

## Summary of country comparisons year 2 results

This report provides a summary of the year 2 results of the six participating countries on the variables in our study. This summary should be read in conjunction with the technical report of the first year of data collection (see <http://schoolinspections.eu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/06/Technical-report-ISI-TL-2011-1.pdf>).

Table 1 first provides an overview of the mean scores of all the countries on the variables of our study. The first two variables describe principals' perceptions of the amount of inspection feedback they received about the school's capacity to improve and the quality of the school organization and teaching. In all countries, except the Czech Republic, principals indicate that the Inspectorate of Education provided most feedback on the quality of the school organization and teaching, and the least on the school's capacity to improve. Principals in England, Sweden and the Netherlands receive the most feedback, while the Inspectorate in the Czech Republic seems to provide the least feedback to schools. Principals in the Netherlands, England and Sweden also report of the most consequences of school inspections, while principals in the Czech Republic, Ireland and Austria experience little consequences of inspections.

Principals in all the six countries report overall high levels of 'accepting feedback', 'setting expectations', 'stakeholders sensitive to inspection reports', and 'promoting self-evaluations'. Principals in the Czech Republic score the lowest on all these variables, while principals in Ireland score the highest on 'accepting feedback' and principals in England score the highest on 'setting expectations', 'stakeholders sensitive to inspection reports', and 'promoting self-evaluations'.

The results indicate that principals overall report of relatively high levels of capacity-building in their schools, particularly in the Czech Republic. According to principals, their school has also improved the level of innovation capacity over the last academic year, although less so in schools in the Czech Republic. Specific improvements vary across countries; England and Sweden score highest in the improvements in teacher cooperation, while this seems a less important topic in the Czech Republic. Principals across all countries report of relatively little unintended consequences. Most unintended consequences seem to occur in England and Ireland, while the Czech Republic and Austria report of the least unintended consequences.

Table 1. Country mean scores on main variables

	Country					
	Ireland	England	Netherlands	Czech Rep.	Austria	Sweden
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Feedback on capacity building	1,52	1,67	1,93	1,39	1,87	1,88
Feedback on effective school and teaching conditions	1,94	2,07	2,62	1,34	1,93	2,18
Consequences (sanctions and interventions)	1,94	2,07	2,62	1,34	1,93	2,18
Accepting Feedback	4,11	3,91	3,93	3,51	3,96	3,82
Setting expectations	3,78	3,87	3,76	3,30	3,55	3,78
Shareholders sensitive to reports	3,90	3,91	3,65	2,86	3,32	3,55
Promoting Self-Evaluations	3,95	4,06	3,82	3,31	3,61	3,59
Capacity Building	4,31	4,46	4,15	4,49	4,31	4,17
Improvement in Capacity Building	3,74	3,67	3,68	3,43	3,76	3,73

Improvement in Teacher Participation in Decision Making	3,80	3,54	3,54	3,51	3,74	3,67
Improvement in Teacher Co-operation	3,88	4,04	3,96	3,36	3,61	4,07
Improvement in Transformational Leadership	3,48	3,57	3,66	3,35	3,95	3,49
School Effectiveness	4,38	4,33	3,89	4,04	4,16	3,89
Improvement in School Effectiveness	3,55	3,73	3,71	3,36	3,59	3,60
Improvement in Opportunity to Learn	3,49	3,76	3,76	3,25	3,68	3,58
Improvement in Assessment of Students	3,81	3,66	3,77	3,28	3,67	3,45
Improvement in Assessment of School	3,41	3,52	3,51	3,37	3,37	3,50
Improvement in Clear and Structured Learning	3,54	3,88	3,74	3,52	3,59	3,78
Unintended Consequences	3,19	3,20	2,81	2,49	2,67	2,99

Table 2 summarizes the consequences of schools in each country for the schools in our sample. The results indicate that schools in almost all of the countries experience consequences from school inspections, except schools in the Czech Republic. In the Czech Republic, only one school indicates more frequent monitoring and handing in an improvement plan to the Inspectorate of Education as a result of school inspections. The schools that report of consequences of school inspections particularly experience more frequent monitoring and handing in of improvement plans. Schools are generally not fined for as a result of an inspection visit and they also receive little financial support for improvement.

