

Chapter 2

CE and School Leadership: Theoretical Perspectives

Studies on school leadership in CE cannot be separated from theories of CE and school leadership, as the latter includes or influences the former. To understand how school leadership in CE in China is influenced by macro- and micro-political forces, this chapter begins by introducing general theories of citizenship and CE to identify the role of the nation-state in shaping them, and then examines theories of school leadership, particularly political school leadership and curriculum leadership. To clarify the extent to which the general literature can and cannot explain specific Chinese issues, this chapter examines debates on China's dual-line school leadership system, the political realities facing Chinese school leaders, and Chinese curriculum leadership. It then presents the nature of CE in China as a process of political socialization, and the tension between CE and academic instruction and CE leadership, after which a framework for the study is proposed.

Concepts of Citizenship and CE

Citizenship and CE are contentious concepts, as they are connected to historical change and diverse social and cultural backgrounds (Law 2007; Osler and Starkey 2003). Although many theories have attempted to conceptualize it, the concepts cannot be separated from the sovereignty and territory of the nation-state (Dagger 2002; Heater 1999, 2002). The nation-state has historically played the key role in defining and controlling citizenship and CE, and school leadership is fundamental to the regulation of CE. This section reviews theories on citizenship to identify the various relationships between citizenship and the nation-state, and then introduces nation-state-oriented and inclusive models of CE and their relationship to the nation-state, as well as the role of school leadership in the regulation of CE.

Citizenship and the Nation-State

Citizenship generally involves certain rights and obligations, which shape individuals' identity and their awareness of their identity when participating public affairs and accepting public values (Cogan 1998; Kymlicka and Norman 1994; Law 2007, 2010). Citizenship is traditionally bound by the nation-state's borders, and the elements of citizenship offered within those borders vary according to the nation-state's level of development. Marshall (1992) proposed three elements whose gradual inclusion in citizenship indicate that its meaning deepens and broadens as the nation-state develops—civil rights (e.g., freedom of speech), political rights (e.g., the freedom to participate in political and governmental affairs) and social rights (e.g., access to community and state resources and cultural elements).

Concepts of citizenship also vary according to different social and cultural contexts, as can be seen in theories on republican citizenship and liberal citizenship (Heater 1999; Kymlicka and Norman 1994). Republican citizenship limits citizenship to those individuals who take on the responsibilities of public and political participation and who place community and nation-state interests ahead of their own (Dagger 2002). Liberal citizenship, on the other hand, gives primacy to individual citizens' private affairs, including one's right to preserve one's life, property, and liberty (Schuck 2002). Despite taking the individual as its starting point, liberal citizenship relies on the nation-state to regulate behaviors so as to protect and secure individuals' rights, liberties, and freedoms from unwarranted interference (Schuck 2002).

Both republican and liberal models of citizenship are criticized for their emphasis on preserving the nation-state's privilege and homogeneity. First, the rights they propose are exclusive, as political participation tends to be the interest and inclination of those who are well-educated, wealthy, and have access to political affairs (Young 1989). Second, both are homogeneous, requiring all citizens to abide by the same goals, rights, and responsibilities, without regard for the complex and multiple needs of marginalized groups (Banks 2009; Young 1989).

Due to these limitations, republican citizenship and liberal citizenship have both been challenged by globalization and its tendency toward increased communication, capital flow, and global migration (Kubow et al. 1998; Mok 2007; Pike 2008; Torres 2002). In the context of globalization, new trends in citizenship have emerged. First, the nation-state is no longer the sole definer of citizenship; the forces of globalization, cultural groups, and local government now also influence citizenship (Banks 2004; Kubow et al. 1998; Ladson-Billings 2007). Second, global awareness and multiple and inclusive values are increasingly advocated in citizenship (Banks 2008; Kubow et al. 1998). To meet the multiple citizenship needs of diverse groups at different polity levels, more inclusive terms of citizenship have been put forward, including global citizenship (Frey and Whitehead 2009; Stokes 2000) and multicultural citizenship (Banks 2009). Global citizenship emphasizes one's transnational awareness, loyalty, and allegiance, which can be

further expressed as one's awareness of one's global identity and of changes in and improvements to global affairs (Stokes 2000). By comparison, multicultural citizenship emphasizes the promotion of equality among socially and culturally diverse people (Banks 2008, 2009).

Although theories of citizenship have changed in the context of globalization and have been analyzed from diverse perspectives, it is still most directly and significantly affected by domestic actors, particularly the nation-state (Kennedy 2010; Law 2006), and nationalism is tenacious (Banks 2004). The nation-state's role in influencing citizenship is twofold (Law 2006): first, the nation-state has the power to define a common national citizenship; second, it decides which global elements should be introduced and transmitted in national citizenship, and which should be filtered and resisted.

Theories on citizenship help to explain the nation-state's role in defining citizenship, as well as the forces shaping it, and shed light on the relationship between CE and the nation-state.

CE and the Nation-State

CE is a project of socializing students by equipping them with "the knowledge, skills and values" necessary to develop their civic consciousness and agency, so that, in the future, they will function and live as good citizens (Banks 2008, p. 129) and contribute to national economic and political development (Dawson et al. 1977). Various models have been proposed to explain how and in what ways CE responds and accommodates to social changes (such as globalization); these models could generally be classified as nation-state oriented (Banks 2008) and inclusive CE (Law 2011).

Nation-state-oriented CE involves providing students with state-prescribed knowledge, skills, and values that represent the nation-state's ideology (Hanasz 2006). Its goal is to foster good producers, consumers, and patriots who could maintain the social *status quo* and reinforce the unity of the nation-state (Hanasz 2006; Sim and Print 2009). CE is emphasized by the nation-state, due to its role in allocation and political socialization (Meyer and Rubinson 1975). Allocation means the ways in which CE provides individuals with political roles and the opportunity to participate in political life; social levels and roles are allocated to individuals based on their internalization of CE (Meyer and Rubinson 1975). Political socialization broadly "refers to the way society transmits its political culture from generation to generation" (Langton 1969, p. 4). According to Sears (1975), CE can promote political socialization by fostering three characteristics: attachment to the political system; partisan attitudes; and political participation. In the process of political socialization, individuals internalize political qualities and act them out in their lives in the wider society; they then create and expand their roles in society, leading to political development (Meyer and Rubinson 1975).

Nation-state-oriented CE uses exclusion and assimilation as its two main approaches (Castles 2004). Exclusionary CE is provided only to students from within the nation-state, while assimilatory CE tries to transform diverse cultures and languages into the nation-state's homogeneous culture and language. Schooling is seen as an important element of CE in these two approaches for two reasons (Apple 1982; Heater 2002; Sim and Print 2009): first, school is designed to reproduce the dominant class' values and ideologies, maintain the nation-state's dominance and exploitation, and shape students' character and behavior; second, some elements of citizenship, such as political knowledge, duties, responsibilities, attitudes, and skills, are more easily and more effectively transmitted through schooling.

Unlike nation-state-oriented CE, inclusive CE prepares individuals' awareness, identities, knowledge, and skills from the global level to the national, local, and individual levels. Four major types of inclusive CE have been developed: global (Kingwell 2000), cosmopolitan (Osler 2011), multicultural (Banks 2004, 2008), and multidimensional (Kubow et al. 1998). Global CE cultivates students' awareness, loyalty, commitment, and allegiance in the global community, rather than within national boundaries (Kingwell 2000). While emphasizing the fostering of students' common humanity and global commitment, cosmopolitan citizenship also advocates cultivating students' identities at the local, national, regional, and global levels. Multicultural CE tries to balance individuals' attachment to and identities among the cultural, national, and global levels, and enable them to participate into civic activities and produce knowledge favoring a more humane nation and world (Banks 2008). Multidimensional CE involves developing four key dimensions of citizenship—personal, social, spatial, and temporal (Kubow et al. 1998). The personal dimension concerns one's capacity for and commitment to the civic ethos. The social dimension refers to one's ability to interact with people holding different ideas and values. The spatial dimension describes one's multiple memberships in interconnected local, regional, national, and multinational communities. Finally, the temporal dimension indicates that one's citizenship is situated within a specific historical context, and includes awareness of world history and of how current events influence the future.

Even though inclusive CE is proposed in the context of globalization, it cannot free itself from the influence of the nation-state. First, the nation-state remains the main force governing national affairs, and has the ability to concentrate its national forces to affect CE; the nation-state is typically unwilling to cede its ability to define and control CE, and may move to limit the influence that cultural groups or local communities have on CE (Law 2011). Second, the nation-state continues to make use of citizenship to cultivate individuals' national identity and strengthen the conception of the nation-state (Kennedy 2004, 2008). Moreover, individuals' commitment and sense of belonging to the nation-state have been further reinforced, in the global context, by such forces as globalization, supra-national governance, and liberalization (Kennedy 2008). Third, CE relies on nation-state-level regulation to ensure that its pursuit of the diverse interests of

multiple cultural groups does not injure those of other groups, and to maintain its own sovereignty (Ambler 1994; Walford 1996). The nation-state can guide and direct CE through policy making, curriculum design, resource allocation and the appointment, and evaluation of school leaders, all of which have a macro-political effect (Buchmann and Hannum 2001). Policies on CE and curriculum design can transmit salient knowledge and values to students and help to develop loyalty and identity, while resources allocation facilitates CE both materially and in terms of human resources (Sim 2008).

School CE is regarded as a curriculum, and numerous scholars (Grossman et al. 2008; Kerr 1999; Pike 2007a) have examined CE curriculum, focusing on such aspects as pedagogy (Kennedy et al. 2013), content (Lee 2004; Prior 2006), strategies (Althof and Berkowitz 2006), and assessment (Pike 2007b). Other research has addressed various groups' perceptions of CE, including teachers (Banks 2001; Osler 2011; Sim and Print 2009; Wang et al. 2006) and students (Fairbrother 2003; Kennedy et al. 2008), or teachers' role in CE (Serriere 2014; Wang and Liu 2008). However, fewer researchers have addressed the topic of school leadership in CE.

School leaders, as Wagstaff et al. (1979) pointed out, are expected to play an important role in CE. Remy and Wagstaff (1982) noted that principals can exercise leadership in CE in three main ways: first, by ensuring teachers devote sufficient time to CE instruction, the development of CE materials, in-service learning, and systematically understanding the goals of CE; second, by creating a school culture that perpetuates accepted behavioral norms, values, beliefs, ceremonies, rituals, and myths among school community members, and that facilitates CE; and third, by establishing and maintaining good relations with the school community, and encouraging teachers to make full use of community resources to further CE. Moreover, Serriere (2014) found that school principals play an active role in fostering students' civic efficacy. Dimmock et al. (2014) pointed out that school leaders of madrasahs (which are primarily intended to deliver religious education) must balance the twin goals of fostering an emerging workforce and nurturing Islamic values and principles, and must therefore have more skill at mediation, modifying curricula, and building up networks among the school's external stakeholders to get resources.

