership is built (Fonsén, 2013, 2014), the structure and contents of broad understanding of pedagogical leadership (Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015) and the cultural and symbolic aspect of leadership (Lahtero, 2011) and human capital that is needed for pedagogical leadership (Fonsén, 2014). Earlier studies have shown that pedagogical leadership and human management leadership are the most important tasks in leadership in the view of directors and principals (Fonsén, 2014; Lahtero et al., 2021).

Furthermore, recent studies in ECE leadership have provided evidence that leadership and the quality of pedagogy have connections. Pedagogical leadership seems to have an impact on children's involvement in learning, positive emotions, physical activity and participation. In addition, directors' assessment of process factors in the quality of early childhood education has connection to children's observed involvement in activities (Fonsén et al., 2022b; Ruohola et al., 2021).

The following paragraphs provide a condensed description of comprehensive and early childhood education in Finland.

Comprehensive Education in Finland

Every child permanently resident in Finland is obligated to achieve the goals of compulsory education. Compulsory education in pre-primary education begins one year before the child turns 7 and starts comprehensive education and ends when the child turns 18 or when he or she completes a secondary school qualification before that age. Completion of the comprehensive school curriculum is part of compulsory education. Comprehensive school covers grades 1–9 and is intended for 7–16-year-olds. In Finland, municipalities are obliged to provide comprehensive education in a local school so that a pupils' journeys to school are as safe and as short as possible

(Ministry of Education and Culture, 2022). According to the Finnish National Agency of Education (2014,14), pupils in comprehensive education have the right to free education and the textbooks and other learning materials, tools and equipment required for it. In addition, pupils have the right to receive free student welfare services required for participation in education, as well as the social benefits and services defined by law. Pupils must also be provided with a full, free and appropriate meal every school day (Finnish National Agency for Education [FNAE], 2014, 14).

The system of comprehensive education is governed by the Comprehensive Education Act and Decree, Government decrees, curriculum criteria, local curricula and by the school yearly plans based on them. The various parts of the system are being reformed to ensure that education is organised in a way that takes account of changes in the world around schools and strengthens their role in building a sustainable future (FNAE, 2014, 9).

Every comprehensive school has a principal who is responsible for the school's activities, in accordance with educational legislation, and who leads, directs and supervises the teaching and educational work of the school. It is difficult to define and describe the job description in detail because of the diversity of school units, the type of education provider and the type of employment relationship. In addition, at local level, the job description is defined by the management regulations. However, the basic mission always includes, inter alia, pedagogical leadership (FNAE, 2013,14).

Early Childhood Education in Finland

Since 2013, early childhood education (ECE) governance has been under the Ministry of Education and Culture, moved from the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. The aims of ECE pedagogy are laid out in the Act on Early Childhood Education and Care (540/2018) and the Finnish National core curriculum for early childhood education and care (Finnish National Agency for Education [FNAE], 2022). ECE teachers' bachelor's level university education provides a strong foundation to interpret these documents.

Municipalities are obligated to organise and provide ECE services, and traditionally they have been the main provider of ECE in Finland. However, currently there is strong growth in the private sector. The statistics from 2019 shows that 18.2% of children participate in ECE organised by private service providers, and further, 54% of Finnish municipalities provide private services (Finnish Education Evaluation Centre [FINEEC], 2019).

The ECE curriculum defines the ECE teacher's role as a pedagogical team leader, but the ECE centre leader has the main responsibility for the pedagogical quality in the ECE centre (FNAE, 2018). The model of distributed pedagogical leadership has

been under development recently. ECE leaders' workload has increased in recent years due to which Finnish municipalities have restructured and expanded the responsibilities of ECE centre directors according to the demands of new legislation and curriculum and because of expanded number of units and growing number of employees (Ahtiainen et al., 2021; Soukainen & Fonsén, 2018).

Broad-Based Pedagogical Leadership

In the Anglo-American research tradition, the term instructional leadership is commonly used to refer to leading teaching and learning in a school. In the Finnish research tradition, the corresponding term has been pedagogical leadership. The roots of instructional leadership can be traced back to the 1970s and 1980s, when U.S. principals became required to take a more active role in managing school performance and student learning outcomes. Graczewski et al. (2009) argue that the need for this new thinking was based mainly on the proliferation of neoliberal education policies and standardised tests. The assumption was that the principal was responsible for student learning outcomes. At the same time, research on school effectiveness and the impact of principals on school effectiveness became more widespread. Principals were required to have strong goal orientation, with a particular focus on improving student learning outcomes. The 1980s saw an emphasis on rational thinking in school leadership. It argued that the ability of the principal to create goals, to motivate staff and students, and to adapt the school's teaching to the goals set, is central to the school's development and effectiveness (Hallinger, 2005). Research on effective schools has mostly focused on schools at which a strong directive principal has been successful in making the necessary changes. A clear shortcoming is that due to the different circumstances, contexts and development needs of schools, the generalisation of instructional leadership models to all schools has generally had a negative impact.

