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In the examinations at the Compulsory Headmaster Program course Result based management headmasters describe how they organize and lead local school improvement. Goals and areas of improvement are often very ambitious and extensive. The background and the motives of school improvement is however unclear. We have similar experiences when working together with headmaster within the government initiative "Samverkan för bästa skola". Principals try to reduce and create greater consistency but are drowning in state and municipal actors' initiatives. But we also see a varied ability in schools to handle the overload and agree on what is important. In this paper, we want to explore how headmaster together with management team do to create more coherence. The empirical material is retrieved from ongoing collaborative work with four schools. The material consists of observations and sound recordings from meetings with school leaders and their teams at each school. Audio recordings and notes from around 76 hours of meeting will be included. The theoretical frame of departure is Fullan & Quinn (Fullan & Quinn, 2015) work on improvement-processes as "the shared depth of understanding about the purpose and nature of the work" (p 1). However Fullan & Quinn doesn't go into how the processes of coherence-making may have it ups and downs. We add theories which shed some lights on improvement as discursive and symbolic struggles and coding. We use the concepts of purity and danger to understand how culture is molded (Douglas, 1966/2004). To code improvement as pure/good or danger/bad is however not sufficient. Actors couple those urgent codes with social background constructions (Alexander, 2011). Our results shows that headmasters who uses widely shared background construction and connect them to their urgent matters are listened to and get more response. Teachers feels listen to. It also seems to be important that headmaster connecting different improvement areas and thereby make a grand narrative connected to widely accepted narratives of success. A chronological narrative where the logic of improvement in terms of what caused the improvement are interpreted by teachers as mirroring professional competence. However, even if headmaster doing these connection between the urgent coding of improvement and widely accepted back ground narratives things comes in between. We discovered that technological matters such as platforms for planning, implementation and follow-up- work are one. We also se that external initiatives for improvement makes it harder for headmaster. This is not necessary because of bad policy rather how the headmaster talk about the policy. Headmasters are interpreted as in the hands of some else for example on municipal level. This also happens between teachers and head teachers when the latter are interpreted as in the hands of the headmaster. Actors have to be interpreted as autonomous.
