



International Journal of Leadership in Education

Theory and Practice

ISSN: 1360-3124 (Print) 1464-5092 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tedl20>

Leadership distribution culturally? Education/ speech and language therapy social capital in schools and children's services

Joan Forbes & Elspeth McCartney

To cite this article: Joan Forbes & Elspeth McCartney (2012) Leadership distribution culturally? Education/speech and language therapy social capital in schools and children's services, International Journal of Leadership in Education, 15:3, 271-287, DOI: [10.1080/13603124.2011.608437](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2011.608437)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2011.608437>



Published online: 31 Aug 2011.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 364



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)

Leadership distribution culturally? Education/ speech and language therapy social capital in schools and children's services

JOAN FORBES and ELSPETH McCARTNEY

This paper is concerned with the operation of professional networks, norms and trust for leadership in interprofessional relationships and cultures and so the analytic of social capital is used. A mapping is outlined of the sub-types, forms and conceptual key terms in social capital theory that is then applied to explore and better understand interprofessional leadership resources and relationships. Since policy statements cite leadership as a principal mechanism for mediating co-working, concepts of leadership and some of the tensions and difficulties in its current conceptualizations and operations are identified. These are analysed in relation to policy and practice governing different children's services professions and subject disciplines, here exemplified by education and health in a Scottish context.

Introduction

Joint working amongst children's service professionals has become a major focus of practice in the UK and internationally, with anticipated benefits for children and for cost-effective service delivery, with positive leadership advanced as a mechanism for effecting good co-working. We begin with the assumption that current policy constitutions of interprofessional leadership relationships in integrated children's services may be inadequate in practice to effect the leadership culture changes now needed in the complex space of children's services. That is, current theorizations of leadership which serve to govern children's services need to be re-thought and

Joan Forbes is a senior lecturer in the School of Education, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, AB24 5UA, UK. Email: j.c.forbes@abdn.ac.uk. She recently directed two seminar series on children's services futures which were supported by Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). Her most recent books are (both edited with Cate Watson) *Service Integration in Schools: Research and Policy Discourses, Practices and Future Prospects* (Rotterdam: Sense, 1999) and *The Transformation of Children's Services: Examining and Debating the Complexities of Interprofessional Working* (London: Routledge, 2011, forthcoming). *Elsbeth McCartney* is reader in speech and language therapy in the School of Psychological Sciences and Health, University of Strathclyde, 76 Southbrae Drive, Glasgow, G13 1PP, UK. Email: e.mccartney@strath.ac.uk. Her research areas are language impairment and intervention in children, oral and reading comprehension difficulties, and speech and language therapists' roles and relationships in education services. Her latest book (edited with Sue Ellis) is *Applied Linguistics and Primary School Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

re-theorized using potentially more fruitful social and spatial relational analytics such as those of social capital theory (Bourdieu 1977, 1986, 1992, Coleman and Hoffer 1987, Coleman 1988, Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, Putnam 1993, 2000).

Examination of the challenges and potentials of transprofessional distribution of leadership occurs and must be set within a specific disciplinary/professional socio-cultural context. Here, as a well-established example of interprofessional collaboration (Forbes and McCartney 2010) and as a support context which demands a range of subject disciplinary knowledge and professional problem-solving knowledge (Gibbons *et al.* 1994, Forbes 2008), we analyse the forms of leadership now needed by teachers, speech and language therapists (SLT) (the usage SLT in Scotland/the UK is internationally cognate with speech language pathologist [SLP]) and other professional groups working together to support children and young people with speech, language and communication difficulties. While there is some professional overlap amongst the subject disciplinary knowledge bases, skills and approaches of teachers and SLTs, in the main teachers may be located in the 'educational/social' domain and SLTs (an allied health profession [AHP] employed by the UK-wide national health service) in the 'medical/biological' and 'linguistic/behavioural' domains: with both professional groups identifying with the 'cognitive/psycholinguistic' domain (Daines *et al.* 1996, Forbes 2008). Thus, early disciplinary specializations producing distinct professional demarcations and identifications may be seen to work against current policy endeavours for effective trans-professional knowledge and skills exchange in re-cultured integrated children's services. It is our contention that the policy aspirations of better integration of hitherto distinct professional disciplines must be realized in/through new forms of disciplinary and professionally culturally sensitive leadership.

The purpose of our study then is to introduce new ideas about the relationships among interprofessional working, leadership and culture change. We use the conceptual framework of distributed leadership and social capital theory to analyse key Scottish policy statements in relation to the leadership of teachers and SLTs, and also relevant to other professional groups in schools and children's services. Policy is analysed at both macro and micro-levels with the aim of uncovering inadequacies and disjunctures, and to make suggestions for different approaches to better effect desired changes. We argue that the kind of whole-scale change restructuring and re-culturing of co-practice envisaged in policy demands that hard questions be asked about which aspects of the children's sector workforce need now to be re-designed and re-modelled; and that concomitant careful attention is required to the specific forms of children's services leadership needed in future. Therefore, before introducing our conceptual and analytical framework of social capital theory, we review related studies on interprofessional working, leadership and cultural change in schools and children's services, summarize the Scottish SLT/education interface as a useful heuristic example of cross-sector working, and consider models of leadership invoked as mechanisms for culture change in recent key Scottish Government (SG) policies.