The current view of instructional leadership is now more nuanced and broader than the view in the 1980s. The focus today is more on the role of the principal as a leader of excellence and enabler of teacher development (Plessis, 2013). Robinson et al. (2008) emphasise that principals influence student learning outcomes best by leading by example. It is therefore not enough for principals to organise and facilitate in-service teacher training. Above all, he or she must be involved in the learning process in formal and informal school forums. The instructional principal can also ensure the quality of teaching by visiting classrooms, supervising teachers and giving them feedback. Bendikson et al. (2012) have identified setting goals, ensuring a quality learning environment, strategic resourcing and problem solving, building a sense of shared responsibility, and ensuring quality teaching as key elements of instructional leadership. Plessis (2013) also combines several concepts to define instructional leadership from a broader perspective. This is primarily related to

learning and teaching, but also refers to all those activities that contribute to student learning, teacher professional development and the development of a positive school culture. Instructional leadership can no longer be seen as the task of the principal alone, but rather as a shared leadership role between principals and teachers. In this way, school leadership is seen as a shared effort to develop the school, based on collaboration between teachers and the principal. As teachers participate in school development, they contribute more fully to the success of the school (Graczewski et al., 2009; Hallinger, 2005; Hansen & Lárusdóttir, 2014). Ultimately, the ability of the principal to create a positive school culture that supports learning at the school emerges as a key competence area of instructional leadership.

The current broader view of instructional leadership is closer in content to its Finnish counterpart, pedagogical leadership. At the same time, Finnish school leadership research has adopted the concept of broad-based pedagogical leadership, which looks at school leadership from a broader perspective than instructional leadership. As a concept, pedagogical leadership is not as well-known as instructional leadership, although it in principle refers to a similar task, particularly in relation to the leadership of an educational institution. Pedagogical leadership is generally accepted as a goal to which a Finnish principal should aspire in his or her institution. Alava et al. (2012) consider pedagogical leadership to include all leadership measures that support the achievement of the school's basic mission and contribute to the implementation of the curriculum. Curriculum implementation requires principals to lead teachers' competence and capacity building and learning, to support teachers in their daily teaching work and to lead community development processes. According to the National Board of Education (NBE) (2013), the principal's key role is to provide pedagogical leadership to ensure the learning of all members of the organisation and the achievement of the school's core mission.

Like instructional leadership, pedagogical leadership can be direct or indirect in nature; both have an impact on students' learning outcomes (Bendikson et al., 2012; Gurr et al., 2010; Larsen & Rieckhoff, 2014). Direct pedagogical leadership focuses directly on the process of learning and teaching. It is about developing curriculum, setting goals and ensuring the quality of teaching. Indirect pedagogical leadership, on the other hand, focuses on the context and environment in which the process of learning and teaching takes place. Indirect pedagogical leadership includes the provision of resources to support the implementation of strategy, the management of competences and the provision of a learning environment that supports learning and teaching (Bendikson et al., 2012; Larsen & Rieckhoff, 2014). In their Finnish study, Alava et al. (2012) define direct pedagogical leadership as the principal's leadership of teachers' competence and capacity building and development, and also daily support for schoolwork, for example through development discussions. In their view, the principal's indirect pedagogical leadership is manifested in how he or she leads development processes that support the competence and development of teaching staff. Raasumaa (2010) has also found that Finnish principals' pedagogical

Fig. 8.1 Direct and indirect pedagogical leadership

leadership is both direct and indirect. As it is impossible for principals to be present in all learning-related situations, most pedagogical leadership is indirect (Fig. 8.1).

This means that the essence of pedagogical leadership is above any active influence on objectives, organisational structures, social networks, staff and school culture.

Technical Leadership, Direct Pedagogical Leadership and Leading Human Resources: Competent Principal

The day-to-day leadership of a school can be divided into three areas: technical leadership, direct pedagogical leadership and leading human resources (Lahtero et al., 2021). Each of these three areas of leadership is necessary and contributes in its own way to the functioning and quality of the school. Direct pedagogical leadership focuses on the process of learning and teaching. Pedagogical leadership through technical and human resources is indirect and focuses on the context and environment in which learning and teaching take place. When principals are successful in leading the technical, direct pedagogical and human resources of their schools, they promote and sustain quality education (Table 8.1). In this case, we can speak of a principal who is competent in his/her task (Hämäläinen et al., 2002).

