

---

# MEANINGFUL DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION: THE ROLE OF DIGITAL MATURITY AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN SUPPORTING TRANSFORMATIVE, INCLUSIVE, VISIONARY, EFFECTIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE EDUCATION

*Dragana Kupres, Nati Cabrera Lanzo, Albert Sangra Morer, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain*

---

## Abstract

In this paper we describe the theoretical framework of educational leadership for meaningful digital transformation of schools, supported by digital maturity improvement and reflection framework. We propose a transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable perspective on education. We argue that the same perspective should be taken when thinking about digital transformation and the purpose of using digital technology in education. We define digital maturity as an institutional improvement and reflection framework serving the proposed vision of education. We describe our understanding of educational leadership needed to support both the transformative and inclusive perspective on education as well as the digital maturation of schools. We claim that two leadership approaches should be combined to influence the meaningful digital transformation: transformational leadership and distributed leadership. We conclude with the need for further research in understanding digital maturity and the role educational leadership plays in digital maturation of schools.

## Keywords:

Educational leadership, school leadership, digital maturity, digital transformation.

## Introduction

This theoretical article can be characterized as a theory synthesis and a theory adaptation (Jakkola, 2020). It synthesises two major theories of educational leadership, transformational and distributed leadership, and it adapts those theories to the context of technology integration in education, relating them to the concept of digital maturity, an organisational improvement and reflective framework designed to guide meaningful digital transformation (Marshal, 2010, 2012; Teichert, 2019; Volungevičienė et al., 2021). This article will propose three claims about how to conceptualize school leadership for meaningful digital transformation and support the claims with argumentations based on literature review, while answering three main research questions.

In the first section, based on literature review and in the context of this paper, we claim that education is a transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable process of cognitive and social development of a person and her community, aware of the wider global, environmental and digital changes (Anderson and Boyle, 2020; Daniels et al., 2019; Freire, 1970; Peters and Jandrić, 2017; Townsend, 2011; Underwood and Dillon, 2004).

In the second section, we claim that digital transformation should serve this vision of education, and not take its separate course. Digital technology should support cognitive and social development of individuals and community in transformative, inclusive, effective and accountable ways. We propose to use digital maturity as an organisational improvement and reflective framework designed to guide this kind of meaningful digital transformation (Marshal, 2010, 2012; Teichert, 2019; Volungevičienė et al., 2021).

In the third section, we claim that two leadership approaches should be combined to influence the described meaningful digital transformation: transformational leadership and distributed leadership.

This paper is set to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the role of education when considering global, environmental and digital transformations our societies are experiencing and how can education be part of them? (addressed in section 1)
2. What kind of meaningful digital transformation can support educational processes to become more transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable and in the same time support a cognitive and social development of a person and of her community? (addressed in section 2)

3. What kind of leadership schools need for continuous organisational improvements towards meaningful digital transformation, having in mind the transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable characteristics of education and related digital maturity? (addressed in section 3)

### **Role of education in global, environmental and digital transformations**

The following section discusses the role of education in the present global, environmental and digital turmoils we all are experiencing as global citizens.

Individual growth and transformation are deeply interrelated with social growth and social transformation, and both should be considered as the goals of education (Anderson and Boyle, 2020; Brosio, 2006; Dewey, 1915/2016; Freire, 1970). In this sense the aim of education is to support the development of both cognitive and social abilities of learners (Underwood and Dillon, 2004:213). This is reflected in what Anderson and Boyle understand as 'good' education, "the growth and development of the whole person" (Anderson and Boyle, 2020:page 16). Individual growth is inextricably related to social growth, reflected primarily in the community in which we live. Education provides "opportunity to become contributing and content members of a healthy society". (Anderson and Boyle, 2020:page 16). Critical educational theory understood education as an altruistic and caring path to social and individual transformation, to democratic empowerment, socioeconomic justice, respect for diversity (Brosio, 2006). Dewey understood education as a vital force in forming democracy and civil society (Dewey, 1915/2016). Using the words of George Bernard Shaw, education is the process of "continual becoming" (St. John, 1931) in cognitive and social sphere. Learner is an active and dynamic participant in her education, a creator of her own future self. This thinking is in line with Freire's liberating potential of a person (Freire, 1970). The knowledge is the person who knows - in terms of Aristotle's "Knowledge [epistēmē], in its being-at-work, is the same as the thing it knows" (Aristoteles, 2001).

The role of education is changing and is influenced by the global, environmental and digital turn (Peters and Jandrić, 2017) of our societies. These shifts are not just negative or just positive but are complex and interrelated. Education is a living organism influenced by its environment, co-created by it and forms part of the wider "ecological system" (Harrison et al., 2014). Education has shifted towards a global market approach, including answering the accountability demands (among others Daniels, 2019; Gumus, 2018; Townsend, 2011). Education is a crucial part of sustainability, and both sustainable thinking and long-term visions should form part of changing the education to respond to the needs of environmental and societal transformations (Michelsen and Fischer, 2017). The digital shift in education is pushed more mainstream after pandemic of covid-19, sometimes with vested interest of commercial solutions in education (Teräs et al., 2020).