Schools/services: interprofessional working, leadership and cultural change

Recent UK debates and studies explore the intersections of interprofessional working, leadership and cultural change in schools and children's services (Forbes and Watson 2009, in press). Warmington *et al.* (2009) recognize the emergence of distributed expertise; and Brown (2009) focuses on systemic issues in public sector reform related to service integration in schools/education. At the micro-level of school-leader identity, knowledge and skills, Crow (2009) notes implications for interprofessional practice and leadership behaviour of the development of leadership identities that move beyond technicist knowledge and skills towards values and practices of interprofessional collaboration. At the macro-level Hartley (2009) surveys the effects for policy and current hierarchical institutional structures and systems of schools/services of whole-scale practice (meso-level) shifts towards networked interprofessional connections. Cowie and Crawford (2009) specifically examine leadership preparation in Scotland in a context of a standard for headship and against a backdrop of unrelenting pressure on school head teachers to improve outcomes, most importantly to raise pupil academic attainment.

The above necessarily selective and succinct review indicates that the identities into which leaders are socialized are crucial for future children's services. It also reveals a continuing vision of the school as the 'hub' for children's services (Scottish Office 1998), one overtaken by subsequent policy (Her Majesty's Inspectorate and of Education [HMIE] 2004) and of teacher preparation for children's services leadership distributed strategically and formally through planned education appointments and designated roles (positional leadership). In contrast, the analysis here develops and applies a conceptual framework of leadership distribution culturally and social capital theory. Our analysis also moves beyond the education mono-sector to consider cross public sector partnerships as a necessary facet of re-designed children's services.

Key policies

In Scotland, most children attend their local mainstream school (Scottish Executive [SE] 2000), where SLTs offer a visiting service. There are around 100 teachers to one school-based SLT (in 2009, 52,993 FTE teachers [SG 2010a]: 1003 FTE SLTs [ISD Scotland 2010], around half working with children). SLTs interact with numerous teachers: individual teachers often with one SLT. Managerial structures are not shared, with each remaining accountable to their 'home' agency and profession. Two registration bodies operate: the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC-S) and the Health Professions Council (HPC): most SLTs also join their professional body the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT). For both professions cooperation and collaboration has moved from a personal, and therefore optional, choice to a mandatory requirement of registration and employment (HPC 2003, RCSLT 2005, GTC-S 2006). Partnership

working for AHPs in education is further specified in *Guidance on Partnership Working between Allied Health Professions and Education* (SG 2010b).

Following an aspirational vision for the children of Scotland (SE 2001), legislation for all services operating in a child's home and community is included in an overarching policy agenda: *Getting it Right for Every Child* (hereafter, GiRFEC) (SE 2005a, SG 2008). Partnership working for AHPs in education is specified in *Guidance on Partnership Working between Allied Health Professions and Education* (SG 2010b). GiRFEC applies to all child services and aims for enhanced co-professional working, which:

builds from universal health and education services and drives the developments that will improve outcomes for children and young people by changing the way adults think and act to help all children and young people grow, develop and reach their full potential. It requires a positive shift in culture, systems and practices across services for children, young people and adults. (SG 2008: 6)

Leadership (mainly positional) is considered to be a main mechanism for culture change (SG 2008: 7).

However, drawing on teacher/SLT policy we would argue that, while recognizing that the status quo (mono-professionalism) is inadequate for the provision of good services, the GiRFEC agenda (and teacher/SLT collaboration policy pre-dating GiRFEC) has not to date produced the necessary policy prescriptions of the forms of leadership needed for collaborative/integrated professional futures. Table 1 highlights this critical policy disjuncture.

In order to consider the relationships that may result, the social capital analytic will next be introduced.

A social capital analytic

Social capital theory identifying and measuring the social benefits of association and networks has provided a theoretical rationale for recent

Table 1. Key teacher/SLT co-practice and leadership policy

Co-practice and leadership policy – prescriptions to two (or more) professions	Co-practice and leadership policy – a (mainly) mono-sector perspective
Her Majesty's Inspectorate (1996) <i>The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders</i>	Health Professions Council (2003) <i>Standards of Proficiency SLTs: 1b2</i>
Scottish Office (1998) <i>New Community Schools: The Prospectus</i>	RCSLT (2005) <i>Clinical Guidelines</i>
Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2004) <i>The Sum of its Parts? The Development of Integrated Community Schools in Scotland</i>	SE (2005b) <i>Delivery through Leadership: NHS Scotland Leadership Development Framework</i>
SE (2005a) <i>Getting it Right for Every Child: Proposals for Action</i>	General Teaching Council Scotland (2006) <i>Standard for Registration Element 2.1.5</i>
SG (2008) <i>The Guide to Getting it Right for Every Child</i>	SG (2007) <i>Better Health, Better Care Action Plan, Section 3</i>
	SG (2010b) <i>Guidance on Partnership Working between AHPs and Education</i>

policy initiatives in the UK countries and other places (Narayan 1999, UK Government Performance and Innovation Unit [PIU] 2002). The social capital theory of Bourdieu has previously been drawn on in the field of educational leadership by, for example, Lingard and Christie (2003) and contributors to the special issue of *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 6(4) edited by Pat Thomson. The present authors have previously drawn on social capital theory as an analytic for teacher–therapist co-work (2010). And others have similarly applied social capital theory to offer insights into interprofessional work relationships (cf. Allan *et al.* 2009, Forbes and Watson 2009) and to explore the effects of social capital in/for individuals’ lifelong and life wide learning, such as that required by children’s sector practitioners taking on new learning for leadership knowledge and skills (cf. Field 2003, 2005, Schuller *et al.* 2004).