Although these theories help us to understand the importance of CE to the nation-state and the latter's influential role in defining CE, they do not specifically delineate how the CPC-led state uses Chinese CE to strengthen its dominance and consolidate China's socialist political system. In addition, the extant studies on school leadership in CE, though helpful in explaining school leaders' influence over CE and the dilemmas they face in mediating school and CE goals, are not specific enough to explain what, if any, any other factors shape school leadership in CE, and cannot explain the complex relationships and interactions among school leaders and macro- and micro-political actors when implementing CE at the school level. To some extent, these inadequacies can be partly supplemented by theories on school leadership.

Theories of School Leadership

Research on school leadership covers a variety of topics, and has evolved from theories of leadership in business and other areas. To help explain the complexities and dynamics of school leadership in CE, this section begins by examining three theoretical approaches of school leadership—rational, systematic, and political. Particular attention is placed on the political approach, so as to reveal the complexity of coping with school-level macro- and micro-politics (i.e., addressing the diverse demands of various school stakeholders from within and outside of the school). Next, the section reviews the debate on school leaders' role in curriculum leadership, which reflects their complex relationship with other school stakeholders.

School Leadership: Three Major Approaches

The literature on school leadership is an extension of that on business leadership. Leadership is defined as an individual's ability to induce followers to pursue a specific goal that benefits both parties (Blondel 1987; Burns 1978). Leadership can be independent of title or position; that is, it can exist in both formal and informal organizations, and need not reside solely in the top positions in those organizations (Blondel 1987). Rowe (2007) defined leadership derived from positional authority as assigned leadership, and to leadership based on one's ability to get people to do great things as emergent leadership. Blondel (1987) proposed that, although a leader is not necessarily tied to a given position, leadership cannot always be separated from that position, and that one can become a leader based on one's occupying a particular position. In this book, the term "leader" is linked to both position and title, and refers to an individual formally occupying a top position in an organization.

Three main models have been proposed to explain school leadership and its environment: rational school leadership, systematic school leadership, and political school leadership (Blase 1991). The rational perspective regards school leadership in terms of measurable, controllable behaviors, situated in a closed mechanistic system that emphasizes authority, regulation, top-down communication, and obedience. This model emphasizes the individual leader's personality, style, and power, as well as the school's communication structure and rules. School leadership is seen as a series of behaviors that the leader controls among his/her followers to achieve certain goals. This model, however, neglects the influence of and variations in schools' external and internal contexts.

The systematic school leadership model, by contrast, does consider the influence of the social environment on maintaining school function and shaping school goals, structures, activities, and relationships; from a natural system perspective, school is a circulatory system in which the external environment, the school's

internal structure, the individual, and the dominant culture interact to shape school outcomes (Hallinger et al. 1996; Hoy and Miskel 2004). School leadership can therefore be seen as a process through which leaders influence their followers to adopt school goals, by managing the systematic interactions between individual leaders and internal and external factors (Dimmock and Walker 1998; Hallinger and Leithwood 1996). School leadership is affected by school leaders' individual factors, as well as those of the school's internal and external systems (Hoy and Miskel 2004). The former includes personality (e.g., self-confidence, stress tolerance, emotional maturity and integrity), motivation and skills (e.g., technical, interpersonal, conceptual and cognitive skills) (Hoy and Miskel 2004), and gender (Hallinger et al. 1996), while the latter includes school structure and culture, organizational size and hierarchy, as well as subordinates' personality, motivation, ability, and needs (Mawhinney 1999). Three main types of external factors have been identified as affecting school leadership: social culture at the national and local levels (Hallinger and Leithwood 1998); government at all levels (Hopkins and Levin 2000); and, school community (such as the socioeconomic status and geographic location of students and their families, and parents' expectations of schooling) (Hallinger and Muppy 1986).

Different from the systematic leadership perspective, which neglects the system's complexities and dynamics, the third model conceptualizes school leadership as a political arena and emphasizes the system's uncertainty and diversity. Political school leadership refers to school leaders' influence in and strategies for balancing the diverse interests of or conflicts between stakeholders who have the power to allocate scarce resources, make decisions and reach commonly agreed-upon goals (Bolman and Deal 2008; Lashway 2006).

These three approaches center on how school leaders exercise influence on and interact with the organization. These approaches help to provide a general picture of the development of school leadership research. The next subsection will focus on the political approach to school leadership, which, as will be shown later, provides a theoretical framework for understanding how school leaders in China interact with schools' internal and external stakeholders during the process of exercising school leadership in CE.

School Leadership: Its Micro- and Macro-politics

Political school leadership recognizes that, in a school system, stakeholders have divergent interests that may not be in accordance with defined school goals (Bagin 1994; Winkler 2010), and which could exercise dynamic influence on school leaders by taking advantage of the power and resources they possess. Schools leaders thus must regularly address salient public service issues, competition, scarcity of resources, and debates over school values to respond to school politics (Malen 1994). School politics are characterized by the diverse logic of the actions with which stakeholders pursue their interests and attempt to maintain or enhance their

influence over school affairs (Bacharach and Mundell 1993); logic of action is “the implicit (that is, often unstated) relationship between means and goals that is assumed by actors in organizations,” which is manifested in the ideology, strategies, and resources people employ (Bacharach and Mundell 1993).

Research on political school leadership focuses on three major issues: addressing macro- and micro-political issues; the role of motive bases and power in political school leadership; and the relationship between macro- and micro-politics at the school level. Macro-politics relates to a school’s external environment and its relationships and interactions with macro-political actors—external stakeholders such as political parties, governments, courts, education administration institutions, and teachers’ unions at the local and national levels (Blase and Blase 2002; Lashway 2006).¹ These actors impact educational policy making and legislative processes, and compel other external actors to modify their influence on the school (Bacharach and Mundell 1993; Lashway 2006). Macro-political actors influence school leaders through such strategies as professional standards (Liu 2005), training (Bush 1998), and evaluation (Thomas 2000).

Micro-politics refers to internal stakeholders’ use of formal and informal powers to advance their interests, purposes, and preferences and to influence organizational affairs (Blase 1991); school-level micro-political actors include school leaders, teachers, students, and parents (Lashway 2006).² Winkler (2010) described a model of school leaders’ political behavior in the micro-political arena, including the behaviors themselves, the factors affecting them, and their outcomes. School leaders’ political behaviors can be affected by factors related to systematic leadership (e.g., individual school leaders’ or school’s internal and external systems) and targets, and can produce either target outcomes or leader outcomes.

Political school leadership informs three implications (Lashway 2006). First, as governments at all levels can regulate school leadership, school leaders should determine government expectations and how they can be met. Second, leadership styles should be adjusted to suit changing policies and needs. Third, school leaders must be able to mediate macro- and micro-political needs. In response to macro-political forces, school leaders can adopt three strategies: reducing dependency; adapting to the environment; and changing the environment (Goldring 1995). Reducing dependency connotes resistance, and involves decreasing the school’s financial dependency on the government by seeking financial support elsewhere, adapting to the environment is accommodative and emphasizes modifying one’s actions to reduce macro-political pressures, and changing the environment connotes obedience, by reshaping the school environment as directed by the government.

¹This sentence is directly quoted from Xu, S., & Law, W.-W. (2015). School leadership and citizenship education: The experiences and struggles of school party secretaries in China. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 14(1), 33–51. With kind permission from Springer Science+Business Media.

²Ibid.

The second major theoretical issue of political school leadership concerns school leaders' motive bases and power, which coexist in political leadership at both the macro- and micro-political levels (Lashway 2006). According to Burns (1978), motive bases include hierarchies of want, need, and aspiration that can be used to mobilize and motivate followers, while power can utilize motive bases. Power in political leadership is manifested in authority and influence (Bacharach and Mundell 1993; Hoyle 1982; Mawhinney 1999). Authority is one's sanctioned right, based on structural position, to make a final decision, while influence is one's self-generated ability (e.g., personality, expertise, and resourcefulness) to guide the decision-making process (Bacharach and Mundell 1993). Micro- and macro-political actors can use power strategies (such as control, negotiation, and coalition) to create collective meaning among organizational members (Bacharach and Mundell 1993; Mawhinney 1999). Researchers show that power is much more than simple control, manipulation, and coercion (power over), and also includes power through (using power to help others) and power with (sharing power with others) (Smeed et al. 2009). Therefore, cooperation and conflicts coexist in the political school leadership process (Blase 1991; Lashway 2006).

Power is of critical importance to school leaders; it gives them a negotiating advantage, helps them to mobilize school members' support, and allows them to suppress opposition voices (Bacharach and Mundell 1993). Although power is a factor in both macro- and micro-politics, researchers place more emphasis on how school leaders use their power in micro-political situations, especially between principals and teachers (Blase and Anderson 1995; Hallinger and Leithwood 1996). Although Smeed et al. (2009) proposed that power over, through and with are all affected by external accountability requirements, most discussions have focused on how they are used in micro-politics.

The third major theoretical issue regarding political school leadership concerns the relationship between macro- and micro-politics. Some researchers (Bacharach and Mundell 1993; Ball 1987; Mawhinney 1999) proposed that the former is framed by the latter, that school micro-politics are affected and shaped by the contests of macro-political actors and the penetration of their diverse logic of actions. School leaders are seen as agents of the government whose function is to accommodate its requirements. School leaders can choose to accommodate macro-political actors for any of three reasons (Clayton 2000): to gain wealth, power, privilege, or superior status; because it is natural for them, as subordinates, to do so; or, because they have no choice but to do so.

Other researchers (Blase 1991; Hoyle 1999; Lashway 2006) have depicted macro- and micro-politics as intertwined, with school micro-politics actively reacting to, rather than being passively framed by, macro-politics. For example, macro-political actors can guide, shape or change individuals' behavior and ideologies, while micro-political actors can create and enact strategies to negotiate with macro-political actors (Bacharach and Mundell 1993; Blase 1991). School leadership thus involves interpreting, implementing, ameliorating, and modifying macro-political directives and influence, and aligning the macro- and micro-political forces at play (Lashway 2006).

The political school leadership model has been used to understand and analyze the micro-political relationships between teachers and principals, other teachers, students, and parents (Blase 1991; Blase and Anderson 1995), and in the promotion of school reform (Datnow 2000), educational change (Bush 2011), instructional improvement (Blase and Blase 2002),³ policy implementation (Malen 2006), and, particularly, how external organization influences policy implementation in educational institutions (Honig 2009). Accordingly, studies have examined school leadership styles and power strategies in the micro-political context (Blase and Anderson 1995). The framework for macro- and micro-politics in political school leadership is adopted in this book to study the dynamics of school leadership in China because, as will be demonstrated later, it can help to analyze the interactions between the state (as a macro-political actor) and school leaders (as micro-political actors), as well as those among the school principal, SPS, and other staff in the micro-political setting of school. Despite its usefulness, this framework has not previously been applied to analyze leadership in CE, specifically. It is also not specific enough to explain how school leaders in China shape and exercise their leadership in CE through interactions with macro- and micro-political actors; for example, how they cope with the struggles between state control and professional autonomy, between the promotion of CPC-prescribed CE and meeting parents' demands of academic performance, and between cooperation and contention for power in school and CE leadership.

