

Science and Mathematics Education Centre

**The Leadership of Principals and Science Heads in Schools with a
Christian Philosophy: Expectations and Realities.**

Stuart J. Quarmby

**This thesis is presented for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
of
Curtin University of Technology**

February 2010

Declaration

To the best of my knowledge and belief this thesis contains no material previously published by any other person except where due acknowledgement has been made.

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university.

Signature:

Date: 11/01/10

Abstract

Prospective Science Heads and prospective Heads of School all have expectations for the nature of the role that they apply for. This research provides prospective Heads of School and prospective Science Heads in schools based on a Christian philosophy with a pool of information on how the realities in these leadership positions differ from the expectations held by other prospective applicants, the expectations of governance (the employers) and the past expectations of incumbents.

The research establishes the views of the key decision makers in a school community based on a Christian world-view regarding:

1. Desired outcomes for students: expectations of the school community
2. The expected leadership characteristics in the role of Principal.
3. The expected leadership characteristics in the role of Head of Science.
4. The differences in expected leadership characteristics between the roles of Principals and Science Heads.
5. The extent to which the actual leadership role differs from that which was expected for successful applicants for these positions.
6. The extent to which the actual leadership role is understood by staff with aspirations for seeking promotion to that role.

Dedicated to my grandmother, Elsie Hannah Early,

~ 100 years of age and half a century of encouragement and support.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support, wisdom, experience and encouragement of my supervisor, Professor Darrell Fisher who helped to fashion the idea for this research eight years ago and to refine it into a manageable and worthwhile exercise. I am very grateful.

To my family, Roslyn, Lisa, Samantha and Catherine, thank you for the support, encouragement and belief that this project would be finished and for keeping things quiet around the house for eight years.

To the Council of Wollondilly Anglican College, thank you for graciously allowing a term's sabbatical for me to complete my interviews and to write up the results. Your "gentle" persuasion and belief in me was a Godsend.

To mum and dad, thank you for your belief, interest and enthusiasm.

To those Heads who allowed me to interrupt a busy schedule at a busy time of year, thank you for allowing me into your schools to talk to you, your governors and staff.

To those educators who participated, thank you for your time and the opportunity to provide a document that should assist in closing the gap between expectations and reality for those considering leadership as Heads or Science Coordinators in schools based on a Christian philosophy.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| DECLARATION | ii |
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| DEDICATION | iv |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | v |
| | |
| Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Current Educational Need | 1 |
| 1.2 Personal Interest | 2 |
| 1.3 Leadership in Schools with a Christian Philosophy | 7 |
| 1.3.1 Outline | 7 |
| 1.3.2 Aim and objectives | 8 |
| 1.4 Summary | 12 |
| | |
| Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW | 13 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 13 |
| 2.2 Literature Relating to Key terms | 14 |
| 2.2.1 Leadership – General | 14 |
| 2.2.1.1 <i>Leadership and Management</i> | 16 |
| 2.2.2 Principal | 17 |
| 2.2.2.1 <i>The Principal as a leader</i> | 17 |
| 2.2.3 Science Heads | 18 |
| 2.2.4 Schools with a Christian Philosophy (Christian Schools) | 18 |
| 2.2.5 Expectations | 19 |
| 2.2.6 Realities | 19 |
| 2.3 Literature Relating to Research Objectives | 20 |
| 2.3.1 Outcomes for students: School Community Expectations | 21 |
| 2.3.1.1 <i>General Educational Outcomes</i> | 21 |
| 2.3.1.2 <i>Outcomes specific to Christian Schools</i> | 21 |
| 2.3.2 Expected leadership characteristics in the role of Principal | 24 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.3.2.1 <i>A disturbing recent trend</i> | 24 |
| 2.3.2.2 <i>Role and process too onerous</i> | 25 |
| 2.3.2.3 <i>General Requirements</i> | 26 |
| 2.3.2.4 <i>Principal Leadership Style</i> | 30 |
| 2.3.2.5 <i>Principal Leadership Style: Two important considerations</i> | 41 |
| 2.3.2.6 <i>Specific Requirements of Independent Schools</i> | 43 |
| 2.3.2.7 <i>Philosophical identity – Requirements of Christian schools</i> | 44 |
| 2.3.2.8 <i>Christian education – Leadership</i> | 45 |
| 2.3.3 <i>Expected leadership characteristics of the Head of Science</i> | 67 |
| 2.3.3.1 <i>Role too onerous</i> | 67 |
| 2.3.3.2 <i>General Requirements</i> | 68 |
| 2.3.3.3 <i>Specific Requirements</i> | 70 |
| 2.3.3.4 <i>Relationship with the Principal</i> | 71 |
| 2.3.4 <i>The reality of leadership and expectations of applicants</i> | 72 |
| 2.3.4.1 <i>Realities for Principals</i> | 72 |
| 2.3.4.2 <i>Realities for Science Heads</i> | 72 |
| 2.4 Summary | 73 |
| | |
| Chapter 3: METHODOLOGY | 75 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 75 |
| 3.2 Website/Prospectus Survey | 77 |
| 3.3. Interviews of Schools’ Stakeholders | 78 |
| 3.4 Ethical Issues | 80 |
| 3.5 Facilities and Resources | 80 |
| 3.6 Interview Questions and Rationale | 81 |
| 3.6.1 <i>Interview questions for Governors</i> | 81 |
| 3.6.2 <i>Interview Questions for Heads (Principals)</i> | 84 |
| 3.6.3 <i>Interview Questions for Prospective Heads (Principals)</i> | 86 |
| 3.6.4 <i>Interview Questions for Science Coordinators</i> | 87 |
| 3.6.5 <i>Interview Questions for prospective Science Coordinators</i> | 88 |
| 3.6.6 <i>Two unanticipated outcomes</i> | 89 |
| 3.7 Summary | 91 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Chapter 4: COLLATION AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS | 92 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 92 |
| 4.2 Website survey results | 94 |
| 4.2.1 Presentation of Data | 95 |
| 4.2.2 Independent Protestant or Catholic Schools | 95 |
| 4.2.3 Government (State Schools) | 98 |
| 4.3 Analysis of Website Survey Results | 102 |
| 4.3.1 Academic Areas | 104 |
| 4.3.2 Service (Servant Leadership) | 105 |
| 4.3.3 An explicit Christian emphasis | 106 |
| 4.3.4 Other Characteristics | 108 |
| 4.4 Expectations and realities for the Head | 109 |
| 4.4.1 The chief expectations of the Head of the school | 109 |
| 4.4.2 How would these expectations differ from other schools? | 114 |
| 4.4.3 Other important areas in the role of Head of the school | 115 |
| 4.4.4 Understanding of the term Servant Leadership | 117 |
| 4.4.5 A Christian World View and how to develop it | 120 |
| 4.4.6 Compassion for Others and Maturity in Faith | 124 |
| 4.4.7 Schools as Evangelistic Agencies | 128 |
| 4.4.8 Expectations – the Head’s Leadership Style | 129 |
| 4.4.9 Reality: Time spent by the Head | 138 |
| 4.4.10 Complexity, Ambiguity and Uncertainty | 140 |
| 4.4.11 Compelling reasons to be a Head | 144 |
| 4.4.12 Compelling reasons not to be a Head | 146 |
| 4.4.13 Expectations of Major Stakeholders | 148 |
| 4.4.14 Realities – The Changing Role of the Head | 152 |
| 4.4.15 Headship: Expectations and Realities | 153 |
| 4.4.16 Realities Resulting from Schools that Change in Size | 155 |
| 4.4.17 Prospective Heads: Bringing expectations and reality closer | 158 |
| 4.5 Expectations and realities for the Head | 161 |
| 4.5.1 Science Coordinators and Heads: Differences in roles | 161 |
| 4.5.2 Creation and Evolution | 163 |
| 4.5.3 The Head’s Expectations of the Science Coordinator | 169 |
| 4.5.4 Heads Expectations of Coordinators | 174 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 4.5.5 Balance of Responsibilities | 176 |
| 4.5.6 Expectations of the Head | 179 |
| 4.5.7 Expectations of Science Coordinators in a Christian school | 180 |
| 4.5.8 Other Aspects of the Science Coordinator Role | 183 |
| 4.5.9 Leadership style: realities and expectations | 184 |
| 4.5.10 The changing role of the Science Coordinator | 186 |
| 4.5.11 Science Coordinator: Expectations and Realities | 187 |
| 4.5.12 Reality: the biggest surprises | 188 |
| 4.5.13 Responsibilities as the school changes in size | 189 |
| 4.5.14 Preparing prospective Science Coordinators for the role | 191 |
| 4.5.15 Compelling reasons for becoming a Science Head | 194 |
| 4.5.16 Compelling reasons for not becoming a Science Head | 195 |
| 4.6 Summary | 196 |
| | |
| Chapter 5: CONCLUSIONS | 197 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 197 |
| 5.2 Conclusions drawn from interviews: Heads | 197 |
| 5.2.1 Expectations of the role of Head of School | 197 |
| 5.2.2 Differences in Expectations for Heads with a Christian brief | 199 |
| 5.2.3 Other important areas in the Head's role in Christian schools | 200 |
| 5.2.4 Understanding of the term Servant leadership | 201 |
| 5.2.5 Developing a Christian World View | 201 |
| 5.2.6 Compassion for others and maturity in faith | 202 |
| 5.2.7 Schools as evangelistic agencies | 203 |
| 5.2.8 Expectations – The Head's leadership style | 203 |
| 5.2.9 Reality: Time spent by the Head | 205 |
| 5.2.10 Complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty | 205 |
| 5.2.11 Compelling reasons to be a Head | 206 |
| 5.2.12 Compelling reasons not to become a Head | 207 |
| 5.2.13 Expectations of major stakeholders | 209 |
| 5.2.14 Realities – The changing role of the Head | 211 |
| 5.2.15 Headship: Expectations and realities | 211 |
| 5.2.16 Realities resulting from schools that change in size | 212 |
| 5.2.17 Professional development of prospective Heads | 214 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 5.3 Conclusions drawn from interviews: Science Coordinators | 215 |
| 5.3.1 Comparing the roles of Science Coordinators and Heads | 215 |
| 5.3.2 Creation and Evolution | 216 |
| 5.3.3 The Head's expectations of the Science Coordinator | 218 |
| 5.3.4 Heads expectations of Coordinators | 219 |
| 5.3.5 Balance of responsibilities | 221 |
| 5.3.6 Expectations of the Head | 221 |
| 5.3.7 Expectations of Science Coordinators in a Christian school | 222 |
| 5.3.8 Other aspects of the Science Coordinator role | 223 |
| 5.3.9 Leadership style: realities and expectations | 224 |
| 5.3.10 Changing role of the Science Coordinator | 225 |
| 5.3.11 Science Coordinator: Expectations and realities | 225 |
| 5.3.12 Reality: The biggest surprises | 226 |
| 5.3.13 Responsibilities as the school changes in size | 227 |
| 5.3.14 Preparing prospective Science Coordinators for the role | 228 |
| 5.3.15 To be or not to be a Science Coordinator | 229 |
| 5.4 Advice for Governance | 230 |
| 5.5 Advice for Prospective Heads | 232 |
| 5.6 Advice for Prospective Science Coordinators | 235 |
| 5.7 Significance | 236 |
| 5.8 Limitations | 239 |
| 5.9 Implications for further research | 242 |
| 5.10 Summary | 243 |
| | |
| REFERENCES | 245 |
| | |
| APPENDIX: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS | 255 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 CURRENT EDUCATIONAL NEED

In January 2001, Wollongong University hosted two meetings to discuss the future of school leadership with representatives from the Australian College of Educators, the Australian Council for Educational Leadership, the NSW Department of Education and Training, the Catholic Education Office and Independent Schools, Primary and Secondary Principals. There was much discussion about attracting quality leadership to schools and the need for research to be undertaken to investigate the changing role of school leaders, the challenges and the issues, and the type of training and support which would most assist educational leaders to provide quality leadership. This was not an isolated instance where these issues of concern were raised. It reflected a broader feeling amongst educational commentators that had been emerging and worsening for some time. The area of school leadership was felt to be particularly significant as was the transfer of leadership experience and expertise into the newly emerging independent schools – many of which were based on a Christian philosophy.

In 1988, Ramey wrote that “a large proportion of current school leaders will retire from all levels in the next five years” (Ramsey, ed., 2000, p. 88). There is a high level of transfer of teachers from government to non-government schools (Ramsey, ed., 2000, p. 182) and consequently, the need to establish any variance in the leadership expectations of sections of the non-government system for those moving across into leadership roles, or aspiring to do so in the future. There is also a decline in the number and apparent quality of candidates for leadership positions in government and Catholic Schools (Ramsey, ed., 2000, p. 88).

1.2 PERSONAL INTEREST

As a Year 10 student, inspired by the enthusiasm of my Science teacher and seeing the engagement and response from other students in the classroom, it became apparent that Science teaching would be a worthy vocation.

I embarked on four years of a Bachelor of Education (Secondary Science degree) and was offered my first teaching position. Whilst I had never harboured ambitions of running a department, the prospect of being a Science Head became more of a possibility in my thinking as I looked at the decision making of my first three Heads of Department, good and bad, and considered the possibility of eventually leading a department myself.

After seven years of teaching, I applied for and accepted a position of Head of Science with a number of expectations of what the position would entail. My expectations were informed by observation of Science Heads, particularly once I had flagged my career interest, assistance from senior management and input from other Heads of Department along with external advice as part of an inspection by an Education Department Inspector. The inspection covered a number of aspects of what might be expected in the role of Science Head and provided a helpful addition to my understanding of the expectations of a Science Head. In addition, I used the time between eligibility for promotion and when I headed my first Science department, to further enhance my understanding of what might be expected.

Despite the preparation, my own view was that I had been ill-prepared for the reality of leadership.

Leadership is different to followership. There were aspects of interacting with the Head of the College and with his expectations of what a Science Head should be achieving in

leadership. The Head monitored broader aspects of whole school involvement expected from middle management. Essential functional roles such as timetabling, camping programs, student leadership, student detentions and parent teacher night organization fell to middle managers in a school. Poor performance in these areas reflected poorly on the school. Given the frenetic pace of schools and the responsibilities of the Head of School, there can be little time devoted to explanation of expectations and a misalignment between what was expected from the Science Head, how it was expected to be delivered and what should be the priority was inevitable.

There were expectations from the Deputy Head who was the direct supervisor of the Science Head and responsible for the monitoring of performance objectives at the departmental level. These included the meeting of deadlines for staff reporting on students, management of the departmental budget, preparation for whole school inspections by the Board of Studies and the clarification and management of parental and staff difficulties with the Science Head.

There were expectations from staff. A person who had previously spent a career as part of a team was expected to take the lead and to make the right decisions on matters that affected budgets, staff morale, and student learning. In anticipation of leading a department, it would not be unusual to expect that staff would respond to leadership in a similar ways to responses observed in previous departments. But, new staff, a new school and a new system provide new, unanticipated, challenges. The reality was very different to expectations.

All schools are different. Moving from one school to another will, therefore, always create a mismatch between expectations and reality. The effect must also be magnified by the added impact of changing systems. For instance, an independent school with a Christian philosophy seeks to position itself in the market by accentuating those things that leaders believe will identify and establish it as being different and, therefore, provide a viable alternative choice to education in a government school.

“Independent” schools have a very broad brief in the identification and adoption of those things that they will seek to position the school in the marketplace. Will the school have an academic, creative, language, or sporting focus for instance? In some schools, the term independent carries an implied invitation for staff, parents, churches and local leaders as stakeholders to have the opportunity for direct input into the leadership and direction of a school. In this context, a new Science Head may be placed in a situation where there are certain school-wide expectations. If it is a school with an academic reputation that the Principal is seeking to advance, for instance, then it stands to reason that there will be an expectation of alignment with this brief from the Science department, a department with a strong component of academic electives (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Earth and Environmental Science).

People have very different interpretations of the word “Christian” and what it means for schools. At one end of the spectrum, people may feel that a Christian school should simply teach good old-fashioned values such as good manners, courtesy, respect and responsibility. At the other end, those with a practised faith may have an expectation that explicit Christian principles and teachings such as Creation, atonement, redemption and salvation by faith should be incorporated at every point in the curriculum. Given this range of expectations on what a Christian school should teach, it is not surprising that there are also consequent expectations regarding a strong and well reasoned position and suitable responses from a Science Head to areas of controversy like the validity of the theory of evolution, explanations of miracles and other similar areas as they arise.

There are bound to be certain expectations of what would be an acceptable leadership style in an Independent Christian school. The consequent reality may require adjustment to the operating paradigms of the newly appointed leader in terms of how staff expected to be treated; in what is acceptable humour; even in work ethic and preparation. Given the strength of influence of the principal in setting the leadership tone in these schools, it is important that the Science Head has an understanding of where his/her own leadership

style varies from the style of the Principal and whether the variation may be complimentary or conflicting.

The gap between my expectations of what might be required in the position of Science Head and the reality of the position in a school that was very different to those I had previously experienced became overwhelming at times. Help was available from more experienced heads of department in matters of leadership, staff relations and Christian philosophy. Sporadic help was also available from one or two mentors I had at the time, in the specific area of leading a Science department, but there were few articles or books to read and little research to assist.

My expectations were different to the reality that I faced. In hindsight, I recall that it would have been beneficial to narrow the gap between expectations of what would be needed to run a department and the reality of actually running a department so that time spent addressing avoidable errors of judgment may have been more effectively spent teaching and complying with administrative processes.

Inevitably, experience in running a department and a commitment to understanding how to improve things, sometimes simply by trial and error, sometimes through success, failure or rebuke, leads to acclimatization and adaption to the role. In my own experience, after nine years as a the Head of a Science department, I had reached the condition where expectations of what the role entailed and the realities of the workplace became so closely aligned as to no longer be problematic and all consideration of my formative dilemma dissipated.

The gap between expectations and reality soon reopened on my appointment as a Deputy Principal. Inevitably, this new role presented a whole new variety of challenges. Five years later, I found myself anticipating leadership of a school. I had certain expectations of what it would like to be the Head. I had even had a brief time as acting head to give the concept a trial and to once again provide an anticipation of expectations

for leadership of a school. I attended courses, interviewed heads and again added to the information that would inevitably assist with leadership of a school. I read what I could on the subject of leading a school – but all schools seemed so different and there were few texts on leading in an independent school with a Christian philosophy.

In 2003, I was appointed as the Foundation Head of Wollondilly Anglican College in NSW, to commence leadership in 2004. It was a new school, a new staff, a new system and a new reality. Again, the gap between expectation and reality was vivid – but this time a whole school community waited to base their interpretation of whether they would continue trusting the education of their children to this new school Head on how well this outcome was managed. One cannot expect to elicit the confidence of a school community with statements that draw attention to a new Head’s emerging perceptions such as, “I didn’t expect this. What should I do next? Can someone please explain how all this works?”

In one sense, well-researched new appointments as Heads already have a good understanding of what it takes to lead a school, particularly if they have served at a school in a senior management capacity before. There are administrative roles such as annual reports, newsletters and enrolments; compliance areas such as policy making, child protection and worker’s compensation; budgetary matters such as payroll, building projects and infrastructure; human resource roles such as the appointment of staff, timetabling and occupational health and safety; stakeholder meetings with school governance, parents and friends associations and local parliamentarians. For most, these expectations are mirrored in reality as functional parts of the role. The difference between expectation and reality, I will hypothesise, lies not in the nature of the work done by the Science Head or the Head of the school, but in the scope of the work – the time required and the extent of emotional maturity required to successfully lead in a modern school.

This research focuses on the difference between expectations and realities for the positions of Science Head and Head of School in schools that are based on a Christian philosophy. In collating the opinions of existing Science Heads and Heads of School, especially those who have been appointed in the last six years, it was anticipated that the conclusions of this work would be of assistance to those who are anticipating application for these roles in the future.

1.3 LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOLS WITH A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

1.3.1 Outline

Australian society has a significant Christian heritage and has been significantly influenced by Christian thinking. Therefore, it is acknowledged that some operational principles and government philosophies by tradition, either tacitly or implicitly, underpin many of our educational institutions, whether government or independent with some basis of Christian thinking. Schools based on a Christian philosophy, for the purpose of this research were considered on the basis, not only of an expressed view that they are based on some Christian thinking or Christian morals, but on an outward, deliberate and distinctive public paradigm of a Christian philosophy based on a Biblical world-view. This represents many of the independent schools in Australia. Examples of public statements that attest to Christian philosophy that is Bible based are evident in school prospectuses and on Web-sites –

“This one true God, revealed in the written Word of God”

“We gladly submit to God's written Word as the guide of all our endeavour”

“The School aims to be a caring, Bible based community founded on the love of God and a commitment to Christian service and education excellence”.

“We are a Bible-based, Christ-centered institution”.

This study establishes the particular expectations of leadership that exist for Heads of Schools and Science Heads in these school communities and compares them to the

realities encountered by incumbents. Most particularly, it examines the expectations of those responsible for the philosophy of the school (those in the position of governance), and those who are nominated by the Head of School as prospective Heads of School or as prospective Science Heads. It determines the degree of awareness of expected leadership qualities and positional realities in aspirants for these promotion positions.

1.3.2 Aim and objectives

Prospective Science Heads and prospective Heads of School all have expectations of the nature of the role for which they are drawn to apply. It would also be reasonable to expect that they harbour doubts as to whether these expectations match the reality of the position. Whilst a cooperative current incumbent would be helpful in providing many of the answers that would draw expectations and realities closer together, the constraints of a busy schedule do not always allow for fulsome discussion. Most dialogue would also centre around the incumbent's perception of what may be needed at other like schools – one person's opinion rather than a collective wisdom. It may also be that the prospective applicant would be seeking to maintain some degree of anonymity in connection with sundry applications to other competitor educational institutions from the current incumbent, at least until some interest has been expressed by the other organization. Such a circumstance makes discussion about the realities one should expect in a promotions position rather difficult to have and a good/critical source of information remains underutilized.

The aim of the research is to provide prospective Heads of School and prospective Science Heads in schools based on a Christian philosophy with a pool of information on how the realities in these leadership positions differ from the expectations held by other prospective applicants, the expectations of governance (the employers) and the past expectations of incumbents.

It is expected that the research will not have exclusive or restricted benefit to prospective Heads of Schools and prospective Science Heads. During the course of the research, almost all governors, Heads and Science Heads expressed a desire to be furnished with a copy of the findings so that they may more fully understand the dynamics of the two roles across a broader pool of like-minded institutions. Most expressed interest in reading the findings concerning the differences between expectations and realities.