Technical leadership can be seen as a rational organisation characteristic of the management institutions of the twentieth century. Principals who emphasise the technical aspect of leadership focus their attention and action on facts and logic. They design and implement structures and processes appropriate to the prevailing circumstances. According to Sergiovanni (2006), technical

Table 8.1 A well-run school and a competent principal

Indirect pedagogical leadership via Leading structures	Direct pedagogical leadership	Indirect pedagogical leadership via Leading human resources
Good and competent principal		

leadership is characterised by planning, organising, coordinating and scheduling. Technical leadership is a basic prerequisite for the day-to-day running of any school, because without a functioning structure, the people working in the school will be unsure of their tasks and objectives. According to a Finnish study of principals (Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015), the typical technical leadership tasks of primary school principals are: (1) routine administrative tasks, such as making various administrative decisions, (2) making school schedules and (3) financial management tasks, such as strategic resourcing. In the school context, the success of the technical dimension of leadership can be judged by its ability to support the context and environment in which the processes of learning and teaching take place.

Unlike technical leadership, direct pedagogical leadership focuses on leading the school's core mission of learning and teaching. Principals who emphasise pedagogical leadership focus their attention and action on improving teaching and learning. They focus their energies primarily on those aspects – learning, teaching and school development – that are relevant to the success of the school and pupils. According to a Finnish study of principals (Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015), the typical pedagogical leadership tasks of primary school principals are: (1) setting goals and strategic leadership, (2) maintaining pedagogical dialogue between the principal and teachers and (3) setting pedagogical policies for the whole school.

The human aspect of leadership is the leadership of psychological factors such as needs, motivation and well-being. Principals who emphasise leading human resources see people as the core of the school organisation. Teachers and other staff will only engage with the school and its goals if they feel that the school meets their needs and supports their personal goals. According to Sergiovanni (2006), principals who emphasise human leadership in their work offer support and encouragement to teachers. This is relevant because high motivation to learn on the part of pupils and high motivation to teach on the part of teachers are fundamental prerequisites for good school leadership. According to a Finnish study of principals (Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015), the most typical human leadership tasks of primary school principals are: (1) leading competence and capacity building, (2) maintaining the interaction between the principal and teachers and (3) providing support to teachers in challenging situations. In the school context, the success of human leadership can be judged by its ability to support the context and environment in which the processes of learning and teaching take place.

The technical, direct pedagogical and human dimensions of leadership can be compared to the different lenses through which the world looks different. A competent principal must be able to look at the school he or she leads through all these lenses. If the principal focuses only on technical leadership, while the human and pedagogical aspects are marginalised, the staff will not be motivated to do their job and the basic mission will be obscured. If the principal focuses only on human leadership, with technical and pedagogical leadership on the side-lines, the basic mission becomes blurred and the school falls into disarray. However, if the principal focuses only on pedagogical leadership, leaving technical and human leadership on the margins, the basic mission will not be achieved. The quality of learning and teaching processes can only be achieved if the school is well organised and staff are motivated and committed.

Symbolic and Cultural Leadership: Towards Excellent Principalship

Symbolic and cultural leadership go beyond technical, pedagogical and human leadership. At the same time, they enable access to excellent levels of engagement and performance. According to Hämäläinen et al. (2002), a principal can be considered excellent when he or she performs well not only in technical, pedagogical and human leadership but also in symbolic and cultural leadership (Table 8.2). The distinction drawn by Hämäläinen et al. (2002) between competent and excellent principals is like the distinction drawn by Schein (2005) between leadership and management: managers live within the organisational culture, but leaders can create and shape it.

The basic principle of symbolic leadership is that the meanings given to events and their interpretation are more important than what happens in the organisation (Lahtero, 2011). It is therefore the giving of meaning that becomes the most important task of leadership. By giving meaning and dealing with symbols, the principal can strengthen the experience of the community and provide the desired image of what the school organisation represents to its members. Since it is often not possible to change things directly, dealing with the school's symbolic system provides an effective means of changing behaviour. Above all, symbolic leadership is about building commitment and trust. Because using the school's symbolic system

Table 8.2 An excellent school and an excellent principal

Indirect pedagogical leadership via Leading structures	Direct pedagogical leadership	Indirect pedagogical leadership via Leading human resources
Symbolic and cultural leadership		
Excellent principal		

appropriately requires considerable self-awareness and sensitivity to others, symbolic leadership is not easy.

