

Decentralisation and Effective School Leadership

Expectation versus Reality

Cecep Somantri

School of Education, The University of Nottingham, United Kingdom (UK)

txcs57@nottingham.ac.uk

Keywords: Decentralisation, leadership, principal.

Abstract: Decentralisation is a management reform that is widely believed to promise a range of benefits in transforming the effectiveness of local governance and broaden local participation. By 1999, nearly all countries in the world were experimenting with decentralisation, at least in policy level. In line with it, education is one of the sectors that has been affected by decentralisation. In a devolved education system, schools are given both autonomy and responsibilities in decision-making authority. At school level, those who receive the transferred-authority are mainly principals, and hence, they have broadened-roles and responsibilities. However, research and literature drawn from more than four decades show that a devolved environment urges for accountability that is oftentimes regarded as pressure and dilemma by school leaders and teachers. When the curriculum and standardised tests remain under the control of central government, accountability is valued in the context of performativity. Furthermore, it is also evident that a devolved education system requires an approach that does not lead to solitude autonomy, segregated collaboration and regulation-based accountability. Therefore, there is an urgency to have a systemic solution that acknowledges the important role of principals, clarifies the responsibilities and roles of principal, and develops capacity of principals.

1 INTRODUCTION

Decentralisation has become a global development strategy and management reform. Jütting, Kauffmann, Mc Donnell, Osterrieder, Pinaud, and Wegner (2004, p.7) argue that, 'decentralisation has been advocated by donors and development agencies as an important factor broadening citizen participation and improving local governance, thereby promoting poverty reduction from the bottom up.' As a result, it has been at the centre stage of policy experiments in many countries in various regions (Lugaz, De Grauwe, with Balde, Diakhate, Dougnon, Moustapha, and Odushina, 2010). For example, in many African countries, decentralisation is regarded as a key component of restructuring management of service delivery (UNESCO, 2004).

Despite receiving much attention worldwide, both literature and research show that decentralisation results variously in its practice. Litvack, Ahmad and Bird (1998, p.1), for example, explain that, 'whatever its origins, decentralisation can have significant repercussions for resource mobilisation and allocation, and ultimately macroeconomic stability,

service delivery, and equity.' Meanwhile, King and Guerra (2005) argue that, decentralisation is not a policy panacea, since the reform process is never smooth and is likely to be punctuated by either progress or setbacks. However, statistical tests by Triesman (2000), using data from 54 countries, suggest that, 'states which have more tiers of government tend to have higher perceived corruption, and may do a worse job of providing public (health) services' (p.2).

In accordance with decentralisation that has been a "fashion" of management and development reform, Fiske (1996) claims that, decentralisation of education has also become a global phenomenon. Allied to this idea, McGinn and Welsh (1999, p.7) argue that, 'decentralisation is one of the most important phenomena to come to the educational planning agenda....' Driven by different reasons, many countries have practiced decentralisation of education to varying degrees with the hope to foster student and teacher motivation, community participation, and curriculum adaptation to local context (Fiske, 1996; McGinn and Welsh, 1999).

However, international experiences show mixed results of its implementation.

A study by Habibi, Yuang, Miranda, Murillo, Ranis, Sarkar and Stewart (2001) reports a positive impact of decentralisation on education in Argentina in improving access to compulsory education, by using 'the ratio of students enrolled in secondary school per one thousand primary students' (p.17). Meanwhile, a study by Behrman, Deolalikar and Soon on the role of education decentralisation in promoting effective schooling in Asian developing countries (2002) found that, 'while virtually all developing countries have made impressive gains in expanding the coverage of primary schooling, enrollment rates remain generally low at secondary and tertiary levels, particularly for children coming from disadvantaged backgrounds' (p.i). Behrman et al (2002) also discovered that the quality of education is a concern, when viewed from the dropout and grade repetition rates, and standardised test scores.

King and Guerra (2005), furthermore, studied the impact of decentralisation of education in East Asia. The study found that, 'decentralisation laws encourage greater local and community participation in providing and financing education, but this feature exposes inequalities between prosperous and poor areas, and the inability of poor areas to mobilise adequate resources' (King and Guerra, 2005, p.195). In line with these study findings, Donald and Boon-Ling (2007) identified the impact of decentralisation on the quality of education in developing countries. The study found that effective decentralisation requires strong institutional capacity building, and effective exercise of responsibilities is dependent upon the capacity of school leaders (Donald and Boon-Ling, 2007).

Based on the implementation of decentralisation that has various results as mentioned above, the paper aims at exploring what research says about the challenges of decentralisation to the existing leadership cultures in schools so that their effectiveness is further improved. While attempting to do so, the paper seeks to figure out what is meant by decentralisation and decentralisation of education, why many countries are adopting it, as well as what its impacts are towards education in general and effective school leadership in particular, by referring to relevant international literature and research.

2 DECENTRALISATION: WHAT AND WHY?

Although widely being experimented as a mechanism for transforming society, decentralisation has been an old debate. Conyers (1984, p.188) argues that 'the decentralisation of government in developing countries has been a topic of debate ever since 1950s.' However, for more than sixty years, the centralisation of power and resources became the trend among industrial nations as it led to massive economic gains and growth (Manor, 1999). As a result, after receiving independence from colonial regimes in 1950s and early 1960s, centralisation also became the model for development in many countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia (Rondinelli, Nellis, and Cheema, 1983; Manor, 1999).

By time, however, it is proven that centralisation has failed to promote development and reduce poverty, since it is often misused as a negative political instrument to create class stratification among people and preserve elitism of the "privileged" (Parker, 1995; Manor, 1999). As a consequence, during the 1980s, the situation began to change in which decentralisation became a widespread phenomenon (Rondinelli et al, 1983; Fiske, 1996; Manor, 1999; McGinn and Welsh, 1999). A study from the World Bank in 1992 shows that 63 developing countries with populations over 5 million claim to exercise some form of political power transfer to local units of government (Dillinger, 1994). By 1999, nearly all countries in the world were experimenting with decentralisation, at least in policy level (Manor, 1999; Lugaz et al, 2010).