Curriculum Leadership as an Integral Part of School Leadership

Numerous studies have focused on many aspects of school leadership, including school leaders' characteristics and styles (Bush 2007; Hoy and Miskel 2004) and school leadership approaches (e.g., transformational, transactional, and distributed leadership) (Smith and Piele 2006). Many of these leadership studies also addressed how school leaders affect the central activities of schools—curriculum and instruction (Mulford and Johns 2004). Similar to studies on school leadership, there have also been debates on whether curriculum leadership is dominated by an individual actor (e.g., school principal) or shared among multiple stakeholders (Elliott et al. 1999; Ylimaki and Brunner 2011). With regard to curriculum leadership, two major perspectives have been proposed; the first views curriculum leadership as synonymous with instructional leadership (Lee and Dimmock 1999), while the other sees it as having a broader scope (Ylimaki 2012).

The first perspective originated from research on school effectiveness, especially in relation to the academic success of students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Hallinger et al. 1996; Hallinger and Murphy 1983, 1986). It argued

³Ibid.

that, to enhance school effectiveness, curriculum leaders should focus on establishing vision and setting goals, improving pedagogy, reviewing the quality of instruction, building school culture to facilitate teaching and learning, motivating teachers and promoting their professional development, ensuring the order and safety of school, and allocating resources (Hallinger and Muppy 1986; Murphy 1990). This led to a further debate about whom those curriculum leaders should be. Earlier research regarded individual principals as the leaders, while more recent research has proposed a distributed leadership, advocating that principals allocate power to deputy principals, teachers, and other professionals with the ability to improve classroom practices (Gronn 2002). From a distributed leadership perspective, principals should model appropriate behaviors by leading the curriculum (Marks and Printy 2003) and inviting teachers and other professional to exercise their influence to improve teaching and learning (Beycioglu et al. 2012). The focus of curriculum leadership is expanded from improving students' test scores, to cultivating citizens who pursue social justice and equity (Saiti 2007; Zachrisson and Johansson 2010).

Unlike the first perspective, which sees curriculum leadership as a means to improve school effectiveness, the second adopts a broader understanding of curriculum leadership, considering it to be more than instructional leadership in three major aspects. First, curriculum leadership involves the participation of and interactions among diverse actors. Glatthorn and Jailall (2009) pointed out that curriculum leadership is exercised by key stakeholders at the state, school district, school, and classroom levels. Macpherson and Brooker (2000) suggested that research on curriculum leadership should consider broader social structures and examine the readiness and interactions among multiple stakeholders (e.g., teachers, students, and parents).

Second, the perspective sees school curriculum as an important mechanism for transmitting salient knowledge and values to students, and for developing in them the values that can help them survive in society (Sim 2008); the purpose of curriculum leadership is not only to improve the quality of teaching and learning, but also to facilitate students' self-transformation and social transformation (Henderson 2001).

Third, school curriculum leadership comprises a series of political acts, including not only exercising instructional leadership, but also understanding cultural politics and making curricula through negotiations with various curriculum stakeholders (Ylimaki 2012). At the school level, these negotiations are often complex and need to be understood within the school's specific political context (Henderson and Gornik 2007). In these political processes, principals can use their interpretations to respond actively to and interact with other stakeholders in the specific policy and sociocultural context (Ylimaki 2012).

Studies on school leadership and curriculum leadership are useful for describing, not only the ways in which school leaders exercise their influence, but also the systems in which school leaders are situated, the situations school leaders face, and the dynamics of their leadership. In particular, the debate on curriculum leadership illustrates that curriculum leadership is a major concern of school leaders,

is a dynamic process influenced by the leaders' perception of curriculum and their identity in a certain sociocultural context, and is shaped by the interactions between school leaders and multiple stakeholders, each of whom have different expectations of and influences on school curriculum. However, the literature on curriculum leadership is not specific enough to explain how internal and external factors affect school leadership in CE curricula. Moreover, it does not specifically explain how principals and SPSs affect each other's exercising leadership in CE in Chinese schools, how China's government ensures school leadership aligns with its socialist agenda and CPC leadership expectations, or how Chinese school leaders respond to this sort of political control.

Debates on School Leadership in China

Research on Chinese school leadership covers many topics, as reviewed in the previous section, including theoretical debates on the conceptualization of school leadership and curriculum leadership. This book adopts Lashway's (2006) and Blase's (1991) macro- and micro-political theoretical perspectives to analyze how Chinese principals' and SPSs' leadership in CE is shaped by diverse school-level political actors, and by the interplay between state-level macro-politics and school-level micro-politics among principals, SPSs, and other actors; as such, Chinese school leadership cannot be fully explained by the study of non-Chinese school leadership. To understand specific issues in Chinese school leadership, this section reviews studies on the complexities of China's dual-line school leadership system, and the politics confronting Chinese school leaders and curriculum leadership in China.

Dual-Line Leadership in Chinese Schools

Chinese schools have dual-line leadership system, in which one leader (the principal) is responsible for school administrative affairs and another (the SPS) for school political work. Both are directly answerable to the state (the educational bureau and its Party Committee) at the local district (county) level, and their school administration and political work responsibilities are defined by educational authorities at higher levels.

Despite being theoretically equal in rank, principals and SPSs are not equal in power in school leadership. Rather, their power distribution, as China's history since the 1950s has repeatedly shown, is affected by changes in political climate and CPC policy on education and school leadership (Bao 2004; Huang 2002). When the CPC has, throughout its history, faced political crises or focused on ideological issues, schools have been forced to emphasize political development and SPSs have been given more power; however, when the CPC has chosen to stress the cultivation of talents for economic modernization and development purposes,

schools have been directed to focus on academic development, and principals' power has increased (Xiao 2000a; Zhang 2006).

To improve the efficiency of school leadership and make a clearer division of power and responsibilities between principals and SPSs, the PRS was readopted, in 1985 (Xiao 2000b); principals, under the guidance of higher level educational authorities, are expected to be school decision-makers, to take charge of all administrative affairs on campus and to bear all related legal responsibilities, while SPSs are mainly responsible for school political work, including developing the School Party Organization (SPO) which, as the school's political nucleus, provides political, ideological, and organizational guidance and works with school staff to promote school development, maintain school harmony, implement CPC policies, and direct the Teachers Congress in their school, and improving ideological work (*sixi-ang gongzuo*) (Communist Party of China Central Committee 1985). The latter is a series of purposive actions, guided by the CPC's political ideology and values, intended to transform and direct school members' political standpoint, political ideology, world view, life view, and morality (Mao 1957).

Principals' concerns are reflected not only in China's educational policy, but also in research on school leadership in China. Although there are two heads in the dual-line school leadership system, the extant research has focused more on principals' leadership than on SPSs'. For example, there were at least 170 papers specifically on principals' leadership and educational reforms between 1998 and 2008 (Walker et al. 2012), covering such topics, according to Walker et al. (2012), as principals' leadership in school improvement and effectiveness, principals' roles, curriculum leadership, relationship with the CPC and government, and factors influencing principals' leadership. Far less research has been done on SPSs' leadership (Cheng 2012), and that has mostly discussed topics of general school leadership or educational leadership (e.g., Bush and Qiang 2000; Law 2009, 2012; Lin 2000; Tao et al. 1988).

While helping to explain China's special school leadership structure and the historical shifts in power relations between principals and SPSs, the extant research is not specific enough to explain how the dual-line leadership system complicates principals' and SPSs' leadership in school and in CE in particular, or how the disparity of power between principals and SPSs affects their ability to fulfill their administrative and political responsibilities. Moreover, few empirical studies have specifically focused on schools' dual-line leadership system or how the dual leaders exercise their influence in CE. These inadequacies, as will be shown in the next section, could partly be supplemented by research on the politics faced by school leaders in China.

Politics and Chinese School Leadership

In the complex Chinese dual-line school leadership system, school leadership in China, like school leadership in the general literature, is affected by individuals

and multileveled contexts (Bush and Qiang 2000; Coleman et al. 1998; Feng 2002; Huang and Cheng 2001; Law 2009, 2012, 2013; Ribbins and Zhang 2006; Wong 1998). Chinese school leadership has three key political actors: the CPC-led state, the principal, and the SPS. The CPC-led state, as will be discussed in Chaps. 3 and 4, is the macro-political actor in China, while the principal and SPS are micro-political actors. Research on Chinese school leadership examines both the macro- and micro-politics with which China's school leaders are confronted. In terms of macro-politics, extant research focuses on how the CPC-led state defines and controls both heads of the school leadership system and their leadership, and how school leaders respond to the control, whereas research on micro-politics between principals and SPSs focuses on cooperation and/or competition in their working relationship.

To explain the complex relationship between school leadership and macro-political actors in China, two major models have been proposed: control/passive obedience, and control/ active response. The control/passive obedience model stresses that school leaders have no power and no space to resist or oppose the CPC-led state, must fully follow and obey the CPC, and must show it full obedience and loyalty through its state-controlled school leadership system (Child 1994). This is because educational authorities control and manage schools for political, social, and economic purposes by appointing and evaluating school leaders and controlling their actions (Ge 2003; Lin 1993). The higher authorities also circumscribe school leaders' power by controlling the recruitment and promotion of teachers, funding, and curriculum (Bush et al. 1998; J. Wang 2012).

The control/active response model points out that, despite being controlled by the CPC-led state, school leaders can still play an active role in analyzing and responding to that control in ways that maximize their and their school's interests. On the one hand, school leaders actively maintain their relationships with the CPC-led state by implementing its requirements and policies, in order to gain more freedom in and resources for school leadership, and to improve their career path (Law 2009). On the other hand, school leaders can actively select values and tasks and adopt strategies for modifying official requirement and policies, rather than being solely influenced by and subject to the CPC-led state's prescriptions (Law 2012). Moreover, to ensure the success of policy metamorphosis, school leaders can cooperate with school internal micro-political actors and some macro-political actors to respond to other macro- and micro-political actors (Ding 2008).

The extant research depicts principals and SPSs as having working relationships that are either cooperative (Tao et al. 1988) or competitive (e.g., Lin 2000; Xiao 2000a). The former view proposes that principals and SPSs are closely connected and must work together; its proponents liken the relationship to that of the human brain and heart—the “brain” can make decisions, but only the “heart” can provide the blood and energy needed to implement them.

The latter (competitive) view holds that, as heads of distinct leadership lines, principals and SPSs have inherent conflicts and institutionalized power struggles. Their supposed power struggle results from their separate responsibilities and the fact that their relative power is not clearly defined in the relevant policies

(Lin 2000; Xiao 2000a). According to the PRS, principals are to take full charge of school administration, while SPSs are to conduct school political work, discuss school key decisions, and supervise principals (Communist Party of China Central Committee 1985); this means that each head can restrict the other's exercise of school leadership (Lin 2000). However, studies on the competitive relationship between principals and SPSs point out that principals have more power and advantages than do SPSs. Bush et al. (1998) showed that, in Xi'an, Shaanxi Province, principals are so powerful that they can reduce the SPSs' influence in school and avoid the SPSs' and Teacher Congresses' constraints; SPSs are even forced to reduce their school political work and focus on instruction (Liu 2008).