Table 2. Consequences of school inspections

	Ireland		England		Netherlands		Czech Rep.		Austria		Sweden	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
More frequent monitoring	11	22%	34	35,8%	46	28,2%	1	4,5%	14	6,3%	16	2,1%
Handing in improvement plan	9	17,6%	16	19%	41	25,5%	1	4,5%	84	37,7%	490	63,6%
Administrative fines (replacement of school board/school principal)	0	0%	1	1,3%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1,3%	50	6,6%
Financial fines	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0,4%	0	0%
Financial support for improvement	1	2%	8	10%	6	3,8%	0	0%	18	8,1%	23	3,1%
TOTAL	51	100%	80	100%	156	100%	22	100%	221	100%	750	100%

Table 3 provides an overview of the mean scores of primary and secondary schools in each country. A comparison of these means indicates potential differences in effects for primary and secondary schools.

The results indicate that principals in primary schools in all the six countries receive the most feedback and experience the most consequences of school inspections, compared to principals in secondary schools. The Czech Republic is an exception as principals in secondary schools report of receiving more feedback than principals in primary schools. This pattern is less consistent for the mechanisms of impact of school inspections; only in Ireland do principals in primary schools score consistently highest on ‘accepting feedback’, ‘setting expectations’, ‘stakeholders’ sensitive to reports’ and ‘improving self-evaluations’ compared to principals in secondary schools.

Principals in both primary and secondary schools indicate that their schools have high levels of capacity-building and have implemented many improvements in their level of innovation capacity over the last academic year. There are no systematic differences between principals in primary and secondary schools, except for the Czech Republic where principals in primary schools score consistently higher than principals in secondary schools. Principals in both primary and secondary schools also indicate that the quality of their school is good and that they have implemented many improvements over the last academic year; only in Sweden do principals in secondary education consistently report of somewhat higher quality and improvements compared to their counterparts in primary education. Principals in primary in almost all of the countries however report of more unintended consequences of school inspections, compared to the principals in secondary education. Only in the Czech Republic perceive principals in secondary education more unintended consequences.

Table 3. Comparison primary and secondary schools on main variables

	Ireland		England		Netherlands		Czech Rep.		Austria		Sweden	
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Feedback on capacity building	1.73	1.45	1.74	1.63	2.00	1.91	1.30	1.46	2.13	1.74	1.96	1.81
Feedback on effective school and teaching conditions	1.92	1.99	2.19	2.00	2.38	2.72	1.26	1.40	2.03	1.85	2.22	2.16
Consequences (1-5)	.50	.41	.	.33	.86	.42	.10	.08	.67	.30	.75	.75
Accepting Feedback	4.15	4.09	4.05	3.81	3.72	4.03	3.28	3.71	3.89	3.87	3.80	3.83
Setting expectations	3.85	3.76	3.92	3.83	3.80	3.74	3.25	3.35	3.65	3.52	3.73	3.81
Shareholders sensitive to reports	4.03	3.82	3.89	3.92	3.58	3.68	2.67	3.03	3.19	3.39	3.59	3.52
Promoting Self-Evaluations	4.02	3.91	4.06	4.07	3.79	3.84	3.44	3.17	3.86	3.64	3.60	3.59
Capacity Building	4.35	4.31	4.38	4.51	4.02	4.22	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.31	4.17	4.17
Improvement in Capacity Building	3.80	3.70	3.66	3.67	3.77	3.63	3.46	3.40	4.13	3.69	3.71	3.74
Improvement in Teacher Participation in Decision Making	3.86	3.75	3.52	3.54	3.58	3.52	3.56	3.46	4.10	3.66	3.66	3.68
Improvement in Teacher Co-operation	3.80	3.86	4.00	4.06	4.10	3.89	3.39	3.33	4.03	3.60	4.06	4.08
Improvement in Transformational Leadership	3.69	3.43	3.60	3.55	3.83	3.58	3.36	3.35	4.25	3.85	3.47	3.51
School Effectiveness	4.37	4.36	4.20	4.42	3.56	4.05	4.07	4.02	4.08	4.26	3.88	3.90
Improvement in School Effectiveness	3.59	3.53	3.75	3.71	3.73	3.70	3.36	3.37	3.83	3.53	3.58	3.62
Improvement in Opportunity to Learn	3.49	3.47	3.77	3.75	3.78	3.76	3.29	3.22	3.95	3.65	3.56	3.61
Improvement in Assessment of Students	3.65	3.82	3.72	3.61	3.70	3.81	3.19	3.38	3.90	3.66	3.40	3.49
Improvement in Assessment of School	3.43	3.43	3.45	3.57	3.70	3.42	3.32	3.43	3.64	3.26	3.46	3.53
Improvement in Clear and Structured Learning	3.74	3.47	3.95	3.84	3.71	3.75	3.54	3.49	3.79	3.50	3.80	3.76
Unintended Responses	3.03	3.28	3.08	3.27	2.64	2.89	2.51	2.47	2.60	2.78	2.98	3.01