Social capital: levels, components and sub-types

The work of a number of distinguished social capital theorists from different theoretical perspectives and academic disciplines (Bourdieu 1977, 1986, 1992, Coleman and Hoffer 1987, Coleman 1988, Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, Putnam 1993, 2000) provides us with a conceptual framework of social capital applied here comprising three main components: *networks*, *norms* and *trust* and three sub-type forms of relations: *bonding*, *bridging* and *linking*.

Putnam (2000) identifies two of these sub-type relations of social capital: *bonding* (strong bonds based on strong shared core values and trust, good for firm and supportive core personal and social circle formation, but exclusive of others not in the group and so potentially restrictive and limiting) and *bridging* (weaker connections that build relationships with others, include more diverse social groups, good for opening up wider social and professional horizons). Woolcock (1998) identifies a third type of relation: *linking* (weaker connections between people holding different power and status positions in institutional and work hierarchies, good for circumventing formal hierarchical positions and power imbalances). Woolcock (1998: 156, parenthesis added), for example, speaks of linking social capital connections ‘linking [individuals] across different institutional realms’.

Coleman emphasizes the role of the key components of *trust and reciprocity*. Putnam (1995: 664–665, emphasis added) refers to social capital as ‘social connections and the attendant *norms and trust*’. Bourdieu (1977, 1992) and Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) theorizes social capital in terms of *networks* and the resources which accrue to individuals from network membership, and in particular through elite network membership. Halpern (2005) provides additional analytical discrimination and purchase conceptualizing social capital as a multi-level matrix, thereby offering an analytic that moves between *macro* (governance and policy), *meso* (inter-professional service delivery/receipt level) and *micro* (individual or personal/inter-personal) systemic levels.

Policy characterizations of leadership

Applied in this analysis to education/SLT relations in the re-designed space of children's services, these key ideas in social capital theory offer an analytic for disjunctures and disconnects in relation to leadership, as envisaged in policy and governance and in practice in current work relations and organization, to be identified and measured. We first analyse macro-level policy statements, followed by consideration of the re-design of transprofessional social capital for leadership and how this might be addressed via the re-design of practitioners' micro-level social capital knowledge, skills, norms and networks.

Drawing on our previous mapping of an analytical framework of social capital (Forbes and McCartney 2010), we identify two key questions to focus analysis here:

- *How does children's services policy constitute leadership?* In what ways, if any, does current policy and governance articulate what constitutes transprofessional leadership (leadership of/by professionals from different home agencies, here teachers and therapists?).
- *What social capital relations underlie current policy constitutions of leadership?* Are the social capital relations instituted in policy and governance characterized by the necessary knowledges and skills needed in new non-formal and non-hierarchical forms of leadership?

How does children's services policy constitute leadership?

Some of the difficulties in practice produced by tensions among conceptualizations of distributed and positional leadership (drawing on MacBeath 2009) will be addressed later, but first policy statements are presented. The key documents (GiRFEC 2008, SG 2010b) both cite leadership as a mechanism to implement co-working and the culture change needed to remodel children's services. GiRFEC stresses the importance of strategic management leaders in implementing change and developing ethos, and for each individual child there are to be two positional leaders—a 'named person', responsible for ensuring a child has the right help to support their development and well-being, and a 'lead professional', who co-ordinates multi-agency planning and ensures a seamless network of support around the child. The nominated 'named person' for school-aged children is usually to be the school depute head, head or guidance teacher. But (and cf. MacBeath [2009]), there is a risk that, without a culture change which privileges co-practice, the 'lead professional' role is designated informally without a specific job description, pragmatically via *ad hoc* delegation, or opportunistically to the person most disposed to take the initiative to lead.

SG (2010b: 42) also explicitly cites 'leadership' as the mechanism through which professionals may focus on the purpose and outcomes of partnership working, (with 'partnership' here spanning the range of co-working practices). Both *positional* and *distributed* models of leadership are described. Regarding positional leaders, the policy prescribes that 'those within organizations who have positions of authority have responsibility

for creating a context and an ethos in which staff can work together well' (2010b: 42). Regarding distributed leadership it is recommended that 'leadership needs to be the responsibility of everyone' (2010b: 42) with 'leadership at all levels and across services' (2010b: 42) endorsed; and that an ethos of working well together 'also means recognising each others' leadership role rather than relying on job titles and positions of authority' (2010b: 42). The summary is that:

in practice then, leadership is about focussing all activities on delivering an effective service to young people. (SG 2010b: 42)

This very broad definition is akin to that of Peck and Dickinson (2008: 23) who suggest leadership can include:

those activities that might enable effective organising, especially within partnerships.

SG (2010b) gives two illustrations of leadership behaviours: excellent communication and shared responsibility. Effective communication at all levels across agencies is in itself said to help in the development of good quality relationships. This emphasis on communication to facilitate culture change also coincides with the strategy endorsed in a GiRFEC pathfinder project report (SG 2009: 82) which states:

An interprofessional working culture... is partly about working collaboratively with professionals from other services and agencies according to a set of agreed principles and values. It is also about recognizing that the specialized language which you use and the working assumptions that you probably take for granted will not be familiar to one's colleagues in other agencies. At best they will need to be explained, but they may even need to be simplified or abandoned in order to facilitate better collaborative working.