Dillinger (1998) reviewed country reports on the spread of decentralisation in developing countries. The review (Dillinger, 1998) notes that, in parts of Africa, for example, decentralisation is shown with the establishment of local-political entities by the national governments in areas formerly under their administration. In Latin America, decentralisation is portrayed through a change in appointing mayors: from centrally appointed to locally elected (Dillinger, 1998). In Asia-Pacific, decentralisation could be seen in the enhanced local democracy as a result of governance reform (United Cities and Local Governments, 2007). In Europe, Crucq and Hemminga (2007) claim that, although decentralisation has been under discussion since 1980s, its adoption became stronger after the creation of Committee of the Regions (CoR) in 1994. The main task of the Committee is to ensure that 'the European Union give decision-making levels close to

citizens as much scope for action as possible' (CoR, 2000, p.8).

It is, however, important to note that decentralisation is a broad concept, because it embraces a complex, and at times confusing, set of policies (Lugaz et al, 2010). Defined simply, decentralisation is about authority-transfer from people in one location to those in another level (Rondinelli et al, 1983). Allied to this definition, Florestal and Cooper (1997, p.2) mention that 'the broad meaning of decentralisation [is] to move decision-making away from the centre and closer to the users of the service.' More specifically, Gash, Randall and Sims (2014, p.7) explain that, 'decentralisation can be broadly defined as the movement of power from central government to lower levels of aggregation.'

Although the terminology is contested, Rondinelli et al (1983) explains that there are four different categories of decentralisation, namely:

- Deconcentration: the handing over of some amount of administrative authority or responsibility to lower levels within central government ministries and agencies;
- Delegation: the transfer of managerial responsibility for specifically defined functions to organisations that are outside the regular bureaucratic structure, and that are only indirectly controlled by the central government;
- Devolution: the creation or strengthening – financially or legally – of subnational units of government, the activities of which are substantially outside the direct control of the central government; and,
- Privatisation: the transfer of power or responsibility to the private sector.

(Rondinelli et al, 1983, pp.15-28)

Besides variation in its categories, in many cases, decentralisation has also been motivated by numerous reasons. For example, a study by Jütting et al (2004) shows that decentralisation in 19 countries (Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Viet Nam, Ghana, Guinea, India, Malawi, Mozambique, Mexico, Nepal, Paraguay, Philippines, South Africa, Sri Lanka, and Uganda) has been motivated by two main arguments: increasing efficiency and improving governance. Meanwhile, in Indonesia, Kristiansen and Pratikno (2006) explain that, the country adopted decentralisation in 1999 due to a severe economic crisis in 1997, the introduction of free elections and democratic governance in 1999, the central government's inability to cover national expenditures, and the "push" from international

agencies, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), to see policy reforms in the direction of devolution.

Different reasons for decentralisation are found in the United Kingdom (UK). By conducting a study on UK's seven main decentralising reforms in 30 years, Gash et al (2014) conclude that decentralisation is important in the UK because: (i) although the evidence is varied, decentralisation is necessary condition to boost economic growth, reflect local identities and preferences, and foster innovation in public services; (ii) there are people attempting to govern locally who feel they could do more, or better, with greater control and influence over decisions in their areas; (iii) national decisions and negotiations with central government institutions are felt to be highly burdensome and bureaucratic; and, (iv) there are self-interested reasons from those in central government to support pressures from public and local level for decentralisation.

3 DECENTRALISATION OF EDUCATION

Education is one of the sectors that has been affected by decentralisation in countries adopting it. McGinn and Welsh (1999, p.9) argue that after going through some ideological debates on who should make decisions and finance public schooling for more than fifteen years, many countries turned their attention to the decentralisation of education. Defined broadly, decentralisation of education is the 'transfer of authority for the financing or governance of schools to a subnational agency' (Kemmerer, 1994, p. 1412). It also refers to the transfer of authority, at least in basic and secondary education, to more local units of government – provinces, municipalities – or even to the smallest units in the education system, that are schools (Florestal and Cooper, 1997; McGinn and Welsh, 1999; Lugaz et al, 2010).

Since decentralisation itself is conceptually and practically contested, the same situation also goes to decentralisation of education. In some countries like Germany, the USA, and some parts of the UK, decentralisation of education refers to 'the transfer of responsibilities away from the educational administration to elected representatives at regional or district level, such as the regional councils or district development committees' (Lugaz et al, 2010). In addition, Bush (2016, p.1) adds that decentralisation of education in England 'involves the granting of powers by national governments to

subordinate bodies'. Therefore, in England, 'each school has a governing body, with representatives of parents, the local community, teachers and other staff, with the head teacher as an ex officio member' (Bush, 2016, p.1). To limit its complexities, decentralisation of education in this paper is taken to mean as devolution of education. McGinn and Welsh (1999) explain that, when decentralisation is understood in the view of devolution, it signifies not simply the transfer of authority, but also responsibilities.

There are numerous reasons why a country adopts decentralisation of education. The reasons could be categorised in three motives: political, financial and efficiency (Fiske, 1996; Florestal and Cooper, 1997; McGinn and Welsh, 1999; Behrman et al, 2002). Political motives refer to increasing demand for participation in public decision-making by people who have or claim to have been excluded earlier (McGinn and Welsh, 1999). A case study by Fiske (1996) shows that Chile is an example of a country decentralising education due to political motives. Chile went through an opposite political transition – from democratic to a military government, and there was a strong support from neoliberal economists and social planners for more decentralisation in education (Fiske, 1996).

Financial motives mean that central governments are no longer capable of providing finance to meet the demand for education and schooling (McGinn and Welsh, 1999; King and Guera, 2005; Kristiansen and Pratikno, 2006). A case study by Pascoe and Pascoe (1998), involving 25 high ranking Australian policy makers and educational bureaucrats and practitioners, discovered that Australia decentralised education due to financial reasons. Decentralisation of education in Australia came in effect after 'the Victorian Commission of Audit found public expenditure on education was far too high' and required for incremental change (Pascoe and Pascoe, 1998, p.3).