It should be remembered that the same message will not produce the same reaction in all listeners (Lahtero & Risku, 2012, 2013). Like the principal, other members of the school organisation sometimes find themselves in situations where they recognise their inability to communicate in a way that is understood in the way they want. Principals should therefore be careful not to misinterpret the reactions of their audiences, because they can easily perceive their own and their audiences' views as being more similar than they are. This bias may be due to overly positive self-perceptions, unrealistic optimism, stereotypes about the audience or illusions of control. The principal has considerable control over the design and presentation of the visible and belonging elements of his or her leadership. In contrast, the symbolic message with which these elements are associated is much more difficult to control. Many symbolic associations are unpredictable. According to Sergiovanni (2006), to understand symbolic leadership, one must look behind the principal's actions and understand, above all, the meaning of those actions. What matters is what the principal stands for and what his or her words and actions communicate to others. In contrast, the official and public symbols of the school – such as logos and missions – may have little to do with how individual members of the organisation describe their school.

Cultural leadership in a school is a deliberate attempt by the principal to structure the meanings that members of the organisation give to their work and to their organisation. In other words, cultural leadership is about influencing the construction of reality and clarifying the deepest meaning of work. The principal's task is to develop and lead the culture of his or her school to promote the fundamental mission of student learning (Barth, 2007). Developing and leading the culture is one of the principal's more important tasks, because a culture that supports the core mission is also a key instrument for the school's other strategic development and for achieving its future vision. Successful cultural change requires that the principal has the courage to give space to the creativity and expertise of the teachers. Only then will it be possible to find genuinely new solutions to problems that are already known or even unknown. An essential part of leading cultural change is therefore to strengthen the capacity for the constant search for new ideas and practises and their selective introduction.

Cultural change must always involve both the creation of the new and the destruction of the old (Schlechty, 2007). In changing the culture of their school, principals must destroy parts of the old culture. This is done by eliminating the symbols that support the old culture of the school. At the same time, existing symbols must be modified to fit the desired culture, and new symbols must be created to support the desired culture. However, Yukl (2006) points out that the influence of the leader on culture varies depending on the stage of development of the organisation. The founder of a new organisation has a strong influence on its culture. As an organisation ages, the culture becomes more unconscious and less stable. Changing the culture of older organisations is therefore much more difficult than creating a new

organisation. One reason for this is that many of the underlying beliefs and assumptions that people share are implicit and unconscious. Changing cultural assumptions is also difficult when they give legitimacy to the past and are a source of pride. In older, relatively prosperous organisations – as schools often are – the culture has more influence on the leader than the leader has on the culture. They are unlikely to change dramatically unless a crisis threatens their well-being and survival. Even then, understanding the culture and leading its change requires considerable insight and ability on the part of the leader. In the school context, the success of cultural leadership can be judged by the extent to which the interpretations and cultural assumptions made by the work community support the success of the basic mission of learning and teaching and the delivery of the curriculum (Lahtero, 2011).

Aiming for Broad-Based Pedagogical Leadership

Broad-based pedagogical leadership consists of technical, pedagogical, human resource, symbolic and cultural leadership (Fig. 8.2). Of the above, technical, pedagogical and human leadership can be considered as a normal leadership activity of the principal, without which it is impossible to lead the school adequately in


Fig. 8.2 Broad-based pedagogical leadership. (Modified from Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015)

general. The principal's normal leadership activities demonstrate to the school's teaching staff what is important and valued at school. The symbolic and cultural aspects of school leadership consist of the meanings given by the teaching staff to the principal's normal leadership activities and to the network of these meanings – the school's leadership culture. When the principal's normal leadership activities are successful and when the leadership culture supports the school's basic mission – student learning – the principal's broad-based pedagogical leadership is excellent (Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015).

This means that the essence of pedagogical leadership is above any active influence on objectives, organisational structures, social networks, staff and school culture.

Dimensions of Pedagogical Leadership

Fonsén (2014) has analysed the construction of pedagogical leadership and found the four dimensions on which it is built (Table 8.3). The first is Value that also passes through the other dimensions. In Fonsén's (2013) earlier study, the Value dimension was missing, and value was understood to be implied within the other dimension. After a careful reflection of the results of the study and deepening understanding, Fonsén (2014) brought up the Value dimension as it proved to be a key factor for successful pedagogical leadership.

Table 8.3 Dimensions of pedagogical leadership

Dimensions of pedagogical leadership	
Value	An umbrella construction that includes other dimensions
The context	Micro level, structure of organisation, definition of core task/purpose Municipality's resources and structure of ECE organisation Macro level, national government intent, situation, place, time, the values and attitudes in society
Organisational culture	Interaction and work community Organisation's cultural structure Distributed leadership
Professionalism	Management skills, Leadership role and style Managing work tasks Time management
Management of substance	Pedagogical competence Management and development of core task of organisation Theoretical and practical knowledge about ECE The desire to develop oneself and develop a pedagogy

Value dimension builds on understanding the pedagogy to be the main value which influences any decisions as a work of leaders. Often, economic efficiency competes alongside pedagogical values in decision-making. The leader's responsibility areas are wide, and they have many administrative and management duties that take a lot of time. Still, they consider pedagogical leadership and human resource management to be the most important task in their profession and at the same time they say that they do not have enough time to perform these tasks (Siippainen et al., 2021). This may also imply that the concept of pedagogical leadership is still unclear (Fonsén et al., 2022a).