It is likely that the information will also provide some benefit to Heads in other schools that have a faith base that is not Christian, as leading a school with a distinct faith position must have some parallel considerations. In the same way, Heads of Schools without a faith position, such as Principals in government schools, will find useful expectations and realities that are centred around general leadership principals and ethics. It is also anticipated that the usefulness of research centred on the expectations and realities of Science Heads and prospective Science Heads will carry significant parallels with those who share this role or aspiration in other subjects such as Mathematics, English and Creative Arts. Leadership in a school based on a Christian philosophy has implications for all subjects and each will have expectations and realities. Many of these will be similar, regardless of the faculty area and have a direct benefit. Those that are different will provide a valuable insight into the unique role of a working colleague.

The research aims to establish the views of the key decision makers in a school community based on a Christian world-view by achieving the following objectives. The objectives were to determine the:

1. desired outcomes for students: expectations of the school community;
2. expected leadership characteristics in the role of Principal;
3. expected leadership characteristics in the role of Head of Science;
4. differences in expected leadership characteristics between the roles of Principals and Science Heads;

5. extent to which the actual leadership role differs from that which was expected for successful applicants for these positions; and
6. extent to which the actual leadership role is understood by staff with aspirations for seeking promotion to that role.

Following this introductory chapter, there are four other chapters.

Chapter Two is a literature review that defines the key terms then explores educational leadership and, more specifically, Christian leadership in the context of the Head of School and the Science Head. The research then explores literature that comments on the realities that a Head of School or Science Head is likely to encounter.

Chapter Three outlines the methodology that was used to determine the expectations and realities faced by Heads of School and Science Heads in schools based on a Christian philosophy.

An analysis was conducted using prospectus materials and web-site statements of exit outcomes for students from 30 schools explicitly based on a Christian philosophy and from 30 government schools in order to determine those elements that are distinctive, or at least emphasised, for the former over the latter. Once identified, it is reasonable to expect that a system that uses such outcomes to broadly delineate their schools as distinctive would have an expectation that those in leadership positions, and particularly the Head of School, would have a reasoned position as to what these outcomes mean and how these outcomes may be achieved in the context of their school. Once identified, a question asked of all who were interviewed – governors, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Heads and prospective Science Heads elicited responses that defined these advertised delineating factors and outlined each school's expectations and realities for promotion of them as student exit outcomes. Some of the key phrases that emerged from the Web-site/prospectus survey were compassion, servant leadership, the development of a Christian world-view and maturity in faith.

Governors were interviewed in order to determine what their expectations were for a Head and for a Science Head. They were asked about their expectations for the school in regard to the delineating outcomes expressed in the web-site/prospectus survey and about their perception of the realities that face the Head of School and the Head of Science.

The interviews of Heads of Schools were pivotal in the research. They were asked about the expectations that they had before accepting the position, the expectations that they believed that governance had of them and the expectations that they had from other key stakeholders in the school community such as the church, parents, staff and students. Each was also interviewed about the realities that they encountered and how these realities differed from their expectations. Heads of school were also interviewed about the expectations they had for their Science Heads.

Prospective Heads of School were asked about their expectations of the role of Head and to speculate on what the realities might be. They were also asked about their preparation for the role of Head. Finally they were asked about the role of Science Head, and what their expectations were for the incumbent in this role at their school.

Science Heads were also a pivotal role in the research. They were asked about the expectations that the Head of School had for them and about the expectations they had of the Head. They were also asked about the expectations that they had prior to taking up the role of Science Head and about how the realities of the role were different.

Prospective Science Heads were interviewed about their expectations of the role of Head of Science and about their preparation for the role.

In Chapter Four the research results are collated and summarised to determine common responses.

Chapter Five examines the collated responses from Chapter Four and makes conclusions on the basis of common popular responses. The final section of Chapter Five, documented in the form of advice to prospective applicants, synthesises key conclusions and is presented as a summary of advice to prospective applicants.

1.4 SUMMARY

There are many challenges and issues encountered in the daily reality of school leaders. Effective leadership in this context must bear a close alignment with the expectations of stakeholders and, for the Head, particularly the expectations of governance. Effective Science Heads, in turn, would have a close alignment with the expectations of the Head.

Prospective Heads and prospective Science Heads each face the dilemma of applying for a promotion role for which they have certain expectations, expectations that may or may not be grounded in reality. The result can be an uncomfortable time of fumbling through predicaments that were not part of an ill-prepared or semi-prepared new incumbent's expectations, whilst at the same time grasping the veneer of resolute control and direction so often expected and demanded by a school community that has placed (and indeed pays for) responsibility on the shoulders of he or she who readily submitted to the trials and torments of leading them onward and providing a great education for their children.

This research provides a collection of answers on the expectations and realities faced by Heads and Science Heads who are leading in schools that are based on a Christian philosophy. For a prospective Head or Science Head, these answers will significantly narrow the gap between their current expectations and the realities of the position they are seeking by recalibrating expectations to include realities.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a review of contemporary literature relating to the educational leadership of principals and science heads in schools with a Christian philosophy. It includes literature that outlines the expectations of these leaders from the perspective of school and community stakeholders such as educational authorities, school councils and governance, parents, the educational community, staff and students. The review also includes the expectations that principals and science heads have of their own leadership roles. These findings are then compared with literature that comments on the realities of leadership for principals and science heads drawn primarily from first hand accounts. The conclusions of the review will focus on similarities and differences between the expectations of the educational community and the realities of leadership in these positions.

Definitions: The first section of the chapter (Literature relating to key terms) sets the context for the review by examining the central terms and phrases; leadership, principal, science heads, schools with a Christian philosophy (Christian schools), expectations and realities.

Expectations: The second section presents a review of literature relating directly to the research objectives, primarily presenting sources that establish expectations of the leadership characteristics of principals and science heads. It then identifies any additional leadership expectations that are characteristic of, or unique to, an independent Christian school context. Some attention is also given to research that presents the realities that incumbents face in both positions.

2.2 LITERATURE RELATING TO KEY TERMS

2.2.1 Leadership – general

“Leadership” is an ambiguous and abstract concept and the subject of a bewildering range of interpretations and definitions. It is important to be aware that the term will mean different things to different people depending on their own style, personality or preference and based on experiences that they have had with leadership and leaders. It would seem to be evident that when one mentions the word “leadership” to a colleague, what one means and what they hear (and understand) are likely to be two entirely different concepts shaped by past experiences.

Consider the following range of definitions from prominent authors.

Bass (1985) defines leadership in a very results-oriented way as the process of influencing group activities toward the achievement of goals. Even a simple definition like this one is open to interpretation. The word “influence” may be considered by some to mean “deliberately cause” e.g., the boss-manager, (Glasser, 1994) and by others to mean “gently encourage” or even “inspire” (Laws et al., 1992).

Burns (1978) holds that predetermined goals as determined by a leader cannot be the sole determinant of corporate direction. This definition holds that leadership is leaders inducing followers to act for goals that represent the values and the motivations, the wants and needs and expectations of both leaders and followers.

Whilst the word “inducing” sets a milder framework than “influencing,” subscribers to the first definition may see it as manipulative to be inducing others to act, particularly if they determine that the most effective influence is direction setting from the front office. The crucial difference in Burns’ view however, is that the path that is followed is

determined in a collaborative way such that the values and the motivations, the wants and needs and expectations of both leaders and followers are met. “Inducing” the group towards such a goal may be less difficult at the school level but more difficult if a collaborative staff direction differs from the expectations of the governing body in the school council board-room.

The second definition also alludes to the importance of articulating and consciously incorporating the consideration of the “values” of followers in the determination of leadership direction where the first definition does not.

Some argue that leadership must be pragmatic. Heifetz (1994) argues that leadership is confronting problems whose solution requires everyone in the work group or community or nation to grow and develop. It follows that effective leadership therefore requires a problem to solve and a capacity for everyone to grow and develop if the leader is to be regarded as effective. Results are important but the process is also a main focus.

Illustrative of the opposite extreme to a results oriented focus, is the following definition where results are not considered worthy of mention, the primary aim being the development of people. Jacobs (1994) defines leadership as the process of maximizing the capability of people to fulfill purpose through the development of character. In holding that leadership is a process, Jacobs has depersonalised it, viewing it as a concept rather than a character trait. It would seem that as people develop their “character” they will begin to fulfil their purpose and that successful leadership will see to it that this process is maximized.

In practice, such a variance of interpretation of the principal selection committee seeking to fill a vacant leadership position who collectively had a “Jacobs” style leader in mind would, in all probability, be at odds very quickly with a successful “Bass” style applicant. It would be wise for any School Board to determine those aspects of

leadership that would most benefit the staff and the students of their school and to carefully measure applicants with these parameters in mind. By the same measure, it would also be important for leadership aspirants to identify and develop an authentic leadership paradigm that allows him to operate within the bounds of their personal understanding and style of leadership.

It is not the intent of this research to define the term *leadership* or *leader*, as different circumstances require different styles and approaches. Schools do not have many of the bottom-line indicators that are so prevalent in the business world. In an educational context, it is difficult to outline measurable outcomes other than balanced budgets and external examination results. Other pivotal and essential factors that are considered by parents in the placement of their children such as uniform standards, level of pastoral care and discipline, are less easily measured. Nevertheless, directions must be set and processes and procedures deliberately decided on to achieve them. Staff must feel a sense of contribution and ownership in the process. It is logical that results will more easily be forthcoming if a team responsible for their pursuit is collectively committed to their attainment.

It is expected that schools based on a Christian philosophy will have certain consequent expectations of leaders. This premise will be discussed in detail as part of this literature review.

2.2.1.1 Leadership and Management

One important distinction to make at the outset is between leadership and management. A leader is primarily concerned with setting the tone and the direction of an organization whereas a manager has the role of effectively carrying out that direction. Sergiovanni, (1990), views too many schools as being over managed and under led, citing the major blockage to leadership as ingrained bureaucracy and highly prescriptive state regulation.

The difference between leadership and management in a school context is best illustrated by the observation of the educational environment that results as a reflection of practice.

A predominantly principal/manager would be concerned with the maintenance of orderly structures, day-to-day functions, prompt work completion and monitoring outcomes and results.

The Principal who is also concerned with leadership would be concerned with each of these factors, but would also be focussed on personal and interpersonal behaviour, change and development, school quality and effectiveness (Whitaker, 1990.) Principals may be good leaders or good managers, but effective principals must be operatively both.

2.2.2 Principal

The term “principal” in this study refers to the leader of the school directly accountable to the school council for the leadership and management of the institution. In the context of this study it will include other positional titles such as Headmaster, Headmistress, Head, C.E.O. and Co-principal. It will not include Deputy Principal or positions such as Head of Junior School or Director of Pastoral Care, who, though they will have some autonomy in the specific areas of responsibility, are still accountable to the Principal for the discharge of delegated responsibilities.

2.2.2.1 The Principal as a leader

For reasons outlined in the previous section, it is acknowledged that the principal, whilst having the title, may not always be an effective leader. It is argued, however, that school selection boards will be selecting candidates for this position on the basis of at least some demonstrable ability to lead, if not proven, demonstrable and refereed

experience. Conrath (1987) holds that leadership is personal, behavioural and a set of learned and practiced skills. Whilst this is true, it is something of an over-reaction for this author to add that the “first mistake is to view the principal’s job as a position of leadership - there is in fact no such thing”.

2.2.3 Science Heads

“Science Heads” will refer to the person who is appointed by the principal as responsible for the leadership and management of the Science faculty. It will include other positional titles such as Science Coordinator, Head of Science and Director of Science. The Head of Science will be considered as a middle leadership/management position. He/she will have the presumed responsibility for the leadership of Science staff and the management of the Science department within parameters outlined by the principal.

2.2.4 Schools with a Christian Philosophy (Christian Schools)

It is important to outline the terminology “Christian school” and “schools based on a Christian philosophy” for the purposes of this study.

In the broadest definition, it may be argued that as all schools have a responsibility to government and that governments in Australia have an historic grounding in the Christian tradition, so all schools are, to some extent, affected by Christian philosophy. It may also be argued that some schools, which began with a Christian philosophy, have since refocused on a new direction and maintain only an oblique connection with the church.

Some would argue that a truly Christian school would employ only Christian staff and would enrol students exclusively from Christian families.

For the purposes of this research, I define a “Christian school”, as an independent protestant school, of no fixed denominational base, which seeks to employ Christian staff and maintains a strong philosophical imperative for the presentation to students of a Christian world view that has the Bible as the basis for ethics, morals and practice. It may or may not only accept Christian students or students from Christian families. The purpose of this definition is to narrow the focus towards the sector of significantly strongest growth in New South Wales. It by no means implies that schools who purport to have a Christian philosophy and do not fit this definition are not “Christian schools”.

2.2.5 Expectations

The Macquarie Dictionary, (1992), defines “expectations” as those things or events that one might regard as likely to happen. In the context of this study, it is reasonable to suggest that,

- Those seeking promotion have an expectation of the requirements of the position that they have applied for, largely on the basis of observing those who have held the same, or similar positions.
- A person taking up the role of Science Head or Principal would have an expectation that the role would reasonably match the parameters that were outlined to them during interview.
- Those interviewing the applicants for these positions, or those who formulated the advertised role description, would have a clear understanding of the nature of the role and an expectation of the leadership characteristics required of those they seek to fill it.

2.2.6 Realities

The Macquarie Dictionary, (1992), defines a “reality” as something that exists independently of ideas about it. In the context of this study, realities of the positions of

principal and science head will need to be assessed and articulated. With the previous section on expectations in mind, it will be important to assess,

- The requirements of the positions of principal and science head and how these may have differed from the successful candidate's expectations.
- How closely the actual role matched the parameters that were during interview.
- How well those interviewing the successful applicants for these positions, or those who formulated the advertised role description, understood the nature of the role and understood the leadership characteristics required of those who now fill it.

2.3 LITERATURE RELATING TO RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed study are to establish the views of the stakeholders in a Christian school community regarding:

1. Desired outcomes for students: expectations of the school community
2. The expected leadership characteristics in the role of Principal.
3. The expected leadership characteristics in the role of Head of Science.
4. The differences in expected leadership characteristics between the roles of Principals and Science Heads.
5. The extent to which the actual leadership role differs from that which was expected for successful applicants for these positions.
6. The extent to which the actual leadership role is understood by staff with aspirations for seeking promotion to that role.

2.3.1 Outcomes for students: School Community Expectations

2.3.1.1 General Educational Outcomes

For schools based on Christian philosophy, there are desired outcomes that are not necessarily specific; those that are intrinsically part of the aims of most schools including the pursuit of excellence, the development of the capacity for critical thinking, the development of individuals where talents would be revealed and helped to flourish and a safe and protective environment (Saulwick, 1998).

2.3.1.2 Outcomes specific to Christian Schools

In addition, there are a number of desirable outcomes that are specific to Christian schools. These generally include a more specific reference to and emphasis on, compassion for others and servant leadership, (Saulwick, 1998).

There is also a unique emphasis on, the development of a Christian world view and maturity in personal faith.

Evangelistic Agencies

A recent increase in the popularity of Christian schools has corresponded with a “marked decline in church attendance” (Crimmins, 2001, p. 23). Therefore, schools based on a Christian philosophy have been increasingly described in the popular press as the way that the churches have to express themselves (Crimmins, 2001) and even as the key to ensuring “the survival of Christianity in Australia” (Hollingworth, 2001 (2), p. 9). Leaders in the church value the importance of Christian schools in the provision of an intelligent articulation of Christian faith translated into practical action in a “deep commitment to building a good society” (Hollingworth, 2001 (2), p. 9). It is important

for many parents that this is accompanied by a transmission of religious values which would not be in conflict with, but rather reinforce, culture and values of their home environment (Saulwick et al., 1998). This leads to a more insistent ideological surveillance of teachers (Connell, 1985) and a strong emphasis on personal example and proper Christian conduct.

The Creation/Evolution debate

One contentious issue, in terms of desired educational outcomes, directly related to Christian schools is an educational position on the creation/evolution debate. A cursory examination of both the popular and academic press reveals a pervading air of deep seated loyalty to one “faction” or the other and strong views on the implications of both views for education.

The Biblical or Creation view of the origin of life has been described as not deliberately scientific (Crimmins, 2001; Pell, 2001), “unscientific” (Miller, 2000, p. 37; Plimer, 2000, p. 43), “anti-science” (Hollingworth, 2001, p. 19), and an “abuse of the education system” (Plimer, 2001, p. 19). It has even been described as a deliberate ploy to boost membership of right-wing political groups (MacKenzie, 2000). Evolution is presented as an alternative and coherent scientific explanation (Skekhan & Nelson, 2000; National Academy of Sciences, 2000; National Centre for Science Education, 1999; Scott, 1997). Scott (2000, p. 35) indicates that “an attack on evolution is an attack on all science”. Despite this, there are very few instructional activities in America that do not include creation accounts (Paterson, 1999) and 47% of Americans believe that humans were created by God a few thousand years ago (MacKenzie, 2000).

The opposing view argues that it is evolution that is not scientific and “the product of absurd reasoning” (Willis, 2000, p. 41) and biased myth (Marcus, 1999). This is evidenced by its variance with the laws of thermodynamics (Walter, 1999), problems with the fundamental tools that it employs (Gower, 1999) and the presumption that a

“complex system could be formed by random processes” (Willis, 2000, p. 41). Ashton (1999) relates the experiences of 50 prominent scientists and summarises their opposition to evolution and support for creation on scientific grounds.

A middle ground in the debate is held by Hollingworth (2001(1)) and the Catholic church. Both believe that evolution is compatible with belief in God. In what may be described as a theistic evolutionary view, they hold that there is a need for ongoing dialogue between science and religion with a view to seek the common ground. Bartlet (1998) points out that many Christians, even creationists, have contributed to the development of evolutionary theory.

The counter argument from Ashton (1999) and Willis (2000) strongly opposes the position of artificial compromise arguing that evolution promotes the notion of the human race as the product of mindless material forces and, therefore, that God is totally out of the picture. There can be no compromise between one set of beliefs that promotes the existence of God and the other which excludes it.

Miller (2000) argues that religion and science do not need to be connected. In his view, they ask different questions and inhabit different arenas.

Plimer (2001, p. 19), urges the importance of a firm stance by all school executives against the “quiet revolution” and the production of students with creationist mind sets in that many will train as teachers and pass the “stuff” on. There is concern from some about the confusion that teaching both evolution and creation together creates in young minds (Plimer, 2001). Supporting research shows that misconceptions about evolution interferes with the ability to objectively view scientific evidence (Jones, 2001; Sinclair, 1997). These findings are supported in general terms in published papers such as Posner et al. (1982) who contend that ideas that challenge understanding must be intelligible, plausible, fruitful and create dissatisfaction with existing personal conceptions. These findings must be considered in concert with the views of researchers and practitioners

such as Greenwood (2001), and Matsumura (1998) who view the opportunity for debate as a positive aspect of presenting both creation and evolution.

Other Specific Requirements

Other factors that are expected by some parents as provisions in the broader category of Independent schools include a “concentration on the ‘Three R’s’, the provision of discipline, and good grades for tertiary entry” (Saulwick et al, 1998, p. 4). Some see today’s society as lacking core values and discipline and believe that independent schools are more likely than government schools to address these needs (Crimmins, 2001; Saulwick et al, 1998). Parents are also seeking an environment that promotes skills necessary for further learning, the ability to engage society, and the promotion and development of leadership qualities (Saulwick et al, 1998).

2.3.2 Expected leadership characteristics in the role of Principal.

2.3.2.1 A disturbing recent trend

The quality of leadership of the principal is regarded as one of the “key requirements of an effective school” (Ramsey, ed., 2000, p. 86). One worrying modern trend is, therefore, a generally recognised “decline in the number and standard of applicants for the position of principal” in both government and Catholic schools (Ramsey, ed., 2000, p. 88; Maslen, 2003, p. 32). Whilst there has been no comment on a similar decline in Independent Christian schools, it would be reasonable to suggest that the reasons given are also present to some extent in these schools. This is a disturbing trend given that, “a large proportion of current school leaders will retire from all levels in the next five years” (Ramsey, ed., 2000, p. 88).

2.3.2.2 Role and process too onerous.

There have been warnings since the late 1980's about the principal's role given the relative uncertainty of expectations, and tenure. In 1992, Murphy and Hallinger cited an unusual five year rise in the complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty in the Principal's work environment, together with the sheer volume of work. Caldwell (1992) agreed, that, the scope and pace of change in education in Australia was extraordinary and, for many, disconcerting if not dislocating. Community leaders have also taken up the call for recognition of the complexity of the position. The NSW State Education minister, John Watkins (in Maslen, 2003, p. 23) described the role of the principal as being "impossibly, all things to all people; financial administrators, community advocates and conflict resolution experts". This pressure for the quick and accurate delivery of pre-determined outcomes has had a deleterious effect on the principal's capacity for long-term focus. The problem is not confined to schools. In reference to a study published in 2002 of 35,000 managers by Human Synergistics International, independent recruitment agencies have concluded that "Australia is not successfully developing leaders, because in the current climate it's all about short term results" (Lennard, in Farrelly, 2003, p. 1).

The rising toll of stress and stress related illness amongst principals saw the establishment of a NSW hotline where they can "talk about their problems without fear of official retribution" (Maslen, 2003, p. 32). Many potential candidates think that the position of principal is now too onerous a role. The predictions, historically scoffed at, that the "spectre of educational negligence claims would soon become a reality," (Nelson, in Nolan, 1989, p. 82) have eventuated, and now consume much of the principal's time. "Almost nine out of ten teachers have stated that the stresses associated with the position of principal would ensure that they would never apply for the position" (Maslen, 2003, p. 32). This situation, which will only be addressed when there exists a clear and relevant professional development structure with the knowledge and skills that they require (Ramsey, 2000), is made more difficult when there is little agreement on

how principals can be best prepared (Ramsey, 2000). Most attention, it seems, is directed at assisting principals once they have already taken up their responsibilities (Maslen, 2003).

With the advent of selection committees and recruitment consultants, the process of selection for principals has become so complicated, that this too may act as a considerable disincentive to those who face the prospect of months of speculation and preparation for an uncertain outcome. Whilst Police commissioners and company CEOs can expect a drawn out process involving several weeks, typically the process of selection for a new principal in 2003 may involve four to six months and most or all of the following stages.

1. Preparation of an application addressing advertised criteria
2. Professional reading and updating in areas of least direct involvement
3. A short-list interview with a selection panel
4. A visit by the selection panel to the applicants school for an on-site interview
5. Demonstrations of competence in teaching, meeting convening, policy direction, public speaking, etc
6. A third interview off site including a presentation on a set topic to the panel
7. Hypothetical scenarios at interview
8. A psychological test
9. A medical examination
10. A personality test

2.3.2.3 General Requirements

It is generally acknowledged that excellent schools often have the characteristics of loose-tight organisations (Peters & Waterman, 1982). These characteristics include a focus on basic goals and accountability whilst fostering a climate of entrepreneurship, autonomy and experimentation. Despite this, there is increasing pressure on schools to

be more specific in outlining the “explicit requirements that are being sought when recruiting a new principal” (Ramsey, 2000, p. 89).