However, a number of studies have also shown that, unlike in the political school leadership model reviewed earlier, school leadership in contemporary China has been encumbered with numerous macro-political functions and missions, such as perpetuating CPC leadership (Ge 2003) and acting on behalf of the CPC to guarantee school-level political orientation and carry out political work (Ministry of Education 1978; Xiao 2000a). Both principals and SPSs are expected to ensure that their schools adhere to the CPC's ideological line, principles, and policies and to supervise school members' political ideology, moral character, and working style. In particular, SPSs are required to improve the SPO by recruiting and cultivating CPC members, and to strengthen in-school CPC leadership by coordinating the activities of the Communist Youth League (CYL), Young Pioneers of China (YPC), Students' Union, Work Union and other Party members (Xiao 2000a).

While the extant literature provides some understanding of the macro-politics facing school leaders and the micro-politics between principals and SPSs in school leadership, it cannot show the patterns by which school leaders respond to macro-political actors' policies and requirements, especially in leading CE, and the diverse interactions among school leaders, and the various micro- and macro-political actors. In addition, it cannot reveal, with empirical evidence, how principals and SPSs divide their responsibilities in CE leadership, school leaders' perceptions of their leadership in CE, or through what mechanisms school leaders exercise their leadership in CE.

Curriculum Leadership in Chinese Schools

One of the most important focuses of research on school leadership in China is curriculum leadership, especially since the early 2000s, when the country's new three-level (national, local, school based) curriculum was introduced, and schools were asked to develop school-based curriculum. Similar to the literature on curriculum leadership in non-Chinese contexts, research on curriculum leadership in China is a subset of research into general school leadership, and focuses on two areas: who should lead the curriculum, and what politics are involved.

Research on Chinese curriculum leadership also asks who should be the leader. Although some studies (Li and Ma 2006; Zhang 2010; Zhong 2002, 2006) advocated assigning curriculum leadership responsibilities to mid-level school leaders and teachers, most still focus on principals' leadership. Principals are regarded as the "head" of the school curriculum (Liu 2011), and as critical to its success (Yin 2010; M. Zhang 2005; Zhong 2006). Principals' curriculum leadership is proposed to include establishing an appropriate school environment, setting school goals, making plans for implementing national and local curricula, developing school-level curricula, promoting teachers' development, guiding students' values, and supervising and evaluating curricula (Yang and Wen 2009).

Similar to the extant research on non-Chinese curriculum leadership, research in the Chinese context also points out that curriculum leadership in China is a political action, involving multiple stakeholders with different interests, and influenced by internal and external school factors and principals' individual factors (Walker and Wang 2011; Yang and Wen 2009; Zhong and Yue 2006). Walker and Wang (2011), for example, adopted a political analysis perspective to review literature on curriculum leadership in mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong, and suggested curriculum leadership is characterized by dynamic interactions between principals and other organizational stakeholders in a certain cultural context.

The political action is twofold—toward internal school stakeholders and toward external school stakeholders (Zhong and Yue 2006). In the former situation, school curriculum leadership mainly concerns the division of labor and power between principals and teachers. In the latter, it focuses on the interactions between principals and higher authorities. Two major types of interaction have been examined (Li and Ma 2006; Zhong and Yue 2006). One originates from China's extant curriculum leadership situation, in which the CPC-led state centralizes curriculum power at the national level (especially for goal setting and content supervision purposes), even as it claims to empower the local and school levels (Zhong 2006). Principals are regarded as the assistants of and speakers for the higher authority; specifically, they help the higher authority implement its curriculum policies and transmit its values, and administer personnel and other resources to ensure policy implementation. Being controlled by the higher educational authority and having limited power, principals dared not openly oppose the higher authorities (Walker and Wang 2011). The second type of interaction refers to school curriculum leadership, and suggests that, while principals actively develop curriculum to suit school needs and make use of internal and external school stakeholders' resources to facilitate curriculum implementation, they still need to follow the CPC-led state's guidelines (Ke 2011; Yin et al. 2014).

In addition to the politics of school curriculum leadership focusing on the power relationship among school principals, the higher authorities and parents, another further political issue of principals' curriculum leadership in China lies in the dilemma surrounding academic examination results. Although principals would prefer to carry out the policies of National New Curriculum Reform, which began in 2001 and aims at changing examination-centered education, Yin et al. (2014) found principals still regard examinations as a central concern of academic

instruction and the core of their curriculum leadership. This dilemma is intensified by the interactions of macro- and micro-political actors. The MoE, an influential macro-political actor, pursues all-round education development by introducing such new initiatives as school-based curriculum and progressive pedagogy; at the same time, however, it also evaluates schools based on their academic performance (Yin et al. 2014). Parents, as micro-political actors, value the quality of their children's development through schooling, but judge that quality based on the school's ability to prepare their children for a good, higher level education (X. Zhang 2005).

The extant research [especially Walker and Wang (2011)], despite describing principals' importance in curriculum matters and how stakeholders (i.e., government, teachers, parents, and parents) affect principals' curriculum leadership, is not sufficient to explain how the interplay between these stakeholders (in terms of cooperation and conflicts) influences principals. Moreover, the extant studies on curriculum leadership in China focus more on principals' leadership in curriculum reform and students' learning for academic examinations, and are not specific enough to explain curriculum issues in CE. In addition, as it emphasizes principals' leadership, the extant research is not specific enough to explain SPSs' role in the curriculum leadership during interactions with multiple stakeholders, or how principals and SPSs share responsibilities in curriculum leadership, especially in CE. These research gaps could be partly addressed by research on CE in China.

Theoretical Issues of CE in China

CE in China, like that reviewed in the general literature, is closely associated with the nation-state and especially the CPC. Chinese CE is designed to further the construction of the CPC's socialist system. As such, the CPC-led state advocates promoting CE through both formal and informal curriculum strategies. To examine the relationship between Chinese CE, the CPC-led state and school leadership, this section first reviews the nature and purpose of Chinese CE. Next, it discusses the struggles between the promotion of CE and China's emphasis on academic instruction. Finally, it presents the leadership of CE in China, with a particular focus on literature on school CE leadership.

The Nature and Purposes of Chinese CE

The nature and purposes of Chinese CE can be viewed from three perspectives. One perspective argues that there is no CE in China (Zhang 2014). Another points out that Chinese CE is implicitly present in such subjects as social studies (Wang 2007), history (Zhao 2009) and ideo-morality, and politics (Li and Zhong 2002; Sun and Duan 2009), but in quantities insufficient to cultivate modern citizenship, and suggests using CE to transform the function and contents of Chinese political

education and moral education (Li and Zhong 2002). This, according to Wan (2003), is because there are three deficiencies in China's political education and moral education. First, their goals are to cultivate socialist elites who are expected to carry forward the CPC's political ideology and leadership and devote to constructing communism rather than to cultivate citizenship. Second, their contents, which stress political knowledge and social responsibilities, are unattractive and too abstract to understand and practice. Third, their methods, which emphasize knowledge indoctrination and obedience to authority, do not facilitate the cultivation of citizens' attitudes, behaviors, and skills. CE, therefore, is suggested as a means to overcome these defects and to promote students' individual development, by balancing citizens' rights and duties (Li and Zhong 2002; Pan 2002) and enhancing their knowledge, skills, and attitudes as subjective and global citizen with an awareness of equity, democracy, and freedom (Huang 1997), and increasing their competencies for rationality and participation in public affairs (Sun 2007).

The third perspective holds that what the second perspective proposes is, indeed, CE with Chinese characteristics. Zeng (1981) pointed out that political education in China is the equivalent of CE in capitalist country. In addition to "political education," other terms (e.g., ideo-political education, moral education and patriotic education) have also been adopted as alternative term of CE and "have been used to describe the project of political socialization" in school in different periods, (Law 2006, p. 606). These terms are often inseparable and used interchangeably (Tan 2007; Wang and Huang 2008; Zhong and Lee 2008; Zhu 1992). Examination of these terms can help reveal the nature and purpose of Chinese CE.

The terms "political education" and "ideo-political education" were adopted to foster students' support for socialism and CPC leadership during the Mao era (1949–1976), and focused mainly on Marxism–Leninism, CPC general knowledge, China's revolution (including class struggle), and morality (based on the "five loves"; i.e., of the nation, its people, labor, science and public property) (Ministry of Education 1957, 1959). These two terms remained in use in policies until the mid-1980s, years after Mao's death, although the weight given the various topics was readjusted to suit the CPC's new national building strategy (Fairbrother 2003).

In the late 1980s, the confusing term "moral education" began to be used to describe education-based responses to social issues and problems (e.g., extreme individualism) arising from China's market reforms and opening to the world (Cheung and Pan 2006). Different from "moral education" in Western contexts, which generally focuses on fostering morality (Kohlberg 1981), moral education in China includes cultivating students' morality, while still giving priority to guiding students' political orientation through Marxism–Leninism and the thoughts of Chinese political leaders, such as Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping (Ministry of Education 1998). To a large extent, moral education represents the expansion of ideological and political education to include teaching about morality and students' psychological quality (Communist Party of China Central Committee 1988;

He 1992), law education (Communist Party of China Central Committee 1994), citizen ethics (Communist Party of China Central Committee 2001), global concerns (Communist Party of China Central Committee and State Council 2010; Ministry of Education 2001), and cultural identity (Central Commission for Guiding Cultural and Ethical Progress 2006; Ministry of Education 2014).

Despite the different terms, the purposes and nature of these value education programs, as observed by numerous researchers who have adopted the third perspective (Fairbrother 2004; e.g., Law 2006; Lee 1997; Zhao and Fairbrother 2010) are to address the CPC-led state's concerns about and aims of promoting political socialization. The CPC-led state has used these programs as an ideological instrument to transmit political doctrines, positions, and values that encourage students to be patriotic and supportive of their leadership, in order to foster a modern Chinese socialist citizenry and ensure the CPC's continued leadership. That is to say, the value education programs presented above describe the de facto Chinese version of CE (Law 2011). Whatever its name, these programs reflected the ideological, political, moral, and propagandist nature of Chinese CE (Tse and Lee 2008) and sought to transmit CPC ideology to students purposely and systematically, and to cultivate their conformity and loyalty to the Party's leadership (Tse and Lee 2008).

This book adopts the third perspective—i.e., that there is CE in China that aims at cultivating students' identity, belonging, rights, and duties by providing them with knowledge, skills, and attitudes (about politics, economics, law, social life, ecology, and personal development) through formal curricula (e.g., subject of politics) and informal curricula (e.g., political activities, moral education activities).

The extant research on Chinese CE helps to clarify the meaning of CE in China, explain its political nature and function, and describe its relationship with the CPC-led state and the framework it prescribes. Nevertheless, it does not account for how the CPC-led state enacts CE through school leaders ("door-keepers"), gaps between implemented and enacted CE, school leaders' various opinions on CE, how they perceive their role in CE, or in what ways and with what strategies school leaders influence CE, and why.