Efficiency motives are arguments supporting that more local decision-making will reduce the cost and long ladder of bureaucracy (Florestal and Cooper, 1997; McGinn and Welsh, 1999; Behrman et al, 2002; Kristiansen and Pratikno, 2006; Gash et al, 2014). With fifty state governments and approximately 85,000 local governments, Rosenbaum (2013) claims that, to some extent, USA is an example why decentralisation is important for efficient management and public services reform, including education.

In addition to the three major motives above, another reason is raised in relation to the role of development agencies and donors in reinforcing the decentralisation of education in developing countries

(Manor, 1999; Rhoten, 2000; Jütting et al, 2004; Kristiansen and Pratikno, 2006). In Argentina, for example, a study in three different provinces by Rhoten (2000) found that UNESCO, USAID, and the World Bank, to a certain extent, advocated decentralisation of education by 'touting school autonomy and education decentralisation as "must have" reforms in progressive public services management' (p.603). In fact, Rhoten's (2000) study finding was implicitly mentioned in the World Bank's world review, *Priorities and Strategies for Education*, in 1995. In the review, the World Bank (1995, p.5, p.120) states that, 'Increasing the involvement of parents and communities by making schools autonomous and accountable can offset the power of vested interests.... Around the world, parents and communities are becoming more involved in the governance of their children's schools.... Many countries have found that communities which participate in school management are more willing to assist in the financing of schooling.'

Although the motives are different from one country to another, however, there are similarities in the objectives why decentralisation of education becomes a "fashionable" method of educational reform. Florestal and Cooper (1997, p.1) argue that many countries decentralise their (at least basic) education systems 'to give users a greater voice in decisions that affect them, to better recognise local linguistic or ethnic diversity.' Allied to this idea, McGinn and Welsh (1999, p.29) add that decentralisation of education will 'improve the operation of education system' from a formerly centralised system to a local-based one. For example, with decentralisation of education, schools will have stronger autonomy to utilise available funding, increase learning innovations, or match curriculum to local interests (McGinn and Welsh, 1999). In the end, by borrowing OECD's language, Ball (2003, p.217) explains that "a devolved environment" will give 'managers and organisations greater freedom in operational decisions and remove unnecessary constraints in financial and human resource management.' In other words, since decentralisation of education, to some extent, locates decision-making authority to school-level (Carr-Hill et al, 2014), schools will have more rooms for improvement to be effective.

4 IMPACT OF DECENTRALISATION ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

In a decentralised system, schools are given more autonomy in decision-making authority (De Grauwe, 2004; the World Bank, 2008). However, which decisions are transferred? and to who (at the school level)? In responding to the first question, De Grauwe (2004) explains that, in the decentralisation of education, the decisions transferred to schools emphasise on: (i) authority to the principal to manage the school's financial and human resources, including, for example, staff recruitment and the use of school's budget; and, (ii) authority to the community, for example on the selection of the principal and the adaptation of the curriculum. Meanwhile, in writing the second question, Leithwood and Menzies (1998) identify four types of authority transfer along with its recipients in the decentralised-education system, namely: (i) administrative control: the principal; (ii) professional control: teachers; (iii) community control: the community or parents; and, (iv) balanced control: parents, teachers and principal in balance authority. In line with these answers, Pont, Nusche and Moorman (2008a) argue that, decentralisation of education makes school leaders, as the ones holding the authority at school level, have broadened-roles and responsibilities.

Gessler and Ashmawy (2014) conducted an explorative qualitative study on the effect of decentralisation on vocational school leadership in Bremen and Lower, Saxony in Germany. With increased autonomy and greater role and responsibilities, Gessler and Ashmawy (2014) argue that the school principals are responsible to manage various aspects, namely: (i) teaching environment: all affairs related to instructional issues; (ii) personnel management: affairs associated with human resources; (iii) financial management: all about financial efficiency; and, (iv) school buildings and furnishings: finance purchases, maintenance and repair.

With these responsibilities, Gessler and Ashmawy (2004, p.184) conclude that 'decentralisation entails the creation of elected bodies through which various stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process, and that schools are able to discretionally plan their own goals and objectives'. As a result, Gessler and Ashmawy (2004) mention that, effective vocational school principal's exercise "participatory

leadership". It is a leadership practice that allows the participation of various stakeholders in making decisions through the school conference consisting of the principals and representatives of teachers, students, parents and relevant enterprises in vocational schools (Gessler and Ashmawy, 2004).

Ashmawy (2004) carried out the same study, yet bigger in its coverage, by comparing the effect of education decentralisation on school leadership in vocational schools in Germany and Egypt. With 30 vocational school principals as the samples (15 from Germany and 15 from Egypt), the study found that principals from both countries have an important role in: (i) being the responsible persons for the compliance to the rules and regulations set by the governments; (ii) motivating teachers and stakeholders to participate in the school life; (iii) sharing information and building good relationships with local educational authorities; (iv) involving stakeholders in the decision-making; and, (iv) guiding the decision-making processes. Based on these findings, Ashmawy (2004) argues that, in order to be effective, the principals from both countries demonstrate "participatory leadership". However, it is clear that the study by Ashmawi (2004) as well as the one by Gessler and Ashmawy (2004) are both limited in their generalisability as the samples are confined to vocational schools, and hence a further study is needed.

Steinberg (2013, p.6), on the other hand, argues that in a decentralised system, 'the role of school principals has shifted from one emphasising instructional leadership to one focused on transformational leadership, and finally to one involving leadership practices that contains both elements.' This argument is somehow backed up by different research with different findings that, while being contradictory to each other, all show the shift in effective leadership strategies.

Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2007) carried out a meta-analysis study by involving 27 published studies of the relationship between leadership and student outcomes. The study found that, 'the more leaders focus their relationships, their work, and their learning on the core business of teaching and learning, the greater their influence on student outcomes' (Robinson et al, 2007, p.636). Based on the findings, Robinson et al (2007, p.655) claim that, 'the impact of instructional leadership on student outcomes is three to four times greater than that of transformational leadership'.

Narrowly defined, instructional leadership, also known as "learning-centred leadership" (Murphy, Elliot, Goldring and Porter, 2006) or "leadership for

learning” (Hallinger and Heck, 2010), focuses on ‘actions that are directly connected to teaching and learning’ (Murphy, 1988, p.127). Viewed broadly, instructional leadership also means leadership actions that centre on student learning, including managerial tasks (Murphy, 1988; Donmoyer and Wagstaff, 1990). The actions cover many things a principal does to support students’ learning achievement and teachers’ teaching ability (Sebring and Bryk, 2000). In addition, Robinson (2010, p.2) explains that, instructional leadership also encompasses ‘sets of leadership practices that involve planning, evaluation, coordination, and improvement of teaching and learning.’

In practice, however, critics regard instructional leadership models to heavily rely on principal-centric approach. Sergiovanni (1995, p.155), for example, explains that, ‘being a strong instructional leader may be a good idea in schools where teachers are poorly trained or lacking in commitment, but it is not a good idea in schools where competence and commitment are not issues.’ Lambert (2002, p.37), furthermore, argues that ‘the days of the lone instructional leader are over. We no longer believe that one administrator can serve as the instructional leader for the entire school without the substantial participation of other educators.’ Allied to these arguments, Leithwood (2007, p.629) explains that,

“Instructional leadership has admonished principals to become closely and directly involved in teachers’ classroom instruction. Especially in larger schools and those offering the kinds of diverse curricula common to high schools, this admonition has never seemed more than a fond but unrealistic dream to even the most conscientious of principals. It simply flies in the face of the unavoidable demands on principals’ time, attention, and professional resources. It is an image of the principal as an educational “superhero”.”

Day, Gu, and Sammons (2016), on the other hand, conducted a study that drew empirical data from a three-year mixed-methods national study investigating the association between the work of more than six hundred effective and improving primary and secondary school principals in England and student outcomes over three years. The study found that,

“Schools’ abilities to improve and sustain effectiveness over the long term are not primarily the result of the principals’ leadership style but of their understanding and diagnosis of the school’s needs and their application of clearly articulated, organisationally shared educational values through

multiple combinations and accumulations of time and context-sensitive strategies that are “layered” and progressively embedded in the school’s work, culture and achievements”.

(Day et al, 2016, p.222)

Based on the findings, Day et al (2016, p.253) conclude that there is ‘...no single leadership formula to achieve success.... successful school principals draw differentially on elements of both instructional and transformational leadership and tailor (layer) their leadership strategies to their particular school contexts and to the phase of development of the school.’

Transformational leadership, put briefly, is ‘a leadership that facilitates the redefinition of a people’s mission and vision, a renewal of their commitment and the restructuring of their systems for goal accomplishment’ (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9). Based on seven quantitative studies, Leithwood (1994, p.506) concludes that, ‘transformational leadership practices, considered as a composite construct, had significant direct and indirect effects on progress with school-restructuring initiatives and teacher-perceived student outcomes.’ Transformational leadership focuses on five broad sets of leadership practices, namely: setting directions, developing people, redesigning organisation, managing people, and coalition building (Leithwood, 2007; Leithwood and Day, 2007). Under these core practices, there are twenty-three more specific practices within each category (Leithwood and Day, 2007). In line with it, Bush (2014) argues that, ‘the transformational model is comprehensive in that it provides a normative approach to school leadership which focuses primarily on the process by which leaders seek to influence school outcomes rather than on the nature or direction of those outcomes.’

There are, however, criticisms against transformational leadership. Chirichello (1999, p.5) argues that transformational leadership might be used as a means by ‘principals to be highly directive and offer little support, yet controlling at the same time.’ Moreover, Bottery (2004, p.17) states that, ‘transformational leaders were to be social architects, who in creating vision, developed the trust of their followers, building loyalty, self-confidence and self-regard.’ Meanwhile, by mentioning that in South Africa the language of transformation is used to underpin a non-racist post-Apartheid education system, Bush (2014, p.558) questions the validity of the transformational model in the policy climate within which schools have to operate.

The study by Day et al (2016), to some extent, relates back to what Marks and Printy (2003) found almost thirteen years ago. Marks and Printy (2003) conducted a study to see the association between principal leadership and school performance by employing twenty-four nationally selected restructured schools in the USA. The study found that, 'When transformational and shared instructional leadership coexist in an integrated form of leadership, the influence on school performance, measured by the quality of its pedagogy and the achievement of its students, is substantial' (Marks and Printy, 2003, p.370). In other words, Marks and Printy (2003) argue that both shared instructional leadership and transformational leadership are important in influencing pupils' learning outcome. The former functions to evaluate the principal's interactive role with teachers in the central areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, while the latter is needed to lead schools through reform as it emphasises the ingredients of change—ideas, innovation, influence, and consideration for the individual in the process (Marks and Printy, 2003, p.391). However, unlike Day et al's (2016) study, Mark and Printy's (2003) study has a minor limitation in the extent of its generalisation as the subjects of the study were purposively selected.

Although these three research are, to some extent, contradictory, they support Steinberg's (2013) argument on the shift of effective leadership practices in a decentralised system mentioned earlier. Literature and research show that decentralisation makes school principals have broadened-authority, roles and responsibilities (Leithwood and Menzies, 1998; De Grauwe, 2004; Pont et al, 2008a; the World Bank, 2008), and therefore, in order to be effective, school principals will have to combine both instructional and transformational leadership practices, not solely focusing on teaching, learning, and pupils' achievements. The studies by Gessler and Ashmawy (2014) and Ashmawy (2014) basically show how effective principals in vocational schools in Germany and Egypt have to combine instructional and transformational strategies in order to undertake their responsibilities in managing teaching environment, personnel management, financial management, and school buildings and furnishings.