If good communication is an important mechanism to foster good relationships, clearly a focused review of communication systems and information for interprofessional sharing purposes should be undertaken by services in preparation for initiating and developing partnership and integrated working. For such a comprehensive strategic and operational review and subsequent re-design of practice, effective outward looking cross-agency leadership will be required at both strategic service management and practitioner leadership levels.

The second strand (SG 2010b: 42) guiding leadership behaviour is rather circular:

different professional interests are put aside when partnerships are working well. Constraints and challenges are understood and responsibility shared in a way that is solution focused.

These factors—professional (self) interest laid aside, constraints/challenges understood, responsibility shared and a focus on solutions—could certainly be included in a definition of a well-going partnership. But the leadership skills required to achieve them are not made clear. Reference is made in SG (2010b) to Heifetz (1994), NHS Scotland (2007, referenced here as SG 2007) and in literature supporting these guidelines to Douglas (2009). The work of Heifetz (1994) was updated by Heifetz and Laurie (1997) who discuss the actions of positional leaders charged with managing adaptive challenges, and employees who feel stressed by change. This

recognizes that change may be worrying, and that staff will require support, but has little to say about distributed leadership. Douglas (2009: 144–145) is also mostly concerned with positional leaders. SG (2007) stresses the need to co-operate, and acknowledges the centrality of leadership, but also notes that the Scottish leadership development programme rolled out in 2005 (SE 2005b: Section 1.4, unpaginated) was still to be reviewed, which was necessary to:

clarify the leadership qualities and behaviours we require to deliver our new priorities.

Thus, the leadership actions to be taken by staff not in managerial or positional leadership roles are not clearly specified by SG (2010b) guidance on partnership working. Peck and Dickinson (2008: 23) note such under-specification of leadership in partnerships is common, despite the concept being corralled into supporting government reform agendas for co-working. They suggest, with reference to SE (2005b), that when investment in leadership becomes an intervention to support such reforms:

what the government considers effective leadership starts to look suspiciously like smart followership. (Peck and Dickinson 2008: 23)

Distributed leadership

The conceptualization of leadership as distributed appears to be critically relevant to culture change. The current re-design of children's services risks 'creating a service so big and complex that it is too hard to manage' (Forbes 2011, in press), certainly too hard to manage using New Public Management forms of hierarchical thinking and leadership practice (Hartley 2009). The re-scale and re-design of non-hierarchical networks and partnerships across services to meet the needs of all children as envisaged in the prevailing GiRFEC agenda is 'a job too big for one' (Grubb and Flessa 2009)—or even for the formal management few.

But where conceptualizations of distributed leadership are so wide that they could include almost all co-working activities, as in SG (2010b) discussed above, it is difficult to specify what constitutes good distributed leadership, or to measure its outcomes. Formulations that identify distributed leadership functions as incorporating both goal-related behaviours that forward the task in hand (such as giving/seeking/summarizing information, structuring team efforts and energizing) and relationship-related behaviours that serve to maintain team cohesion (such as encouraging participation, facilitating communication, assessing the emotional climate and relieving tension [Johnson and Johnson 2009: 191–192]) might provide a more fruitful model that would serve to balance the 'solution focused' approaches promulgated in policy guidelines, and contribute to the formation of positive co-working relationships.

Further theorizations of distributed leadership (Harris 2004, Spillane 2005, Leithwood *et al.* 2009, MacBeath 2009) provide alternative models

to refine conceptualizations of distributed leadership. The *Six Forms of Leadership Distribution* model MacBeath (2009: 45, parentheses added to apply the model to service integration) provides discriminations conceptually helpful in this analysis:

- *Distribution formally*: through designated roles/job description.
- *Distribution pragmatically*: through necessity/often ad hoc delegation of workload.
- *Distribution strategically*: based on planned appointment of individuals to contribute positively to the development of leadership throughout the [service].
- *Distribution incrementally*: devolving greater responsibility as people demonstrate their capacity to lead.
- *Distribution opportunistically*: capable [practitioners] willingly extending their roles to [service]-wide leadership because they are pre-disposed to taking initiative to lead.
- *Distribution culturally*: practising leadership as a reflection of [service's] culture, ethos and traditions.

MacBeath (2009: 53) notes that distribution culturally 'may be described as social capital' in its 'bridging' type and so it is of particular interest in this analysis, focusing on the re-design of leadership in relationships that are outward looking and cross cutting of previous boundaries, whether of discipline, profession, agency or sector.

It may be that policy is 'underpinned by a sophisticated conception of leadership as a cultural artefact' (MacBeath 2009: 53). But at present however, lacking nurturing conditions of shared values, distributed leadership as a mechanism to foster good co-practice remains a plausible general assertion in Scottish policy discourses, rather than distribution culturally being realized as a new way of doing things around children's services. Without careful close analysis of forms of leadership distribution, and evidence-based knowledge of the implications of the use of each form in practice across children's services, exhortation without implementation and/or exhortation with patchy, unaccountable leadership seem destined to persist.