Tension Between CE and Academic Instruction

In China, the promotion of CE has been confronted by the emphasis on academic instruction to prepare students for public examinations. The relationship between CE and academic instruction has been a concern in both academic research and school practice in China, and three major interrelated patterns have been proposed to describe it: giving CE priority over academic instruction; focusing on academic instruction and ignoring CE; and balancing CE and academic instruction.

The first pattern holds that CE guides students and informs their future development. Prioritizing CE over academic instruction was proposed by Mao Zedong, in the 1950s (Mao 1957), and has been part of educational policies in China ever

since. CE has been called the “first,” “primary,” and “core” task of school work, as it can ensure students develop in accordance with the CPC’s political orientation, become socialist constructors and successors, and do not endanger the society (H. Wang 2012).

The second pattern reveals that, in practice, academic instruction is at the core of school work and consumes the most time and resources, while CE is not emphasized beyond the minimum schools are compel to provide (Wang 2006; You 2011). First, academic instruction is highly valued by parents, school leaders, and teachers, who spend more time on enhancing exam scores than on developing good citizens (Wang 2006). Second, fewer impressive teacher resources are available for CE than for key examination subjects (e.g., Chinese Language, mathematics); CE-specific teachers are seen as inferior to teachers of other subjects in terms of competencies and position, and the latter, though requested to integrate CE into their subjects, cannot spare the time to do so (You 2011). Third, CE activities are not as systematic as instruction for examination subjects. The former are often organized to correspond with inspection tours from higher authorities or to cope with ad hoc student problems, whereas academic instruction has a detailed implementation flow (Luo 2013; You 2011).

Unlike the first two patterns, which point to or argue for the unequal relationship between CE and academic instruction, the third pattern advocates a balanced relationship. Wang (2006) argues that both CE and academic instruction are important for students’ development and should play an intertwined function. The former provides an ideological basis for academic instruction, and the latter advances values and attitudes to complement students’ knowledge and skills. Li (2006) states that both CE and academic instruction are necessary to and inseparable from school work, and should be united by embedding CE into academic instruction and developing students’ knowledge and skills in CE.

While useful for understanding the theoretical and practical relationships between CE and academic instruction, the literature is not specific enough to reveal how school leaders perceive and position CE and academic instruction, to what extent their perception are similar and different, how they mediate macro- and micro-political actors’ interests therein, or how they share their responsibilities therein.

Who Should Lead CE in School?

Despite the tension in school work between CE and academic instruction, the CPC-led state still requires school leaders to make CE a leadership priority. A number of studies have explored various topics related to CE in China, including curriculum (Zhu 2006), pedagogy (Zhao and Fairbrother 2010), and CE and social change (Law 2011). However, studies on leadership in CE are rare.

The CPC-led state has placed great emphasis on leadership in general school administration and political work, including CE, as reflected by its establishment

of the dual (administrative and political) leadership system in school. Nevertheless, the roles and responsibilities of principals and SPSs in leading CE have varied with changes in policy. From 1949 to 1978, school leaders were responsible for transforming students' ideology to meet CPC political requirements (State Education Commission 1951), raising students' political awareness (Communist Party of China Central Committee and State Council 1958), directing student organizations (such as CYL, Students' Union and YPC) and cultivating students' ideo-morality (Ministry of Education 1963). The importance of school leadership in CE has been stressed since 1978 (Deng 1978), at which point SPSs were regarded as leaders in successful ideo-political education (Ministry of Education 1978). Since the revision of the PRS in 1985, principals have been given authority over CE, and SPSs restricted to designing CE plans, unifying school organizations to work for CE and cooperating with principals on CE (Communist Party of China Central Committee 1986, 1988; Teng 1988).

Although principals' and SPSs' CE responsibilities are divided, they are still interconnected (Communist Party of China Central Committee 1986; Ministry of Education 1998; State Education Commission 1990, 1995a, b; Teng 1988). First, SPSs supervise principals' CE instruction and the construction of the school's CE environment. Second, both principals and SPSs are responsible for CE activities.

However, current research on leadership in China's CE mainly focuses on its problems (e.g., school principals not paying attention to CE and passing responsibility for implementing CE on to HCEs and class heads, focusing on students' behavioral norms, and equating CE to activities organized by the CYL and YPC) (Chi 2007). Other research proposes strategies for improving CE effectiveness through school regulations and curriculum (e.g., Chi 2007; Yang and Zhang 2010; Zhang 1997), improving CE activities (Zhao 1989) and improving school environment and culture to nurturing CE (Tan 2007).

While helping to explain the complex CE leadership system, as well as principals' and SPSs' shared responsibility for CE, the research on CE leadership has paid little attention on how principals and SPSs respond to policies regulating their CE responsibilities, work as dual heads to lead CE, and deal with the relationship between CE and academic instruction, or to the factors affecting school leaders' interactions with the CPC-led state and their peer leaders in leading CE.

Theoretical Framework Proposed by This Book

This section introduces the theoretical framework this book proposes to interpret school leadership in CE. It has three parts: first, a summary of the usefulness of extant literature for directing this research; second, an analysis of the limitations of extant literature in explaining this research; and third, the introduction of the theoretical framework itself.

The discussions on citizenship and CE recounted above show that the state is the key factor influencing CE. Research on CE helps to explain why the state

stresses CE, how CE is developed and expanded to respond to social change, and the ways in which school leadership can influence CE. Theories on school leadership identify three major models of school leadership from different organizational perspectives, and present school leadership in a complex and dynamic context involving multiple stakeholders' diverse interests. Theories of political school leadership facilitate an understanding of why and how school leadership is shaped by school macro- and micro-politics, how macro- and micro-politics interact, and how school leadership is exercised in response to the interplay between macro- and micro-politics. Moreover, they also define macro- and micro-politics. In this book, macro-politics refers to interactions between and among, and the influence of, organizations external to the school that have the power to authorize, support, and guide education in a country or area. In China, macro-political actors can be understood as organs of the CPC-led state, because the CPC dominates legislation, the judiciary, and governance at the national and local levels.

This book defines school micro-politics as the use of formal and informal power to arouse dynamic interactions between and among individuals and groups, in order to attain desired goals in school. Micro-political actors, in this research, include principals, SPSs, teachers, students, and parents. Theories of curriculum leadership show dynamics and complexities similar to those in general school leadership. Regarding curriculum leadership specifically, studies show it to be a dynamic process influenced by leaders' perceptions of curriculum and their identities in a certain sociocultural context, and shaped by interactions between school leaders and multiple stakeholders with different expectations and influences on school curricula.

Examining the dual-line school leadership system helps to explain the structure of school leadership in China, historical changes to principals' and SPSs' power and position in school leadership, the CPC-led state's domination of the school leadership system, and the lack of research relating to SPSs' leadership. Rehearsing the politics facing school leaders in China sheds light on the dynamic relationship between the CPC-led state and school leaders, and highlights the working relationships between principals and SPSs in school leadership. Examining political leadership in China's schools exposes its particular nuances, and examining curriculum leadership in China shows principals' importance and multiple stakeholders' diverse interests. The review of CE theories in China shows how CE responds to social development, how it is dominated and utilized by the CPC-led state to promote political socialization, and what CE framework is provided by the CPC-led state. Viewing the theoretical debates on the relationships between CE and academic instruction helps to explain the complex and contradictory position of CE, and indicates that CE's position is influenced by multiple stakeholders with diverse interests. Explaining leadership in CE helps to explain the CPC-led state's key role in defining the CE system and the importance of school leadership in CE in China.

Despite its many positive contributions, however, the extant literature is not specific enough to explain three key aspects of school leadership in CE: (a) school leaders' perceptions of CE; (b) how macro- and micro-political actors affect

school leadership in CE in certain social contexts; and, (c) how school leaders perceive and respond to macro- and micro-political forces in leading CE, and why. Moreover, the extant research is not specific enough to explain the interactions between Chinese school leaders and the CPC-led state, or how it influences school leaders and their leadership over CE. The literature does not specifically examine what micro-politics emerge, as principals and SPSs share their responsibilities of leading school and CE.

This book examines the complex political and administrative responsibilities school leaders are required to fulfill, and explores and explains how and why school leaders can facilitate and challenge the CPC-led state in carrying out its policies on and requirements for school CE. It also examines and explains how and why principals and SPSs, as heads of schools' administrative and political lines, can cooperate with each other to fulfill their CE responsibilities in response to macro- and micro-political actors' expectations, and compete with each other to gain power in school. It seeks to identify the following issues: school leaders' responsibilities; the dynamic and complex interactions between and among school macro-political actors, principals and SPSs, all of whom are school-level micro-political actors; and, the meaning of school leadership in CE, in the specific context of Shanghai. Other micro-political actors (e.g., teachers, students, and parents) could also influence principals' and SPSs' leadership and will be examined as influential factors. These issues can be summarized as the research problem of this book: to determine the complexities and dynamics of how school leaders form and exercise their leadership in CE by handling macro- and micro-politics.

To understand better the research problem, this section has proposed a theoretical framework for interpreting school leadership in CE as a political exercise in which school leaders interact with macro- and micro-political actors to fulfill administrative and political responsibilities in a specific context. School leadership in CE is affected by factors at the international, national, local, school, and individual levels, and the interplay between these factors. The exercise of school leadership is a process of maneuvering and adjusting administrative and political responsibilities, and involves mediating the struggles between macro-political actors' control over school leadership and school leaders' pursuit of professional autonomy, the diverse interests between macro- and micro-political actors, and the micro-politics between school administrative and political leaders.

Summary

This chapter has introduced theories on school leadership and CE beyond and within China's experience, examined their usefulness and inadequacies for understanding the case of Shanghai, and proposed a theoretical framework to interpret the complexities and dynamics of school leadership in CE in Shanghai, China. This chapter has also identified that school leadership in CE involves multiple stakeholders with diverse interests. School leadership in CE in China is guided

and regulated by the CPC-led state and is shared by both principals and SPSs on campus.

Studies on school leadership and CE shed light on the complexities and dynamics of how school leaders perceive and exercise their influence on school. However, the literature is not specific enough to explain how macro- and micro-political forces shape school leadership in CE in Shanghai. To understand this problem more deeply, this book attempts to explore and understand the complex and dynamic interactions between school leaders and school macro-politics exercised by the CPC-led state, as well as the micro-politics between principals and SPSs. Based on the theoretical framework discussed in this Chapter, Chaps. 3 and 4 portray the macro-political context at national and local level in which the leadership provided by school leaders, as micro-political (i.e., school level) actors in China, is shaped and exercised; Chaps. 5 and 6 will present how school leaders cope with macro- and micro-politics. Chapter 7 provides possible explanations for the complex and dynamics of school leadership in CE in China. The methodology upon with the empirical results presented in this book can be found in the Appendix.