The context of educational organisation varies even the curriculum states the guidelines for pedagogical work. The Finnish municipalities have wide autonomy to decide how they provide the education within the government's regulations. That means the structures of leadership systems in municipalities differ in rural and urban areas as the municipalities sizes also differ. Pedagogical leadership is realised in many ways in these various structures. Extensive responsibilities and the simultaneous management of several units weaken the effort that leaders could use for pedagogical leadership (Fonsén, 2014). Globally, we can investigate the leadership system of education as a leadership structure at the national level but also at the local organisational level.

*Organisational cultur*e is based on the quality of communality, values and interaction between organisation's members. Collaborative atmosphere in work supports personnel's work wellbeing and if the leadership is distributed, it empowers teachers towards professional development. (Fonsén & Ukkonen-Mikkola, 2019). Sergiovanni (1998) states that pedagogical leadership enhances the social capital of the work community, and it is an alternative for bureaucratic and entrepreneurial leadership. In the next section, the theory of human capital needed for pedagogical leadership is explained (Fonsén, 2013, 2014).

One of the pedagogical leadership dimensions is *professionalism*. Without sufficient professional skills for management, it is impossible to master the leadership skills for leading the pedagogy. Leaders need to enable organisations to function, which includes human resources management, budgeting, administrative tasks and so on (see Lahtero & Kuusilehto-Awale, 2015). When the external and internal conditions of the organisation are in order, the leader can also focus on pedagogical leadership. Even if the leadership is distributed, leaders must fulfil the leadership role and take the responsibility of the leader. The leaders always have the main responsibility for the organisation, and the distributed nature of leadership does not exclude professional liability.

Management of substance means the need to manage educational knowledge. Leaders need to know the direction in which to lead the pedagogy, and for that they need educational knowledge, and they are expected to act as interpreters of the curriculum. At the centre level, leaders evaluate the pedagogical quality and use the curriculum and their own knowledge about education as refers to what it bases (Ahtiainen et al., 2021). High-level initial training in education is needed but also continuing learning and interest in new research (Fonsén, 2013, 2014). As well as

being leaders, teachers must have educational knowledge and also be interested in developing their professionalism and educational knowledge.

These dimensions are strongly connected and interrelated with each other and together they model the entity of pedagogical leadership. They can also be well applied to teachers' pedagogical leadership.

Human Capital Needed for Pedagogical Leadership

After finding the dimension of pedagogical leadership, Fonsén (2014) developed the model of human capital needed for pedagogical leadership by applying Sergiovanni's (1998) ideas of human capital. As Sergiovanni argues, through pedagogical leadership, leaders develop social and academic capital for students, and also intellectual and professional capital for teachers. Thus, the instruments needed for pedagogical leadership can be described through the human capital needed for pedagogical leadership (Table 8.4).

Educational knowledge is a crucial aspect of pedagogical leadership competence for leaders. The leaders' own professional background should be derived from education because it is necessary to know what good pedagogy is and how it can lead pedagogy towards high quality. In addition, the desire to acquire new professional knowledge seems to be important. New research knowledge may change the pedagogical thinking and old habits, and methods may prove inappropriate for the time and for the aims of the current curriculum. Sergiovanni (1998) has also written about academic capital that deepens learning and teaching culture while the focus of leadership is pedagogy and educational knowledge, in which all decisions are made by considering children's or students' learning and well-being.

Knowledge about the implemented pedagogy in practice requires leaders' time to observe teachers' work or other tools for evaluating teaching. While leaders have knowledge based on educational theory and the content of the curriculum, they are competent for evaluating pedagogical practices. If leaders have several units to lead and limited time to evaluate by themselves, they need evaluation tools and structures for pedagogical reflection and discussion with teachers. In addition, teachers as team leaders need tools for reflection to promote pedagogical practices and support teachers and the other educators' professional agency (Melasalmi & Husu, 2019).

Table 8.4 Human capital needed for pedagogical leadership

Knowledge about high-quality pedagogy
Knowledge about implementing pedagogy in practice
Skills to lead the staff to promote pedagogy
Ability to argue for pedagogy in all organisational levels

Skills to lead the staff to promote pedagogy are needed as human capital for pedagogical leadership. Leaders need to lead reflection, development work and evaluate the learning needs of teachers as well as to provide in-service training, when needed. Furthermore, critical reflection is the key issue for teachers to develop their own work. In a supportive and acceptable atmosphere, reflection is encouraging, not negative and enhances learning of the whole work community.