Up to this point, it is safe to say that decentralisation gives wider autonomy in decision-making to schools to be effective. However, what are the challenges that it gives to the existing school leadership cultures to further improve their effectiveness?

5 CHALLENGES OF DECENTRALISATION TO THE EXISTING LEADERSHIP CULTURES IN SCHOOLS

A decentralised-education system is not only a matter of giving schools broader autonomy in their decision-making, but it is also followed with a transfer of responsibilities that demands accountability. In the same way, De Grauwe (2004, p.3) explains that giving authority and responsibilities to schools is not the same as giving them a "blank cheque", because more autonomy equals more accountability. In this context, OECD (2010; 2011) research findings imply that there is positive association between positive outcomes and school autonomy, when it is combined with accountability. Both PISA 2009 and 2015 results (OECD, 2010; 2011) conclude similarly by confirming the interplay between school autonomy and accountability. OECD (2010; 2011) explain that when school autonomy and accountability are intelligently combined, and supported with systems where principals have more autonomy over resources, curriculum and other school policies, students gain better performance.

Accountability is, however, a contested notion. For example, Møller (2007) regards that the term might be difficult to put into practice, since it is rather "elusive." In the same way, Levitt, Janta, Wegrich (2008) argue that accountability can be a "slippery" concept, because it can be defined differently in theory and practice, and applied variously in a range of circumstances. In addition, Levitt et al (2008, p.2) explain that accountability is an ethical term as 'it concerns proper behaviour, and deals with the responsibilities of individuals and organisations for their actions towards other people and agencies.'

To fulfil the semantic as well as academic clarity, accountability, as defined by Bovens (2005), based on a research on public accountability, refers to 'the methods by which the actor may render an account (i.e. justify their actions and decisions) to the stakeholders and by which the stakeholders may hold the actor to account (i.e. impose sanctions or grant permissions).' In line with this definition, Levitt et al (2008) explain that the "actor" refers to individual or organisation, while "stakeholders" refer to people with a particular interest in the work of the actor (including the actor's conduct, perceptions, attitudes and the outcomes of the actor's activities).

In school context, accountability is oftentimes regarded as "pressure" (Mulford, 2006) or "dilemma" (Fullan and Hargreaves, 2015). It becomes "pressure" and "dilemma" when authority, responsibilities, and management of education have been decentralised to

school level, but the curriculum and testing remain centralised (Behrman et al, 2002). When this happens, accountability is oftentimes valued in the context of “performativity”. By formulating it based on individualised comments from teachers in the UK, Ball (2003, p.216) explains that, ‘performativity is a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change – based on rewards and sanctions (both material and symbolic).’ Based on the definition, Ball (2003) regards “performativity” as a “terror” for teachers.

Allied to Ball’s (2003) argument, Fullan (2003a, p.xiii) argues that, unrealistic expectations and a policy environment that contributes to increased prescription of the statistical targets of learning outcomes, and diminished coherence between learning needs and curriculum, cause “a dismal for principalship.” Meanwhile, a case study in five local authorities in England by Stevenson (2013) found that when educational achievement is measured solely by standardised tests and the publication of “league tables” of school performance, school leaders, especially principals, are faced not only with “right versus wrong” issues, but also “right versus right” dilemmas. As a result, inevitably, there will be “either/or” situations ‘where there exists a clear opportunity cost resulting from whatever action is not pursued’ (Stevenson, 2003, p.380). Taken together, Ball’s (2003), Fullan’s (2003a) and Stevenson’s (2013) arguments show that, accountability as perceived in the sense of “performativity” becomes “pressure” and “dilemma” for both school principals and teachers.

By borrowing Ball’s (2003) language, “the terror of performativity” is faced by different countries with devolved-education system. In England, for example, Bush (2016) explains that although affairs related to budgets, school choice and governance have been decentralised to school level, the curriculum remains centralised. The national curriculum is set by the central government through the Department for Education, and its implementation is monitored by the statutory Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). The inspection covers a number of areas, namely overall effectiveness, leadership and management effectiveness, quality of teaching, learning and assessment, personal development, behaviour and welfare, and outcomes for pupils (Ofsted, 2016, p.33). Based on the inspection, Ofsted inspectors use the following four-point scale to make all judgements, ranging from: (i) grade 1: outstanding; (ii) grade 2: good; (iii) grade 3: requires improvement; to, (iv) grade 4: inadequate (Ofsted, 2016). These judgments will then result in the form of “league tables” (Stevenson, 2013), allowing, to

some extent, the public to make another judgment on the schools’ accountability based on the ranking.

Indonesia, on the other hand, is an example of a country where accountability in school context is somewhat measured by standardised tests. Since its implementation in 1950, there has been continuous debate on the fairness of determining learning quality through national examination (Ministry of Education and Culture, Republic of Indonesia, 2015). The debate is raised due to the country’s demographic diversity, covering 81,626 villages, around 17 thousand islands and 680 native languages, as well as discrepancy in education quality among more than 50 million students enrolled in over 200 thousand schools throughout the country (Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016; Ministry of Education and Culture, Republic of Indonesia, 2015).

In its broadest sense, however, accountability does not only bring pressure, but it also opens up opportunity for school leaders and teachers to be effective by showing responsibility. In Indonesian context, for example, a quantitative study by Pritchett (2013, p.118) suggests that the country would need at least 101 years to reach average OECD levels at Finland’s pace. In line with it, de Ree, Muralidharan, Pradhan, Rogers (2016) conducted a large-scale randomised experiment across more than 3,000 teachers and 80,000 students in Indonesia. The study found that, ‘the doubling in pay led to no improvements in measures of teacher effort or student learning outcomes, suggesting that the salary increase was a transfer to teachers with no discernible impact on student outcomes’ (de Ree et al, 2016, p.1). Based on these studies, it can be safely argued that, accountability cannot be solely taken as pressure, because it also seeks for responsibility from (Indonesian) school leaders and teachers to work more effectively.