References

- Althof, W., & Berkowitz, M. W. (2006). Moral education and character education: Their relationship and roles in citizenship education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(4), 495–518.
- Ambler, J. S. (1994). Who benefits from educational choice? Some evidence from Europe. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 13(3), 454–476.
- Apple, M. W. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bacharach, S. B., & Mundell, B. L. (1993). Organizational politics in schools: Micro, macro, and logics of action. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(4), 423–452.
- Bagin, D. (1994). *The school and community relations* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization*. London: Methuen.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 5–16.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). *Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129–139.
- Banks, J. A. (2009). *Multicultural education: Dimensions and paradigms*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bao, C. (2004). Xiaozhang fuzhezixia de xiaozhang quanli daxiao jiqi guiyue (School principals' power in principal responsibility system and its regulation). *Jiaoyu Kexue (Education Science)*, 20(4), 51–53.
- Beycioglu, K., Ozer, N., & Ugurlu, C. T. (2012, February 2–5). *Distributed leadership and organizational trust: The case of elementary schools*. Paper presented at the 4th World Conference on Educational Sciences-WCES 2010, University of Barcelona-Spain.
- Blase, J. (1991). *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict and cooperation*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Blase, J., & Anderson, G. L. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment*. London: Cassell.

- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2002). The micropolitics of instructional supervision: A call for research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 6–44.
- Blondel, J. (1987). *Political leadership: Towards a general analysis*. London: Sage.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Buchmann, C., & Hannum, E. (2001). Education and stratification in developing countries: A review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 77–102.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. (1998). The national professional qualification for headship: The key to effective school leadership? *School Leadership & Management*, 18(3), 321–333.
- Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3), 391–406.
- Bush, T. (2011). The micropolitics of educational change. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 39(6), 642–645.
- Bush, T., Coleman, M., & Si, X. (1998). Managing secondary schools in China. *Compare*, 28(2), 183–195.
- Bush, T., & Qiang, H. (2000). Leadership and culture in Chinese education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 20(2), 58–67.
- Castles, S. (2004). *Migration, citizenship, and education* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Central Commission for Guiding Cultural and Ethical Progress. (2006, May 24). Guanyu shenru xuexi shijian shehui zhuyi rongruguan dali jiaqiang sixiang daode jianshe de yijian (Directive on promoting socialism outlook for honor and dishonor and strengthening ideological construction). *China education daily*.
- Cheng, H. (2012). *Zhongxiaoxue dangzuzhi shuji zhuan yehua fazhan yanjiu (Professional development of school party secretaries in primary and secondary schools)*. Shanghai: Northeast Normal University.
- Cheung, K. W., & Pan, S. Y. (2006). Transition of moral education in China: Towards regulated individualism. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2(2), 37–50.
- Chi, X. (2007). Xuexiao deyu guanli zhongde jizhong changjian wuqu ji duice fenxi (The mistakes and strategies of school moral education administration). *Zhongxiaoxue Guanli (Administration of Primary and Secondary School Education)*, 12, 41–43.
- Child, J. (1994). *Management in China during the age of reform*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayton, T. (2000). *Education and the politics of language: Hegemony and pragmatism in Cambodia, 1979–1989*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.
- Cogan, J. (1998). *Citizenship education for the 21st century: Setting the context*. London: Kogan Page.
- Coleman, M., Qiang, H., & Li, Y. (1998). Women in educational management in China: Experience in Shaanxi province. *Compare*, 28(2), 141–154.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1985). *Reform of China's educational structure*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1986). Guanyu shehuizhuyi jingshen wenming jianshe zhidao fangzhen de jueyi (Decision on the guideline of socialist spiritual civilization). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1976–1990) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1976–1990))* (pp. 2504–2505). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1988). Guanyu gaige he jiaqiang zhongxiaoxue deyu gongzuo de tongzhi (Notice of reforming and strengthening moral education in primary and secondary school). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1976–1990) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1976–1990))* (pp. 2821–2824). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (1994). Gaunyu jiaqiang dang de jianshe jige zhongda wenti de jue ding (Decisions on several issues of strengthening party construction). Retrieved March 21, 2012, from http://news.xinhuanet.com/ziliao/2003-01/18/content_695401.htm

- Communist Party of China Central Committee. (2001). Gongmin daode jianshe shishi gangyao (The program for improving civic moral). Retrieved December 20, 2008, from <http://www.people.com.cn/GB/shizheng/16/20011024/589496.html>.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee, and State Council. (1958). Guanyu jiaoyu gongzuo de zhishi (The instruction of the work on education). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1949–1975) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1949–1975))* (pp. 858–861). Haikou: Hainan press.
- Communist Party of China Central Committee, and State Council. (2010). *Guojia zhongchangqi jiaoyu gaige he fazhan guihua gangyao: 2010–2020 (The outlines of middle and long term educational reform and development in China)*. Beijing: People's press.
- Dagger, R. (2002). Republican citizenship. In E. F. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 145–158). London: Sage Publications.
- Datnow, A. (2000). Power and politics in the adoption of school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(4), 357–374.
- Dawson, R. E., Prewitt, K., & Dawson, K. S. (1977). *Political socialization: An analytic study* (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Deng, X. (1978). Zai quanguo jiaoyu gongzuo huiyishang de jianghua (The speech made at national education conference). In Central Committee of Communist Party of China Document Editorial Commission (Ed.), *Deng Xiaoping wenxuan (Deng xiaoping's anthology)* (Vol. 2, pp. 103–110). Beijing: People's press.
- Dimmock, C., Hairon, S., & Tan, C.-Y. (2014). Curriculum, leadership and religion in Singapore schools: How a secular government engineers social harmony and the 'state interest'. In J. D. Chapman, S. McNamara, M. J. Reiss, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *International handbook of learning, teaching and leading in faith-based schools* (pp. 533–551). Netherlands: Springer.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (1998). Administration: Developing a cross-cultural conceptual framework. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 558–595.
- Ding, X. (2008). Policy metamorphosis in China: A case study of minban education in Shanghai. *The China Quarterly*, 195, 656–674.
- Elliott, B., Brooker, R., Macpherson, I., & Mcinman, A. (1999). Curriculum leadership as mediated action. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 5(2), 171–185.
- Fairbrother, G. P. (2003). *Toward critical patriotism: Student resistance to political education in Hong Kong and China*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Fairbrother, G. P. (2004). Citizenship education in a divided China, 1949–1995. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 24(1), 29–42.
- Feng, D. (Ed.). (2002). *Goutong yu fenxiang: Zhongxi jiaoyu guanli lingxian xuezhe shiji huitan (Communication and sharing in educational administration: The dialogue between leading Chinese and western scholars at the turn of the century)*. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.
- Frey, C. J., & Whitehead, D. M. (2009). International education policies and the boundaries of global citizenship in the US. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(2), 269–290.
- Ge, X. (2003). Woguo xianxing “xiaozhang fuzezhi” de falv yu zhidu fenxi (A legal and systematic analysis on system of headmaster's accountability to primary and middle school in China). *Beijing Shifan Daxue Xuebao (Shehui Kexueban) (Journal of Beijing Normal University (Social Sciences))*, 6, 48–55.
- Glatthorn, A. A., & Jallall, J. M. (2009). *The principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught and tested Thousand Oaks*. California: Corwin Press.
- Goldring, E. (1995). Striking a balance: Boundary spanning and environmental management in schools. In S. B. Bacharach & B. L. Mundell (Eds.), *Images of schools: Structure and roles in the organizational behavior* (pp. 283–315). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. In K. A. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 653–696). Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Grossman, D. L., Lee, W. O., & Kennedy, K. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.

- Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1996). School context, principal leadership and student reading achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(5), 527–549.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. A. (1996). Culture and educational administration: A case of finding out what you don't know. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34(5), 98–116.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. A. (1998). Unseen forces: The impact of social culture on school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 126–151.
- Hallinger, P., & Muppy, J. F. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94(3), 328–355.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1983). Instructional leadership and school socio-economic status: A preliminary investigation. *Administrator's Notebook*, 31(5), 1–4.
- Hanasz, W. (2006). Toward global republican citizenship? *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 23(1), 282–302.
- He, D. (1992). Zai quanguo zhongxiaoxue deyu gongzuo huiyishang de jianghua (Speech at the conference of national primary and secondary school moral education). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1991–1997) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1991–1997))* (pp. 3337–3341). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Heater, D. B. (1999). *What is citizenship?*. Malden, Mass: Polity Press.
- Heater, D. B. (2002). The history of citizenship education: A comparative outline. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55(3), 457–474.
- Henderson, J. (2001). Deeping democratic curriculum work. *Educational Researcher*, 30(9), 18–21.
- Henderson, J., & Gornik, R. (2007). *Transformative curriculum leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prince-Hall.
- Honig, M. I. (2009). “External” organizations and the politics of urban educational leadership: The case of new small autonomous schools initiatives. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84(3), 394–413.
- Hopkins, D., & Levin, B. (2000). Government policy and school development. *School Leadership & Management*, 20(1), 15–30.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2004). *Educational administration, policy, and reform: Research and measurement*. Greenwich: Information Age Pub.
- Hoyle, E. (1982). Micropolitics of educational organisations. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 10(2), 87–98.
- Hoyle, E. (1999). The two faces of micropolitics. *School Leadership & Management*, 19(2), 213–222.
- Huang, F. (1997). Xuexiao gongmin jiaoyu: Wenti jiqi duice (Citizenship education in school: Problems and solutions). *Xueshu Yanjiu (Academic research)*, 4, 79–83.
- Huang, F. (2002). Xiaozhang fuzezhi xia de weituo-daili wenti chutan (The issue of consignment-agency relationship in principal responsibility system). *Jiangxi Jiaoyu Yanjiu (Jiangxi Educational Research)*, 8, 22–24.
- Huang, Z., & Cheng, J. (2001). *Jiaoyu guanlilun (Theories of education administration)*. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press.
- Ke, Z. (2011). *Lijie kunjing: Kecheng gaige shishi xingwei de xinzhidu zhuyi fenxi (dilemma of understanding: New institutionalism and promotion of curriculum reform)*. Beijing: Education Science Publishing House.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2004). Searching for citizenship values in an uncertain global environment. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy, & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 9–24). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2008). Globalised economies and liberalised curriculum: New challenges for national citizenship education. In D. L. Grossman, W. O. Lee, & K. J. Kennedy (Eds.), *Citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 13–26). Netherlands: Springer.