We cannot expect education to remain intact when the world is in flux. Education needs to change together with society and respond to the global, environmental and digital challenges we are all facing. In this response education should not be replaced by commodified, global enterprise, but needs to be:

- *liberative and transformative*, with strong mission to prepare students to be critical thinkers, global thinkers, active citizens (Anderson and Boyle, 2020; Freire, 1970; Townsend, 2011; Underwood and Dillon, 2004)
- *inclusive* of to the social needs of all citizens, both elites and marginalised groups, co-creating present and future democratic societies (Anderson and Boyle, 2020; Freire, 1970)
- *visionary*, aware of the challenges of the future job markets, climate change and social impact of digital technologies (Peters and Jandrić, 2017)
- *effective*, striving to achieve the educational outcomes (the school intends to achieve) (Daniels et al., 2019)
- *accountable* to the public that provides finances, by using public resources responsibly to provide the best quality service back to the citizens (Townsend, 2011).

Based on the presented arguments we claim that education should be understood as a transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable process of cognitive and social development of a person which contributes to both the achievement of the full potential of a person and of her community (Anderson and Boyle, 2020, Brosio, 2006, Dewey, 1915/2016, Freire; Underwood and Dillon, 2004). This process should be accountable to the public it serves, public resources it uses, and mindful of the wider global, environmental and digital transformations (Peters and Jandrić, 2017).

## **Digital maturity as transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable framework and a reflective tool for digital transformation of education**

This second section reflects on the nature of digital transformation needed to support the transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable vision of education.

We acknowledge that digital turn (Peters and Jandrić, 2017) in education is becoming increasingly important with government-led national initiatives trying to use technology as a lever supporting various educational reforms (Hakansson Lindquist et al., 2019; Kampylis et al., 2016; Toh and So, 2011). However, there is a need for a “radical change” of how technology is exploited in teaching and learning (European Schoolnet, University of Liege, 2013), taking an approach that is “both gradually accepting and sceptical” (OECD, 2015).

We also acknowledge that the digital shift in education is pushed more mainstream after pandemic of covid-19. Closing educational institutions down during pandemic years in many ways transferred the responsibility for education to families of various social and educational backgrounds. This exposed latent social and educational inequalities and reinforced them even further, and brought about “economic, social, cultural, emotional and digital divides” (Tarabini, 2021:6). If not considered carefully, digital technology can be easily used to perpetuate and reinforce the same inequalities and can contribute to what Tarabini calls the crisis of meaning of the schools in the sense of “crisis of the very process of socialisation and cultural transmission” (Tarabini, 2021:10).

Therefore, to follow in the same path as education we want to witness, we claim that digital transformation should take the system-wide ecological perspective (Harrison et al., 2014) and also be transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable process, mindful of the social changes, having in mind the cognitive and social development education is aimed to achieve. This is especially relevant to school education, if the purpose of schools in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is still, if not even more, to ensure socialising and teaching of children and young people (Tarabini, 2021).

Digital maturity is a concept capable of having a holistic view on technology in education because it brings the “social aspects of technology acceptance” (Harrison et al., 2014: p. 1). Digital maturity supports and reflects upon digital transformation of educational institutions across a range of organisational, infrastructural, teaching and learning, competency and cultural issues. It is a “valuable proxy for indicating the extent of technology adoption across the whole eco-system of a school.” (Harrison et al., 2014:page 346). It can and indeed should reflect and warn about unequal and insufficient resources schools have in using digital technologies for meaningful instructional and learning activities, both in terms of infrastructure and competencies, but also leadership capacities, to name only the most relevant for the topic of this article.

Digital maturity models serve as a roadmap, a guideline, support for institutional planning, organisational change and benchmarking, support continuous improvement and open space for reflection and understanding of the wider, system context (Marshal, 2010, 2012; Volungevičienė et al., 2021). Digital maturity models connect the complex variables and provide complex narratives of interventions over specific duration, by capturing complexity of evidencing the effects of ICT in educational settings including activities, processes, technologies and skills (Sanchez-Puchol et al., 2018; Underwood et al., 2004, 2010). It has been seen as a potent opportunity for a long-term assessment of digital transformation of institutions as well as large-scale national technology investments, seeking the evidence of the benefits of technological investments across educational systems. See for example Framework for Digitally Mature Schools in Croatia (Balaban et al., 2018) or Framework for Digitally Competent Organisations (Kampylis et al., 2016).

### **Educational leadership for meaningful digital transformation and digital maturity of schools**

The last section proposes the kind of leadership schools need for making meaningful digital transformation and for growing towards digitally mature organisations.