Policy constitutions of leadership: underlying social capital relations

A social capital analysis would suggest that cross-agency policies support networks linked and characterized by relations of trust, with co-working becoming the normal professional practice. The relationships between teachers and SLTs across health and education agency boundaries as they work with individual children on specified and time-limited intervention episodes or interact on training courses will mostly be characterized by bridging relations. These should foster trust and support from the other professions and better understandings of, and connection to, the other professions' norms and values. However, the large numbers of brief contacts across existing professional networks, each with their separate formal and strategic positional management and leadership, will mean that such bridging between individual professionals remains weak. Stronger bridging social capital will develop only where (and if) cross-service strategic lead-

ership engages in service re-designs that enable cross-professional practitioners to spend sufficient time together as a reflection of a new culture, one that serves to nurture forms of distribution culturally, incrementally and strategically (MacBeath 2009).

Bridging ties are important, constituting in the words of Clark (2007: 12) connections between ‘two different networks of strong ties, along which ideas, innovations, information and artefacts flow’, creating new opportunities to improve service to children and families. Teacher/SLT relationships are of this kind, bridging (and linking) between the two strongly intra-professionally bonded networks of health and education. Such bridging social capital relations *should* support and promote innovative approaches to supporting children in schools and may also be seen as powerful in fostering change across, as well as between, networks (Clark 2007). Backed by policy enjoiners, weak bridging ties may go a long way to providing better services for individual children in their school settings. However, applied to education/SLT relations, the weak and often transitory practitioner ties formed around a child are unlikely to fundamentally change the professional cultures of teachers or SLTs. Rather, without co-leadership, staff views, values and norms and professional networks are likely to continue to be shaped by ongoing intensive exposure to the existing and very strong acculturation and bonding social capital, including leadership and management structures and relations, within their home agencies. This, drawing on MacBeath (2009) produces distribution pragmatically and opportunistically and perhaps incrementally, continuing to lack distribution that is formally, strategically or culturally based.

The ‘culture change’ effected by current policy is therefore likely to involve SLTs and teachers working together on a proficient and skilled professional basis, with good co-operative working relationships and perhaps enhanced effectiveness, but without the transformation of professional understandings and practices that are sought and which would produce distribution culturally (MacBeath 2009: 45) as a reflection of transprofessional culture and ethos.

Policy enjoiners naturalizing and routinizing such positive co-professional working will have achieved a great deal, and even without a strong investment in leadership for change current positive, ‘businesslike’ approaches to co-working will no doubt be sustained. But if further culture change is sought, as the GiRFEC policy initiative asserts, the complex effects, some problematic, of prevailing forms of professional preparation of practitioner leaders need to be recognized and addressed. Learning from children’s services theory and from practice in places furth of Scotland, the section that follows frames some suggestions for re-designing teacher/therapist leadership preparation.

Changing cultures: applying learning from wider children’s services theorizing to SLT/teacher leadership

Applying micro-level (individual practitioners’ knowledge and skills level) mappings of bonding, bridging and linking knowledge and skills networks

(drawn from Forbes and McCartney 2010) the following three questions frame the analysis in this concluding section:

- Is practitioner leadership bonding in nature, that is, characterized by the privileging of strong mono-professional knowledge base networks?
- Is practitioner leadership bridging in nature, that is, are knowledge ties forged to the knowledge and skills networks of other professions in other subject disciplines?
- Is practitioner leadership linking in nature, that is, are all necessary links forged with practitioners at appropriate levels in other agencies' hierarchies and professional organizations?

Current initiatives by policy-makers and requirements in pre-service interprofessional learning are now analysed to address these questions and then suggestions made for effecting change.

Policy-makers' culture change initiatives

As noted above, the stated aim in and through the *Getting it Right for Every Child* agenda is to change professional cultures (SG 2008) towards integrated working and, unsurprisingly, policy-makers have recognized the need to go beyond policy statements to further develop co-working and leadership. The GiRFEC programme implementation offers an opt-in online 'Learning Community' to share best practice accompanied by an implementation guide with summaries for strategic and operational managers and practitioners, and with further detailed practice tools in preparation (SG 2010c).

Pre-service interprofessional learning

However, whilst the rhetoric of policy supports inter-agency links, and distributed leadership, the roles of and training for mono-professional positional leaders remain more extensively specified in governance and legislation. Viewed thus, the current role of professions' positional leaders would, perversely, seem destined to reinforce minimal bridging relations.

Professional knowledges are acquired in pre-service education programmes. In Scotland, at the time of writing, seven universities educate teachers, one of which also qualifies SLTs, and an eighth university educates SLTs alongside other AHPs. All courses include interprofessional learning, but student teachers and SLTs meet seldom and only for a few hours, offering limited opportunities for student-student exchanges.

A Scottish Common Core Curriculum project (SG 2011) identified common core characteristics for health care professionals, with implications for pre-service AHP education, but did not have a remit to consider the education of teachers. Pre-service education therefore remains separate, albeit with some consideration of the roles of other professions. As a result, SLT and teacher educators currently lack the neces-

sary strong inter-departmental and inter-disciplinary social capital connections to successfully forge new bridging and linking shared understandings concerning leadership forms, practice and relations across education and SLT—and more widely across the children's public sector professions.