- Kennedy, K. J. (2010). Neo-statism and post-globalisation as contexts for new times. In A. Reid, J. Gill, & A. Sears (Eds.), *Globalization, the nation-state and the citizen: Dilemmas and directions for civics and citizenship education* (pp. 223–229). London: Routledge.
- Kennedy, K. J., Fairbrother, G. P., & Zhao, Z. (Eds.). (2013). *Citizenship education in China: Preparing citizens for “the Chinese century”*. London: Routledge.
- Kennedy, K. J., Hahn, C. L., & Lee, W. O. (2008). Constructing citizenship: Comparing the views of students in Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(1), 53–91.
- Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship education in the curriculum: An international review. *The School Field*, 10(3/4), 5–32.
- Kingwell, M. (2000). *The world we want: Virtue, vice and the good citizen*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Viking.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kubow, P. K., Grossman, D., & Ninomiya, A. (1998). Multidimensional citizenship: Educational policy for the 21st century. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education* (pp. 115–134). London: Kogan Page.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship. *Ethics*, 104(2), 352–381.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2007). Culture versus citizenship: The challenge of racialized citizenship in the United States. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 99–126). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Langton, K. P. (1969). *Political socialization*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Lashway, L. (2006). Political leadership. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for excellence in student learning* (pp. 266–281). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Law, W. W. (2006). Citizenship, citizenship education and the state in China in a global age. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(4), 597–628.
- Law, W. W. (2007). Globalization, city development and citizenship education in China's Shanghai. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(1), 18–38.
- Law, W. W. (2009). Culture and school leadership in China: Exploring school leaders' views of relationship- and rule- based governance. In A. W. Wiseman (Ed.), *Global contexts and international comparisons* (pp. 303–341). Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- Law, W. W. (2010). The state, citizenship education and international events in a global age: The 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. *Comparative Education Review*, 54(3), 343–367.
- Law, W. W. (2011). *Citizenship and citizenship education in a global age: Politics, policies, and practices in China*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Law, W. W. (2012). Educational leadership and culture in China: Dichotomies between Chinese and Anglo-American leadership traditions? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(2), 273–282.
- Law, W. W. (2013). Culture, gender and school leadership: School leaders' self-perceptions in China. *Compare*, 43(3), 295–322.
- Lee, W. O. (1997). Changing ideopolitical emphases in moral education in China: An analysis of the CCP central committee documents. In W. O. Lee & M. Bray (Eds.), *Education and political transition: Perspectives and dimensions in East Asia* (pp. 99–114). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Lee, W. O. (2004). Perceptions of citizenship qualities among Asian educational leaders. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy, & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 137–155). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.
- Lee, J. C. K., & Dimmock, C. (1999). Curriculum leadership and management in secondary schools: A Hong Kong case study. *School Leadership & Management*, 19(4), 455–481.

- Li, W. (2006). Zhuiqiu deyu yu zhiyu de hexie tongyi (Uniting moral education and academic instruction). *Zhongguo Deyu (Chinese Journal of Moral Education)*, 1(7), 88–90.
- Li, C., & Ma, Y. (2006). Xiaozhang kecheng lingdao de jingyu ji juejue celue (The problems facing principals' curriculum leadership and the solutions). *Quanjia Jiaoyu Zhanwang (Global Education)*, 35(6), 50–55.
- Li, P., & Zhong, M. (2002). Gongmin jiaoyu: Chuantong deyu de lishixing zhuanxing (Citizenship education: The historical transformation of traditional moral education). *Jiaoyu Yanjiu (Educational Research)*, 10, 66–69.
- Lin, J. (1993). *Education in post-Mao China*. Westport: Praeger.
- Lin, J. (2000). Reform in primary and secondary school administration in China. In C. Dimmock & A. Walker (Eds.), *Future school administration: Western and Asian perspectives* (pp. 291–309). Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, Hong Kong Institute of Education Research.
- Liu, L. (2005). Zhongxiaoxue xiaozhang zhuanze biaoqun yanjiu (Study on professional standards of elementary and secondary school principals). In H. Chu (Ed.), *Zhongguo jiaoyu guanli pinglun (Chinese educational administration review)* (Vol. 3, pp. 232–276). Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House.
- Liu, X. (2008). Zhongxiaoxue shuji duiwu jianshe cunzai de wenti yu duice (The problems of secondary and primary school party secretaries' leading group construction and its solutions). *Xuexiao Dangjian Yu Sixiang Jiaoyu (School Party Construction and Ideological Education)*, 3, 23–24.
- Liu, D. (2011). Guonei xiaozhang kecheng lingdaoli de yanjiu gaikuang (Principals' curriculum leadership in China). *Jiaoxue Yu Guanli (Journal Teaching and Management)*, 8, 14–15.
- Luo, G. (2013). Tisheng xuexiao yishi huodong de deyu gongxiao (Enhancing the efficiency of school rituals in moral education). *Sixiang Lilun Jiaoyu (Ideology, Theory and Education)*, 2, 24–28.
- Macpherson, I., & Brooker, R. (2000). Positioning stakeholders in curriculum leadership: How can teacher educators work with teachers to discover and create their place? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(1), 69–85.
- Malen, B. (1994). The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics. *Journal of Education Policy*, 9(5), 147–167.
- Malen, B. (2006). Revisiting policy implementation as a political phenomenon: The case of reconstitution policies. In M. I. Honig (Ed.), *New directions in education policy implementation: Confronting complexity* (pp. 83–104). Albany: The State University of New York Press.
- Mao, Z. (1957). Guanyu zhengque chuli renmin neibu maodun de wenti (jiexuan) (How to deal with the people's internal contradiction (selection)) In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1949–1975) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1949–1975))* (pp. 725–727). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370–397.
- Marshall, T. H. (1992). *Citizenship and social class*. London: Pluto Press.
- Mawhinney, H. B. (1999). Reappraisal: The problems and prospects of studying the micropolitics of leadership in reforming schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 19(2), 159–170.
- Meyer, J. W., & Robinson, R. (1975). Education and political development. *Review of Research in Education*, 21(2/3), 134–162.
- Ministry of Education. (1957). Guanyu zhongxue shifan xuexiao shezhi zhengzhike de tongzhi (Announcement on providing political lesson in secondary school and secondary normal school). In Research Institute of Curriculum and Instruction (Ed.), *20 shiji zhongguo zhongxiaoxue kecheng biaoqun & jiaoxue dagang huibian: Sixiangzhengzhijuan (Curriculum standard and syllabus of primary and secondary schools in China in 20 century: Ideo-political subject)* (pp. 198–202). Beijing: People's Education Press.

- Ministry of Education. (1959). Zhongdeng xuexiao zhengzhike jiaoxue dagang (shixing caoan) (Syllabus of politics subject for secondary school (trial)). In Research Institute of Curriculum and Instruction (Ed.), *20 shiji zhongguo zhongxiaoxue kecheng biao zhun & jiaoxue dagang huibian: Sixiangzhengzhijuan (Curriculum standard and syllabus of primary and secondary schools in China in 20 century: Ideo-political subject)* (pp. 205–217). Beijing: People's Education Press.
- Ministry of Education. (1963). Quanrizhi xiaoxue zanxing gongzuo tiaoli (caoan) (The temporary working regulations in full-time primary school (trial)). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1949–1975) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1949–1975))* (pp. 1151–1155). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Ministry of Education. (1978). Quanrizhi zhongxue zanxing gongzuo tiaoli (shixing caoan) (The regulations of the work in full-time primary school (trial)). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1976–1990) (The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1976–1990))* (pp. 1630–1635). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Ministry of Education. (1998). Zhongxiaoxue deyu gongzuo guicheng (Regulations of primary and secondary school moral education). Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <http://www.moe.edu.cn/edoas/website18/33/info5933.htm>
- Ministry of Education. (2001, July 27). Jichu jiaoyu kecheng gaige gangyao (shixing) (The outline of curriculum reform in basic education). *China Education Daily*.
- Ministry of Education. (2014). Wanshan zhonghua youxiu chuantong wenhua jiaoyu zhidao gangyao (Directive on perfecting education on Chinese excellent traditional culture). Retrieved October 10, 2014, from <http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s7061/201404/166543.html>
- Mok, K. H. (2007). *Local response to a global agenda: Changing state-education relations in mainland China*. Pittsburgh PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Mulford, B., & Johns, S. (2004). *A preliminary model of successful school leadership*. Paper presented at the AARE.
- Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. In R. S. Lotto & P. W. Thurston (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school* (pp. 163–200). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Osler, A. (2011). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: National identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 1–24.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Education Review*, 55(5), 243–254.
- Pan, Y. (2002). Women xuyao zenyang de gongmin wenhua (What citizenship culture should we need). *Zhongguo Qingnian Yanjiu (China Youth Study)*, 3, 33–36.
- Pike, M. A. (2007a). The state and citizenship education in England: A curriculum for subjects or citizens? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39(4), 471–489.
- Pike, M. A. (2007b). Values and visibility: The implementation and assessment of citizenship education in schools. *Educational Review*, 59(2), 215–229.
- Pike, G. (2008). Citizenship education in global context. *Brock Education Journal*, 17(1), 38–49.
- Prior, W. (2006). Civics and citizenship education. *Ethos*, 14(4), 6–11.
- Remy, R. C., & Wagstaff, L. H. (1982). Principals can exert a leadership role in citizenship education. *NASSP Bulletin*, 66(454), 55–62.
- Ribbins, P., & Zhang, J. (2006). Culture, societal culture and school leadership: A study of selected head teacher in rural China. *International Studies of Educational Administration*, 34(1), 71–88.
- Rowe, W. G. (2007). *Cases in leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saiti, A. (2007). School leadership and educational equality: Analysis of Greek secondary school data. *School Leadership & Management*, 27(1), 65–78.
- Schuck, P. H. (2002). *Liberal citizenship*. London: Sage Publications.
- Sears, D. O. (1975). Political socialization. In F. I. Greenstein & N. W. Polsby (Eds.), *Handbook of political science* (Vol. 2, pp. 93–153). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Serriere, S. C. (2014). The role of the elementary teacher in fostering civic efficacy. *The Social Studies*, 105(1), 45–56.
- Sim, J. B.-Y. (2008). What does citizenship mean? Social studies teachers' understandings of citizenship in Singapore schools. *Educational Review*, 60(3), 253–266.
- Sim, J. B. Y., & Print, M. (2009). The state, teachers and citizenship education in Singapore schools. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 57(4), 380–399.
- Smeed, J., Kimber, M., Millwater, J., & Eahrich, L. (2009). Power over, with and through: Another look at micropolitics. *Leading and Management*, 15(1), 26–41.
- Smith, S. C., & Piele, P. K. (2006). *School leadership: Handbook for excellence in student learning* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- State Education Commission. (1951). Guanyu zai xuexiao jinxing sixiang gaizao he zuzhi qingli gongzuo de qingshi (Asking for instruction of conducting ideological work and checking up organization in primary school). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1949–1975)* (*The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1949–1975)*) (pp. 132–133). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- State Education Commission. (1990). Guanyu jinyibu jiaqiang zhongxiaoxue deyu gongzuo de jidian yijian (Suggestions on further strengthening moral education in primary and secondary school). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo Zhongyao Jiaoyu Wenxian (1976–1990)* (*The Important Educational Documents in People's Republic of China (1976–1990)*) (pp. 2965–2967). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- State Education Commission. (1995a). Guanyu jinyibu jiaqiang he gaijin zhongxue sixiangzhengzhi jiaoxue gongzuo de yijian (Opinions on further strengthening and improving secondary ideo-political teaching). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1991–1997)* (*The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1991–1997)*) (pp. 3910–3912). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- State Education Commission. (1995b). Zhongxue deyu dagang (The outline of secondary school moral education). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1991–1997)* (*The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1991–1997)*) (pp. 3778–3782). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Stokes, G. (2000). Global citizenship. In W. Hudson & J. Kane (Eds.), *Rethinking Australian citizenship* (pp. 231–242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sun, F. (2007). Quanqiuhua yu bentuhua shiyexia gongmin jiaoyu de jiazhi zhuiqiu (Value pursuit of civic education in the view of globalization and localization). *Xibei Daxue Xuebao (Zhaxue Shehui Kexueban)* (*Journal of Norwest University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*), 37(1), 126–131.
- Sun, F., & Duan, X. (2009). Sixin pinde jiaokeshu zhong gongmin jiaoyu jiazhi quxiang jiben kuangjia (Citizenship education in ideo-morality textbooks). *Education Research Monthly*, 2, 74–76.
- Tan, C. (2007). Dangqian gongmin jiaoyu yingdang guanqie de sange zhongyao mingti (The three propositions that should be favored in the citizenship education at present). *Renmin Jiaoyu (Peoples Education)*, 15(16), 4–6.
- Tao, Z., Liu, G., & Yi, X. (1988). Tantan zhongxue de dangzheng fenkai wenti (On the separation of administrative power and party power in middle schools). *Renmin Jiaoyu (People's Education)*, 6, 19–20.
- Teng, T. (1988). Zai quanguo zhongxiaoxue deyu gongzuo huiyishang de baogao (Remarks addressed at the national education conference). In D. He (Ed.), *Zhonghua renmin gongheguo zhongyao jiaoyu wenxian (1976–1990)* (*The important educational documents in People's Republic of China (1976–1990)*) (pp. 2759–2761). Haikou: Hainan Press.
- Thomas, D. W. (2000). Policies and practices involved in the evaluation of school principals. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(3), 215–240.
- Torres, C. A. (2002). Globalization, education, and citizenship: Solidarity versus markets? *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2), 363–378.