Case studies in Indonesia by Raihani and Gurr (2006), Raihani (2007), and Raihani, Gurr and Drysdale (2013) signify how the pressure from the public as well as the newly adopted decentralisation of education system has been able to make the principals become more “transformational”. Raihani and Gurr (2006) found that, three successful public senior secondary school principals in Yogyakarta Province demonstrated several common values and beliefs of successful school leadership found by Day, Harris, Hadfield, Tolley, and Beresford (2000), namely trust, caring and empathy. In addition, the principals also performed beliefs and values related to their Islamic values (e.g. the responsibility to God to do one’s best, and faith and piety), the family-relationship value, and promotion of Javanese values. However, emphasised more in the research, Raihani and Gurr (2006, p.121) found that, ‘trust was an important feature of the principals’ leadership due to

concerns in Indonesia about corruption.’ Based on these findings, Raihani (2007) argues that, the three effective principals in Yogyakarta Province exercised transformational leadership practices. Raihani (2007, p.481) claims that, ‘the principals demonstrated ability in developing the school vision, setting strategies, building capacity, and establishing a broader network to achieve the benefits of school improvement.’

Raihani et al (2013), furthermore, explored the work of Mr. Mulyono, a successful public Islamic senior secondary school (MAN) in Palangkaraya, Central Kalimantan Province. The study is worth attention, because ‘whilst MAN is a school for Muslim children staffed by Muslim teachers, both students and staff come from diverse cultural backgrounds that reflect this complex part of the world.’ The study found that, in order to be effective, the principal was being humble by showing empathy and respecting others, put quality teaching over ethnicity, worked with religious differences, and developed students’ multicultural awareness (Raihani et al, 2013). An important aspect found in the study also relates to trust, since Mr. Mulyono is not originally from Palangkaraya. Raihani et al (2013, p.185) explain that, ‘Mr. Mulyono is not only charged with leading a school in a culturally diverse community, but [also] doing [it] as an ‘outsider’.’

From the case studies, it could be seen that the “pressure” given to Indonesian school principals to show accountability could result positively. Since corruption was extensive under the centralised system that anchored in the country for more than 54 years (Bjork, 2003; Kristiansen and Pratikno, 2006), school principals are entitled to show their accountability by being trustworthy as a way to create a culture of trust. In fact, research findings by Day (2013, p.105) conclude that, ‘trust has been found to be key elements in all countries.’

However, the question now is how to develop an approach ‘in which the elements of a devolved system are held in creative tension, with checks and balances to make sure that autonomy does not lead to isolation, that diversity does not become a barrier to collaboration and that accountability does not slip into regulation’ (National College, 2012, p.3). More than a decade ago, Fullan (2003, p.22) argued that ‘the solution is to acknowledge the extreme importance of the principalship, clarify the power nature of the principal’s role, and invest in developing capacity of principals in numbers to act as chief operating officers.’ In order to realise it, Fullan (2003b) explains that it requires individual and system action independently and conjointly.

At the individual level, school leaders are to take actions consistent with the moral purpose, and push for and be responsible to the opportunities they have

(Fullan, 2003, p.63). Meanwhile, at the system level, Fullan (2003b) emphasises that, ‘the point is that leaders learning in context and fostering leaders at many levels is the core strategy....’ Although Fullan’s (2003) proposed-solution might be outdated and was not based on research, Austria, England, Finland, Belgium and Australia provide examples of how the solution is implemented in practice (Pont, Nusche and Hopkins, 2008b).

Case studies conducted by Pont et al (2008b) show that, the five countries ‘demonstrated models of school organisation and management that distribute education leadership roles in innovative ways; and showed promising practices for preparing and developing school leaders’ (p.10). In England, for example, Pont et al (2008b) found a systemic approach that provides opportunities for schools and school leadership to collaborate for school improvement through the role of the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). NCSL has played an important role in developing national school leaders, promoting school networks, and enhancing collaboration among schools (Pont et al, 2008b, p.111). In 2013, NCSL was merged with the Teaching Agency to form National College for Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) (the UK Department for Education [DfE] and Gove, 2013). NCTL has responsibilities to: (i) improve academic standards by: ensuring the availability of a well-qualified and motivated teaching profession, in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of the school system; and (ii) help schools to help each other to improve (NCTL, 2016, p.8). With its important role and wide range of responsibilities, to some extent, NCTL represents England’s serious commitment and effort to improve the quality of teaching and educational leadership workforce through individual and systemic approach as suggested by Fullan (2003).

6 CONCLUSIONS

Decentralisation is a globally adopted development strategy and management reform. It widely is believed to promise a range of benefits by being an important element to improve the effectiveness of local governance and broaden local participation. However, since it is motivated by different reasons, decentralisation is defined and exercised variously in actual practice. In line with it, literature and research show mixed results in the implementation of decentralisation in different countries. One common feature found from research is that, decentralisation depends on the capacity and commitment of central government to devolve authority to lower units of government.

Education, on the other hand, is one of the sectors that has been affected by decentralisation in many parts of the world. Yet, since decentralisation itself is conceptually and practically contested, decentralisation of education is practiced variously. In this paper, decentralisation of education is interchangeable with devolution of education. In a devolved education system, schools are given both autonomy and responsibilities in decision-making authority. The decisions transferred to school level encompass the authority to the principal to manage the school's financial and human resources, and the authority to the community (e.g. to select the principal). At school level, those who receive the transferred-authority are school leaders, mainly principals. Therefore, under a decentralised-education system, school principals have broadened-roles and responsibilities.

Research show that decentralisation of education allows the creation of elected bodies to involve various stakeholders in the decision-making process, and enables schools to plan their own goals and objectives independently. As a result, decentralisation of education makes principals demonstrate participatory leadership model in order to be effective. In addition, research also support the argument that decentralisation of education has made effective school principals combine elements of instructional and transformational leadership practices.