Ability to argumentation for pedagogy in all organisational levels is the fourth part of human capital needed for pedagogical leadership. It is not enough to have knowledge about high-quality pedagogy but also the skills to use this knowledge and argue for high-quality pedagogy. That argument is needed in all situations in which leaders need to make decisions concerning educational organisation and its management. Especially important is the ability to argue when financial and efficiency interests compete alongside pedagogical interests. Moos (2017) argues that neo-liberal governance forces educational leaders to make decisions based on efficiency requirements instead of pedagogical quality. Leaders need strong pedagogical leadership, knowledge of pedagogy and argumentation skills to justify their decisions.

In a subsequent study (Ahtiainen et al., 2021), the theory of human capital for pedagogical leadership (Fonsén, 2014) and the process of educational change (Ahtiainen, 2017) were merged into a leadership competence model for leading pedagogy and curriculum implementation (Ahtiainen et al., 2021) (Fig. 8.3). Human capital for pedagogical leadership proved to be a fruitful definition of the


Increased knowledge

Awareness of the quality of implemented pedagogy

Skills to lead development

Ability to argue for ECEC pedagogy

HUMAN CAPITAL FOR PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP

Entry

Dissemination

Objectives

Impact

PROCESS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

Fig. 8.3 Leadership competence model for leading pedagogy and curriculum implementation. (Modified from Ahtiainen et al., 2021)

competence leaders need when they must implement educational changes in their organisation. Ahtiainen (2017) has introduced phases in which *entry* gives purpose to the change, *objective* directs the focus to the aims of desired change, *dissemination* includes strategies and actions in terms of the change agenda. Finally, follow-up is needed on the educational change to evaluate its *impact.* In conclusion, the result of this research indicates that leaders need to have the human capital of pedagogical leadership (Fonsén, 2014), and they need to understand the process of educational change (Ahtiainen, 2017) to successfully implement the curriculum (Ahtiainen et al., 2021).

The theory of human capital for pedagogical leadership (Fonsén, 2014) has also been utilised in the research of early childhood education teachers' professional development during in-service training (Fonsén & Ukkonen-Mikkola, 2019). The competencies that the model defines, and which were followed in the content of in-service training proved to increase professional empowerment and professional development. To support distributions of leadership and strengthen teachers' pedagogical leadership, based on their study, Fonsén & Ukkonen-Mikkola (2019) recommended that the initial training of ECE teachers should include more studies of pedagogical leadership. In addition, university-based long-term in-service training is needed for enhancing teachers' skills in pedagogical leadership.

Conclusions and Discussion

Through introduction of our theories and models of pedagogical leadership, we claim that we may enhance the understanding of leading high-quality education. Pedagogical leaders at all levels of educational organisations are needed to ensure the high quality of education. Especially in the times we are living in, the pressure of neo-liberal politics that jeopardise educational equality and children's opportunity to achieve high-quality education despite their backgrounds and economic and social status (Moos, 2017). The economic situation forces leaders to make decisions that are sometimes against the ethics of children's benefit and educational premises. Leaders with a good knowledge of pedagogical leadership may be more able to face those challenges.

At school level, the principal's key role is to ensure that the school achieves the objectives set out in the curriculum. The Finnish National Core Curriculum for Comprehensive Education (FNAE, 2014) does not only set the objective of learning to master the content of subjects. The concept of transversal competencies, which refers to a set of knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and will, is included, too. This also means the ability to use knowledge and skills in a way that is appropriate for the situation. How pupils use their knowledge and skills is influenced by the values and attitudes they hold and by their will to act. The increased need for transversal competences is driven by changes in the world around us. Growing as a human

being, learning, working and acting as a citizen now and in the future requires competencies that transcend and integrate knowledge and skills (FNAE, 2014). The changing world growing as a human being and the skills needed for the future are challenging the field of education all over the world. Broad understanding about pedagogical leadership provides a useful framework for examining and developing educational leadership when the goals set go beyond the learning outcomes of individual subjects.

Ultimately, the success of the curriculum depends on the success of teaching and the interaction between teachers and pupils. The long-term development of teaching and interaction cannot succeed without the commitment of the teaching staff. This commitment is best achieved when staff can have the opportunity to participate in setting objectives and developing activities. Broad-based pedagogical leadership therefore focuses the principal's attention on developing staff competence and initiating and maintaining processes for setting objectives. According to the Finnish National Agency of Education (2013), the principal's most important task as a pedagogical leader, alongside the fulfilment of the school's core mission, is to ensure the learning of all members of the school community – students, teachers, principal and support staff.