- Tse, T. K. C., & Lee, J. C. K. (2008). China: Defending socialism with Chinese characteristics. In J. U. Landowe (Ed.), *Education in China* (pp. 25–40). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Wagstaff, L. H., Remy, R. C., & Ogawa, R. (1979). *Principals and citizenship education: A guide for effective leadership*. Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Walford, G. (1996). School choice and the quasi-market. In G. Walford (Ed.), *School choice and the quasi-market* (pp. 7–15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, A., Hu, R., & Qian, H. (2012). Principal leadership in China: An initial review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 23(4), 369–399.
- Walker, A., & Wang, F.-J. (2011). Same mother, different lives: The social organisation of leadership for learning across three Chinese societies. In T. Townsend & J. MacBeath (Eds.), *International handbook of leadership for learning* (Vol. 25, pp. 1083–1106). Netherlands: Springer.
- Wan, M. (2003). Lun gongmin jiaoyu (On citizenship education). *Jiaoyu Yanjiu* (Educational Research), 9, 37–43.
- Wang, S. (2006). Pingheng yu shentou: Deyu he zhiyu guanxi de xiandai zouxian (Balance and permeation: Modern tendency of moral education and intellectual education). *Zhongshan Daxue Xuebao* (Shehui Kexueban) (Journal of Sun Yatsen University (Social Science)), 46(5), 70–73, 142.
- Wang, W. (2007). Shehuike kechengzhong de gongmin jiaoyu xinquxiang jiqi jiaoxue celue (New trends and strategies of citizenship education in curriculum of social studies). *Jiaoyu Yanjiu* (Educational Research), 7, 55–60.
- Wang, H. (2012). Jianchi deyu shouyao diwei, qianghua deyu guifanhua guanli (Insisting the priority of moral education and standardizing its administration). *Henan Jiaoyu* (Henan Education), 11, 43–44.
- Wang, J. (2012). *Yige chengzuo danwei de xuexiao: Jiyu dui jindong m zhongxue de shidi diaoyan* (The schools called work unit: A case study of M secondary school). Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University Press.
- Wang, W., & Huang, F. (2008). Woguo gongmin jiaoyu kecheng fazhan de huigu yu zhanwang (The retrospect and prospect of citizenship education curriculum in China). *Xueshu Yanjiu* (Academic Research), 11, 145–152.
- Wang, C. K. J., Khoo, A., Goh, C. B., Tan, S., & Gopinathan, S. (2006). Patriotism and national education: Perceptions of trainee teachers in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 26(1), 51–64.
- Wang, C. K. J., & Liu, W. C. (2008). Teachers' motivation to teach national education in Singapore: A self-determination theory approach. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(4), 395–410.
- Winkler, I. (2010). Micro-politics approach to leadership. In I. Winkler (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership theories* (pp. 65–74). Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Wong, K. C. (1998). Culture and moral leadership in education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 106–125.
- Xiao, Z. (2000a). *Jiaoyu guanli yanjiu* (Research on education administration). Wuhan: Central China Normal University Press.
- Xiao, Z. (2000b). Xiaozhang fuzezhi de tichu ji neihan (The proposition and meaning of principal responsibility system). *Zhongxiaoxue Guanli* (Primary and Secondary School Administration), 11, 2–5.
- Yang, D., & Wen, H. (2009). Gaige kaifang 30nian: Zhongguo kecheng lingdao yanjiu de huigu yu fansi (The review and reflection of research on Chinese curriculum leadership in the past 30 years). *Jiaoyu Kexue Yanjiu* (Educational Science Research), 6(27–31), 36.
- Yang, R., & Zhang, X. (2010). Woguo jiaqiang gongmin yishi jiaoyu de neirong, zuoyong he tujing tantao (Intensified education about citizenship: Content, significance, and methods). *Jiaoyu Wenhua Luntan* (Journal of Education Culture), 1, 38–42.

- Yin, H. (2010). Jiaqiang kecheng lingdao: Xianshi de tiaozhan yu yingdui de celue (Improving curriculum leadership: The challenges and coping strategy at present). *Shanghai Research on Education*, 3, 16–19.
- Yin, H., Lee, J. C.-K., & Wang, W. (2014). Dilemmas of leading national curriculum reform in a global era: A Chinese perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(2), 293–311.
- Ylimaki, R. M. (2012). Curriculum leadership in a conservative era. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 304–346.
- Ylimaki, R. M., & Brunner, C. C. (2011). Power and collaboration-consensus/conflict in curriculum leadership: Status quo or change? *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(6), 1258–1285.
- You, Y. (2011). You xuexiao deyu diwei hualuo yinfa de sikao (Ideas stipulated from the decline of school moral education). *Zhongxiaoxue Deyu (Journal of Moral Education for Primary and Secondary School)*, 10, 16–18.
- Young, I. M. (1989). Polity and group difference: A critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. *Ethics*, 99(2), 250–274.
- Zachrisson, E., & Johansson, O. (2010). Educational leadership for democracy and social justice. In S. Huber (Ed.), *School leadership—international perspectives* (pp. 39–56). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Zeng, D. (1981). Renqing xingshi wei gaijin he jiaqiang zhongxue zhengzhike jiaoxue er nuli (Clarifying the situation to improving the teaching of politics in secondary school). *The teaching of politics in secondary school (zhongxue zhengzhike jiaoxue)*, 2, 1–6.
- Zhang, B. (1997). Shilun gongmin jiaoyu de yiyi, dongli he shishi (On the significances, motivations and implementing approaches of citizenship education). *Jiaoyu Tansuo (Education Exploration)*, 3, 13–15.
- Zhang, M. (2005). Xiaozhang de kecheng lingdao (Principals' instructional leadership). *Jichu Jiaoyu Cankao (Basic Education Review)*, 9, 4–6.
- Zhang, X. (2005). Xuexiao kechengguanli: Fuquanhou de kunhuo yu jueze (School curriculum management: The confusion and choice after empowerment). *Jiaoyu Kexue Yanjiu (Educational Science Research)*, 11(17–19), 26.
- Zhang, Z. (2006). Xiaozhang fuzezhi: Fazhan licheng yu wenti pouxi (Principal responsibility system: History and problems). *Zhongxiaoxue Guanli (Journal of Primary and Secondary School Administration)*, 10, 11–14.
- Zhang, S. (2010). Jiaoyu dudao ying guanzhu xiaozhang kecheng lingdaoli (Principals' curriculum leadership should be one of the concerns of educational supervision). *Jichu Jiaoyu Cankao (Basic Education Review)*, 6, 4–6.
- Zhang, X. (2014). Xinzhongguo gongmin jiaoyu jiazhi quxiang de shanbian (Continuities and changes of citizenship education in People's Republic of China). *Jiaoyu Lilun Yu Shijian (Theory and Practice of Education)*, 34(22), 41–45.
- Zhao, Y. (1989). Xuexiao jiaoyu yu zhengzhi shehuihua (school education and political socialization). *Jiangsu Shehui Kexue (Jiangsu Social Sciences)*, 2, 70–77.
- Zhao, Y. (2009). Xuexiao lishi kecheng de gongmin jiaoyu zhuiqiu (The pursuit of citizenship education in school history curriculum). *Global Education*, 38(4), 71–75.
- Zhao, Z., & Fairbrother, G. P. (2010). Pedagogies of cultural integration in Chinese citizenship education. In K. J. Kennedy, W. O. Lee, & D. L. Grossman (Eds.), *Citizenship pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 37–52). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Zhong, Q. (2002). Cong kecheng guanli dao kecheng lingdao (From curriculum administration to curriculum leadership). *Quanqiu Jiaoyu Zhanwang (Global Education)*, 31(12), 24–28.
- Zhong, Q. (2006). Cong “xingzheng quanwei” zouxiang “zhuanke quanwei”: “Kecheng lingdao” de kunhuo yu nanti (From administrative authority to expertise authority: The confusion and difficulties of curriculum leadership). *Research in Educational Development*, 4A, 1–7.

- Zhong, M., & Lee, W. O. (2008). Citizenship curriculum in China: A shifting discourse towards Chinese democracy, law education and psychological health. In D. L. Grossman, W. O. Lee, & K. J. Kennedy (Eds.), *Citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 61–73). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong.
- Zhong, Q., & Yue, D. (2006). Xuexiao cengmian de kecheng lingdao: Neihan, quanxian, zeren he kunjing (Curriculum leadership at school level: Definition, power, responsibility and dilemma). *Global Education*, 35(3), 7–14.
- Zhu, K. (1992). Dengxiaoping tongzhi lun jianchi dang dui jiaoyu de lingdao (Deng xiaoping's opinion on party's leadership in education). *Zhongnan Minxu Xueyuan Xuebao (Zhexue Shehui Kexueban)* (South-Central College for Nationalities (Social Sciences)), 4, 105–108.
- Zhu, X. (2006). Moral education and values education in curriculum reform in China. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 1(2), 191–200.

School Leadership, Citizenship Education and Politics in
China

Experiences from Junior Secondary Schools in Shanghai
Xu, S.

2016, XVII, 195 p. 3 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-981-10-1641-7