One Scottish university offers a continuing professional development module within a nursing, midwifery and healthcare pathway for those who may become lead professionals, and professional organizations offer tailored leadership training. The GTC-S accredits training for head teachers which includes leadership development, and RCSLT is seeking to develop UK-wide training programmes to help SLTs move into clinical and professional leadership roles. These initiatives relate to sector-specific professional leaders. Although cross-boundary issues will no doubt be considered, the context is that GTC-S and RCSLT separately institute and police mono-professional standards through their intra-agency systems and structures. Leadership training is likely to perpetuate the current 'separatist' position, without agreed aligned standards for cross-agency and cross-profession leadership being jointly put in place. As the discourses of 'standards' permeates all aspects of professional training, including competencies for leadership, the current 'separatist' position is likely to prevail.

Therefore, key to the establishment of professional leadership identities is initial professional immersion and qualification in specific mono-disciplinary knowledge (Forbes 2008) in separate higher education institution departments. This, together with and reinforced by the policing of separate discipline-based professional knowledge and skills 'standards' by separate professional bodies, does not easily form individuals equipped to bridge and link to 'the other' discipline and profession as leaders based on cultural distribution—a tension which is equally apparent across children's services.

Part of the responsibility for re-culturing children's services must lie with those responsible for leadership training in initial professional education departments. However, there is little evidence of any re-structuring of university departments which educate and prepare practitioners for the children's services professions into the necessary interprofessional and transdisciplinary re-designs. The (academic) disciplinary boundary-crossing re-alignments that this would demand do not seem of central concern for professional bodies or to government. The question of practitioner education and training for children's services remained peripheral in a recent literature review on teacher education (Scottish Government Social Research [SGSR] 2010)—a critical lost opportunity to situate teacher preparation within the wider needs of children's public sector professions' preparation. In Scotland, a trans/professional preparation and training agenda, including leadership preparation, which would cut across education/SLT and wider children's services professional training, remains tangential to the demand for individual service improvement linked to separate professional benchmarks and standards that institute, police and maintain intra-profession bonding.

Effecting change: conclusions and some suggestions

As the above analysis suggests, despite policy intentions, attempts to encourage the development of ‘practitioner leadership’ and distributed practice as part of post-bureaucratic governance (Hartley 2009) have not, to date, radically altered the culture of schools and children’s services in Scotland (Cowie and Crawford 2009). We have argued throughout that for better understanding of the complexities of the new children’s services policy and practice terrain new social relational and spatial theorizations and analytics of the types suggested below are now needed. This position underpins the conclusions and suggestions which we now propose. Focusing on one well-demarcated partnership and its related policies has, we argue, provided messages relevant across the wider children’s sector.

Preparing well-equipped interprofessional leaders demands attention to their practitioner identities, social capital connections and knowledges for practice in new contexts. To achieve culture change, preparation must now focus on equipping new leaders differently and adequately in new forms of interprofessional education and training, underpinned by suitable new interprofessional governance and standards, collaboratively instituted by the relevant government directorate/s and (albeit currently separate) professional bodies. This examination has introduced the question of whether the time is not now right for professional bodies across children’s services to re-distribute culturally to work more actively, openly and ethically together to address the urgent issues of the re-design of professionalism and of leadership, to the benefit of all professionals across all agencies now charged in policy to work together for children in better integrated service.

A number of studies into distributed practitioner leadership consider children’s services more widely and there may be learning from these to inform leadership in the specific teacher/SLT interprofessional work context. Therefore, we would argue, a focused programme of research and knowledge exchange into the range is now needed, to uncover the complexities of transdisciplinary and transprofessional cultural boundary-crossing practice and leadership. In addition to the work of MacBeath (2009) into the social capital relations of leadership distributed culturally drawn on here, there are no doubt lessons to be learned in and through knowledge exchange from recent children’s sector leadership change in England (cf. Brown 2009). And recent research into the children’s sector workforce remodelling in England and other places (cf. Butt and Gunter 2009) may aid the re-conceptualization and re-design of teacher/SLT leadership roles in Scotland.

In the current post-bureaucratic moment, the issue of transdisciplinary leadership/ followership is not only of relevance and concern in the children’s public sector. There is much that may be learned from knowledge and experience gleaned from the adult public sector, and indeed from leadership change in the private sector. For example, in the professions associated with architecture in the construction industry co-practice in projects and major construction works are currently being reconfigured and led and managed distributively in flattened hierarchies. Examination

of the 'more open boundary-less relationships' (MacBeath 2009: 53) in the space of integration in other professional fields is likely to offer alternative theorizations with applicability in the current re-design of children's services.

As this analysis has shown, interprofessional leadership preparation, now beginning to be addressed in theory (Crow 2009, Cowie and Crawford 2009), remains inadequately taken up and addressed in government and in separate professional bodies' policy and governance. The theme of leadership preparation has emerged as central not only to the effective functioning of the teacher/SLT relation, but across the children's sector (Brown 2009, Hartley 2009). Therefore, knowledge is needed of how new leaders are prepared for and understand what is involved in managing and leading across children's services. A range of connected issues relating to the complexities of the making of transprofessional leaders and equipping them well for successful practice need to be explored including the sometimes vex questions of interprofessional identity (Crow 2009). With the needs of government and interprofessional educators in mind, studies into leadership learning for practice must include hard questions about, for example: the purposes of transprofessional leadership preparation in the current context of service transformation; interprofessional initial and leadership socialization; interprofessional leaders' identity formation; and the role of leaders in interprofessional working.