There is some debate on whether school boards have the expertise necessary to initiate and satisfactorily complete this process. Recognition of this may be a contributing factor in the increased use of recruitment consultants during the principal selection process. Sergiovanni, (1990), holds that though successful school leaders know the importance of leadership or value added dimensions, often the audiences they serve (school boards, state bureaucrats, politicians) do not, demanding instead exclusive attention to managerial or added dimensions. Carver (1990) has long advocated a more proactive stance emphasising that school governors should themselves be carefully selected so as to include members with the capacity to consider such things as, leverage and efficiency, expertise, fundamentals, vision and inspiration.

There has been considerable input by educational writers on these selection criteria. They should provide guidelines for expectations for the successful candidate covering areas such as the following,

- **A capacity for adaptability** and change management (Manasse, 1984; Lunenberg & Ornestein, 1993), particularly when reflecting the “views and aspirations of staff” (McCallum, 2001, p. 34). A determination to see changes to fruition is also important.
- Explicit requirements about the candidate’s **educational knowledge and the degree of expertise** and experience expected (Ramsey, 2000) are important at interview as well as their impressions of the expertise required of staff and results required of students (McCallum, 2001).
- **Accredited standards** gained through further learning (Ramsey, 2000),
- The ability to create an infrastructure to support teacher-leaders (Childs-Bowen et.al, 2000), to **monitor staff professionalism** (Bolin, 1989) and “promote dedication” (McCallum, 2001, p. 34). A school leader with this capacity will encourage a predominant mood of performance investment, and intrinsic work

satisfaction rather than extrinsic reward where tasks are performed because they are important, not necessarily because they are rewarded. Sergiovanni (1990) comments that poor school leaders encourage a climate of participation rather than performance – a fair days work for a fair days pay. There should be “no excuse from a staff member for anything other than a rich classroom setting” (McCallum, 2001, p. 34).

- The ability to **continue effective leadership and management under circumstances of personal and corporate stress**. Lunenberg and Ornestein (1993) view the capacity for stress management as a dominant feature in exemplary school leaders. Gagen (1997) highlights that it is a particularly important capacity when dealing with staff related matters. His work found that the overall stress and unpleasantness of dealing with such issues had several administrators declaring they would not consider repeating the procedure (Gagen, 1997).
- The ability to **implement externally driven policy** (Bolin, 1989; Waller, 1932).
- **Vision and a capacity for proactive response** (Bolin, 1989; Lambert, 1997; Leithwood et al, 1997; Manasse, 1984; Ramsey, 2000). “This vision should be drawn out into a number of goals which are published in a prominent position” (McCallum, 2001, p. 34). Sergiovanni, (1990), highlights the necessity of a sense of direction and an ethical and moral meaning behind the administration of a school. He highlights the need for the principal to express and articulate the vision or risk missing the point of leadership altogether. It is important, in this respect that the principal has the capacity for big picture thinking rather than a propensity for preoccupation with issues of minimal consequence. Senge (1992) describes this capacity as systems thinking - a discipline for seeing wholes and patterns rather than static snapshots. Leadership in any situation is more likely characterised by inter-relationships rather than by linear cause and effect chains. He comments that it is common for poor leaders to select a favourite one or two issues as a focus for their attention and efforts for change, often at the expense of more pressing and less desirable matters.

- An understanding of, and a capacity to manage **student behaviour** including a proactive approach to welfare (McCallum, 2001). Gagen (1997) indicates that conflict over student behaviour and appropriate measures for the management of student behaviour, as the most common issue facing school leaders and administrators.
- Maturity and well developed **interpersonal skills** (Decoux, 1999; Whitaker, 1990), particularly with senior executives. (McCallum, 2001), emphasises trust as a valuable commodity in a school, even at the price of control. The capacity for cooperation with others is an interpersonal skill emphasised by Lunenberg and Ornestein (1993). The capacity for clear communication and to maintain and transmit passion and enthusiasm is also important (McCallum, 2001).
- **Management capability and expertise** such as the efficient processing of correspondence, communicating information and checking resources is considered as an important characteristic in school leaders (Ridden, 1992). High visibility is essential (McCallum, 2001). Lunenberg and Ornestein (1993) add that there must also be a willingness to assume the responsibility and be accountable for such processes. Allison (1997) expresses concern that at the same time that principals are expected to be competent managers of schools (that is to perform routine organizational tasks efficiently) they are also required to provide effective school leadership. He comments that very busy and highly unpredictable work days with many individuals and groups competing for a principal's time along with routine leadership and management decisions, are likely to produce considerable stress.
- An understanding of **personal leadership style and strength** (Bolin, 1989; Manasse, 1984), including the ability to correct others where necessary. Sergiovanni (1990) considers it important to have a propensity for leadership by outrage - to have passion with practice, characterised by extraordinary amounts of time, strong feelings of purpose, a focus on the key issues and to care enough to become irate when ideas are comprised by others. Lunenberg and Ornestein

(1993) describe exemplary leaders as dominant, decisive, assertive and self confident.

2.3.2.4 Principal Leadership Style

Introduction

Principal appointments committees usually have a specific view of the leadership style and attributes that they are seeking. Conversations in the boardroom are likely to follow along the lines of, “Our next principal will need to be ... or should be ...” In schools where a significant change in direction is not being sought, the committee may well be seeking a leader with a similar style to the outgoing principal in order to facilitate a smooth transition. In the opposite circumstance, where there is a mandate for the new principal to change the direction of the school, it could be that the leadership style of the new principal should be in stark contrast to that of the incumbent. The degree of change expected along with the perceived general shortcomings of the school should be communicated to the principal and regular channels of communication made available. Without regular feedback and appraisal, it is quite probable that a principal who is effectively leading a school as measured in his own genuine interpretation, may be seen as a moderate or even ineffective leader by school stakeholders. The research of Daresh and Playko (1984) found that new principals were discouraged to the point of considering leaving the principalship after only one or two years, despite the fact that they were viewed as quite effective in their systems. It was found that they had experienced considerable frustration that their expectations had not been met - that they did not understand the nature of leadership responsibilities before they accepted the position.

Waldersee and Eagleson (1996) consider that the development and understanding of a dominant leadership style is pivotal to effective leadership. The leadership style of the principal is a critical indicator in the organisational process of a school (Cheng, 1991).

In contrast, Lunenburg and Ornestein (1991) hold that leadership style is only a means to an end and time spent thinking about style is better invested in the development of substantial ideas. Hersey and Blanchard (1998) write that style has a conditional importance, given that in their view, most effective leaders appear to exhibit a degree of versatility and flexibility that enables them to adapt their behaviour to the changing and contradictory demands made on them.

Task-Orientated leadership

Strong advocates of a task-orientated style of leadership believe that leadership is results-driven and positional. Drucker (1996) argues that an effective leader is not someone who is loved or admired but someone whose followers do the right things. He emphasises that leaders should not be concerned with popularity, and should be highly visible and set an example to others.

A task-oriented principal is concerned with the “bottom-line,” as determined by measurable outcomes such as enrolments, H.S.C. scores, student crime rates and profit/loss figures. He or she is likely to be assertive, with a keen sense of corporate direction and may be aggressive when challenged. There is also a strong belief that leadership is positional and that it is the principal’s responsibility to ensure that the school is achieving measurable outcomes. Proponents of this style argue that any principal who cannot produce acceptable results will be quickly out of a job.

By definition, a new task-orientated leader would prefer a degree of autonomy but may require initial assistance with the determination of direction and may need regulated feedback from governance including measurement of outcomes and accountability.

People-Orientated leadership

Advocates of a people-orientated style of leadership argue that leadership cannot be measured in terms of goals and objectives as these presume an overly simplistic cause and effect relationship, uncommon in schools. The argument follows that those who are pre-occupied with this paradigm have missed the fact that schools are primarily about people and effective relationships.

Lambert (1997) writes that leadership should be compassionate and focussed on relationships rather than structures, inspiring devotion and extra effort.

It follows that a people-orientation and the consideration of the needs of community, staff and students would mean that the results would take care of themselves. Some of the greatest contributions that leaders have made to schools like staff unity, student compassion and pastoral care cannot be measured on a scale from one to ten. There is nothing second rate about intention, so long as it is purposeful and not accidental. A focus on results, on the other hand, precludes the possibility of the unforeseen and presents, in their view, a restrictive and myopic view of leadership.

The qualitative research of Kirby et al (1992) on extraordinary leadership as defined by staff members in a school, identified a clear people-oriented (caring, personable, supportive) leadership style.

In contrast to the task-oriented leader, a new people-orientated leader would be more likely to require initial feedback from governance on the professional and personal history of staff members and their perceived strengths and weaknesses.

Motivational leader (Task-people orientation)

Waldersee and Eagleson (1996) write that the effect of leadership style on the achievement of outcomes is dramatic and that a balance of relationship behaviour associated with satisfaction and task behaviour associated with performance is desirable. Cheng (1991) and Laws et al (1992) agree, determining that leadership is not only a matter of what a leader does but how a leader makes people feel about themselves in the work situation and about the organisation itself.”

Research by Cheng (1991) found that staff interactions in the areas of esprit and intimacy was best served by a high task orientation and a high relationship orientation leadership style. This was also reflected in perceived organisational effectiveness. Waldersee and Eagleson (1996) found that it is better to be both a task oriented and relations oriented leader than to favour one or the other. They also concluded that if one style of leadership is preferred, the “task” leader will be marginally more successful at implementing change but that either a task or relations emphasis is better than none at all.

Kirby, Paradise, and King (1992) conducted separate qualitative and quantitative studies. Both studies established that a high task and relationship orientation are both desirable in exemplary leaders and that a leader with a high orientation for task/relationships can “transform” a school.

Distributed leadership

Waldersee and Eagleson (1996) found in their research that the division of the functions of task and people orientated leadership between different individuals is the most manageable, and therefore most effective, solution to the dilemma of effective school leadership in an increasingly complex environment. Belbin, (1988) agrees, advocating the collaborative matching of the most appropriate personality/orientation to a situation

that needs leadership. He advocates that any successful leadership team would identify its area of weakness and appoint someone to look after the jobs that looked as though they belonged naturally to the missing team role.

Research on the *Apollo syndrome* has shown that the selection of management teams of highly motivated individuals, deliberately selected to work together in a competitive environment, rarely performed as well as a group of ordinary workers who had to rely on specialisation and the pooling of their talents (Belbin, 1988). Senge (1992) emphasises the importance of effective distributed leadership in terms of alignment. It is his view that unaligned teams are characterised by wasted energy where individuals work extraordinarily hard, but their efforts do not efficiently translate to team effort. By contrast, he argues, that when a team becomes more aligned, a commonality of direction emerges, and individual energies harmonise.

Governance would need to be aware that a new principal with a propensity for distributed leadership would experience a great deal of frustration if a degree of ingrained lethargy existed on staff. Conversely, with a mandate for change, this could be the very area that the appointment is designed to target.

Transformational leadership

Effective (transformational) leadership has aspects of both task and relationship orientation. Kirby et al (1992) compare the definition of transformational leadership (above) to transactional (ordinary) leadership where follower compliance is exchanged for expected rewards. The purpose of their quantitative research was to investigate educators' perceptions and they found that transformational leadership was associated with higher levels of performance and satisfaction (Kirby et al, 1992).

A school seeking to transform educational philosophy and practice through focussing on the development and growth of individual professionals through activity and dialogue would be most suited by a new principal with a transformational leadership focus.

Autocratic Leadership

Advocates of autocratic leadership argue that the notion of shared leadership is a textbook fiction and that leadership is “positional” in reality – there are only a few people with the motivation and capability necessary to run a huge organization such as a school. The analogy in the quote above, whilst drawn from the army, was made to illustrate the fact that people with different responsibilities in a school will have vastly different focuses. Imagine the alternative; the school ruled by a majority vote and a rotational leadership structure monitored by collective accountability. It would be the inconsistent communication and decision making disaster that would fail to provide any real alternative to structure.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) believe that an autocratic leadership style results from the presumption that work is inherently distasteful to people and that most are not ambitious, have little desire for responsibility, and prefer to be directed. There is also the understanding that most people have little capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems and must be closely controlled and often coerced to achieve organizational objectives.

It is held by some that the reality of leadership requires bosses who are capable of emphasising the need for integrity and compliance in the articulation and workplace practice of maintaining core values and the vision of the organisation as well as directing the workplace tone in the development of these attitudes in those whom they lead. Often, in order to achieve this, the autocrat or “boss style” manager will create an environment where staff and executive are adversaries and bosses think that this is the way it should be (Glasser, 1994).

A risk of this style of leadership is the perception of staff that the principal has no confidence in them or does not trust them to make decisions. Duignan (1997) describes this as the panache of corporate managerialism, where the excesses of leadership expediency and obsession with self interest and narcissistic behaviour, personal advantage, and lust for power and privilege have contributed to a persistent feeling among the followers of being used, cheated and even demeaned.

Duignan (1997) argues that the time where it was possible to be an autocratic leader has passed with the increasing complexity of the role of school leader. There are different expectations of the role of principal in the minds of staff. He states that there was a time when leaders could manipulate organisations more readily because life was less complicated, environments were relatively stable and power and wisdom were perceived to flow from their heroic figures.

A school council selecting a new principal with an autocratic leadership style would be wise to consider the implications of such a mindset when it came to the acceptance of governance decisions. It would be prudent to establish early guidelines in this area.

Paternalistic leadership

It is possible to have a “positional” mindset but to modify the mechanism of communication with staff so that the emphasis shifts from “tell” to “sell.” It may be that staff view such a leader as strong and purposeful, yet caring enough to consider their feelings and to explain why a decision has been made and where it fits into the schools vision. The danger is that the leader may be seen as condescending towards the staff, stifling those who not only want to be part of the vision but to contribute towards it.

Senge (1992) recalls a good friend who tried, fruitlessly to overwrite the unwritten law in his organisation that all should work long hours by pleading with staff to go home

and undertaking any number of measures to assist them with home-work balance, whilst at the same time, working a seventy hour week himself.

Consultative leadership

A principal with a consultative leadership style would invite staff to offer suggestions from their expertise in the decision making process while still reserving the ultimate responsibility for the final decision. This process would need to be a clearly established paradigm. The principal would need to establish a mood of genuine consultation and yet tactfully reserve the right to act unilaterally in certain circumstances. Senge (1992) argues that there is no merit in acknowledging an interesting idea or direction with no intention of ever incorporating it into custom and practice.

The most significant advantages of a consultative style of leadership include recognition, both personally and corporately, of the value of the gifts and abilities of others. If managed in a genuine way, this style will protect the principal from being perceived as arrogant and pursuing a myopic course of action that is not subject to change, seeking always to be understood, and rarely to understand. The consultative principal is characterised by a focus on listening with the intent to reply rather than listening with the intent to understand another point of view. If staff are encouraged to picture the school with a broader view and to make genuine contributions to the decision making process, they develop empathy with the leader and are often much more committed to “their” final decision.

A disadvantage of this style exists where there is a perception amongst staff that they do not have the principal’s complete confidence, or detect a real or imagined lack of transparency in the process. This is particularly likely if there are some members of staff who have had regular input only to find that it is consistently not reflected in the final decision. (“Why has my time and energy been totally wasted yet again?”) This situation may be offset to some degree by the delegation of decisions that do not have the

capacity to compromise the tone or ethics of the school, or for which the principal may be found to be inconsistent to be made without direct consultation.

It would be difficult for a new principal with a genuine consultative leadership style to replace an outgoing principal who had the habit of employing a subterfuge consultation process.

Democratic leadership

Lunerberg and Ornestein (1991) regard the capacity to exercise democratic leadership as a character trait of successful leaders. The democratic leader adopts the role of facilitator and chairman of meetings. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) contend that such a devolving of decision making is based on the premise that the capacity for creativity in solving organizational problems is widely distributed among staff. It also presumes that staff are well motivated at social, esteem and self-actualization levels as well as at the psychological and security levels and that staff can be self-directed and creative at work.

One advantage is that there can be little question of staff feeling that they had the complete confidence and trust of the leader and there would be high motivation amongst staff who felt that they had directly contributed to the ethos and functioning of the school.

Drawbacks of a democratic leadership style would be the slowness and inconsistency of decisions along with a possible perception of the principal as lukewarm and unable to commit on issues of importance. There are also likely to be occasions where staff are voting on issues which they have no particular interest in, yet which may change the direction or philosophy of the school. A “chairman” principal with a “majority rules” *modus operandi* may find that this style of leadership creates a compromise of ethics. Given that all school boards require the principal to accept ultimate responsibility for day-to-day management, educational leadership and decision making, in such a situation

he or she would be forced into some difficult options. Either overrule the majority on ethical grounds and undermine the respect of the staff having initiated and supported a “democratic” system, support a majority decision that compromises personal ethics and integrity, or remain consistent with the democratic mindset that the product is less important than the process.

The selection of a new principal with a democratic leadership style would create a paradigm for the school that council would need to carefully consider. It presumes a wealth of experience, big-picture thinking and motivation from staff. It also includes the necessity for time delays, some inconsistencies and possible changes in corporate direction. There would be an inevitable perception from some council members, historically unaware of the principal’s selection brief, of his or her inability to get on with matters of importance and with making the decisions that he or she is paid to make.

Collaborative leadership

As opposed to a consultative leadership style, where the principal genuinely seeks input from individuals or groups, collaborative leadership involves the deliberate introduction of committees, task forces and groups, working together to create a shared vision. Senge (1992) argues that when there is commonality of purpose and a sense of a developed corporate purpose, individuals do not sacrifice their personal interests to those of the team; rather, the shared vision becomes an extension of personal visions. He contrasts this perceived ideal with the situation in many workplaces where one person’s vision is imposed commanding compliance at best - not commitment. Sergiovanni, (1990), argues that enabling staff requires giving discretion, support, preparation, and guidance rather than direction. Collegiality is enhanced when staff and executive engage in specific conversation about work and encourage each other with their focus on a common direction.

A collaborative leadership style involves a capacity to share power and to allow staff to contribute in an organised way to the decision making process and the direction of the school (Bolin, 1989; Connell, 1985; Manasse, 1984; Rost, 1991). Such an approach makes considerable sense given the loosely coupled nature of education where there is a history of imposed top-down decisions not getting past the classroom door where the teacher operates in accordance with their own professional paradigm. Whitaker (1990) agrees that in most schools, teachers have considerable freedom to interpret and enact policies and plans determined by senior staff.

Ridden (1992) argues that the trend towards collaborative structures is also a clear and obvious response to the increasing complexity of demands being placed on schools and therefore on school principals. Whitaker (1990) comments that the trend towards collaborate leadership began in the 1980s with more emphasis on flexible rather than fixed roles, shared responsibility and teamwork. He adds that there has been a flattening of hierarchies to create a collaborative management culture, the developing rather than the delivering of expertise, an emphasis on effectiveness as opposed to efficiency and the shift in leadership from “power over” to “power to.” Leadership has lost its Lone Ranger or Pied Piper of Hamelin image - the idea that there is one person who is out in front taking charge, and everyone else is following, more or less blindly, toward leader - initiated goals (Rost, 1991). Ridden (1992) warns that principals who make all the decisions themselves, do everything themselves, or tell everyone else what they will do, find that either the school suffers or they do. It is his contention that principals should access the availability of experience, skills, knowledge and energy of all staff.

Servant Leadership

A servant leadership style is characterised by the capacity of the leader to ensure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served, often before and at the expense of immediate personal needs of the leader (Greenleaf, 1991). Such a leadership mindset requires that the servant not only understands the needs of those to be served, and

willingly seeks to meet these needs, but is also prepared to suffer personal inconvenience (Lambert, 1997). Duignan (1977), describes a trend away from traditional hierarchical perspectives towards leadership including service and stewardship.

2.3.2.5 Principal Leadership Style: Two important considerations

Regardless of a principal's individual leadership style, there are other important considerations that establish educational direction and practice and serve to frame his or her response to situations that arise. A principal's leadership style will necessarily be affected to a large degree by the nature of the school that he or she is, or will be, leading – council, staff, students, parents and the underlying philosophy under which the school was established. Therefore, there is a need to consider both the existing educational environment (situational leadership) and the essential purpose or mission of the school along with accepted and expected ethical, moral and directional scaffolds (principle centred leadership).

Situational leadership

Situational leadership requires the principal to be adaptable according to the needs of individuals or groups in the school (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). A principal's leadership style will therefore exist as some combination of individual orientation, what council, staff, students and parents expects and what an individual situation requires.

One disadvantage of “being all things to all people” is the recognition by stakeholders of a lack of consistency. Staff, for instance, may think it unfair that the principal interacts with senior or experienced staff in a more familiar or “respectful” manner than he or she does with them.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) strongly endorse situational leadership and the capacity to adapt as essential for the effective principal. They argue that whilst the acknowledgement and development of personal leadership style is important, even with good diagnostic skills, leaders may still not be effective unless they can adapt their style to meet the demands of their environment.

Principle centred leadership

One common feature of successful visionary institutions or companies is the unswerving adherence to an historically consistent ideology; a set of core values that define existence.

The Ford Motor Company prides itself on the principles of honesty and integrity – They regard people as their source of strength, products as the result of effort and view profit as a necessary means and measure for success. In the case of another multinational, the Disney Corporation, the core principles include fanatical attention to consistency and detail, no cynicism, continuous progress via creativity, dreams and imagination and preservation of a “magic” image.

Each of these organisations maintains a highly motivated and dedicated staff.

Covey (1989) states that clearly defined principles in an organisation lead to principle centred decision making by individuals. There has been much recent growth in the popularity of school “mission statements” outlining the core principles that dictate the expected outcomes of individual institutions. It is incumbent on a principal to be fully cognisant of these principles, their reflected practice, and to be aware of their reflection, or otherwise, in individual staff and faculties.

2.3.2.6 Specific Requirements of Independent Schools

Accountability

Whilst all schools are expected to be accountable, the high rate of parental and ex-student involvement in independent schools is symptomatic of an increased expectation of accountability from staff and especially from the principal. There is an expectation that money given to a school, especially when a good quality alternative is available at no expense, will be used wisely and for the educational benefit of students.

A survey of parents in independent schools by Saulwick (1988) demonstrated the need for principals of these schools to be selected for the ability to provide an educational environment that particularly encourages academic success, the acquisition of research techniques and an inquiring mind. Specifically, the research indicated priorities as the development of a capacity for continued learning, the acquiring of skills and knowledge to build a future economically and socially, the development and flourishing of latent student talents and the provision of broad curriculum alternatives and post school options.