We start from a classical definition of leadership as “the process of influencing the activities of an organised group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement” (Stogdill, 1950). We acknowledge that the very general meaning of leadership is the process of influence. If the goal we seek is digital transformation that support the school’s vision of education, than what kind of leadership schools should practice?

We argue that (1) the distribution of leadership authority (Dexter, 2018; Gumus et al, 2016; Leithwood et al., 2008; Voogt et al., 2018) is one of the major prerequisites for the influence towards meaningful digital transformation to happen in schools, motivated by (2) a transformational vision for self-actualisation and achievement (Daniëls et al, 2019; Leithwood and Jantzi, 2005) of the individuals, schools, community and the wider system. This claim is supported by Joke Voogt and a group of authors in stating that distributed leadership perspective, together with transformative and instructional leadership actions, are framing main functions of leading technology innovations: developing vision, supporting integration, ensuring the accountability of technology initiatives (Voogt et al., 2018). Distributed and transformational leadership perspectives support the vision of education (described in the first section) in a number of ways:

- To be able to support the variety of paths in which any person and/or community could develop, the leadership influence should be inclusive and participatory. When leadership influence and power are distributed to several individuals, groups and teams without formal leadership positions (usually teachers) individual capacities are enhanced through social interactions. In this distribution the meaning, knowledge and leadership practice are socially constructed and are co-performed (Dexter, 2018; Harris, 2009).
- To be able to transform, this influence should be able to guide and motivate all to strive for individual, school and system improvements. The main role of transformational leaders is to motivate followers to open to self-actualisation and lead to a vision for the school (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2005; Bush and Glover 2003).
- To be able to be effective, this influence should have a strong vision on teaching and learning and students' engagement and achievements in the core of these processes, and distributed leadership has positive effects on teacher effectiveness, student outcomes and student engagement (Harris, 2009; Leithwood et al., 2008).
- To be able to be accountable, this influence should have strong responsibility towards the public good it serves and the public resources it uses, "ensuring the accountability of technology initiatives in terms of ownership and outcomes" (Voogt et al., 2018).
- Finally, to be able to consider the larger context of a global, environmental and digital transformations (Peters and Jandrić, 2017), this influence should take into account the visions of many different people and open the space for their opinions to be exchanged and new meanings and knowledge created in this exchange, but from the perspective of *interactions* rather than actions and states (Harris and De Flaminis, 2016).

To support the liberating and transformative process of a person's development, we claim that less directive and more bottom-up approach to educational leadership is needed, the one that can support different paths of personal and social transformation and goals achievements. We argue that two leadership approaches should be combined if this influence is to bring fruits: transformational and distributed leadership.

Distributive leadership offers the co-created inclusive methodology while transformational leadership inspires, guides and motivates all to strive for individual and school improvements through cognitive and social development of a person and of a community. In this distributed process of influencing, which is not a directive but inclusive, two-way process, different visions are shared and common meanings transformed through co-creation. This co-created school vision is mindful about both personal and community's potential and is adjusted to changing needs and environment and co-created by school staff, students and community stakeholders.

## Conclusion

We have asked ourselves what the role of education is when considering global, environmental and digital transformations happening today. We acknowledge that education should be mindful of the wider transformations but should always continue to support cognitive and social development of a person who is then able to become active and contributing citizen of the same changing and troubled world.

We acknowledge digital transformation as an important lever for supporting the aforementioned vision of education. We ask what kind of meaningful digital transformation can support a cognitive and social development of a person and her community? We propose to use digital maturity as an organisational improvement framework and a reflective tool designed to guide meaningful digital transformation (Marshal, 2010, 2012; Volungevičienė et al., 2021; Teichert, 2019) of education from the system-wide ecological perspective (Harrison et al., 2014) into

transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable process of cognitive and social development of individuals and communities (Underwood and Dillon, 2004).

Lastly, we asked what kind of leadership schools need to digitally mature in a way that is meaningful for them and their community? We argue that if this process is to be meaningful, we need educational leadership that is a n exchanging process of influence and relationship leading to a shared vision and a common purpose for the school, that is mindful about personal and community's potential and is adjusted to changing needs and environment and co-created by school staff, students and community stakeholders. To be able to support the variety of paths in which any person and/or community could develop, the leadership influence should be inclusive and distributed. To be able to transform, this influence should be able to guide and motivate all to strive for individual, school and system improvements.

We conclude with the idea that distributing leadership to all stakeholders (including teachers and students) in reflecting and devising meaningful digital transformation using digital maturity concept should move schools and educational systems closer towards digitally mature (school) education, in which shared transformative and inclusive vision of education, mindful of wider global, environmental and digital changes, leads to cognitive and social development of a person and of a community.