Despite giving schools broader autonomy in their decision-making, however, decentralisation of education creates a number of challenges to the existing leadership cultures in schools. A devolved environment urges for accountability that is oftentimes regarded as pressure and dilemma by school leaders and teachers. When the curriculum and standardised tests remain under the control of central government, accountability is valued in the context of performativity. Yet, when viewed broadly, accountability opens up opportunity for school leaders and teachers to show responsibility in order to be effective.

Another challenge relates to developing an approach in which elements of a devolved system do not lead to solitude autonomy, segregated collaboration and regulation-based accountability. A solution worth considering is by acknowledging the important role of principals, clarifying the responsibilities and roles of principal, and developing capacity of principals. However, it is important to take into account that it takes individual and systemic approach to realise it.

REFERENCES

- Ashmawy, I. K., 2014. *The effect of political decentralization on school leadership in the vocational schools: A Comparative Study between the German and the Egyptian Practice*. Dissertation to attain the Ph.D. degree by the doctoral commission Dr. Phil at Bremen University.
- Ball, S. J., 2003. The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18:2, 215-228.
- Behrman, J. R., Deolalikar, A. B., Soon, L. Y. 2002. *Conceptual Issues in the Role of Education Decentralization in Promoting Effective Schooling in Asian Developing Countries*. [Online] Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Bovens, M., 2005. *Public accountability*. In Ferlie, E., Lynn, L. E. and C. Pollitt, *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bush, T., Glover, D., 2003. *School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence*. [Online] Nottingham: National College for School Leadership NCSL.
- Bush, T., Glover, D., 2014. School leadership models: what do we know?. *School Leadership and Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 34:5, 553-571.
- Bush, T., 2016. School leadership and management in England: the paradox of simultaneous centralization and decentralisation. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, 11, pp. 1-23.
- Carr-Hill, R., Rolleston, C., Pherali, T., Schendel, R., 2014. *The Effects of School-Based Decision Making on Educational Outcomes in Low and Middle Income Contexts: A Systematic Review*. [Online] Oslo: The Campbell Collaboration.
- Crucq, P., Hemminga, H-J., 2007. *Decentralization and Economic Growth per capita in Europe*. [Online] Available at: http://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/14621122/EC_178_Decentralization.pdf. [Accessed 12 January 2017].
- Country of the Regions CoR., 2000. *OPINION of the Committee of the Regions of 17 February 2000 on the 2000 Intergovernmental Conference* [online]. Brussels: CoR. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/dorie/fileDownload.do?sessionId=7R2Xz5VieexfSHTjc7QP08KT23Lh8LOtnrrp3ulZSYIuCRrjvE0q!2096757176?docId=177179&cardId=177179> [Accessed 12 January 2017].
- Day, C., 2003. Successful leadership in the twenty-first century. In Harris, A., Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreaves, A., and Chapman, C. Eds. *Effective Leadership for School Improvement* pp.157-179.. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Day, C., 2015. *International Successful School Principals Project ISSPP.: Multi-Perspective Research on School Principals*. [Online] Nottingham: The University of Nottingham.
- Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolley, H., Beresford, J. 2000. *Leading Schools in Times of Change*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Day, C., Gu, Q., Sammons, P. 2016. The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: How Successful School Leaders use Transformational and Instructional Strategies to Make a Difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol 52., pp.221-258.
- De Grauwe, A. 2004. *School-based management SBM.: does it improve quality?:* Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, The Quality Imperative [Online] Paris: UNESCO.
- Department for Education and The Rt Hon Michael Gove MP 2013. *Launch of National College for Teaching and Leadership* [online]. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/launch-of-national-college-for-teaching-and-leadership> [Accessed on: 7 January 2016].
- Diana, C. 1984. Decentralization and development: a review of literature. *Public Administration and Development*, [online] Vol. 4, pp.187-197.
- Dillinger, W. 1994. *Decentralization and its implications for Service Delivery*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Donald, W., Boon-Ling, Y. 2007.. *Identifying the Impact of Education Decentralization on the quality of Education*. AED: Education Quality Improvement Program 2 EQUIP 2. working Paper. Available at: http://www.equip123.net/docs/e2-DecentQuality_WP.pdf [Accessed on: 25 December 2016].
- Donmoyer, R., Wagstaff, J. G. 1990.. Principals can be effective managers and instructional leaders. *NASSP Bulletin* [online], 74525., pp.20-29.
- Fiske, E., B. 1996. *Decentralization of Education: Politics and Consensus*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Florestal, K., Cooper, R. 1997. *Decentralization of Education*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Fullan, M. 2003a. *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fullan, M. 2003b. *Leading in a Culture of Change Personal Action Guide and Workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M., Hargreaves, A. 2015. *Professional Capital as Accountability*. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 2315. This article is part of EPAA/AAPE's Special Series on A New Paradigm for Educational Accountability: Accountability for Professional Practice. Guest Series Edited by Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond.
- Gash, T., Randall, J., Sims, S. 2014. *Achieving Political Decentralisation: Lessons from 30 years of attempting to devolve political power in the UK*. [Online] London: Institute for Government.
- Gertler, P., Patrinos, H. A., Rubio-Codina, M. 2008. *Impact Evaluation for School-Based Management Reform* [online]. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Gessler, M., Ashmawy, I. K. 2014. The effect of political decentralization on school leadership in German vocational schools. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, Vol 442., pp.184-204.
- Habibi, N., Huang, C., Miranda, D., Murillo, V., Ranis., G., Sarkar, M., Stewart, F. 2001. *Decentralization in Argentina*. Center Discussion Paper No. 825. [Online] Yale University.
- Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H. 2010. Leadership for Learning: Does Collaborative Leadership Make a Difference in Student Learning? *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* [online], 38 6.: pp.654-678.
- Hargreaves, A. 2003. Professional learning communities and performance training cults: the emerging apartheid of school improvement. In Harris, A., Day, C., Hopkins, D., Hadfield, M., Hargreaves, A., Chapman, C. Eds. *Effective Leadership for School Improvement* pp.180-195.. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Jütting, J., Kauffmann, C. Mc Donnell, I., Osterrieder, H., Pinaud, N., Wegner, L. 2004. *Decentralisation and Poverty in Developing Countries: Exploring the Impact*. [Online] Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Kemmere, F. 1994. Decentralization of Schooling in developing nations. In T. Husen, T.N. Postlethwaite Eds., *The International Encyclopedia of Education* pp. 1412-1416.. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- King, E., M. Guerra, S., M. 2005. *Education Reforms in East Asia: Policy, Process, Impact. East Asia Decentralizes: Making Local Government Work*, [online] pp. 179-208.
- Kristiansen, S., Pratikno 2006. Decentralising education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, [online] Vol. 26, pp.513-531.
- Lambert, L 2002. *A Framework for Shared Leadership. Educational Leadership* [online], 59 8.: pp.37-40.
- Leithwood, K. 2007. What We Know About Educational Leadership. In Burger, J.M., Webber, C.F., Kleinck, P. Eds. *Intelligent Leadership: Constructs for Thinking Educational Leaders* pp. 41-66.. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Leithwood, K. 2007. The Emotional Side of School Improvement: A Leadership Perspective. Chapter 34, *International Handbook of School Effectiveness and Improvement* pp.615-634. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C. 2007. What we learned: A broad view, in K. Leithwood, C. Day Eds. *Successful School Leadership in Times of Change*. Toronto: Springer., pp. 189-203.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., Hopkins, D. 2006. *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. [Online] Nottingham: National College for School Leadership NCSL.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, R. Steinbach 1999. *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., S., Anderson, S., Wahlstrom, K. 2004. *How leadership influences student learning*. [Online] New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Leithwood, K., Menzies, T. 1998. *A Review of Research Concerning the Implementation of Site-Based Management, School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, [online] Vol 9:3, 233-285.