A strong affective domain

The Saulwick (1988) survey highlighted essential features of independent schools from a parent perspective in the affective, pastoral care domain. Parents indicated that their choice of school was based on the care and nurture of students, the development of well rounded human beings, the development of self discipline and respect for others and the safety and protection of their children.

Reinforcement of family values and culture

The Saulwick (1988) research found that a strong indicator for parental selection of an independent school was a close alignment of the school with the values and traditions of their family. Parents are seeking a strong home and school partnership where, during their formative years, the values, morals and attitudes that their children are raised with are not compromised by conflicting lifestyle and moral paradigms taught, or implied, at their school.

2.3.2.7 Philosophical identity – Requirements of Christian schools

As well as having the skills required for leadership in general schooling and a specific set of skills for independent schools, principals in Christian schools are expected to create or preserve a unique, specific philosophy and identity. There are parallels in other schools bound by a single philosophy. For instance, it is suggested that the best school leaders in Catholic schools proclaim Catholic identity as integral to the school's mission (Tracy, 1997) and participate fully in the evangelizing mission (Gusdane, 1999). Independent Christian schools, by definition are characterised by a capacity, especially in the principal, for the "transmission of Christian values" (Saulwick, 1998, p. 4). In fact, for many parents with strong Christian beliefs, the development in their children of values that reinforce those at home is the school's most important function. They deliberately choose a Christian school to avoid mixed messages on morality and values and "allowing teachers who do not share Christian beliefs to educate children for Christian homes for six hours a day, five days a week" (Friskin, 2003, p. 2). There is some Biblical support for such a stance:

Can a blind man lead a blind man? Will they not both fall into a pit? A student is not above his teacher, but everyone who is fully trained will be like his teacher (Luke 6:39-40).

Whilst this is the most common expectation, there are other parents who see Christian education and the “consequent transmission of values as essentially a home function” (Saulwick, 1998, p. 9) and seek only reinforcement and consistency from the school. Friskin (2003) disagrees and describes such an approach as ineffective. He contends that children, even in Christian homes, watch four to six hours of television a day which means that, in the absence of Christian teaching that touches all aspects of the school, a student will not have the spiritual resilience to counter secular values creeping in. He describes four marks of a Christian school,

1. All teachers must be Christians.
2. The curriculum must be Christ centred. Biblical beliefs should underpin all that is taught and not be seen as simply an add-on.
3. It should be a Christian learning community marked by love, acceptance and forgiveness by students, staff and parents. Christianity should be caught not taught.
4. High standards of education.

In order to maintain a cohesive message it follows, therefore, that in Christian schools, “the principal has the added responsibility of ideological surveillance of staff” (Connell, 1985, p. 130).

2.3.2.8 Christian education – Leadership

Identity

In Christian schools, and with the ideal of an authentic identity in mind, it is becoming more common for principals to stipulate the employment of Christian staff, many even requiring a minister’s reference from the church currently attended. Staff are selected on qualifications, experience and other factors that are used for selection in all schools, but also on the basis of common commitment to the school’s ideals and mission.

It follows that if a principal is expecting a consistent, mature and well-grounded Christian world-view and philosophy of education from staff (classroom leaders) in the school, then it is important to set an example in this area personally. A new principal with a strong, consistent track record of leadership will be highly sought after in a secular school, yet may be found wanting in a Christian school if no thought has been given to the specific requirements of both personal and corporate leadership in a Christian setting. And what is to be the determinant of such a view of leadership? The Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation holds that Christian teaching and leadership should conform to the Bible and its view of reality. It is possible to be viewed as effective in leadership by worldly standards, to translate these same standards into a Christian setting and then to be seen as unsuccessful,

For the wisdom of the world is foolishness (1Cor 3:19).

It is not to be understood by this, that the Christian leader should shrink away from the world and to fail to engage it. As Paul writes in a letter to the church leader, Timothy,

Everything that God created is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving (1Tim 4:4).

A Christian school principal has the added responsibility of meeting the spiritual needs of staff and often those of the community. There is an imperative that he or she has a mature and consistent Christian framework for leadership, reflected in thought, word and action. This consistency can then be encouraged in others;

Phil 2:2 then make my joy complete by being like-minded, having the same love, being one in spirit and purpose.

The principal, in this way, will establish credibility as a Christian leader, just as Paul built a good reputation with the elders in Ephesus;

Acts 20:18 You know how I lived the whole time I was with you.

The final authority for Christian leadership is the Bible – God’s word. In order to be an effective Church leader, it is important to focus on objectives that will fulfil the purposes of God.

Desirable Characteristics for Biblical Leadership

The characteristics required for Christian leadership are listed in Paul’s first letter to Timothy (1 Tim 3:1-7). A Christian principal (elder) should be,

- Above reproach (also Dan 12:3)
- Self controlled (also Tit 1:7) and diligent (Rom 12:8; Pr 14:23; Pr 21:5)
- Respectable
- Hospitable
- Able to teach (also Tit 1:9)
- Gentle (also 1Thes. 4:11)
- Not a lover of money
- A devoted family man
- Not a recent convert
- Humble (also 2Tim 24-25)
- A person of integrity

God was pleased with Solomon’s grasp of the essential qualities of Christian leadership, as recorded in his prayer,

2Chronicles 1:10 - Give me wisdom and knowledge, that I may lead this people.

It is clear from these attributes and from this mindset, that a person who seeks a leadership position in a Christian context, motivated by position and power for the primary purpose of feeding personal ambition is likely to experience great difficulty.

What good will it be for a man if he gains the whole world, yet forfeits his soul?
(Mat 16:17).

It is difficult to maintain this focus “against the backdrop of a materialistic society” (Macaulay & Barrs, 1979, p. 29). The Christian principal must prioritise living,

In a right way in undivided devotion to the Lord (1 Cor.7:35),

Thereby he or she is either directly or indirectly, influencing and motivating staff to do likewise.

The Bible is clear on the expectations that followers should have of themselves regarding those who lead.

Remember your leaders, who spoke the word of God to you. Consider the outcome of their way of life and imitate their faith (Heb 13:7).

Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established (Rom 13:1).

There are some clues here for those who would aspire to a Biblical model of leadership. It is implicit that these leaders should have a faith that is worthy of imitation and to make decisions in the knowledge that their motivation will be the subject of accountability in the highest court; accountability to God.

Biblical Leadership Styles

Whilst the Bible is quite prescriptive when outlining the characteristics necessary for leadership, leadership style is another matter altogether. There are a variety of styles recorded in the Bible. Depending on the individual, the motivation and the circumstances, these styles have been both successful unsuccessful and sometimes even disastrous.

The concept of leadership is mostly used in connection with God. For instance, He,

Leads the people in unending love (Ex 15:13), and;
on a straight and true path (Ps 27:11, Mat 6:13, Luke 11:4).

Little is said directly about the leadership style of Jesus, however, through the story of His life, the reader is left with the lasting impression of a single minded, motivational, compassionate, servant leader.

Task-oriented leadership

There is a Biblical imperative for leaders in Christian schools to maintain focus on predetermined goals, particularly those goals that the leader feels “called” to pursue in the light of much prayer and deliberation.

Noah was given the specific task of building an ark according to a number of precise dimensions (Gen 6:14-18). God blessed Noah and his sons (Gen 9:1-3) for Noah’s faithfulness in carrying out the task required of him.

There are other examples of tasks that were required of leaders in the Bible. Moses was given quite specific instructions on the construction of several artifacts such as the ark, table, lampstand, tabernacle, altar and courtyard in Genesis 25-27.

Christ was born and died to achieve a singular task. In Matthew's gospel, it is recorded that,

Jesus began to explain to them that the Son of Man must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things at the hands of the elders, chief priests and teachers of the law, and that he must be killed and on the third day be raised to life (Mat 16:21).

Task-orientation in a Christian leadership context has Biblical and Godly justification.

The question that must be answered concerns the intent behind the pursuit. Will this policy, program or direction serve to glorify God or, will it serve to hinder the gospel? It is a question worth asking more than once. The directions and practices of a school can easily lose purpose and bearing, being reduced to pointless rituals; propagated by managers with sight rather than leaders with vision.

Principals of Christian schools must seek to maintain a clarity of purpose. Whilst a task-orientation is important, care must be taken to avoid "the pitfall of becoming a heavily program-oriented organisation" (Willis 1998, p. 66). The focus for principals should equally be on the identification and utilisation of the gifts and talents that new staff members bring rather than simply adding them onto a pre-existing program roster according to a "last-in, worst-job" maxim.

People orientated leadership

Whilst Christ was dedicated to the single-minded pursuit of his ultimate purpose, he was also absorbed with distractions. Jesus was a people-orientated leader. His concern for the people was paramount. He referred to them in intimate terms;

Whoever does God's will is my brother and sister and mother (Mark 3:35).

He sought to comfort those in need, such as the woman who had been the subject of constant bleeding for many years (Mark 5:24-34), the father of a dead girl (Mark 5:35-43), the paralyzed man (Mark 2:1-12). He fed them when they were hungry (John 6:1-13), even at personal cost (John 6:15).

Willis (1998) takes up the emphasis that Christ had on ministry when referring to leadership in the context of a church. It is his view that whilst methods and programs are of importance in a church, the primary focus must always be on the people, for He has chosen to reveal Himself through His people to a lost world (Willis, 1998, p. 71). Viability in a church has little to do with economics but everything to do with people. Where its people are growing the church will grow (Willis, 1998, p. 70).

It is important for the principal in a Christian school to be aware that modelling the leadership of Christ through shepherding, service and a strong relationship orientation is not just a text book exercise. The principal must provide a model of genuine concern for others to follow if a concern for the needs of others is to be a corporate paradigm. It should be "caught" rather than "taught".

A people-orientation for leaders in a Christian context is not a choice. It is a directive. Christ commands all Christians to love one another.

A new command I give to you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another (John 13:34-35).

This is my command: Love each other (John 15: 17).

Motivational leadership

In light of the assertion by Laws et al (1992) that the most effective leadership is not only a matter of what a leader does, but how a leader makes people feel about themselves, it is little wonder that Christ is regarded by Christians and non-Christians alike as one of the most influential leaders in history.

Many of the statements of Christ reflect the balance of task and people orientation that characterizes a motivational leader. In what has been termed “the great commission” Jesus urges those who would follow him, to also lead others to the truth.

Therefore go and make disciples of all nations (people orientation), baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you (task orientation). And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age (people orientation), (Mat 28:19-20).

In preparation for his crucifixion, Christ ensures that the task of bringing people into a relationship with God will be carried on by others, beginning with the faith of Peter;

And I tell you that you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not overcome it (Mat 16:18).

Christians are followers of Christ.

Christian leaders should be motivational leaders.

Distributed leadership

Just as each one of us has one body with many members, and these members do not all have the same function, so in Christ we who are many form one body, and each member belongs to the others (Rom 12:4-5).

Leadership is a gift from God and Christians are encouraged to exercise their gifts. It follows, therefore, that there is a Biblical mandate for a principal in a Christian school to identify, encourage and develop potential leaders in the school through practical leadership experience. A requirement for any principal in this regard, must be a capacity for discernment. Gifts from God are particular to an individual (1Cor 7:7), not to be neglected (1Tim 4:14), or kept for selfish motives;

Each one should use whatever gift he has received to serve others (1Peter 4:10).

Coupled with pragmatic organisational aspects, such as the division of the functions of task and people orientated leadership between different individuals providing increased efficiency (Waldersee & Eagleson, 1996), or complementing teams (Belbin, 1988), the natural “alignment” of an organization provided by distributed leadership (Senge, 1992), in this circumstance, would be in accordance with Godly principles at its mechanistic core.

Distributed leadership was common practise in the Bible.

As the task of governing Israel grew in complexity, part of the burden of leadership was transferred from Moses to a council of seventy elders (Num. 11:16-17). In the legal codes recorded in Deuteronomy, these elders were responsible for administering justice, sitting as judges in the city gate (Deut. 22:15), deciding cases affecting family life (Deut. 21:18-21, 22:13-21), and executing decisions (Deut. 19:11-13; 21:1-9).

As Paul and Barnabas established churches throughout Asia, Galatia and Cappadocia, they sought to distribute the workload among those that they identified as capable leaders. These leaders were appointed, not elected, and were referred to as the elders in the church, regardless of age.

Paul and Barnabas appointed elders for them in each church and, with prayer and fasting, committed them to the Lord, in whom they had put their trust. (Acts 14:23).

Transformational leadership

Jesus demonstrates in the calling of his disciples (Mat 4:18-22), the essential elements of transformational leadership. His purpose is to ensure that they receive all the training (professional development) that they need in order to achieve a pre-determined and specific end point. As their leader, he determines that it is essential to see to their training personally.

Come, I will make you fishers of men (Mat 4:19).

There is an immediate, and expected, task and relationship orientation that serves to provide the scaffold for transformational leadership. This example provides stark contrast to transactional leadership - there was no immediate personal reward for the disciples, who were asked to leave behind their families and their income, as recalled by Peter;

We have left everything to follow you! (Mark 10:28).

True to his word in the depiction of events that follow, Jesus focuses a great deal of energy into the development of the disciple and urges them to follow his example with others.

A principal in a Christian school must carefully plan and continuously evaluate both the end-point objectives for his or her school, and the processes by which staff can be professionally developed as a means to that end.

Autocratic leadership

Christianity is not a conditional arrangement. “No Lord!” is a contradiction in terms. Chapman (1998) describes a repentance of wilful acts of rebellion in deference to a single act of surrender. But whilst there is a general understanding that Christians are to submit to God as ultimate ruler, there can be more reluctance on their part to be subject to the authority of earthly leaders. Yet the Bible is clear and unequivocal on the responsibility of those who are being led to submit to those who have been appointed (by God) to lead them. There are no leaders, secular or Christian who are not appointed by God.

Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established (Rom 13:1).

A first impression, is that any Biblical directive for followers to submit to leaders must also, by logical extension, be a mandate for leaders to laud it over those who must submit to them. But this is a historical, rather than Biblical perspective. There is no scripture that reads, “force your subjects to obey you for you are the sole God-appointed authority and they do not possess leadership skills or leadership potential”. On the contrary, “a Biblical leader is a person with God-given capacity and God-given responsibility to influence a specific group of God’s people towards God’s purposes for the group” (Clinton, 1988, p. 197).

In fact, even as the Bible is directing all followers to be submissive towards leaders, there are indications of leader's ultimate accountability;

They keep watch over you as men who must give an account (Heb 13:17);

Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly (Jam 3:1).

This begs an important question. If God was aware of the nature of mankind, and if He knew that this fallen nature would produce the worst kind of autocratic leadership, despotism, then why does He allow these types of leaders to exist? The answer is recorded in the 1 Samuel 8; the people asked for an autocrat, and despite being warned by God of the consequences for His people of having that type of leader, they asked for one again.

And the Lord told him: "Listen to all that the people are saying to you; it is not you they have rejected, but they have rejected me as their king" (1Sam 8:7).

A self-centred autocratic style of leadership is not a Christian model of leadership. Whilst there are times when difficult decisions need to be made and an imperative that a leader must be supported by followers, he or she also has distinct responsibilities. Primarily, and ironically, the leader must have the mind and motives of a servant.

Jesus called them together and said, "You know that the rulers of the gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must first be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave (Mat 21:25-27).

Paternalistic leadership

God is a paternalistic leader. Indeed, there is a Biblical request to call Him “Father.” Jesus instructed all Christians to pray to their Father in heaven -

When you pray, go into your room and pray to your Father, who is unseen (Mat 6:6).

As his children, Christians are said to belong to Christ (Rom 1:6), or to the Lord (Rom 14:8; 1Cor 7:39). As father, God strengthens his children (Ps 66:10), rewards them (Ps 66:12), punishes them (Num 32:13), blesses them (Eze 34:26), rescues them (Eze 34:27), frees them from fear (Eze 34:28), cares for them (Na 1:7; 1Pet 5:7), comforts them (Ps 23:4; Zec 1:17). A Christian leader, in seeking to reflect the nature of Christ, must likewise seem to emulate the role of a compassionate parent in leadership.

There are clearly leaders in history who have successfully “taken up their cross” and led by example through compassion, service and love for those that they served. The people were urged to,

Remember your leaders who spoke the word of God to you. Consider the outcome of their way of life and imitate their faith (Heb 13:7).

It should be the aim of every Christian principal to consider that their faith, as reflected in their way of life, should be considered by those they lead as worthy of imitation.

Rather than a passively waiting for people to notice in the hope that they may watch and imitate, it is incumbent on a Christian school principal to take a proactive interest in their own development as godly men and women.

Jesus placed a preeminent emphasis on the importance of effective leadership in the continuing growth and expansion of God's kingdom. He provided the example for Barnabas, who in turn recognised the potential in Paul, who in turn developed the great promise shown by Timothy. Moses took great care to develop leadership in Caleb and Joshua (Deut 31, Num 13) and Samuel devoted himself to the protection and nurture of David (1 Sam 16; 19:18-24). Schools are not only in need of full time leaders, but leaders who are equipped to function at all levels (Clinton 1988, p. 196) and with a capacity to seek the will of God.

Paternalistic leadership, is most effective when consideration is given to the needs of the recipient. A potential future leader should be encouraged to examine his or her own life in terms of Godly parameters (1 Timothy 4: 6-7) before he or she acts as a model of Christian leadership for others.

Before committing to the process it is also important for the Christian leader to embark on some earnest and truthful self-examination around some important principles such as

-

- Is my leadership Christ centred? (John 15:5)
- Am I passionate enough to see the process through?
- Am I willing to listen in confidence and be there when needed?
- Can I afford to set time aside every few weeks?
- Am I prepared to be open and honest about my own failings and to take the responsibility for correction and admonishment where necessary? (Acts 20:31),
- Am I competent in the areas of spiritual life that a person is likely to wish to grow in and am I able to teach?
- Will prayer take a prominent place, (Mallison 1998, p.64-68).

Consultative leadership

God is willing to consult and to change plans in accordance with the arguments of men. God asks the question,

Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do? (Gen 18:17),

Yet, the answer to His question lies in God's own action. He decides to outline His plan for the destruction of the city of Sodom and then modifies the plan after accepting input and argument from Abraham. The leader (God) employs consultative leadership in not only considering the ideas of the led (Abraham), but taking them seriously to the point of superseding an original intended plan of action. Though consultative, God still reserves the ultimate responsibility for the final decision.

Consultative leadership is also the characteristic style of King Xerxes, though in this case, it has negative rather than positive consequences.

Since it was customary for the King to consult experts in matters of law and justice, he spoke with the wise men who understood the times and were closest to the King (Esther 1:13).

The King, in this case, was weak and in the habit of accepting advice rashly and without thought of consequence. Again, his style of leadership is visibly flawed when he accepts poor and self-seeking advice from Haman and hands him the royal seal for his personal use (Esther 3:10)

Democratic leadership

Whilst Australian Christian leaders in any field of endeavour have an obligation to the democratically elected government (Rom 13:1-2), and to this extent are bound to a democratic system, there is little Biblical evidence to justify the translation of this philosophy into the Christian school workplace.

Biblical leadership has more basis in appointment or birthright than in democracy. It is God's will that is the sole determinant of who will lead - It is God who "hires and fires." Samuel reminds King Saul that he has been appointed by God,

Has not the Lord anointed you leader over His inheritance (1 Sam10:1).

But when Saul incurs the wrath of God for not keeping His commandments, Samuel returns to announce that the days of Saul's leadership will end,

But now your kingdom will not endure; the Lord has sought out a man after His own heart and appointed him leader of his people, because you have not kept the Lord's command. (1 Sam13:14).

The Lord speaks directly to Joshua in appointing him to lead His people.

Be strong and courageous because you will lead these people to inherit the land I swore to their forefathers to give them" (Josh 1:6).

God appoints Christian leaders; they are not elected. God calls a leader, or potential leader to apply for a position. A Christian school council prays for God's will to be done and that He will make it clear to them who should be appointed to the position. The council appoints the principal. The principal follows the same process and employs the staff. Democracy is a process that is used to resolve issues where two or more prayerful

people reach different conclusions and a process that requires a resolution does not deliver a clear and immediate answer.

Collaborative leadership

Collaborative leadership is evident in practice in the descriptions of the early Christian church from the book of Acts.

Collaborative leadership is centred on the concept of working together to create a shared vision. In Acts, this is certainly evident.

Every day they continued to meet together in the temple courts. (Acts 2: 46), where,

They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and to the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer (Acts 2:42),

This sense of a developed corporate purpose, Senge (1992), is a functional result of a group of individuals who met with a commonality of purpose and a desire to create a shared vision as an extension and refinement of personal vision. A focus on the needs of the organization and on corporate vision is also an effective mechanism for the elimination of self centredness and consequent unhelpful competition among believers (Bridges, 1992).

The early church is not an isolated or curious case of collaborative leadership in action. The description serves as a model of right thinking when establishing and maintaining a Christian organization that seeks to be godly in its charter. This biblical mandate for a primary focus on corporate rather than individual vision is also expressed in Phillipians 2.

Do nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit, but in humility consider others better than yourselves. Each of you should look not only to your own interests, but also the interests of others” (Php 2:3-4).

Collaborative leadership, in a biblical sense, should take place within the confines of clear and distinctive boundaries. In a school context, the principal or even the school board may carry the mandate to set these boundaries. The conditions of group engagement for situations of collaborative leadership are clearly articulated:

Therefore as God’s chosen people, holy and dearly loved, clothe yourselves with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness and patience. Bear with each other and forgive whatever grievances you may have against one another (Col 3:12-13).

Situational Leadership

It is evident from the Bible, that God appointed different leaders for different situations.

When an historical situation required courageous leadership, God chose Joshua.

No one will be able to stand up against you all the days of your life (Josh 1:5).

When the situation required wisdom, subtlety and cunning, to save His people, He chose Esther.

If I have found favour with you, O King, and if it pleases your majesty, grant me my life – this is my petition. And spare my people – this is my request (Est 7:3)

When a situation required the ability to communicate with a variety of cultures (e.g. Jews and Gentiles) and to meld them into a cohesive Christian church, God appointed

Paul to the task. Paul's leadership and testimony to the gospel, takes considerable account of the context of the people he is seeking to influence. In the delivery of his message and the planting of the early church in the farming communities of Lystra and Derbe, Paul delivers the message of the gospel in a way that would be most meaningful to this community:

He (God) has shown kindness by giving you rain from heaven and crops in their seasons; he provides you with plenty of food and fills your hearts with joy (Acts 14:17).