Table 4 shows a comparison of responses of schools that were inspected last academic year to schools that were not inspected; these results are presented for each country separately in table 5. We expected inspected schools to consistently report of higher levels of received inspection feedback and consequences of inspections. The results in table 4 and 5 indicate that across all countries non inspected schools report of more inspection feedback on effective school and teaching conditions, particularly in the Netherlands; there are no significant differences between inspected and not inspected schools in the amount of feedback on capacity building and consequences of inspection visits.

Inspected schools also report of significant higher levels of ‘accepting feedback’, ‘setting expectations’, and ‘promoting self-evaluations’ compared to non inspected schools, particularly in Ireland, the Netherlands and Austria. Inspected schools in England, the Netherlands and Austria also indicate more improvements in the innovation capacity of the school (e.g. teacher participation in decision-making, teacher cooperation, transformational leadership), and in the improvement of effective school and teaching conditions (e.g. opportunity to learn, assessment of students). There is no difference between inspected and not inspected schools in the level of unintended consequences, except for Ireland and the Netherlands. Inspected schools in the Netherlands report of more unintended consequences, while in Ireland we find an opposite effect as non inspected schools report more unintended consequences.

Table 4. Comparing inspected and non inspected schools

	Did the school have an inspection visit last year?						T-Test
	Yes			No			
	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	P-Value
Feedback on capacity building	1.78	203	0.72	1.80	399	0.70	0.739
Feedback on effective school and teaching conditions	2.21	202	0.83	2.08	399	0.74	0.072
Inspection Consequences	0.52	183	0.79	0.47	324	0.74	0.478
Accepting Feedback	4.05	206	0.70	3.88	428	0.69	0.005
Setting expectations	3.79	206	0.60	3.65	427	0.60	0.007
Shareholders sensitive to reports	3.64	203	0.69	3.57	421	0.72	0.275
Promoting Self-Evaluations	3.91	204	0.71	3.70	651	0.78	0.001
Capacity Building	4.33	205	0.39	4.33	670	0.46	0.948
Improvement in Capacity Building	3.82	204	0.57	3.66	669	0.51	0.000
Improvement in Teacher Participation in Decision Making	3.74	202	0.64	3.63	661	0.57	0.015
Improvement in Teacher Co-operation	3.99	202	0.76	3.69	668	0.71	0.000
Improvement in Transformational Leadership	3.80	203	0.70	3.70	665	0.71	0.080
School Effectiveness	4.11	205	0.47	4.17	668	0.46	0.109
Improvement in School Effectiveness	3.73	204	0.50	3.58	666	0.45	0.000
Improvement in Opportunity to Learn	3.74	204	0.57	3.63	662	0.60	0.021
Improvement in Assessment of Students	3.79	203	0.69	3.63	658	0.63	0.002
Improvement in Assessment of School	3.54	202	0.63	3.41	658	0.63	0.010
Improvement in Clear and Structured Learning	3.80	204	0.64	3.63	663	0.59	0.001
Unintended Responses	2.81	206	0.55	2.90	432	0.62	0.082