- Levitt, R., Janta, B., Wegrich, K. 2008. *Accountability of Teachers: Literature Review*. [Online] Cambridge: General Teaching Council England.
- Litvack, J., Ahmad, J., Bird, R. 1998. *Rethinking Decentralization in Developing Countries*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Lugaz, C., De Grauwe, A., with Balde, D. Diakhate, C., Dougnon, D., Moustapha, M., Odushina, D. 2010. *Schooling and Decentralization: Patterns and Policy Implications in Francophone West Africa*. [Online] Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning IIEP.
- Manor, J. 1999. *The Political Economy of Democratic Decentralization*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Marks, H., Printy, S. 2003. Principle leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol 393., pp.370-397.
- McGinn, N., Welsh, T. 1999. *Decentralization of education: why, when, what and how?*. [Online] Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning IIEP.
- Møller, J. 2007. *School Leadership and Accountability: Moving beyond Standardization of Practice*. [Online] Available at <http://www.fm-kp.si/zalozba/ISBN/978-961-6573-65-8/001-008.pdf>. [Accessed 24 December 2016].
- Mulford, B. 2006. *Leadership for Improving the Quality of Secondary Education: Some International Developments*. *Revista de curriculum y formación del profesorado*, [online] Vol 10:1.
- Murphy, J., Elliot, S. N., Goldring, E., Porter, A. C. 2006. *Learning-Centered Leadership: A Conceptual Foundation*. [Online] New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- Murphy, J. 1988.. Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* [online], 102., pp.117-139.
- National College for Teaching and Leadership NCTL. 2016. *National College for Teaching and Leadership Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 March 2016* [online] Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/537534/56348_HC_399_web.pdf [Accessed on: 7 January 2016].
- OECD 2015. *PISA 2015 Results in Focus* [online]. PISA: OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2014. *PISA 2012 Results: What Students Know and Can Do – Student Performance in Mathematics, Reading and Science* Volume I, Revised edition, February 2014. [online]. PISA: OECD Publishing.
- Office for Standards in Education 2016. *School inspection handbook*. [Online] London: Ofsted.
- Parker, A., N. 1995. *Decentralization: The Way Forward for Rural Development*. [Online] Washington, D.C. DC: The World Bank.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., Moorman, H. 2008a. *Improving School Leadership, Volume 1: Policy and Practice*. [Online] Paris: OECD.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., Hopkins, D. 2008b. *Improving School Leadership, Volume 2: Case Studies on System Leadership*. [Online] Paris: OECD.
- Pritchett, L. 2013.. *The Rebirth of Education: Schooling Ain't Learning*. Washington DC: Center for Global Development.
- Raihani 2007. An Indonesian model of successful school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration* [online], 464., 2008, pp.481-496.
- Rhoten, D. 2000. Education decentralization in Argentina: a 'global-local conditions of possibility' approach to state, market, and society change, *Journal of Education Policy*, 15:6, pp.593-619.
- Robinson, V. 2010.. From instructional leadership to leadership capabilities: empirical findings and methodological challenges. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 91., pp.1-26.
- Robinson, V., M., J., Lloyd, C., A., Rowe, J., R. 2007. The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, [online] Vol 445., pp635-674.
- Rondinelli, D., Nellis, J. R., Cheema, G.S. 1983. *Decentralization in Developing Countries: A Review of Recent Experience*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Rosenbaum, A. 2013. Decentralization and Local Governance: Comparing US and Global Perspectives. *Administrative Culture*, [online] 14 1., pp.11-17.
- Sergiovanni, T. 1995.. *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective. 3rd Edition*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Steinberg, M., P. 2013. *Leadership and the decentralized control of schools*. [Online] Rockville: REL Mid-Atlantic.
- The World Bank 1995. *Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review*. [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- The World Bank 2007. *What Is School-Based Management?* [Online] Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- United Cities and Local Governments 2007. *Decentralization and Local Democracy in the World. Executive Summary. First Global Report*. [Online] Barcelona: United Cities and Local Governments.
- UNESCO 2004. *Decentralising Education Management. Newsletter – a quarterly publication in English and French, International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa* [online], 61.