He employs the same strategy of situational leadership in the religious community of Athens where he identifies their "unknown god".

Men of Athens! I see that in every way you are very religious (Acts 17:22)

Christian leaders are expected to have the capacity to recognise those situations, which would best suit their particular leadership capabilities, and to have a distinct sense of God's calling.

Principle Centred Leadership

There are inherent expectations in the form of predetermined principles, shaped after the character of God (Eph 5:1), which are to serve as a template and also a yard-stick for judgement.

It is chastening to consider that few should accept the responsibility for teaching, and even fewer, the responsibility for leading teachers:

Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly (Jam 2:1).

Christian leaders are not to let unwholesome talk come out of their mouths (Eph 4:29), or harbour bitterness, rage, anger, brawling, slander and malice (Eph 4:31). Instead, they are to be kind and compassionate to one another, forgiving each other, just as God forgave them (Eph 4:32). And this list is by no means exhaustive. The Bible exhorts the Christian leader to aspire to principled behaviour in thoughts words and deeds, and to be consistent in seeking to know and follow the will of God.

Servant Leadership

If there is one style of leadership that should be distinctively evident in a Christian school principal, it is servant leadership. Whilst there will be considerable variations among leaders in style and emphasis, leaders in Christian schools will not be judged as successful without the mindset and practice of a servant.

A “leader” who seeks position and power within an organisation to feed ego and ambition is of little use as a leader in the footsteps of Jesus. Rather,

Whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many (Mat 20: 26-28).

Christ also said that,

The greatest among you will be your servant (Mat 23:11).

Willis emphasises the essential nature of this mindset when referring to church leadership as a ministry that is exercised by pastors and church leaders who see themselves as servants of God’s church in deference to 2 Corinthians 4:5 (Willis, 1997).

Servant leadership, a seemingly enigmatic and contradictory juxtaposition of words, comes at a great cost in worldly terms. Jesus said that,

The man who loves his life will lose it, while the man who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life (John 12: 25).

Lambert (1997) outlines four characteristics essential for the servant leader. He contends that such a leader should be a,

- Humble Visionary - willingly prepared to undertake menial tasks and to show the deepest humility in providing assistance.
- Persevering Disturber - there is no paradox in being a servant, and at the same time, having ideas, making suggestions and urging change.
- Wise Persuader - able to pursue the ideal, to challenge the present, and to do so with such diplomacy as to convince others.
- Trusting Agent - Serving God first means to dedicate every part of our lives to him and trust Him to guide us.

Justice and Mercy

There is a popular misconception that at an Independent School, parents agree to accept a clearly stipulated code of behaviour for their children giving them little or no recourse when that code is violated and that this situation provides little or no latitude for dispute. In reality, whilst accepting a general principle that applies to all students, parents often challenge decisions (even clear cut and obvious ones) when they result in disciplinary action involving their own child.

An illustration of this difficulty might be a conflict situation involving the bullying of child A by child B and child C. If “Christian compassion” is shown towards child B, taking merciful account of factors such as the student’s genuine remorse, cooperative parents, recent family turmoil and a former clean slate, it is likely that B’s parents will

be full of praise for the Christian witness of the merciful Headmaster. The parents of child C, on the other hand may view any differential treatment of their child (who had committed the same crime), as unjust and unmerciful. In the meantime, the parents of the victim, child C, may be so incensed at the “unjust” mercy the principal has shown that they challenge the Christian integrity of the principal and the school.

Gagen (1997) reports that conflict over student behaviour and how to manage such behaviour is a constant source of stress among administrators in any school. In Christian schools, the analysis and criticism of the strength of a principal’s personal faith in action provides a significant added complication to an already difficult situation.

Authentic Leadership

Whilst style is an important consideration for a principal to consider and the ability to adapt to different situations is a desirable capacity to embrace, compromise should only be considered to the extent that the leader is consistent within preconsidered boundaries that define his or her character and beliefs. Authentic leadership embodies an honesty, integrity, and consistency that will keep the principal closely aligned with the core values of the organisation such that staff are clear in their minds regarding the direction for the future and are willing to commit and contribute to their school and their students’ success.

Leadership is much more than an instinctive reaction to events. The role of principal in a school requires a willingness to assume responsibility for the effective education of students and the well being and professional development of staff. A leader should operate within the confines of certain pre-dispositions and attitudinal paradigms that will effectively shape, or at least contribute to, the schools philosophy and ethics. He or she must also be able to operate within the boundaries of the schools core beliefs and demonstrate a capacity for adaption but only within the confines of ethical compromise. In order to effectively lead, it is imperative therefore that the principal be aware of the

beliefs that govern personal leadership practices. Leadership style is a fundamental personality characteristic that can be developed and adapted within the confines of authenticity. An effective leader should regularly revisit personal assumptions and analyse responses to ensure that leadership actions are consistent with leadership ethics.

For a leader in a Christian school, ultimate authenticity encompasses leadership style and practice that endeavours to most closely seek and fulfill the purposes of God for the school, often at the expense of personal glory and ambition. Solomon, that great king who built the temple and was regarded as fabulously wealthy and wise, lamented the worthlessness of great achievements that sought to glorify himself and excluded God.

I undertook great projects: I built houses for myself and planted vineyards. I made gardens and parks and planted all kinds of fruit trees in them. I made reservoirs to water groves of flourishing trees ... Yet when I surveyed all the work that my hands had done and what I had toiled to achieve, everything was meaningless, a chasing after the wind; nothing was gained under the sun (Ecc 2:4-11).

2.3.3 Expected leadership characteristics of the Head of Science.

2.3.3.1 Role too onerous

The established trend in the decline of quality of candidature for principals' positions in government and Catholic schools is mirrored in applications for the position of Head of Science (Ramsey, 2000). Palmer (2001, p. 8) reports that the response to a Head Teacher Development Project had "touched a nerve" in every district. It reported that the workload expected of these middle managers in schools needed revision so that more time could be devoted to balancing curriculum and teaching expertise with leadership and administrative responsibilities. Logically, if frustration is being experienced by

Science Heads and expressed to the teachers in their care, the staffroom climate will not be conducive to encouraging others to apply for the position.

2.3.3.2 General Requirements

Given the complexity of the principal's leadership tasks, it is not surprising that alarm has been raised over the lack of time that is devoted to the selection and evaluation of middle management and other senior leadership positions in the school. Hawkes (1992) is one principal who regards this lack of priority as surprising, given the crucial role that Heads of Department play in the school. He emphasizes the necessity to "fashion a clear job description for the purposes of both selection and ongoing evaluation" (Hawkes, 1992, p. 42). The Palmer project quotes extensive research into the Head Teacher position, stating that there are fourteen common leadership domains. They are,

- Instructional leadership.
- Curriculum management. Hawkes (1992, p. 42) emphasizes that the head teacher should be an "accomplished educational ambassador" with sound interest in their subject area.
- Cultural leadership.
- School planning.
- Performance management.
- School leadership.
- Faculty leadership. Hawkes (1992) expands this aspect as an organizational and administrative capacity for areas such as course development, assessment, budgeting and resourcing.
- Team management. Ritz (1981), adds emphasis to this aspect by arguing that any list of leadership characteristics is in fact superseded by the importance of the development of interpersonal relationships and communication.
- Staff welfare. Ritz (1981) also includes the faculty head's own personal relationship style and ability to build and reinforce positive relationships Hawkes (1992).

- Community communication. Hawkes (1992, p.44), notes that it is necessary for Heads of department to have the skills to effectively deal with parents, who are increasingly “stepping over the demilitarized zone of the front gate to question teachers on educational policies and practice.”
- Teaching. Hawkes (1992) sees the effective head of department as an energetic classroom practitioner.
- Student behaviour management (Hawkes, 1992).
- Personal professional development.
- Personal reflective practice (Palmer, 2001, p. 10). This includes the capacity to “model professional dress, integrity, language and writing skills, punctuality and co-curricular involvement” Hawkes (1992, p. 42).

The complexity of the role of faculty head is increased by the supervisory role that they are expected to perform. Whilst staff are aware that some accountability is required, close supervision causes resentment and challenges the ideology of professionalism (Connell, 1985, p. 129). A Science Head who is not managing this aspect of the role effectively can expect conflict with staff (Blumberg, 1974). The situation is exacerbated by disparate views held on the nature of the role of Science Head between the incumbent and supervised staff (Ritz et al, 1981) and can cause “entrenchment and unresponsiveness” (Ramsey, 2000, p. 87). This is particularly true when a successful candidate for the position of Head of department has to cope with a member of the same faculty (close cohesive group), who had applied for the same position, not succeeded and may be feeling “stuck.” (Brooker & Mulford, 1989; Hawkes, 1992; Littleford, 2001). Conversely, if well managed, there will be the creation and maintenance of an effective subgroup within the school, the faculty, where the “lost” feeling of staff in an often large community, is countered by close friendships and non-threatening professional development, Hawkes (1992). Bolin (1989), alerts teachers wanting to accept further responsibility to the misnomer that their strength depends on another person’s weakness or lack of status reflected in comments such as “forget what you have learned in University” (Ramsey, 2000, p. 87).

In addition to the general requirements of faculty heads, the Science Head is also required to lead and manage in several subject specific areas. There are the added responsibilities of managing the laboratory assistant, ordering specialized equipment and awareness of policies and procedures pertaining to specific areas of potential liability such as Chemical safety and First aid.

There is also the “declining international interest in Science” (Harrison, 2002, p. 3), brought about, in part, by the perceived lack of stimulating investigations, collection of data, and interpreting of results as opposed to knowledge transfer (Harrison, 2002). An attempt is being made to redress this trend in Australian schools by an endeavour to develop a more “outcomes based experiential approach” (Holden, 2002, p. 6). Science is also viewed as increasingly irrelevant (Dearn, 2002) and unrelated to the student’s world around them (Hackling et al, 2001). The situation is not helped by the fact that “primary schools are often under resourced with Science equipment” (Di Stefano, 2002, p. 52) so that students are given minimal practical Science experiences in the formative years of their education.

2.3.3.3 Specific Requirements

The Science Head in a Christian school may also expect an additional set of responsibilities, not dissimilar to those of the principal, including the preservation of a unique, and sometimes quite specific philosophy or identity. It has been argued that a Science Head in a Christian school begins with an impossible role by trying to combine two concepts that are incompatible (Martin, 1997). Modernist thought has challenged Christian beliefs such as,

(God as), the pillar and the foundation of truth (1 Tim 3:15)

All scripture is God breathed and useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness (2 Tim 3:16),

Mohler, in Hastie, (2003) describes modernism as the belief that only those things that can be proved or disproved by the application of Science are truths of substance – all other supposed truth is speculation. In this circumstance then, a Science head in a Christian school faces the expectation of Christian faithfulness, or,

Being sure of what we hope for and certain of what we do not see (Heb 11:4),

This must in some way be aligned with a modernist scientific view that what cannot be empirically shown and demonstrated can never be really seen as truth. Such a position must naturally exclude applicants with a postmodernist mindset also. The postmodern view that there is “no such thing as authoritative, objective truth” (Mohler, in Hastie, 2003, p. 4) is anathema to both Christian and modernist (Scientific) world views.

There will also be tension over matters of substance. Evolution, for instance, may be challenged by the school community (Osif, 1997), compromised by a school board insisting that it be “presented as theory rather than fact” (MacKenzie, 2000, p. 37) or resisted by Science staff.

2.3.3.4 Relationship with the Principal

A Science Head will need to have the capacity to work closely with the principal in the knowledge that the relationship that develops will be quite unique (Marlow, 1999), especially in regard to curriculum development. As intimated previously, the principal striving to reflect strong Christian views (including anti-evolutionary views) of parents through ideological reinforcement of a home-school bond is therefore bound by his or her responsibilities for ideological surveillance of staff. Due to the nature of the position

of Science Head, it is likely that much of the principal's focus will be directed towards this position.

2.3.4 The reality of leadership and expectations of applicants.

2.3.4.1 Realities for Principals

Regardless of the theory of leadership, practical research into the actual time spent on different tasks by the school principal can often paint a different (and somewhat more realistic) picture of the role.

An *Educare News* article published in April 1997 recorded that independent school principals were focussed in reality on the following activities (in order of time spent),

1. Internal Administration
2. Representing the school at official meetings or in the community
3. Responding to questions from state or regional education officials
4. Talking with parents
5. Discussing education objectives with teachers
6. Initiating curriculum revision and / or planning
7. Professional Development activities
8. Hiring and training teachers
9. Teaching including preparation (Primary)

2.3.5.2 Realities for Science Heads

Palmer reports that many head teachers are feeling “stuck in their current positions” and that there is a disparity between the attention focussed on principals in the gaining of transitional skills when moving from management to leadership roles and the “scant attention given to developing Head teachers” (Palmer, 2001, p. 8). Often, this inertia will lead to backward professional growth and cynicism. There can no longer be an assumption “that Head teachers will absorb all that is necessary to lead a department,

simply by being led for a number of years themselves”, Hawkes (1992, p. 42). This principal adds that it is possible for some teachers to have crammed into a shorter time span “much more professional development and creativity and effective teaching than those whose staff photographs are yellowing with age on their notice-boards.” There are also stresses that are unique to the head teacher role such as the disparity between aspiration and the realities of the role and differing perceptions of what the role is or could be (Palmer, 2001). There is a need to “identify and nurture potential school leaders” (Palmer, 2001, p. 10) set against a reality of a “lack of planning and poorly managed professional development programs” for leaders (Ramsay, 2000, p. 87)

2.4 SUMMARY

The literature review has established that there are specific educational outcomes, unique to Christian schools which relate to the nature of Christian beliefs and the subsequent expectations of those who govern and lead schools for those who are charged with the responsibility of educating students there.

The types of specific educational outcomes that may be expected were then researched along with the particular expected characteristics of principals who lead such Christian institutions. Characteristics of principals suited to lead such organisations were examined in terms of personal leadership style, (as outlined in educational literature), the requirements of independent schools (based on literature and research) and models of Christian leadership (as presented in the Bible and by Bible commentators).

A similar research exercise was conducted for Science Heads.

An examination of literature highlighted the need for research data, particularly for those who are considering leadership in schools based on a Christian philosophy. There was notably a lack of research on the gap between the expectations of prospective leaders and the realities of the positions that they would be applying for.

Chapter Four will establish the research methodology to determine the extent of the understanding of prospective applicants for Headship or Science Faculty leadership by comparing their responses to the realities articulated by incumbents.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Expectations: When a person is appointed to a position of leadership in any organization, there are tacit or implicit expectations of the philosophy, competence and leadership skills of the appointee by those responsible for the selection decision. The leader will also have personal expectations of what is required of him or her in order to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the position that they have been selected for. Prospective leaders in turn have expectations of what skills and philosophical frameworks would be required in order for them to successfully lead an organization.

In schools based on a Christian philosophy, the main positional leader is the Head of the School or Principal. Those who select the Principal and are responsible for his or her ethical conduct and leadership effectiveness are the governing body of the school or Council. Prospective Heads are normally identified as Deputy Heads, Vice Principals, Directors of Curriculum or other senior managers in a school.

In this research, Principals were asked to identify and contact experienced members of Council from their school who would be willing to participate in articulating personal or corporate expectations that they had for the leader of their organization. Questions were drawn from the literature review of expectations that may be specific to Christian schools (such as whether the school should be an evangelistic agency), from the review of literature on leadership characteristics and style (such as what specific style is expected) and to expand concepts and ideas that Christian schools collectively say uniquely about themselves in promotional materials and on websites (such as the promotion of “servant leadership” and the development of a “Christian world view”).

Principals were also asked to outline the expectations that they had for the position, prior to taking up the role and whilst they were the incumbent.

Prospective Principals were then asked the same questions to more clearly understand what they were expecting in the role of Principal, should an offer ever eventuate.

Realities: The Principal is best placed to comment on the realities that are faced in the leadership of the school. Principals were asked to comment on those aspects of the role that consumed most of their time and on how the leadership role is changing, particularly in regard to educational commentary reflected in the literature review on any increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty. They were asked to comment on how the realities of the role differed from their expectations of what would be required before they commenced.

Council members and prospective Heads were also asked about their understanding of the realities that may be faced by the Head.

Science Coordinators: Science Coordinators were asked about the expectations that they held for the role before taking it up. They were then asked to compare these expectations to the realities that they faced.

Council members were asked questions to establish their expectations of Science Coordinators in the knowledge that it is actually the Principal to whom the Science Coordinator is directly responsible. Principals were asked for their expectations of their Science Coordinators and to share insights into the realities that they may face. Prospective Science Coordinators were also asked about their own understanding of the requirements of the position and how they envisage that the reality may differ from their expectations.

Delineating Characteristics: What makes a Christian school Christian? Before commencing the interviews, it was important to establish those things that Christian schools say about themselves that are distinctive from what non-Christian (secular) schools say about themselves. Such information is available from statements of expectations and exit outcomes on prospectus materials and websites. Key statements and phrases were identified and included in the interview questions. The process allowed for cross validation by considering any alignment between advertised expectations and realities (in a general sense for Christian schools) with those espoused by Principals and Science Heads at the selected schools as observed in situ.

3.2 WEB SITE/PROSPECTUS SURVEY

This survey was carried out on public schools (schools that do not explicitly espouse a Christian philosophy), and independent schools based on a Christian philosophy. Desirable outcomes for students were sorted and grouped in order to determine the features that delineated the latter group. These stated differences were then included in the interviews conducted with key stakeholders. Schools were chosen by selecting rural towns or cities from a map of Australia and looking at websites; selecting those who had a vision or mission statement.

Schools based on a Christian philosophy are all independent or systemic non-government schools. In effect, they are all only partially funded by governments and therefore all charge parents a tuition and service fee for students enrolled at the school. Given that all of these schools cost parents a relatively high tuition fee in comparison with government schools, it stands to reason that there must be distinguishing features that are expected in such schools and that at least some of these distinguishing features centre around an explicit Christian foundation.

A Web Site/Prospectus survey collated the expected student outcomes and distinguishing features of schools using statements that they identified and published

about themselves – their own aims and objectives in these areas as described in Mission Statements. The survey was then used to inform questions asked at interview that centre on participants’ anticipated expectations and realities experienced, as they regard these stated delineating aspects of Christian schools.

3.3 INTERVIEWS OF SCHOOLS’ STAKEHOLDERS

It was originally anticipated that interviews would be conducted at five independent schools based on a Christian philosophy.

Representatives of five target groups were to be interviewed to gauge expectations and realities for the roles of Principal and Science head. The target groups were –

- Governors
- Principals
- Prospective Principals
- Science Heads
- Prospective Science Heads

Selection criteria

1. **Governors:** Principals were contacted and asked to identify experienced governors who would have a clear understanding and the ability to articulate their expectations for leadership at the school.
2. **Principals:** Principals were selected on the basis of having been newly appointed to the position. Each was selected on the basis of having been in the position for least six months on the premise that they had an opportunity to evaluate the realities of the expectations of the position. Each was also selected on the condition of having been in the position for no longer than six years on the premise of a reasonable possibility that they could recall personal and governance expectations before commencing service.

3. **Prospective Principals:** Identified by Principals from among senior staff
4. **Science Coordinators:** Science Coordinators were also selected on the basis of having been newly appointed to the position. Each was selected on the basis of having been in the position for least six months on the premise that they had an opportunity to evaluate the realities of the expectations of the position. Each was also selected on the condition of having been in the position for no longer than six years on the premise of a reasonable possibility that they could recall personal and the Principal's expectations before commencing service. (One interviewee had actually been in service at the school for eight years but could clearly recall his initial expectations for the position and so his responses were included)
5. **Prospective Science Coordinators:** Identified by Principals from among experienced Science staff.

Expansion of the sample size

Logistically, it soon became apparent that the plan for restricting the sample size to five schools was flawed. The prospect of locating a school with governors who were willing to participate (or Heads willing to have governors participate), a new Head, a prospective Head, a new Science Head and a prospective Science Head was difficult in one instance, let alone replicating it another four times.

In the end, eleven independent school Heads agreed to participate. Some provided governors, others Science Coordinators etc. The collective effect was an added depth and richness to the data collected. Data were collected from –

- Eight governors
- Seven Heads
- Ten prospective Heads
- Six Science coordinators
- Five prospective Science coordinators

All prospective interviewees were given a copy of the questions beforehand and a copy of Ethics Statement below. Their receipt of this document was verified at the interview.

3.4 ETHICAL ISSUES

A document including the following six points was provided to all interviewees before the interview.

1. There will be an opportunity for verification and validation of responses – each respondent will be able to check a transcript of the meeting as a true and accurate record.
2. The research will not serve as a comparison of schools.
3. The research will make no judgement on educational “systems” or types of school.
4. It will not measure the effectiveness of individual principals, governors or heads of department – all responses will be aggregated and no direct links will be made between individuals for any one school.
5. Names of schools or individuals will not be published nor will they be made available to other interested parties. Pseudonyms will be used for schools and individuals if required.
6. This statement, along with the title and purpose of the research will be made available to all participants.

3.5 FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

Voice recognition software was the initial choice for recording interviews. Trialing of the software showed that the method would be cumbersome as it recognized the interviewer but had difficulty interpreting the interviewee. Attempts to reverse the recognition and focus on the interviewee required time to train the software to recognize

a new voice and also proved problematic, both for the quality of the product and the extra time required for a busy interviewee.

Three methods were used for the recording of responses.

1. In some instances the interview was recorded on paper and the notes taken checked by the interviewee for accuracy at the end of each question.
2. In most instances, the interview was recorded by typing responses onto a laptop template and notes taken checked by the interviewee for accuracy at the end of each question.
3. In a few instances where direct contact was problematic, such as separation by considerable distance, responses were emailed. No alterations were made to emailed responses.
4. In a few instances where direct contact was problematic, such as separation by considerable distance, responses were given over the telephone. In these cases, responses were read back to the interviewee over the telephone for verification.

3.6 INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND RATIONALE

This section lists the questions that were asked of governors, Principals, prospective Principals, Science coordinators and prospective Science coordinators. Questions that were asked are printed in italics and the rationale for each question given immediately thereafter in normal print.

3.6.1 Interview Questions for Governors

Questions are recorded in italics with rationale in normal type:

1. *What are three chief expectations that you have of the Head of your school?*

The purpose of this question was to gather a potentially lengthy response into three (or less) essential expectations. Thus, the culmination of responses from all participants allowed for focus on those expectations thought most pivotal.

2. *How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?*

Depending on the nature of the open responses to the question above, this question provided an opportunity for the respondent to delineate what makes a school essentially Christian. (If responses to Q1. did not mention anything about a Christian dimension to leadership, it was anticipated that the answer to Q2. Would be, “They don’t.”