Table 5. Comparing inspected and non inspected schools for each country

	Ireland			England			Netherlands			Czech Republic			Austria		
	Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?		
	Yes (n=13)	No (n=85)	T-Test	Yes (n=28)	No (n=136)	T-Test	Yes (n=93)	No (n=66)	T-Test	Yes (n=22)	No (n=67)	T-Test	Yes (n=49)	No (n=316)	T-Test
	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value
Feedback on capacity building	1.52	1.51	0.98	1.64	1.67	0.82	1.96	1.93	0.81	1.39			1.76	1.91	0.21
Feedback on effective school and teaching conditions	2.02	1.91	0.65	1.97	2.10	0.42	2.71	2.54	0.20	1.34			1.83	1.96	0.19
Inspection Consequences	0.33	0.45	0.64	0.14	0.39	0.23	0.74	0.30	0.00	0.09			0.48	0.55	0.53
Accepting Feedback	4.58	3.94	0.02	3.95	3.90	0.77	4.00	3.85	0.10	3.51			4.30	3.87	0.00
Setting expectations	4.15	3.64	0.01	3.86	3.87	0.96	3.87	3.58	0.00	3.30			3.71	3.51	0.03
Shareholders sensitive to reports	4.28	3.77	0.04	3.93	3.93	0.98	3.71	3.57	0.08	2.86			3.52	3.27	0.02
Promoting Self-Evaluations	4.13	3.92	0.39	4.29	4.03	0.09	3.96	3.68	0.01	3.18	3.35	0.36	3.85	3.57	0.02
Capacity Building	4.53	4.27	0.05	4.39	4.47	0.44	4.17	4.15	0.77	4.60	4.46	0.07	4.42	4.30	0.07
Improvement in Capacity Building	3.83	3.73	0.50	3.89	3.65	0.02	3.77	3.55	0.01	3.43	3.43	0.94	4.05	3.72	0.00

	Ireland			England			Netherlands			Czech Republic			Austria		
	Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?		
	Yes (n=13)	No (n=85)	T-Test	Yes (n=28)	No (n=136)	T-Test	Yes (n=93)	No (n=66)	T-Test	Yes (n=22)	No (n=67)	T-Test	Yes (n=49)	No (n=316)	T-Test
	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value
Improvement in Teacher Participation in Decision Making	3.81	3.80	0.97	3.81	3.51	0.01	3.63	3.43	0.03	3.49	3.51	0.85	4.02	3.69	0.00
Improvement in Teacher Co-operation	4.12	3.85	0.19	4.43	3.99	0.00	4.08	3.81	0.01	3.25	3.40	0.35	3.88	3.56	0.01
Improvement in Transformational Leadership	3.62	3.46	0.40	3.55	3.60	0.69	3.75	3.55	0.06	3.48	3.31	0.18	4.22	3.91	0.01
School Effectiveness	4.55	4.35	0.08	4.36	4.33	0.78	3.91	3.86	0.46	4.14	4.01	0.17	4.22	4.15	0.32
Improvement in School Effectiveness	3.64	3.54	0.45	3.89	3.71	0.06	3.81	3.65	0.04	3.40	3.35	0.52	3.63	3.58	0.45
Improvement in Opportunity to Learn	3.62	3.47	0.39	3.87	3.75	0.33	3.87	3.70	0.05	3.20	3.27	0.43	3.68	3.68	0.98
Improvement in Assessment of Students	3.81	3.81	0.99	3.93	3.61	0.01	3.89	3.71	0.14	3.34	3.27	0.54	3.73	3.66	0.45
Improvement in Assessment of School	3.38	3.42	0.86	3.61	3.53	0.52	3.58	3.48	0.32	3.40	3.36	0.78	3.52	3.35	0.09
Improvement in Clear and Structured Learning	3.72	3.51	0.24	4.06	3.85	0.09	3.87	3.69	0.07	3.64	3.48	0.19	3.60	3.59	0.94



	Ireland			England			Netherlands			Czech Republic			Austria		
	Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?			Did the school have an inspection visit last year?		
	Yes (n=13)	No (n=85)	T-Test	Yes (n=28)	No (n=136)	T-Test	Yes (n=93)	No (n=66)	T-Test	Yes (n=22)	No (n=67)	T-Test	Yes (n=49)	No (n=316)	T-Test
	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value	Mean	Mean	P-Value
Unintended Responses	2.87	3.30	0.06	3.22	3.20	0.84	2.84	2.69	0.08	2.49			2.66	2.68	0.87