Even more important is that a comprehensive view for leading education is needed at the levels of policy makers in the governance and administration of education. In our chapter, we have presented theoretical modelling of pedagogical leadership which can be utilised in the design of training for future pedagogical leaders. This theoretical thinking has been the basis for the EduLeaders project (see Chap. 3 in this book) and future design for the Vepo johtaminen 2035 project (Ahtiainen & Fonsén, 2021) both of which aim to do product research based studies for educational leaders at various levels from teachers to the administration of education.

References

Ahtiainen, R. (2017). Shades of change in Fullan's and Hargreaves's models: Theoretical change perspectives regarding Finnish special education reform (Doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki). http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-51-3549-0

Ahtiainen. R. & Fonsén, E. (2021). Vepo johtaminen 2035 [Vepo leadership 2035]. https://www2. helsinki.fi/fi/tutkimusryhmat/kasvatus-ja-opetusalan-johtajuuden-tutkimus-ja-koulutusryhma/ tutkimus/vepo-johtaminen-2035-varhaiskasvatuksen-seka-esi-ja-perusopetuksen-johtajuuden-kehittamissuunnitelma-ja

Ahtiainen, R., Fonsén, E., & Kiuru, L. (2021). Finnish early childhood education directors' perceptions of leadership and assessment of the National Core Curriculum in times of change. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood., 46*(2), 126–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/18369391211010971

Alava, J., Halttunen, L., & Risku, M. (2012). *Muuttuva oppilaitosjohtaminen. [Changing school management].* Opetushallitus. Muistiot 2012:3.

Barth, R. S. (2007). Culture in question. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *Educational Leadership* (pp. 159–168). Jossey-Bass.

Bendikson, L., Robinson, V., & Hattie, J. (2012). Principals' instructional leadership and secondary school performance. *Research Information for Teachers, 1*, 2–8. https://doi.org/10.18296/set.0387

Finnish Education Evaluation Centre (FINEEC). (2019). *Tilastoraportti varhaiskasvatuksen järjestämisestä [Statistical report of the providing early childhood education]* https://karvi.fi/app/uploads/2019/09/Karvi_vaka_tilastoraportti_2019-1.pdf Retrievied 10 February 2022.

Finnish Government. (2021). Education Policy Report of the Finnish Government 2021:24. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-383-622-8. Retrieved 26 October 2022.

Finnish National Agency for Education (FNAE). (2013). *Rehtorien työnkuvan ja koulutuksen määrittämistä sekä kelpoisuusvaatimusten uudistamista valmistelevan työryhmän raportti. [Report of work group preparing determining principals' job description and reforming qualification requirements].* Opetushallitus. Raportit ja selvitykset 2013:16. ISSN 1798-8926.

Finnish National Agency for education (FNAE). (2014). Comprehensive Education National Core Curriculum.

Finnish National Agency for Education (FNAE) (2022). *Finnish National core curriculum for early childhood education and care.*

Fonsén, E. (2013). Dimensions of pedagogical leadership in early childhood education and care. In E. Hujala, M. Waniganayake, & J. Rodd (Eds.), *Researching leadership in early childhood education* (pp. 181–192). Tampere University Press.

Fonsén, E. (2014). *Pedagoginen johtajuus varhaiskasvatuksessa. [Pedagogical leadership in ECE]. PhD Thesis*. University of Tampere.

Fonsén, E., & Ukkonen-Mikkola, T. (2019). Early childhood education teachers' professional development towards pedagogical leadership. *Educational Research, 61*(2), 181–196.

Fonsén, E., Ahtiainen, R., Kiuru, L., Lahtero, T., Hotulainen, R., & Kallioniemi, A. (2022a). Kasvatus- ja opetusalan johtajien näkemyksiä johtamisosaamisesta ja sen kehittämistarpeista. [school and early childhood education leaders' views on their own leadership competences and needs for its development]. *Työelämän tutkimus [Working life research], 20*(1), 90–117.

Fonsén, E., Lahtinen, L., Sillman, M., & Reunamo, J. (2022b). Pedagogical leadership and children's Well-being in Finnish early education. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 50*(6), 979–994. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220962105

Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., & Holtzman, D. J. (2009). Instructional leadership in practice: What does it look like, and what influence does it have? *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 14*(1), 72–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824660802715460

Gurr, D., Drysdale-George, L., & Mulford, B. (2010). Australian principal instructional leadership: Direct and indirect influence. *Magis, Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación, 2*(4), 299–314.

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(3), 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793

Hämäläinen, K., Taipale, A., Salonen, M., Nieminen, T., & Ahonen, J. (2002). *Oppilaitoksen johtaminen. [Leading an educational institution]*. WSOY.