3. *What other areas are important in the role of Head of school?*

This is an extension of Q1. It was an opportunity to add any other main expectation.

4. *What is your understanding of the term Servant Leadership?*

This question was drawn from the web-site/prospectus survey. The term “servant leadership” is a common delineating statement for schools based on a Christian philosophy. Servant leadership is also a common term used in literature describing Christian leadership and Christian schools (see Literature Review – Chapter 2).

5. *What is a Christian World view and how should a Head seek to develop it?*

This question was also drawn from the web-site/prospectus survey. The term “Christian world view” is also a common delineating statement for schools based on a Christian philosophy. Given its common use, it would stand to reason that a governor would be able to clarify its meaning and have a view on how a Head would seek to develop it.

6. *Some Christian schools emphasise Compassion for others, Servant Leadership, the development of a Christian world view and maturity in faith. What is the importance of each of these outcomes?*

This question gathers “servant leadership” from Q.5 and “Christian world view” from Q.6 and adds a third distinctive from promotional material and outcomes for Christian schools, the development of a “maturity in faith.” It also takes the concept of “Compassion for others,” one term used more frequently (but not distinctively) in Christian school literature and seeks to arrange these concepts in a relative order of importance.

7. *Should the school be an evangelistic agency?*

Several authors in the Literature Review (Chapter Two) discussed schools based on a Christian philosophy as being “evangelistic agencies.” This question explores the interpretation and understanding of the term and whether it is an important consideration for implementation.

8. *What would be the leadership style that you would expect from the Head?*

The literature review highlighted the importance of the consideration of leadership style for Heads of Christian schools and particularly the responsibility of governance in considering this characteristic before and during the selection process for the Head.

9. *How should the Head manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?*

The importance of a position on the Creation – Evolution debate was also highlighted by authors in the literature review, even if it is a deliberate strategy of favouring both or neither.

10. *What three major areas consume most of the Head’s time?*

As with the first question which provided an opportunity to outline expectations the purpose of this question was to gather a potentially lengthy response into three (or less) areas that consume the Heads time as an expression of the realities faced in the position. Thus, the culmination of responses from all participants allowed for focus on those perceptions of realities most commonly shared.

11. *How would the role of the Head be different to that of a Science Coordinator?*

In focussing on the difference between the role of the Head and the role of the Science coordinator it was anticipated that this question would provide further insights (expectations and realities) into both the role of the Head and the role of the Science Coordinator.

12. *It has been stated by researchers that the role of Head is facing increasing “complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty.” How accurate is this statement?*

This question used a direct quote from the literature review which summarised the statements of several authors about the changing face of the role of the Principal.

3.6.2 Interview Questions for Heads (Principals)

In the following sections, some questions are same as those asked of governance and are, therefore, not repeated. A rationale for questions 2, 4-7 and 15-19 is omitted for this reason. A rationale is provided where the reason for the question is different from that given in section 3.6.1.

Questions are recorded in italics with rationale in normal type:

1. What are three chief expectations that School governors have of the Head of school?

This question was set to provide the reverse perspective from the first question in the previous section and to allow direct comparison of answers.

3. Are these expectations the same or different from other stakeholders such as the church, parents staff and students?

This question, along with the question following allows the Head to articulate the expectations, and differences in expectations, held by the key stakeholders that he/she has daily interaction with.

8. How is the role of Head changing?

This question is related to commentary in the literature review on the changing nature of Headship and the increasing complexity of the role. It allows for a more open-ended response than the more specific question nineteen in this section.

9. Before beginning the role, what were your expectations of the role of being a Head of a school and is the reality different?

This is the pivotal question for this research project – Leadership in schools based on a Christian philosophy: Expectations and Realities.

10. If the reality is different, what were the three biggest surprises?

This question is quantified to limit responses so that collation of answers from the group of respondents can focus on the central issues. If the answer was in the affirmative to the question above, this question was asked as, “What were the

three biggest surprises?” If the answer was in the negative above, this question was omitted.

11. As the school changes in size, are there different priorities for the Head?

This question is related to commentary in the literature review on the changing nature of Headship and the increasing complexity of the role. It allows for a more open-ended response than the more specific question nineteen in this section, but this time allows changes in priorities to be couched in terms of change in size. Whilst the term “changes in size” was anticipated to indicate growth, it is interesting that some Heads, due to their specific context, interpreted the question to also include reduction in size.

12. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?

Whilst giving some insight into the role of the Head, this question was more specifically intended to give an insight into the expectations that the Head has for the role of the Science coordinator.

13. What are prospective Heads at your school doing now that will prepare them for the role of Head?

This question served also to gauge the extent to which prospective Heads are allowed an insight into the role of Head so as to realistically prepare them for a narrowing of the gap between their own expectations and the reality of the position.

14. What different knowledge or activity would be helpful in preparing you for the role?

In considering what activities prospective Heads are currently undergoing in order to better prepare for Headship, it was thought important to also consider what other activities would be important. The responses in this question can then be compared to the activities currently being undertaken by prospective Heads and those activities that they would feel would be of benefit when they are asked the same questions from their perspective.

20. What are three chief expectations that you have of the Science Coordinator?

This question is to gauge whether the Head sees the role of Science coordinator as different to that of other Heads of faculty at the school. If the role is seen as

different, it provides a contained response so that the main expectations can be collected and collated from the pool of responses.

21. In what ways are your expectations of a Science head different to those of other Heads of department?

This question was not asked if the response to question twenty indicated that the role of Science coordinator was no different to the role of other coordinators.

22. How should the Science Coordinator manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?

This question addressed the issue raised in a substantial section of the literature review.

23. What percentage of time should a Science Head devote to the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?

This question endeavoured to quantify time in the three main areas of a Science coordinator's role so as to gauge the Head's understanding of the Science coordinator's reality.

3.6.3 Interview Questions for Prospective Heads (Principals)

In this section, some questions are same as those asked in previous sections and are, therefore, not repeated. A rationale for questions 1-4 and 12-22 is omitted for this reason.

Questions are recorded in italics with rationale in normal type:

5. What other areas are important in the role of Head of school?

Whilst there would be elements of observed realities in this response, particularly if the Head has an inclusive style that provides quality feedback to a prospective Head or if the prospective Head had been in the role of Acting Head for a time, it was anticipated that there would be differences between the prospective Head's expectation and the Head's reality.

6. How would you best describe your leadership style? Would this style change if you took on Headship?

This question allows for a description of style and a consideration of how style may change in light of their anticipated expectations of what would be required in role of Head. It was anticipated that the respondent would have another opportunity to think through the implications of Headship and what may be expected by imagining changes, if necessary, to their own style if they were placed in that position.

7. What three major areas consume most of the Head's time?

It would be most accurate to consider the answers of a prospective Head to this question as their expected realities.

8. How is the role of Head changing?

Again, answers of a prospective Head would be expected realities.

9. As the school changes in size, are there different priorities for the Head?

Again, answers of a prospective Head would be expected realities.

10. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?

It was anticipated that prospective Heads should have clear expectations for both these positions – one that they aspire to and the other that they will lead (and possibly do provide leadership for already).

11. What are you doing now that will prepare you for the role of Head?

This question served also to gauge the extent to which prospective Heads are allowed an insight into the role of Head so as to realistically prepare them for a narrowing of the gap between their own expectations and the reality of the Head's position.

3.6.4 Interview Questions for Science Coordinators

In this section, some questions are same as those asked in previous sections and are, therefore, not repeated. A rationale for questions 4-9, 11-12 and 15-18 is omitted for this reason.

Questions are recorded in italics with rationale in normal type:

1. What are three chief expectations that you have of the Head of your school?

This question will bring a middle management perspective to the expectations that key stakeholders have of the Head.

2. What are three chief expectations that the Head of your school has of you?

The Head's expectations, in this context, become the Science coordinator's realities.

3. How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?

This question was framed to determine what expectations would be specific to leading this faculty in a Christian context.

10. Before beginning the role, what were your expectations of the role of being a Science Coordinator at a school and is the reality different?

This time in the context of a Science coordinator, this is the key question for the research.

13. In what ways would the expectations that the Head would have of a Science Coordinator be different to those of other Heads of department?

Differences between Head's responses to this question and Science coordinator's responses, if significant, would reveal that one of the realities a Science coordinator has to face would be an incomplete understanding of his or her role from the leader of the organisation.

14. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?

This question seeks new information on an important part of this research project, one for which there is little, if any, previous research. (See Literature review section 2.4)

3.6.5 Interview Questions for prospective Science Coordinators

In this section, some questions are same as those asked in previous sections and are, therefore, not repeated. A rationale for question 17 is included to highlight the importance of considering a prospective applicant's perception.

Questions are recorded in italics with rationale in normal type:

17. What percentage of time should a Science Head devote to the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?

This final question allows the prospective Science coordinator to compare expectations for how time will be spent in the role of Science coordinator to how time should be spent. Both are expectations although the latter provides an opportunity for the respondent to consider how his or her reality may be ideally different.

3.6.6 Two unanticipated outcomes

After the commencement of the interviews, two patterns of responses caused the modification of the interview questions thereafter. Both were unanticipated.

“I’m not really sure I should be a Head”

On two occasions, Heads responded that there had been such a gulf between their expectations for what would be required in the position and the realities that they faced, that they felt that they had made a poor career decision in accepting the extra responsibility. This was an unanticipated outcome.

“It’s nice that the Head has identified me as a prospective Head, but I can assure you that I have no intentions of taking on such an onerous role.”

On two occasions in the early interviews of prospective Heads, it became apparent that two well regarded and, by all accounts, quite competent people who certainly could have been considered worthy candidates for Headship, both indicated that they were flattered by their nomination to be interviewed but that they intended to remain forever as “prospective” Heads.

Two additional questions

It was clear that there were distinct realities in the minds of Heads that had been unanticipated and unexpected when they were considering the position. It was also clear that there were distinct prohibitive expectations (no doubt based on observed realities of issues faced by their “boss”) that were hindering competent professional leaders and potential Heads, as identified by current Heads, from considering Headship as worthy of pursuit.

Two questions were, therefore, added for future interviews. There was no reservation from almost all respondents that there were characteristics of the role of Head that provided apprehension and malediction whether these are realities faced by an incumbent or perceptions by a prospect. The purpose of the first question, therefore, was to identify the single noble reason for leading a school that would compel one through the cloying morass. The second was to identify the single biggest hindrance to progress that would so stifle a burgeoning professional career. These were worthy and informative questions to ask – both to confident and cheerless Heads; both to assured and apprehensive prospective Heads.

Additional Question 1. *Give one compelling reason why a prospective Head should take up the position of Head.*

Additional Question 2. *Give one compelling reason why a prospective Head should not take up the position of Head.*

3.7 SUMMARY

The research was framed and advised by analysis of relevant literature and research and the consideration of what schools said about themselves on websites and in prospectus information. On the basis of this information, questions were constructed for Governors,

Heads, prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators in order to determine the differences between expectations and realities for the roles of Head and Science Coordinator for schools based on a Christian philosophy.

The results of the Website/Prospectus survey and the collation and summary of the results of interviews of incumbents and prospective applicants are documented in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER 4

COLLATION AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION.

Whilst the initial intent of the research was to collect data from five schools based on a Christian philosophy, it was clear in the early stages that there were a number of schools who had incumbents in the position of Head or Science Head who did not fit the criteria of “new.” There was also a dearth of staff members who could be identified as “prospective” candidates for the position of Head or of Science Head, particularly the latter. In the end, eleven schools were contacted and offered staff to be interviewed, most organising multiple interviews.

The consequence of a broader sweep was access to 36 people for interview across a wide variety of schools based on a Christian philosophy. Types of schools varied from systemic denominational schools, to stand alone denominational and non-denominational Christian schools; co-educational to single sex; high fee (\$20,000 p.a.) to low fee (\$4,000 p.a.); established schools (100 years plus) to new schools (five years old); urban and rural schools.

In almost all cases, interviews were conducted in person. Where this was an inconvenient arrangement for an interviewee, they were conducted as second preference over the phone or finally by email.

Of the 36 responses, eight were from current governors, seven were from Heads, ten from those identified by the Head of the school as “prospective Heads”, six were from Science Coordinators and five from those identified by the Head of school as a “Prospective Science Coordinator”.

During the course of the first few interviews, it became clear that a number of the persons nominated by the Head of the school as prospective future applicants for the position of Head or Science Coordinator indicated that, whilst they were flattered to be nominated by the Head, there were a number of reasons why they were not interested in promotion. These responses prompted the addition of two survey questions for the other people interviewed: *Give one compelling reason why a person should become a Head?* And, *Give one compelling reason why a person should not become a Head?* These two questions were replicated in those interviewed regarding the position of Science Coordinator.

Following this introduction, there are three other sections in this Chapter:

4.2 Web Site Survey Results – a survey of school website mission statements which was used in the next section to distinguish those features that made independent schools based on a Christian philosophy different from other schools on the basis of the things that schools said about themselves.

4.3 Analysis of Web Site Survey Results - an analysis of the Website survey of Mission Statements that was conducted prior to the formulation of the questions that were used in the interviews of school personnel. The survey sought to determine those features of an independent school based on a Christian philosophy that would make it different to a government school. These delineating features which were identified were then used as the basis of questions for interview. The collection of data in the website survey and its subsequent analysis was conducted as a prelude to the formulation of questions for the interviews.

4.4 Expectations and realities for the Head – common themes and interpretations about the role of the Head were drawn together from the opinions and experiences of school personnel.

4.5 Expectations and realities for the Science Coordinator – common themes and interpretations about the role of the Science Coordinator were drawn together from the opinions and experiences of school personnel.

The opinions and experiences of the collation and summary of interview responses in sections 4.4 and 4.5 were then used to form conclusions in the final chapter, Chapter Five, about the expectations and realities of the leadership of Principals and Science Heads in schools based on a Christian philosophy.

4.2 WEBSITE SURVEY RESULTS

Mission statements were collected from 30 Independent schools based on a Christian Philosophy to summarise those things that they said about themselves as being differentiators from other schools. The term “Mission statement” was used to broadly describe statements of purpose, vision statements, values statements, school commitments, school aims and school goals. Each mission statement was then subdivided into key terms or phrases. The absence of a term from a mission statement does not necessarily mean that that characteristic is absent from a school or system, simply that it is not included in the mission statement.

These key terms or phrases were then used to map the mission statements of government schools. It was anticipated that the use of terms familiarly used in independent schools (such as Christian philosophy), may not appear in government school mission statements. When typical independent school terms are used to map government schools it may, therefore, be anticipated that government schools will have a significantly lower percentage for areas (such as a Christian emphasis) where that result would be entirely in keeping with expected outcomes. Lower percentages for government schools in areas where independent schools are high are therefore not necessarily any reflection on the relative strengths of mission statements, or nobility of goals, but emphasise the intent of the survey – to sample what schools from the two systems say about themselves and to separate those delineating characteristics that are notable in independent schools based on a Christian philosophy.

Those things that independent schools based on a Christian philosophy said about themselves which were unique or significant in comparison to government schools were then taken as delineating statements that could be included in the survey of governors, Heads, prospective Heads, Science coordinators and prospective Science coordinators in schools based on a Christian philosophy. The results are interpreted in Chapter Five.

4.2.1 Presentation of data

The following is an explanation of the presentation of data. Each mission statement was separated into its constituent component goals. The total number of schools who saw that goal as part of their mission was then presented out of a total (possible) of 30 schools. The number out of thirty was then presented as a percentage. The raw data were then presented in the next line with each number 1 – 30 representing a school. For instance, if school 20, an independent protestant or catholic school viewed the pursuit of academic excellence in a balanced environment, then the number 20 would appear under both goals in the raw data (see below).

Synopsis –

| Goal from statements | Schools with that goal / Total schools | % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---|
| Individual schools from the survey with that goal (coded one to thirty) | | |

4.2.2 Independent Protestant or Catholic Schools

Mission statements promoted –

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Academic potential | 8/30 | 27% |
| 8. 11. 14. 17. 20. 21. 22. 24. | | |
| Academic rigour (excellence) | 10/30 | 33% |
| 2. 5. 7. 15. 17. 19. 20. 23. 24. 28. | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Balanced development | 3/30 | 10% |
| 1. 20. 25. | | |
| A caring environment (community) | 9/30 | 30% |
| 4. 5. 8. 16. 18. 20. 22. 24. 30. | | |
| A caring personality | 4/30 | 13% |
| 4. 24. 25. 26. | | |
| Change (ability to accept, respond) | 3/30 | 10% |
| 4. 19. 24. | | |
| Character | 3/30 | 10% |
| 5. 21. 25. | | |
| Christian commitment (personal) | 11/30 | 37% |
| 2. 4. 5. 6. 10. 15. 21. 22. 23. 26. 30 | | |
| Christian values (perspective) | 14/30 | 47% |
| 2. 4. 9. 11. 12. 15. 18. 22. 23. 25. 26. 27. 29. 30. | | |
| Christian community | 16/30 | 53% |
| 1. 4. 10. 12. 13. 15. 16. 18. 19. 20. 21. 23. 24. 26. 29. 30. | | |
| Communication | 4/30 | 13% |
| 1. 10. 23. 25. | | |
| Courage (maintain principles) | 2/30 | 7% |
| 4. 21 | | |
| Creative thinking (skills) | 8/30 | 27% |
| 1. 4. 5. 7. 8. 14. 23. 25 | | |
| Critical thinking | 5/30 | 17% |
| 1. 11. 14. 15. 23 | | |
| A dynamic environment | 4/30 | 13% |
| 4. 8. 17. 26 | | |
| Enjoyment of learning | 1/30 | 3% |
| 2. | | |
| Reaching one full potential | 6/30 | 20% |
| 9. 10. 13. 17. 18.29 | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Environmental responsibility 4. 18. 25. | 3/30 | 10% |
| Individuality (uniqueness) 14. 21. 25. 26. 28. | 5/30 | 17% |
| Integrity 9. 14. 18. 25. 26. 29. | 6/30 | 20% |
| Intellectual development 1. 2. 18. 23. 24. 26. 29. | 7/30 | 23% |
| Leadership 2. 7. 24. 26. | 4/30 | 13% |
| Life skills 1. 4. 13. 18. 23 | 5/30 | 17% |
| Life long learning (interest, passion) 4. 8. 9. 10. 11. 17. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 29. | 12/30 | 40% |
| Love (interest in) learning/education 4. 7. 8. 18. 20. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 29. | 12/30 | 40% |
| Love of life 2. 4. 20 | 3/30 | 10% |
| Loyalty 4. | 1/30 | 3% |
| Manners (good) 5. | 1/30 | 3% |
| Moral understanding (development) 3. 17. 20. 25. 26. 29. | 6/30 | 20% |
| Understanding of international issues 2. 14. 25 | 3/30 | 10% |
| A sense of occasion 4. 15. | 2/30 | 7% |
| Participation 5. 11. 13. 14. 17. 19. | 6/30 | 20% |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Personal endeavour | 4/30 | 13% |
| 4. 5. 12. 23 | | |
| Personal excellence (pursuit of) | 10/30 | 33% |
| 1. 4. 5. 6. 7. 10. 16. 19. 22. 23. | | |
| Personal skills (self esteem, self discipline) | 10/30 | 33% |
| 2. 5. 10. 14. 16. 17. 18. 19. 23. 29 | | |
| Physical Development (well being) | 7/30 | 27% |
| 1. 8. 14. 18. 24. 25. 26. | | |
| Religious understanding | 4/30 | 13% |
| 3. 7. 19. 23. | | |
| Respect for others | 21/30 | 70% |
| (Social, economic, cultural differences, tolerance, diversity) | | |
| 2. 3. 4. 7. 8. 10. 11. 13. 14. 15. 17. 18. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 26. 27. 28. 29. | | |
| Scientific understanding | 2/30 | 7% |
| 3. 27 | | |
| A secure environment | 4/30 | 13% |
| 1. 2. 5. 21 | | |
| Service (benefit others) | 14/30 | 47% |
| 2. 4. 5. 6. 7. 9. 12. 13. 15. 18. 20. 21. 25. 29. | | |
| Social development | 16/30 | 53% |
| (Justice, compassion, relationships, cooperation) | | |
| 1. 4. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 14. 17. 18. 20. 21. 24. 25. 26. 29. | | |
| Spiritual development (awareness) | 5/30 | 17% |
| 1. 7. 8. 14. 17. | | |
| Sportsmanship (sporting excellence) | 8/30 | 27% |
| 5. 7. 13. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. | | |
| A supportive environment | 1/30 | 3% |
| 2. | | |
| Technological proficiency | 2/30 | 7% |
| 10. 27 | | |

| | | |
|-----------|------|------------|
| Tradition | 2/30 | 7% |
| 20. 25 | | |
| Trust | 1/30 | 3% |
| 4. | | |
| Vision | 3/30 | 10% |
| 6. 23. 25 | | |