The SGSR review of the literature on Teacher Education in the twenty-first century mentioned above (SGSR 2010: 55) found that in considering the form/s of future teacher education an important avenue for development would appear to be to consider 'what might be learned from looking at other professions'. We would go further here and say that what now urgently needs to be examined are the relations, in all their governance, policy and practice constitutions, between and amongst the various children's sector professions involved in providing the educational experiences and the wider personal development of children and young people.

Research is now needed into the knowledge/s and skills required across the children's sector and of the knowledge/s and skills held—or lacking—amongst the professions (Forbes 2008). Through research into the subject disciplinary and problem-solving modes of knowledge (Gibbons *et al.* 1994) and skills which currently underpin forms of children's sector practitioner practice, we might provide clear evidence of what is now needed in children's sector practitioner education (cf. Forbes 2008). Building such evidence is now urgent for all those involved in children's sector practitioners' learning and development: government and its agencies, higher education providers and practitioners. And critically, evidence for the forms that leadership remodelling should now take is urgently needed by leadership preparation providers across children's services. It is necessary to carry out research into the current forms of children's services and their future transformation and re-design in order to have good evidence for what is needed in relation to remodelling the workforce—including leaders—for future service in that new configuration. Borrowing from the *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st*

Century (SGSR 2010: 55) we would argue that it is through an integrated and coherent research approach to children's sector practitioner education that a more integrated and coherent approach may be taken to practitioner education through the career lifecourse—including leadership roles. It is only in/through such a programme of research, using potentially more fruitful social and spatial relational analytics such as those of social capital, that we will identify and understand current knowledge/s and skills for more suitable forms of leadership in the re-design of children's services.

References

- Allan, J., Ozga, J. and Smyth, G. (eds) (2009) *Social Capital, Professionalism and Diversity* (Rotterdam: Sense).
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) Cultural reproduction and social reproduction, in: J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (eds) *Power and Ideology in Education* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press), pp. 487–511.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital, in: J.G. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (New York, NY: Greenwood), pp. 241–258.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992) *The Logic of Practice* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).
- Brown, D. (2009) Leadership and capacity in the public sector: integrated children's services and schools, in: J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *Service Integration in Schools: Research and Policy Discourses, Practices and Future Prospects* (Rotterdam: Sense), pp. 109–125.
- Butt, G. and Gunter, H. (2009) Modernising and remodelling schools: are there 'global solutions' to transforming the school workforce?, in: J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *Service Integration in Schools: Research and Policy Discourses, Practices and Future Prospects* (Rotterdam: Sense), pp. 145–156.
- Clark, A. (2007) *Real Life Methods Working Papers: Understanding Community*. Available online at: <http://www.reallifemethods.ac.uk/publications/workingpapers/2007-05-rlm-clark.pdf> (accessed 19 November 2010).
- Coleman, J. (1988) Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, **94** (supplement), S95–S120.
- Coleman, J. and Hoffer, T. (1987) *Public and Private High Schools* (New York, NY: Basic Books).
- Cowie, M. and Crawford, M. (2009) Perspectives on 'becoming' and 'being' a headteacher, in: J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *Confluences of Identity, Knowledge and Practice. Building Inter-professional Social Capital. ESRC Seminar 4 Proceedings* (Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen), pp. 39–53.
- Crow, G. (2009) The development of school leaders' professional identities: challenges and implications for interprofessional practice, in: J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *Research into Professional Identities: Theorising Social and Institutional Identities. ESRC Seminar 1 Proceedings* (Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen), pp. 41–52.
- Daines, B., Fleming, P. and Miller, C. (1996) *Spotlight on Special Educational Needs: Speech and Language Difficulties* (Tamworth: National Association of Special Educational Needs).
- Douglas, A. (2009) *Partnership Working* (New York, NY: Routledge).
- Field, J. (2003) *Social Capital* (Abingdon: Routledge).
- Field, J. (2005) *Social Capital and Lifelong Learning* (Bristol: The Policy Press).
- Forbes, J. (2008) Knowledge trans/formations: examining the knowledge needed in teacher and speech and language therapist co-work. *Educational Review*, **60**(2), 141–154.
- Forbes, J. (2011) Inter/professional capital in children's services transformations. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, **15**(5), 573–588.
- Forbes, J. (in press) Trans/professional social capital in children's services: dis/connects in policy and practice? in J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *The Transformation of Children's Services: Examining and Debating the Complexities of Inter/professional Working* (London: Routledge).
- Forbes, J. and Watson, C. (eds) (2009) *Service Integration in Schools: Research and Policy Discourses, Practices and Future Prospects* (Rotterdam: Sense).
- Forbes, J. and Watson, C. (eds) (in press) *The Transformation of Children's Services: Examining and Debating the Complexities of Inter/professional Working* (London: Routledge).