We propose further research that will improve positioning of digital maturity as an improvement and a reflective framework for meaningful digital transformation of education towards transformative, inclusive, visionary, effective and accountable process of cognitive and social development. In doing this, the further research should aim at better understanding the role of leadership in digital maturation of (school) education.

## References

- Anderson, J., & Boyle, C. (2020). "Good" Education in A Neo-Liberal Paradigm: Challenges, Contradictions and Consternations. In C. Boyle, J. Anderson, A. Page, & S. Mavropoulou (Eds.), *Inclusive Education: Global Issues and Controversies*. Leiden ; Boston Brill Sense. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004431171\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004431171_003)
- Aristoteles. (2001). *On the soul and On memory and recollection* (J. Sachs, Trans.). Green Lion Press.
- Balaban, I., Redjep, N. B., & Čalopa, M. K. (2018). The analysis of digital maturity of schools in Croatia. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(6), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i06.7844>
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? *School Leadership and Management*, 34(5), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680>
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). School Leadership: Concepts and Evidence. National College for School Leadership, (Spring), 1–42.
- Daniëls, E., Hondeghem, A., & Dochy, F. (2019). A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. *Educational Research Review*, 27(March), 110–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.02.003>
- Dewey, John (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: Macmillan. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/democracyandedu00dewegoog/page/n6/mode/2up?view=theater>
- Dexter, S. (2018). The Role of Leadership for Information Technology in Education: Systems of Practices. In J. Voogt, G. Knezek, R. Christensen, K-W. Lai (Eds.), *Second Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education*. Springer International Handbooks of Education.
- Freire, Paulo (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Gumus, S., Bellibas, M. S., Esen, M., & Gumus, E. (2018). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 46(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216659296>
- Harris, A. (Ed.). (2009). *Distributed Leadership: Different Perspectives* (Studies in Educational Leadership, Vol. 7). Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009.
- Harrison, C., Tomás, C., & Crook, C. (2014). An e-maturity analysis explains intention-behavior disjunctions in technology adoption in UK schools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 34, 345–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.10.042>

- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10(1–2), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0>
- Kampylis, P., Devine, J., Punie, Y., & Newman, T. (2016). *Supporting school to go digital: From a conceptual model towards the design of a self-assessment tool for digital-age learning*. ICERI2016 Proceedings. 9th International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation. November, 4–16. 2017. Seville, Spain.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177–199. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244769>
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060>
- Marshall, S. (2012). Improving the quality of e-learning: Lessons from the eMM. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 28(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2011.00443.x>
- Marshall, S. (2010). A Quality Framework for Continuous Improvement of E-learning: The E-learning Maturity Model. *Journal of Distance Education Revue De L'Éducation À Distance*, 24(1), 143–166.
- Michelsen, G., Fischer, D. (2017). Sustainability and Education. In M.V.Hauff and C. Kuhnke (Eds.), *Sustainable Development Policy. A European perspective* (pp. 135-158). London: Routledge. Retrieved June 13, 2022 from <https://www.routledge.com/Sustainable-Development-Policy-A-European-Perspective/Hauff-Kuhnke/p/book/9781138284999>
- Peters, M. A., & Jandrić, P. (2017). Dewey's Democracy and Education in the age of digital reason: the global, ecological and digital turns. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 4(1), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2017.1395290>
- St. John, C. (Ed.). (1931). *Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw: A Correspondence*. G.P.Putnam's Sons, Ltd.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, 47, 1-14
- Tarabini, A. (2021). The role of schooling in times of global pandemic: a sociological approach. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 00(00), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2021.1966825>
- Teräs, M., Suoranta, J., Teräs, H., Curcher M. (2020). Post-Covid-19 Education and Education Technology 'Solutionism': a Seller's Market. *Postdigit Sci Educ* 2, 863–878 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00164-x>
- Toh, Y., & So, H. J. (2011). ICT reform initiatives in Singapore schools: A complexity theory perspective. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(3), 349–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-010-9130-0>
- Townsend, T. (2011). School leadership in the twenty-first century: Different approaches to common problems? *School Leadership and Management*, 31(2), 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2011.572419>
- Volungevičienė, A., Brown, M., Greenspon, R., Gaebel, M. & Morrisroe, A. (2021). *Developing a High-Performance Digital Education System: Institutional Self-Assessment Instruments*. European University Association absI. Retrieved from <https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/digi-he desk research report.pdf>
- Voogt, J., Knezek, G., Christensen, R., & Lai, K.-W. (2018). Developing an Understanding of the Impact of Digital Technologies on Teaching and Learning in an Ever-Changing Landscape. In J. Voogt, G. Knezek, R. Christensen, & K.-W. Lai (Eds.), *Second Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education*. Springer International Handbooks of Education.
- Underwood, J., & Dillon, G. (2004). Capturing complexity through maturity modelling. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 13(2), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14759390400200181>