4.2.3 Government (State Schools)

Mission statements promoted –

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Academic potential | 13/30 | 43% |
| Schools: 4. 8. 9. 10. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 23. 24. 29 | | |
| Academic rigour (excellence) | 17/30 | 57% |
| 1. 2. 5. 6. 7. 8. 11. 12. 13. 14. 20. 23. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29 | | |
| Balanced development | 2/30 | 7% |
| 13. 23. | | |
| A caring environment (community) | 5/30 | 17% |
| 2. 6. 7. 9. 17 | | |
| A caring personality | 4/30 | 13% |
| 6. 13. 17. 29 | | |
| Change (ability to accept, respond) | 1/30 | 3% |
| 12. | | |
| Character | 3/30 | 10% |
| 6. 13. 22 | | |
| Christian commitment (personal) | 0/30 | 0% |
| Christian values (perspective) | 0/30 | 0% |
| Christian community | 0/30 | 0% |
| Communication | 0/30 | 0% |
| Courage (maintain principles) | 0/30 | 0% |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------|------|------------|
| Creative thinking (skills) | 2/30 | 7% |
| 6. 22 | | |
| Critical thinking | 0/30 | 0% |
| A dynamic environment | 1/30 | 3% |
| 10. | | |
| Enjoyment of learning | 4/30 | 13% |
| 5. 22. 24. 28 | | |
| Reaching ones full potential | 1/30 | 3% |
| 4. | | |
| Environmental responsibility | 1/30 | 3% |
| 3. | | |
| Individuality (uniqueness) | 8/30 | 27% |
| 12. 16. 19. 20. 23. 25. 27. 30 | | |
| Integrity | 1/30 | 3% |
| 25. | | |
| Intellectual development | 1/30 | 3% |
| 5. | | |
| Leadership | 2/30 | 7% |
| 6. 12. | | |
| Life skills | 3/30 | 10% |
| 4. 6. 9. | | |
| Life long learning (interest, passion) | 8/30 | 27% |
| 4. 8. 10. 12. 17. 18. 23. 28 | | |
| Love of (interest in) learning/education | 6/30 | 20% |
| 5. 16. 17. 18. 23. 25 | | |
| Love of life | 2/30 | 7% |
| 16. 30. | | |
| Loyalty | 1/30 | 3% |
| 25 | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Manners (good) | 0/30 | 0% |
| Moral understanding | 2/30 | 7% |
| 8. 13. | | |
| Understanding of international issues | 2/30 | 7% |
| 6. 13. | | |
| Occasion (sense of) | 0/30 | 0% |
| Participation | 2/30 | 7% |
| 24. 28 | | |
| Personal endeavour (continuing) | 3/30 | 10% |
| 4. 5. 6. | | |
| Personal excellence (pursuit of) | 6/30 | 20% |
| 1. 5. 6. 7. 13. 16. | | |
| Personal skills | 7/30 | 27% |
| 1. 4. 6. 8. 12. 16. 22 | | |
| Physical Development (well being) | 1/30 | 3% |
| 6. | | |
| Religious understanding | 0/30 | 0% |
| Respect for others | 22/30 | 73% |
| (Social, economic, cultural differences, tolerance, diversity) | | |
| 1. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 19. 21. 22. 25. 26. 27. 28. 30 | | |
| Scientific understanding | 0/30 | 0% |
| A secure environment | 7/30 | 27% |
| 3. 8. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21 | | |
| Service (benefit others) | 2/30 | 7% |
| 8. 13. | | |
| Social development | 8/30 | 27% |
| (Justice, compassion, relationships, cooperation) | | |
| 1. 5. 6. 8. 16. 19. 23. 25 | | |
| Spiritual development (awareness) | 0/30 | 0% |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Sportsmanship (sporting excellence) | 15/30 | 50% |
| 2. 5. 6. 7. 8. 11. 12. 13. 14. 17. 18. 19. 23. 25. 28 | | |
| A supportive environment | 3/30 | 10% |
| 9. 10. 15 | | |
| Technological proficiency | 6/30 | 20% |
| 7. 18. 22. 23. 24. 28 | | |
| Tradition | 6/30 | 20% |
| 6. 11. 12. 13. 24. 27 | | |
| Trust | 1/30 | 3% |
| 25. | | |
| Vision | 1/30 | 3% |
| 9. | | |

4.3 Analysis of Website Survey Results

The following table provides a summary of the data collected from mission statements from 30 independent schools based on a Christian philosophy (section 4.2.2) and 30 government schools (section 4.2.3). Mission statements were separated out into key words or phrases and the percentage of schools nominating that characteristic as important were listed in two columns for easy comparison and interpretation.

| Characteristic | Independent | Government |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Academic potential | 27 | 43 |
| Academic rigour (excellence) | 33 | 57 |
| Balanced development | 10 | 7 |
| A caring environment (community) | 30 | 17 |
| A caring personality | 13 | 13 |
| Change (ability to accept, respond) | 10 | 3 |
| Character | 10 | 10 |
| Christian commitment (personal) | 37 | 0 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Christian values (perspective) | 47 | 0 |
| Christian community | 53 | 0 |
| Communication | 13 | 0 |
| Courage (maintain principles) | 7 | 0 |
| Creative thinking (skills) | 27 | 7 |
| Critical thinking | 17 | 0 |
| A dynamic environment | 13 | 3 |
| Enjoyment of learning | 3 | 13 |
| Reaching one full potential | 20 | 3 |
| Environmental responsibility | 10 | 3 |
| Individuality (uniqueness) | 17 | 27 |
| Integrity | 20 | 3 |
| Intellectual development | 23 | 3 |
| Leadership | 13 | 7 |
| Life skills | 17 | 10 |
| Life long learning (interest, passion) | 40 | 27 |
| Love (interest in) learning/education | 40 | 20 |
| Love of life | 10 | 7 |
| Loyalty | 3 | 3 |
| Manners (good) | 3 | 0 |
| Moral understanding (development) | 20 | 7 |
| Understanding of international issues | 10 | 7 |
| A sense of occasion | 7 | 0 |
| Participation | 20 | 7 |
| Personal endeavour | 13 | 10 |
| Personal excellence (pursuit of) | 33 | 20 |
| Personal skills (self esteem, self discipline) | 33 | 27 |
| Physical Development (well being) | 27 | 3 |
| Religious understanding | 13 | 0 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Respect for others | 70 | 73 |
| Scientific understanding | 7 | 0 |
| A secure environment | 13 | 27 |
| Service (benefit others) | 47 | 7 |
| Social development | 53 | 27 |
| Spiritual development (awareness) | 17 | 0 |
| Sportsmanship (sporting excellence) | 27 | 50 |
| A supportive environment | 3 | 10 |
| Technological proficiency | 7 | 20 |
| Tradition | 7 | 20 |
| Trust | 3 | 3 |
| Vision | 10 | 3 |

4.3.1 Academic Areas

At first glance, it would seem that government schools have a significantly higher emphasis on the development of an individual's academic potential and on the pursuit of academic excellence and academic rigour. On further examination, it is clear, however, that independent schools favour other descriptive terms to identify the same goals and objectives from their mission statements such as the development of critical thinking, creative thinking and intellectual development. There seemed no basis for a focus in questions for the interviews of independent school personnel on an emphasis on academic pursuit or excellence as being a characteristic that was relatively overstated or understated in independent schools.

| Characteristic | Independent | Government |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Academic potential | 27 | 43 |
| Academic rigour (excellence) | 33 | 57 |
| Creative thinking (skills) | 27 | 7 |
| Critical thinking | 17 | 0 |
| Intellectual development | 23 | 3 |
| | 127 | 110 |

4.3.2 Service (Servant Leadership)

There was a significant emphasis in the literature review of the leadership characteristics sought in those who carry significant responsibilities in schools based on a Christian philosophy on an expected characteristic of servant leadership. Not surprisingly, this is also a characteristic that is a very significant delineator between the mission statements of these schools when compared with government schools. It is also a character trait that has a centrally desired emphasis in the education and development of students. It is also significant that in this case, a search for other similar terms from government school mission statements, such as the development of character or an emphasis on care or caring did not provide a counterbalance to this strong service persuasion.

| Characteristic | Independent | Government |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Service (benefit others) | 47 | 7 |
| Social development | 53 | 27 |
| A caring personality | 13 | 13 |
| Character | 10 | 10 |

In asking questions of key personnel on the nature of the uniqueness of leadership expectations and realities in schools based on Christian principles, it was, therefore,

thought important on the basis of the website survey and the literature review to ask two questions of key stakeholders –

- *What is your understanding of the term Servant Leadership?*

And, as part of another question,

- *Some Christian schools emphasise Servant Leadership. What is the importance of this outcome?*

4.3.3 An explicit Christian emphasis

It would be expected to be self-evident that schools based on a Christian philosophy would seek to promote an understanding and acceptance of Christianity. It would also be expected that organisations not explicitly based on a Christian philosophy would not emphasise the development of a Christian world view in their mission statements. The website survey produced this expected result, but also more broadly showed that religious understanding and spiritual development, characteristics with a broader focus than on Christianity alone, were not central goals or pursuits of government schools.

Central to the description of Christian values that were thought important to be nurtured and developed were characteristics such as service, selflessness and compassion and were often referenced back to the Bible in phrases such as Biblically based, or based on God’s Word. These central, pivotal values were then often linked to a sense of Christian community.

| Characteristic | Independent | Government |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Christian commitment (personal) | 37 | 0 |
| Christian values (perspective) | 47 | 0 |
| Christian community | 53 | 0 |
| Religious understanding | 13 | 0 |
| Spiritual development (awareness) | 17 | 0 |

In asking questions of key personnel on the nature of the uniqueness of leadership expectations and realities in schools based on Christian principles, it was, therefore, thought important on the basis of the website survey and the literature review to ask two further questions of key stakeholders –

- *What is a Christian World view and how should a Head seek to develop it?*

And, as part of another question,

- *Some Christian schools emphasise the development of a Christian world view. What is the importance of this outcome?*

To capture the sense of the development of those attributes mentioned as the fruits of the development of Christian perspective, character and values, and to avoid another amorphous phrase such as “Christian perspective,” one frequently mentioned value, “compassion for others”, was identified as a common indicative exemplar and added to the interview questions.

- *Some Christian schools emphasise Compassion for others. What is the importance of each of this outcome?*

Likewise, the term “maturity in faith” was a phrase used to describe the desirable impact of the education provided by the schools in the development of a student’s personal Christian commitment. It seemed a good addition to the interview questions to highlight the expectation that would be incumbent on school leaders for not only the development of Christian understanding in students, but also the real expected influence (from the website survey) that a school would have in developing the faith of those who are new Christians or who enrol with a Christian faith already.

- *Some Christian schools emphasise maturity in faith. What is the importance of this outcome?*

These last few questions were grouped and asked together –

- *Some Christian schools emphasise Compassion for others, Servant Leadership, the development of a Christian world view and maturity in faith. What is the importance of each of these outcomes?*

Given the emphasis placed on Christian commitment, perspective and values in many of the mission statements for these independent schools, one further question was added on the strength of the delineating statements and on the strength of the opinions of several authors in the literature review.

- *Should the school be an evangelistic agency?*

4.3.4 Other Characteristics

Of the other characteristics compared between the two systems, differences were either not significant, or not significant enough to provide a basis for added questions.

| Characteristic | Independent | Government |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Sportsmanship (sporting excellence) | 27 | 50 |

Sportsmanship, for instance, was mentioned as a key goal in half of the government schools yet only a little over a quarter of the independent schools. It was not thought significantly relevant to add to the list of interview questions.

| Characteristic | Independent | Government |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Life long learning (interest, passion) | 40 | 27 |
| Love (interest in) learning/education | 40 | 20 |

A love for learning and a n interest or passion for life-long learning were key phrases that were emphasised in the independent school statements over the government school statements but were also clearly less significant in difference or delineation than servant leadership or the developments of a Christian world view.

4.4 Expectations and realities for the Head

4.4.1 The chief expectations of the Head of the school.

Governance responses

- Christian Leadership (6 responses):
 - *A Christian ethos: Implement a Christian world-view. Decisions, both personal and public need to be made in the light of the saving work of Christ. The Head should assist others in this also.*
 - *Over riding acknowledgement of God's role in all that occurs*
 - *leadership within the framework of a Christian world view*
 - *places God at the centre of the students' world*
 - *have a pastoral heart for staff, parents and students that would blend creatively a mixture of justice and mercy*
 - *the Head needs to be thoroughly converted to Christianity. They need to be the embodiment of Christ*

- Educational Leadership (5 responses):
 - *The transfer of educational theory into practice: that the Head has worked out and thought through educational theory and has the skills to implement it into practice. This will directly influence his decisions regarding buildings, staff, staff allowances etc.*
 - *Dynamic educational leadership*
 - *encourage love of learning in students*
 - *encourage a professional attitude in staff that is dominated by a willingness to serve those they seek to teach*
 - *The best qualifications in Education*

- Business Leadership (5 responses):
 - *To provide guidance based on a firm set of values in all areas of the business processes*
 - *To empower the staff to be able to carry out the various processes effectively and efficiently (for example by providing the necessary resources)*
 - *Know the job – aspects of expertise need to include teaching, administration, education, regulations and legal requirements*
 - *Understand the structure of the organisation that he is working under – governance expectations, business imperatives – College history and the effect of history – who are the benefactors and how do we best look after them? – How do we get the best out of what is available?*
 - *The finest tuned management skills possible*

- Development of relationships (4 responses):
 - *That they will develop good relationships with all stakeholders – from the Kindergarten student to the Council Chair.*
 - *Relational skills – staff and the school community*
 - *Conflict resolution skills*
 - *The ability to lead and to take others with him or her (this is a wilful act)*

- Personal Presence and skills (8 responses):
 - *Leadership by personal example*
 - *Strength*
 - *Objectivity (don't let personal issues invade)*
 - *Knowledgeable (people need to have confidence)*
 - *Integrity*
 - *Motivation*
 - *be wise in his decision making*

- *a nature that is sympathetic yet strict: the ability to guide others – a man for all seasons*
- To generate a vision (2 responses):
 - *To provide a tangible vision with regards to the purpose and future of the organisation*
 - *provide visionary, pro active leadership*

Head's responses

- Christian Leadership (3 responses):
 - *Christian – honesty integrity Christian perspective. Means that governance can squeeze more out of the Head (It's a mission)*
 - *Maintain the Christian ethos*
 - *Gospel focus*
- Educational Leadership / Management (5 responses):
 - *Culture building*
 - *Lead the school (as opposed to manage the school) – Head is leader*
 - *Manage the school effectively – world view, values*
 - *Compliance to governance understanding of education*
 - *Quality education*
- Business Leadership / Management (7 responses):
 - *Day to day management*
 - *Manage the school efficiently – fiscal connotation*
 - *Financial management*
 - *Efficiency in multitasking with a very low budget*
 - *Stay financial – enrolments, affordability etc*
 - *To manage the finances of the School*
 - *Manage the school effectively*

- Development of relationships (2 responses):
 - *Keeping everybody happy*
 - *To maintain an open and honest relationship with the Chairman and the Council*

- Personal Presence and skills (2 responses):
 - *Be everything to everybody – a split personality*
 - *To do my best by the School*

- To generate a vision (2 responses):
 - *Future plans for staff and infrastructure*
 - *Consider the future strategic need to deliver the mission*

Prospective Head's responses

- Christian Leadership (4 responses):
 - *Be a Godly witness and example to others*
 - *Christian Leadership*
 - *Authentic Christian faith in action*
 - *Strong, firm Christian leadership – Christian values*

- Educational Leadership (9 responses):
 - *The transfer*
 - *Educational Leadership*
 - *Educationalist first and foremost – implement and develop programs*
 - *Leadership that will impact academically*
 - *Leadership for educators*
 - *Maintain essential traditions*
 - *Embrace progress – development and academic work*
 - *Connect educationally with the parents – keeping enrolments*

- *Educational leader and innovator – find distinctive*
- Business Leadership / Management (11 responses):
 - *Report back to stakeholders*
 - *Management of finances – compliance – everything*
 - *Managing the School*
 - *Proven organisational skills – finances*
 - *Understanding of – legal and compliance issues*
 - *Fiscal responsibility*
 - *Tight ship – runs well*
 - *Give an honest assessment of progress - represent and inform Council eg Accounts*
 - *Create and implement a financially sustainable strategic plan*
 - *Build confidence in the school amongst its various stakeholders, the community and industry*
 - *Finances – administration – trends in demographics – keep the numbers up*
- Development of relationships (3 responses):
 - *Manage the school so as to effectively develop a sense of community*
 - *To understand people and to communicate well with them*
 - *Involvement with other Heads and professional development*
- Personal Presence and skills (6 responses):
 - *Leadership*
 - *Competency in leadership and management*
 - *Drive and energy*
 - *Passion and motivation*
 - *Able to fulfil the mission of the school*
 - *Governors can trust implicitly*

- To generate a vision (4 responses):
 - *set effective goals*
 - *has a vision (3),*

| | Governance | Heads | Prospective Heads | Total |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| Christian | 6 | 3 | 4 | 13 |
| Educational | 5 | 5 | 9 | 19 |
| Business | 5 | 7 | 11 | 23 |
| Relationships | 4 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| Personal | 8 | 2 | 6 | 16 |
| Vision | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |

4.4.2 How would these expectations differ from other schools?

Governance responses

That schools based on a Christian philosophy, in order to have substance and meaning, would defer to a Biblically based Christian world view in matters of philosophy, standards, morals, ethics and service, but that operationally, they would have similar objectives to other schools. The point was made that all schools adopt a world-view, either implicitly or explicitly.

Heads' responses

Head's gave responses that were similar to governance. One emphasised that the nature of an independent school provided more scope for leadership. Another lamented that the down side of a Christian philosophy can be an unreasonable expectation of service from governance that all staff and the Head need to "work to the bone." It was felt that the

Christian context made it more difficult for a Head who was “having a bad day” in the expectation of (a Godly example in) how things were managed.

Prospective Heads’ responses

Prospective Heads’ responses mirrored the governors and Heads’ responses in substance. One interviewee reflected on an experience in a previous school which, although based on a Christian philosophy, had some governors who were not Christians, and on the difficulties in philosophical direction that resulted at governance level. It was felt by a few respondents that it was worth stating the “obvious”; that schools based on a Christian philosophy MUST employ a Christian Head. The “scope for leadership” mentioned by a Head as a positive aspect of independent schools, was balanced by one respondent who saw “independence” as less centralised bureaucratic support for policies and administration.

4.4.3 Other important areas in the role of Head of the school

Governance responses

Functional roles:

- *Selection of staff; ongoing care for staff; financial control*

Aspects of character:

- *A strength of conviction and character, but collaborate where appropriate; Christian beliefs and values; lead by example; motivator of others; a discernment of the difference between management and leadership; continual personal spiritual development*

Community Building:

- *Shaping public perception (especially in a rural setting); overcoming anti-private school sentiment; changing laissez faire into high achievement culture; commitment to the local church (same denomination as the school); maintaining the critical link to the target market of the business; Community relations*

Heads' responses

Functional roles:

- *Compliance (3); managing finances (2); strategic planning (2); politics and people management (2); marketing; curriculum planning; Occupational Health and Safety matters; dealing with bureaucracy.*

Aspects of character:

- *Educational leadership (2); Understanding the role and benefits of external bodies (professional development); ability to multitask; ability to be able to make sense of competing demands and expectations; caring.*

Community Building:

- *Building community (2); Building strong traditions; deal with every rumour and innuendo; know what your community values; maintaining a strong Christian ethos : being accessible and supportive of all the stakeholders*

Prospective Heads' responses

Functional roles:

- *Educational outcomes and requirements (3); management of staff and student issues (2); active interest in the leadership and professional development of staff (2); maintaining uniform; and discipline; dealing with major issues; finances;*

teaching; innovation; staff appointments; mingle with other Heads; building programs; establishing new staff and new routines;

Aspects of character:

- *Good communicator (3); influential and charismatic (2); visionary and the ability to bring others along (2); ability to lead (2); ability to find time to rest; a great reader of people – to be one step ahead of the tsunami; high Emotional Intelligence; transparent in decision making; makes others feel good*

Community Building:

- *Marketing and influence on the community (3); fosters culture and partnerships (3); public relations (2); creating academic, community and industry links.*

4.4.4 Understanding of the term Servant Leadership.

Governance responses

Governance interpreted servant leadership in context of working as part of a team –

- *A servant leader works along-side others,*
- *Leadership that sees itself as part of a team and not necessarily above the members of the team,*
- *It encourages leaders to serve others while staying focused on achieving results in line with the organization's values and integrity.*

Servant Leadership was also seen as focussing on others at the expense of self –

- *He/she models service and has a giving nature (not always taking),*
- *Is willing to get his own hands dirty – not always delegating,*
- *Puts others needs ahead of their own,*
- *Seeks to bring out the best in staff and students,*

- *Completely focussing on the needs of those “to be led” without losing the perspective of why you are doing the leading.*

Servant leadership was also expressed in terms of the characteristics that might be perceived by others –

- *A loving, nurturing, sacrificial nature,*
- *Sacrificing ego,*
- *A steward of the resources,*
- *Declaration, through actions, of the sovereignty of God,*
- *Knowing how to serve without begrudging it.*

The prime example of a servant leader was considered to be Jesus Christ –

- *The ultimate example of this is of course, Jesus,*
- *It is the type of “other centredness” modelled by Jesus as He washed the disciples’ feet and walked to the Cross,*
- *Jesus – follow him in all ways e.g. Philippians 2: 5-8 “Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: Who being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, and made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness. And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death – even death on a cross!”*

Heads’ responses

Heads also interpreted servant leadership as being part of a team –

- *The decisions and actions that you take should be predicated on the betterment of the community for others,*
- *A willingness to be one of the team, to join in with the hard work and to not take/have privileges.*

Heads also saw servant leadership as focussing on others at the expense of self –

- *Put others before yourself,*
- *It is a principle – to lead for others,*
- *Eyes down model – Look down at the next level and ask how can I serve them?*

Heads also expressed Servant leadership in terms of the characteristics that might be perceived by others –

- *Encourages, edifies and uplifts without being self-centred and arrogant.*

Heads also pointed to Christ as the prime example of servant leadership –

- *It is the paradox of the Christian life – the paradox that God's Son actually died friendless.*

Prospective Heads' responses

Prospective Heads also interpreted servant leadership as being part of a team –

- *See everyone as equal and treating them as such,*
- *Links to shared leadership, where the leader seeks to help others in becoming their own leaders. For them to have a sense of ownership in their working practices, being willing to sacrifice some autonomy for others within the organisation to feel more empowered,*
- *Getting in and rolling the sleeves up to assist those in need.*

Prospective Heads also saw servant leadership as focussing on others at the expense of self –

- *Be prepared to do what you ask others to do,*
- *The greatest among you shall be the least. Servant leadership does not assume authority,*
- *Leading to serve others – not self,*

- *Not asking anyone to do something that you are not prepared to do yourself – also to do those things,*
- *Lose your life to save it. The role is so demand in on your personal life that it comes at great cost BUT our sense of mission enables us to count the cost as gain. It is a death to self to take on leadership. As leadership is becoming more onerous, the pool of those willing to take it up is shrinking,*
- *Putting others before oneself,*
- *Somebody that is not beyond implementing their own directives – a willingness to do the same that you ask others to do.*

Prospective Heads also expressed Servant leadership in terms of the characteristics that might be perceived by others –

- *Exercising compassion and grace*
- *Say to the kids – “Have you been treated fairly” and being prepared to listen to the answer,*

Prospective Heads also pointed to Christ as the prime example of servant leadership –

- *Aptitude and attitude of working with others based on the modelled life of Jesus.*
- *Following the model of Christ,*
- *How can you be Christlike in your job?*
- *Christ washed the feet of his disciples – how do you do the same?*

4.4.5 A Christian World View and how to develop it

Governance responses

A Christian World View –

Governors reflected a Biblical definition of a Christian as a valuable person made in the image of God who is in a fallen state and in need of redemption. Most emphasised that a

Christian world view would mean seeing the world from a Christian perspective, interpreted through the Bible.