- Forbes, J. and McCartney, E. (2010) Social capital theory: a cross-cutting analytic for teacher/therapist work in integrating children's services? *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, **26**(3), 321–334.
- General Teaching Council Scotland (2006) *Standard for Registration Element 2.1.5* (Edinburgh: GTC Scotland).
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge* (London: Sage).
- Grubb, W. N. and Flessa, J. J. (2009) A job too big for one. Multiple principals and other non-traditional approaches to school leadership, in: K. Leithwood, B. Mascal and T. Strauss (eds) *Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence* (London: Routledge), pp. 137–164.
- Halpern, D. (2005) *Social Capital* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Harris, A. (2004) Distributed leadership and school improvement: leading or misleading? *Educational Management and Administration*, **32**(1), 11–24.
- Hartley, D. (2009) Education policy and the 'inter'-regnum, in: J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *Service Integration in Schools: Research and Policy Discourses, Practices and Future Prospects* (Rotterdam: Sense), pp. 127–140.
- Health Professions Council (2003) *Standards of Proficiency SLTs: 1b2* (London: HPC).
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994) *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Cambridge: Belnap Press of Harvard University Press).
- Heifetz, R. A. and Laurie, D. L. (1997) The work of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, **75**(1), 124–134.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate (1996) *The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders* (Edinburgh: HMSO).
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (2004) *The Sum of its Parts? The Development of Integrated Community Schools in Scotland* (Edinburgh: HMIE).
- Information Services Division Scotland (2010) *NHS Scotland workforce statistics. AHP staff by profession*, 30th September 2009. Available online at: <http://www.isdscotland.org> (accessed 11 November 2010).
- Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, F. P. (2009) *Joining Together*, 10th edn (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education).
- Leithwood, K., Mascal, B. and Strauss, T. (eds) (2009) *Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence* (London: Routledge).
- Lingard, B. and Christie, P. (2003) Leading theory: Bourdieu and the field of educational leadership—an introduction and overview of this special issue. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, **6**(4), 317–333.
- MacBeath, J. (2009) Distributed leadership: paradigms, policy and paradox, in: K. Leithwood, B. Mascal and T. Strauss (eds) *Distributed Leadership According to the Evidence* (London: Routledge), pp. 41–57.
- Narayan, D. (1999) *Bonds and Bridges: Social Capital and Poverty* (Washington, DC: World Bank).
- Peck, E. and Dickinson, H. (2008) *Managing and Leading in Inter-Agency Settings* (Bristol: The Policy Press).
- Putnam, R. D. (1993) The prosperous community: social capital and public life. *The American Prospect*, **13**(Spring), 35–42.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995) Tuning in, tuning out: the strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science and Politics*, **28**, 1–20.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster).
- Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) (2005) *Clinical Guidelines*. Available online at: <http://www.rcslt.org/members/publications/clinicalguidelines> (accessed 16 November 2010).
- Schuller, T., Preston, J., Hammond, C., Bassett-Grundy, A. and Bynner, J. (2004) *The Benefits of Learning: The Impact of Education on Health, Family Life and Social Capital* (London: Routledge Falmer).
- Scottish Executive (2000) *Standards in Scotland's Schools etc. Act 2000: Guidance on Presumption of Mainstream Education, Last modified March 2006* (Edinburgh: SE).
- Scottish Executive (2001) *For Scotland's Children: Better Integrated Children's Services* (Edinburgh: SE).
- Scottish Executive (2005a) *Getting it Right for Every Child: Proposals for Action* (Edinburgh: SE).
- Scottish Executive. (2005b). *Delivery through Leadership: NHS Scotland Leadership Development Framework*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/06/28112744/27466> (accessed 17 November 2010).

- Scottish Government. (2007). *Better Health, Better Care Action Plan, Section 3*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/12/11103453/3> (accessed 1 December 2010).
- Scottish Government (2008) *A Guide to Getting it Right for Every Child*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/1141/0065063.pdf> Word formatted version- 03/09/08 (assessed 14th May 2011).
- Scottish Government (2009) *An Evaluation of the Development and Early Implementation Phases of Getting it Right for Every Child in Highland: 2006–2009*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/292706/0090352.pdf> (accessed 19 November 2010).
- Scottish Government (2010a) *Pupils in Scotland 2009: Teachers–Teacher Numbers, updated 1st December 2009* (Edinburgh: SG).
- Scottish Government (2010b) *Guidance on Partnership Working between Allied Health Professions and Education* (Edinburgh: SG).
- Scottish Government (2010c) *A Guide to Implementing Getting it Right for Every Child: Messages from Pathfinders and Learning Partners*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/07/19145422/0> (accessed 1 December 2010).
- Scottish Government (2011) *From Strength to Strength: Celebrating 10 Years of the Allied Health Professions in Scotland Part 8*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2011/03/11104802/8> (accessed 6 May 2011).
- Scottish Government Social Research (2010) *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century* (Edinburgh: Education Analytical Services, SG).
- Scottish Office (1998) *New Community Schools: The Prospectus*. Available online at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library/documents-w3/ncsp-00.htm> (accessed 21 June 2008).
- Spillane, J. (2005) *Distributed leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass).
- UK Government Performance and Innovation Unit (2002) *Social Capital: A Discussion Paper* (London: Performance and Innovation Unit).
- Warmington, P., Daniels, H., Edwards, A., Leadbetter, J., Martin, D., Middleton, D., Brown, S., Popova, A. and Apostolov, A. (2009) Learning leadership in multiagency work for integrating services into schools, in: J. Forbes and C. Watson (eds) *Service Integration in Schools: Research and Policy Discourses, Practices and Future Prospects* (Sense: Rotterdam), pp. 97–107.
- Woolcock, M. (1998) Social capital and economic development: towards a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society*, 27, 151–208.