Hansen, B., & Lárusdóttir, S. H. (2014). Instructional leadership in compulsory schools in Iceland and the role of school principals. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research., 59*(5), 583–603. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.965788

Lahtero, T. (2011). *Yhtenäiskoulun johtamiskulttuuri. Symbolis-tulkinnallinen näkökulma. [leadership culture in unified comprehensive school, symbolic-interpretative approach]* Jyväskylä studies in education, psychology, and social research 405. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-4186-4

Lahtero, T. J., & Kuusilehto-Awale, L. (2015). Possibility to engage in pedagogical leadership as experienced by Finnish newly appointed principals. *American Journal of Educational Research, 3*(3), 318–329. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-3-3-11. http://pubs.sciepub.com/education/3/3/11/index.html

Lahtero, T. J., & Risku, M. (2012). Symbolic leadership and leadership culture in one unified Comprehensive School in Finland. *School Leadership and Management: Formerly School Organisation, 32*(5), 523–535. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2012.724669. ISSN 1364-2626 (Online).

Lahtero, T. J., & Risku, M. (2013). Symbolic leadership culture and its subcultures in one unified Comprehensive School in Finland. *International Journal of Educational Management, 28*(5), 560–577. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2013-0036. ISSN: 0951-354X (Online)

Lahtero, T., Ahtiainen, R., Fonsén, E., & Kallioniemi, A. (2021). Rehtoreiden ja opettajien käsityksiä perusopetuksen opetussuunnitelman toteutumista edistävistä tekijöistä laajan pedagogisen johtamisen viitekehyksessä [examination of the implementation of the comprehensive education national core curriculum within the framework of broad-based pedagogical leadership]. *Hallinnon tutkimus [Administrative Studies], 40*(5), 326–338.

Larsen, C., & Rieckhoff, B. (2014). Distributed leadership: Principals describe shared roles in a PDS. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, 17*(3), 304–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2013.774051

Melasalmi, A., & Husu, J. (2019). Shared professional agency in early childhood education: An in-depth study of three teams. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 84*, 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.05.002

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2022). Comprehensive education. https://okm.fi/en/basic-education

Moos, L. (2017). Neo-liberal governance leads education and educational leadership astray. In M. Uljens & R. M. Ylimaki (Eds.), *Bridging educational leadership, Curriculum theory and didaktik, educational governance research* (Vol. 5, pp. 151–180). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58650-2_2

Plessis, P. (2013). The principal as instructional leader: Guiding schools to improve instruction. *Education as Change, 17*(1), 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2014.865992

Raasumaa, V. (2010). Perusopetuksen rehtori opettajien osaamisen johtajana. [The principal of comprehensive school as a leader of teacher competence]. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research, 383. Jyväskylä University Printing House. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-3803-1

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Ruohola, V., Fonsén, E., Lahtinen, L., Salomaa, P., & Reunamo, J. (2021). Johtajien arvioinnit varhaiskasvatuksen laadun prosessitekijöistä ja niiden yhteys lasten toimintaan sitoutuneisuuteen. [directors' assessments of process factors in the quality of early childhood education and their connection to children's involvement in activities]. *Journal of Early Childhood Education Research, 10*(3), 282–316.

Schein, E. H. (2005). Defining organizational culture. In J. M. Schafritz, J. S. Ott, & Y. S. Yang (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory* (pp. 360–367). Thomson Wadsworth.

Schlechty, P. C. (2007). Understanding the normative system. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *Educational leadership* (pp. 221–238). Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1998). Leadership as pedagogy, capital development and school effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership in Education Theory and Practice, 1*(1), 37–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360312980010104

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2006). *The Principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Pearson/Allyn Bacon.

Siippainen, A., Sarkkinen, T., Vlasov, J., Marjanen, J., Fonsén, E., Heikkinen, S., Hjelt, H., Lahtinen, J., Lohi, N., & Mäkelä, M. (2021). *"Yhdessä yritetään tehdä parasta mahdollista varhaiskasvatusta ja laatua jokaisen lapsen päivään" Varhaiskasvatuksen moninaiset johtamisrakenteet ja johtaminen. ["Together, we aim to provide the best possible early childhood education and care and quality to the day of every child" The diverse management structures and leadership in early childhood education awnd care]*. Kansallinen koulutuksen arviointikeskus. [Finnish Education Evaluation Centre]. Julkaisuja [Publication] 23:2021.

Soukainen, U., & Fonsén, E. (2018). Will the Leadership Last? Sustainable Leadership in Early Childhood Education. In E. Rogulj, A. V. Jevtić, & A. Jurčević-Lozančić (Eds.), *Early Childhood Relationships: The foundation for Sustainable Future. Proceedings. International Scientifical and Professional Conference OMEP 2017* (pp. 312–329) http://omep.hr/assets/zbornik.pdf. Retrieved 26 October 2022

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. Pearson Prentice Hall.