- *A Christian allows what Jesus has said, done and who he is influence every facet of their lives.*
- *The Christian World View focuses on the eternal purpose of our mortal existence, under the Kingship of Jesus the gracious redeemer,*
- *The world is God's creation. A Christian world view is bringing Gods sovereignty into all aspects of our world – to recognise God's part in all we do,*
- *A Christian world view involves an appreciation of God's great love us in that while we were yet sinners he sent his son to die on the cross so that those who trust in Him might be set free from the sin that binds them and be the people we always were meant to be,*
- *We need to see the world against God's word and his revealed character. God is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient (He knows everything – even our thoughts before we do). All things need to be calibrated against the scriptures in a Christian World View.*

The Heads role in developing a Christian World View –

It was seen as essential that the Head be a Christian and have a well formulated way of viewing all aspects of decision making and policy direction in the context of Biblical truth -

- *It is essential that the Head is a Christian and that he seeks the counsel of other Christians,*
- *Be Christ centred in all that he does,*
- *Every aspect of the business including its Vision, Mission, Objectives and values should be brought under Christ and ultimately point all stakeholders in His direction.*
- *No business is even legitimate which does not submit to the Biblical moral imperatives as a fundamental minimum.*

- *I would expect a leader to develop his business constantly in the direction of the Gospel.*

Heads' responses

A Christian World View –

Heads also reflected a Biblical definition of a Christian, though generally in a more simplistic sense than governance and reflecting the operational circumstance of allowing for the different Christian perspectives of staff.

- *A Christian world view holds that we have been created to have a relationship with God,*
- *Underlying principles on which you base everything you do,*
- *Staff have different faith traditions and therefore we focus on the non-negotiables. A Christian World View has to transcend the culture you are in.*
- *Biblical view of the world and of God's kingdom – having an understanding of this,*
- *All things are referenced back to God as the Creator, sustainer and redeemer of the world,*
- *Concept of Absolute truth - values are not relative.*

The Head's role in developing a Christian World View –

Heads focussed on the practical differences between a school that was based on a Christian World view and one that was not such as curriculum initiatives including Christian Studies and Chapel. Some also emphasised that the role of the Head is also to introduce Christian ways of operating personally with others, and particularly with students.

- *The ideal is for kids to see this modelled so as to better understand what it is – the process of sin – repentance – restoration of good relationships,*
- *Don't force God into the curriculum but don't deny obvious opportunities to celebrate God's influence.*

- *Challenge is to find a really good Christian who is also a good teacher. Some explicit structures – Chapel, Christian studies.*
- *Structural things such as Chapel and Christian studies; all policies reflect grace and reconciliation.*

Prospective Heads' responses

A Christian World View –

Prospective Heads were aligned with Heads in presenting a more simplistic Biblical definition of a Christian than governance.

- *It is a Bible based and Christ-like view of the world. It is good for us to think outside Australia and to contextualise what we have here,*
- *Seeing life as a member of God's family by faith. All things are under Jesus,*
- *Alignment with God's word – not seeking glory for ourselves – serve the community rather than try to impress.*
- *We need to be in the world but not of the world (Biblical view). Christian world view is the mechanism by which you keep to this principle.*
- *A Christian World view is the view that all we have comes from God and all we seek to do should be to the glory of God.*

The Head's role in developing a Christian World View –

Prospective Heads either responded in a general sense to the role of the Head in developing a Christian World View in a community or were quite specific about how it should be done. Examples of a more general response included -

- *Christian world view is stated through your actions, the way that you live, the decisions you make, your style of leadership,*
- *Need to be explicit – even though the core business is academic – there needs to be programs and professional development,*
- *Secular values and ethics ought to be tested against Christian values and ethics,*

- *Need to have a deep understanding of our Christian faith in order to defend it in a secular world,*
- *A Head should seek to develop this by reiterating the ideals espoused in the Gospel, by leading by Christian example, by referring to the Gospel and by matching the vision and mission of the school to the Gospel,*
- *Christ is the centre of everything – Head needs to start from this. Employ staff (if possible) who have Christ at the core of who they are,*
- *Develop by putting Christianity into the curriculum where appropriate.*

Examples of specific actions included in responses were –

- *The Head needs to develop it himself first – he needs to travel the world, visit different cultures and remote communities and then involve the students in the same way,*
- *Don't paste the pages together and shield kids from society – take on the issues like abortion and homosexuality,*

4.4.6 Compassion for Others and Maturity in Faith

Governance responses

Compassion for Others –

Governors agreed that schools in their care should promote compassion for others and that it should be modelled by the teachers -

- *All important – compassion – seeking good in and for others,*
- *Being taught to show compassion for others leads to an understanding of others and their position and as a step to understanding how to show Christian love,*
- *Compassion for others must be demonstrated through teachers.*

Maturity in Faith –

Governors were divided on the notion that their schools should promote “developing a maturity in faith” for students. It was seen by most that such a notion is only possible if the students already have a faith -

- *Nurture the leaders at a time when many of the students will come to faith – don’t lose them,*
- *We all need to grow in our faith,*
- *Can only help that if a student has decided to follow Christ – provide a forum like a lunchtime bible study – nurture the person to develop faith,*
- *I do not agree that we should be advertising a maturity in faith – God does that. (It is much better to say that we encourage Christian growth),*

Compassion for others, Maturity in Faith, Servant Leadership and a Christian World View inextricably linked –

On two occasions, governors linked the four notions mentioned in the question together as a natural sequence. Interestingly, the “natural” sequences were different –

- *A Christian world view is the first priority. The second is the development of a maturity in faith. Servant leadership and compassion for others flow from these.*
- *The order of development should be – Compassion, Servant Leadership, Developing Christian world view and then Developing maturity in faith*

Heads’ responses

Compassion for Others –

Heads also agreed that Compassion for others was an important aspect to develop in schools based on a Christian philosophy. Their answers differed from governance in the provision of practical examples of community service and overseas mission work that they saw as essential out-workings of compassion -

- *Compassion is all important – seeking good in and for others,*

- *Our pastoral care program makes the point of “looking out” and developing compassion for others. We are exploring options for students to be immersed in poor communities overseas and in Australian indigenous mission work,*
- *Compassion for others is not exclusively a Christian world view. Compassion is a value for social justice,*
- *Christian education and pastoral care groups focus on compassion – empathy – fundraising – mission work,*
- *We are building a school in Africa together (compassion for others).*
- *Compassion for others is promoted through a comprehensive community service program through the vertical nature of the school where there is much interaction between older and younger girls, and through the organised charity work.*

Maturity in Faith –

The concept of development of maturity in faith again elicited a mixed response with most recalibrating the question to eliminate “maturity” and replace it with “develop” or to point out that students have a “foundation” of faith leading to “life-long development” -

- *It is important to develop faith. Of the four student leaders in our volunteer Christian group, three became Christians while they were at the College,*
- *Firstly need to personalise faith –it is not a corporate concept - you are saved by personal involvement not by association.*
- *Maturity in faith is life-long – schools encourage the formation of foundations as part of leadership training.*
- *We don’t use “maturity in faith” – students need to fail gloriously – they are beginning Christians who will not do terribly well (but in a safe and secure environment as they grow).*

No Heads sought to sequence Compassion for others, Maturity in Faith, Servant Leadership and a Christian World View.

Prospective Heads' responses

Compassion for Others –

Like Heads, prospective Heads gave a number of practical examples of programs and practices at their school designed to promote Compassion for Others -

- *Develop compassion for others by showing it to staff, students, parents,*
- *Develop Compassion in the Pastoral Care program,*
- *Compassion for others is developed if the school is mission minded – adopt an overseas school for financial support and pastoral visits,*
- *Compassion for other would come through a strong pastoral program, camp program, Christian studies program and Chapel program, community focus, Duke of Edinburgh program, charity program and outreach to international, national and local aid initiatives,*
- *Compassion is the hardest thing to develop – and yet the most important.*

Maturity in Faith –

There were significantly fewer responses by prospective Heads than by governance or Heads to this part of the question. In two of the three cases, it was noteworthy that the phrase was used by the respondent to refer to the development of faith in staff, not students –

- *It is important to develop faith. Of the four student leaders in our volunteer Christian group, three became Christians at the College.*
- *Heads should encourage increased maturity in staff,*
- *Maturity in faith – a comprehensive Christian studies program, scope and sequence of chapel activities, camp program. Professional development of staff in Christian Teaching. Daily devotions that are lead by the chaplain, local ministers and staff.*

Like Heads and unlike governors, no prospective Heads sought to sequence Compassion for others, Maturity in Faith, Servant Leadership and a Christian World View.

4.4.7 Schools as Evangelistic Agencies

Governance responses

All governors agreed that schools based on Christian philosophy should seek to promote the gospel. Some qualified the statement by adding that the primary role of the school is education and that the school was not a church -

- *The priority of the school is education but as a Christian school it is encouraged that Christians evangelise.*
- *Yes – BUT not first and foremost. It is not a church, it is a school and within this there are a variety of opportunities to talk about the faith – if we cannot do this then what is the point of having a Christian school.*
- *Yes – BUT – not at the expense of education – we must not manipulate the curriculum.*

Others did not qualify their assent -

- *Yes*
- *Yes. Knowing God is the ultimate educational reality. The scriptures urge all Christians to proclaim the gospel. We need to do this with a burning passion.*
- *Definitely – we need to show we are Christians in all workplaces.*
- *Yes – The only question lies in how do we do it, as a Christian organisation we must hold to inherent word of God and seek others to know Christ.*

One respondent pointed out that all schools are evangelistic -

- *This is not our brief alone. Secular schools are also evangelistic: For instance a performing arts high school preaches the good word about performing arts; same for a selective school or a gifted and talented school.*

Heads' responses

Like governors, Heads agreed that schools based on Christian philosophy should seek to promote the gospel. Also, like governors, some qualified the statement by adding that the primary role of the school is education and that the schools was not a church -

- *Yes – BUT – we charge fees for an education (on the premise that we share the gospel). We don't charge for the gospel. We need to teach well to give the gospel any credibility,*
- *The school is evangelical but not an evangelistic tool – it is a school,*
- *Yes we are clear about our purpose which is to hear the gospel of Christ (enrolment contracts, prospectus). We have Mission week, Christian groups, Guest Christian speakers. Christ is more overt than hidden – but it is not indoctrination. We encourage questioning and critical inquiry – conversion is the work of God.*

Again, others did not qualify their assent -

- *Definitely – it is our mission to evangelise – in the governance mission statement. The school is a mission field – to sow seeds,*
- *Yes – because that is the mission – we think that life in Christ is worthy of your consideration,*
- *Yes – The primary role of Christians is to proclaim the gospel and all things will flow from that,*
- *Yes: because a Bible-based evangelical Christian message is preached clearly and regularly.*

4.4.8 Expectations – the Head's Leadership Style

General trends were established in this section by tabulating interview responses and matching key phrases against leadership characteristics and leadership styles from the Literature Review in Chapter 2.

Governance responses

Responses from governance were collated and ascribed a code (Response 1 was coded as R1 etc).

R1. *Open to ideas and change. Interact with staff – listen – be approachable.*

R2. *Strong sense of his vision for the school but to be skilful in the selling and sharing of that vision so that others come on board.*

R3. *Be inclusive – respected (earnt); decision maker.*

R4. *There are many styles that all have elements of “truth” and utility. However, the one model which is unmistakably biblical is that of a servant leader. There is a growing trend of understanding (even amongst the secular world) that this form of leadership which is based on moral and ethical ideas of right / wrong is probably the most effective*

R5. *Servant leadership. Leading as would be expected of a head but with a humble approach and recognition (expressed through acknowledgement to staff, students and parents) of God’s role and God’s blessing on the school.*

R6. *With great tact and diplomacy because Christian views differ so widely.*

R7. *Sympathetic and strict – firm and knowledgeable in the right areas – adaptable – e.g. keep up to date in the use of computers. Needs to be able to say “no” and keep the respect of staff. Needs to be compassionate with staff with needs.*

R8. *Decisive, directional, collaborate (as appropriate), informed, Christian (and all that flows from being a Christian). The Head needs to know where we are going. The Head needs to take people with them to achieve a goal – (the emphasis is on TAKE not ASK – if you do it well they will follow)*

The first column of the table lists each of the responses below. Response 1 (R1) is listed as “1” in the R column for convenience of space. Theoretically predicted and therefore expected leadership traits (1-10) are then mapped using key words or phrases from each response. Leadership styles (11-23) are also mapped using key words or phrases.

Characteristics

1. *Adaptability*
2. *Knowledge and expertise*
3. *Accredited standards (through further learning)*
4. *Monitor staff professionalism*
5. *Lead under stress*
6. *Implement policy*
7. *Have a vision*
8. *Monitor student behaviour*
9. *Interpersonal skills*
10. *Have management capability*

Leadership Style

11. *Task-Orientated Leadership*
12. *People-Orientated Leadership*
13. *Motivational Leadership (Task-people orientation)*
14. *Distributed Leadership*
15. *Transformational Leadership*
16. *Autocratic Leadership*
17. *Paternalistic Leadership*
18. *Consultative Leadership*
19. *Democratic Leadership*
20. *Collaborative Leadership*
21. *Servant Leadership*
22. *Situational Leadership*
23. *Principle Centred Leadership*

| R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| 1 | x | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | x | x | | | x | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | x | | | | | x | | x | | | | x | | | x | x | x | | | | | | | |
| 3 | x | | | | | | | | x | x | | | x | x | | x | | x | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | x | | x |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | x | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| 7 | x | x | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | |

Whilst the question specifically asked about the leadership style of the Head, governance used it as an opportunity to also comment on leadership characteristics. Generally, governors have an expectation that the Heads will be people with highly developed interpersonal skills and the capacity and desire to use these skills to drive the organisation towards a vision and to bring staff along in the process. This should be managed in a way that reflects the Christian principles on which the schools is based. A summative view is that the Head should be -

Decisive, directional, collaborate (as appropriate), informed, Christian (and all that flows from being a Christian).

Head's responses

Responses from Heads were also collated and ascribed a code (Response 1 was coded as R1 etc).

R1. Flexible – depending on the circumstances: Collaborative when needed but dictatorial when needed. Needs to be based on a strong belief.

R2. Decisive; consultative within parameters – significant consultancy with some people. My role is to lead and manage the school and that is what I will do. I don't consult with everybody on everything but I will consult with some people on some things. If I consult and do something different – I still value your opinion.

R3. Not stuck – different types of styles for different things. Instructional leader. Collaborative and directional. Situational. Distributive.

R4. Open – transparent (not based on relationships but on positions). Not a relational style – no special deal with timetables etc for staff favourites. Consensual – very flat – based on teamwork. Trust.

R5. Collaborative, consultative, able to articulate a vision in a meaningful way – explain complex ideas simply. Unashamedly idealistic and romantic (visionary and transformational) people need a reason and something to aspire to.

R6. Inclusive leader – seeking consensus but happy to make the decision in the end. Motivation - lead at the front.

R7. My leadership style is collaborative but decisive.

As before, the first column of the table lists each of the responses below. Response 1 (R1) is listed as “1” in the R column for convenience of space. Theoretically predicted and therefore expected leadership traits (1-10) are then mapped using key words or phrases from each response. Leadership styles (11-23) are also mapped using key words or phrases.

Characteristics

- 1. Adaptability*
- 2. Knowledge and expertise*
- 3. Accredited standards (through further learning)*
- 4. Monitor staff professionalism*
- 5. Lead under stress*
- 6. Implement policy*
- 7. Have a vision*
- 8. Monitor student behaviour*

9. *Interpersonal skills*

10. *Have management capability*

Leadership Style

11. *Task-Orientated Leadership*

12. *People-Orientated Leadership*

13. *Motivational Leadership (Task-people orientation)*

14. *Distributed Leadership*

15. *Transformational Leadership*

16. *Autocratic Leadership*

17. *Paternalistic Leadership*

18. *Consultative Leadership*

19. *Democratic Leadership*

20. *Collaborative Leadership*

21. *Servant Leadership*

22. *Situational Leadership*

23. *Principle Centred Leadership*

| R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | x | | | x |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | x | | | | | x | | | |
| 3 | x | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | | | | x | | x | |
| 4 | x | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | x | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | x | | | | | x | | | x |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | x | | | |

Heads identified collaborative leadership as their preferred leadership style, though, almost without exception, qualified their response by adding that they were often

responsible for the final decision having listened to the views of others. In this regard, a typical response had elements of collaborative, yet autocratic responses.

My leadership style is collaborative but decisive.

It is noteworthy that most Heads equated the term stakeholders as meaning parents. Given that there are a number of key stakeholders in a school; governance, parents, staff and students all among them; it is interesting that Heads focussed in their responses on parents. Whilst not directly the intent of the question, it could be surmised from this interpretation of the question that Heads see parents as the most significant stakeholders.

There was a general consensus that a collaborative style, tinged with decisiveness was also the style that is expected of the Head by parents. One Head commented that parents expect a more autocratic style –

Stakeholders want a dictator at times – hard on discipline, hard on uniform – even for their own kids.

One Head commented that circumstance also affect the Head's approach, alluding to the necessity for some flexibility in style depending on circumstances -

Circumstances direct style – a Head is far more directional in a recession.

Prospective Head's responses

Responses from prospective Heads were also collated and ascribed a code (Response 1 was coded as R1 etc).

R1. Practical – lead by example; Compassionate helper (a surprise for those expecting a Deputy to be more autocratic); Christlike servant leadership.

R2. Personable; unflappable; a change agent; not conforming; pastoral; high expectations; encourager; sometimes need to pull the gun.

R3. Consultative, participative, servant, transformative (vision based – hopefully a lot), transactional (this is how it should happen. Style depends on changes in circumstances and context.

R4. Consultative, democratic (open and honest communication).

R5. Fairly relational. Consultative but ultimately authoritative.

R6. Approachable – listen and incorporate the view of others – not a dictator. Relational. Like to be involved without micro-management.

R7. Relational – team building.

R8. Consultative, collaborative, delegating

R9. Like to empower others. Not a consensus leader. Can make a decision if needed. Could work on compassion.

Whereas for governance and Heads, the table referred to expected leadership style, for prospective Heads the table summarises their self-evaluated current leadership style. As before, the first column of the table lists each of the responses below. Response 1 (R1) is listed as “1” in the R column for convenience of space. Theoretically predicted and therefore expected leadership traits (1-10) are then mapped using key words or phrases from each response. Leadership styles (11-23) are also mapped using key words or phrases.

Characteristics

- 1. Adaptability*
- 2. Knowledge and expertise*
- 3. Accredited standards (through further learning)*
- 4. Monitor staff professionalism*
- 5. Lead under stress*
- 6. Implement policy*
- 7. Have a vision*
- 8. Monitor student behaviour*
- 9. Interpersonal skills*
- 10. Have management capability*

Leadership Style

11. *Task-Orientated Leadership*
12. *People-Orientated Leadership*
13. *Motivational Leadership (Task-people orientation)*
14. *Distributed Leadership*
15. *Transformational Leadership*
16. *Autocratic Leadership*
17. *Paternalistic Leadership*
18. *Consultative Leadership*
19. *Democratic Leadership*
20. *Collaborative Leadership*
21. *Servant Leadership*
22. *Situational Leadership*
23. *Principle Centred Leadership*

| R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | x |
| 2 | x | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | | | | | | x |
| 3 | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | x | | | | | x | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x | | | | | x |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | x | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | x | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | x |

Prospective Heads cumulatively identified consultative leadership as their current leadership style. It was generally seen as principle based and people centred. In this

regard, a typical response had elements of collaborative, yet autocratic responses. One prospective Head described themselves as -

Fairly relational. Consultative but ultimately authoritative

Most prospective Heads felt that they would need to change leadership style and to develop different characteristics if they were appointed to the role of Head. It was felt that the Head's role would be more lonely and objective –

*The Head would need to become more removed,
I would have to develop more political grunt and a thicker skin,
Less flexibility to work through the issues – less luxury in this area.*

Some saw the need for the Head to be more autocratic –

*More undemocratic,
I would need to make more autocratic decisions at times when expediency and need arises.
Much more autocratic – by necessity (that's the job). This would be difficult to do – very hard for a person with a pastoral care brief,*

Others saw the Head's role in a more positive light –

*Headship gives a chance to communicate the Christian basis of the College – a greater sense of purpose.
Change maker, visionary. I would need to learn to change.*

4.4.9 Reality: Time spent by the Head

This section of the survey moves away from eliciting responses regarding expectations of the Head's role at a school and focuses on the realities that a Head faces – perceived or actual.

Governors are of the opinion that the Head spends time on the following activities –

- Compliance (7 responses) – typically *reporting to the Board of Studies, government agencies and to Council and the Board.*
- Staff matters (7 responses)
- Discipline and student issues (4 responses)
- Budget issues (3 responses)
- Administration and management (OHS etc) (3 responses)
- Strategic issues (3 response) – typically *planning both short and long term*
- Customer contact (Parents) (2 response)
- Facilities and property issues (1 response)

Heads report that they spend the most time on the following activities –

- Compliance (5 responses) Including – *time directed towards governance*
- Customer contact (Parents) (4 response) Including - *disgruntled parents / conflict*
- Administration and management (OHS etc) (3 responses) Typically - *Email – horrible – correspondence; Meeting and conferences*
- Staff matters (2 responses)
- Discipline and student issues (2 responses)
- Budget issues (2 responses) Including - *financial management*
- Strategic issues (2 response)
- Public face of the College (2 response) Including - *community events 2 to 3 nights per week*
- Facilities and property issues (1 response)

Prospective Heads are of the opinion that the Head spends time on the following activities –

- Budget issues (7 responses)
- Strategic issues (7 response) Including *Policy; Maintain the Christian and the Educational focus – the ethos*
- Compliance (5 responses) including - *Dealing with governance*

- Facilities and property issues (2 responses)
- Customer contact (Parents) (2 response) Including - *Trouble shooting – being one step ahead of the wolves at the door*
- Administration and management (OHS etc) (2 responses) Including - *Administrative dross – time is taken away from , the real education issues*
- Meetings (2 response) Including - *Relational aspects – gets frustrating as the school gets bigger – become further removed from detail*
- Staff matters (1 responses)
- Discipline and student issues (1 responses)
- Public face of the College (1 response)
- Leading the Teaching and Learning of the School (1 response)
- Collegial Networking (1 response)

4.4.10 Complexity, Ambiguity and Uncertainty

The survey quoted research into the changing role of the Head of a school and then asked a question about the sentence – *It has been stated by researchers that the role of Head is facing increasing “complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty.” How accurate is this statement?*

All three groups of respondents who were asked this question chose to either generalise (to answer the question in terms of complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty together) or to give a response to each concept in turn. Some respondents chose to do both. The question was based on a common theme in the literature review regarding the changing nature of Headship.

Governance responses:

General – Governors generally agreed with the statement, some identifying the higher demands of parents and others drawing the parallel with the increasing demands of compliance on all aspects of the workplace. Typical responses included –

- *Very accurate but the story is similar for all CEOs and General Managers of organisations. They are all driven by more compliance to government – eg Occupational Health and Safety, Child Protection.*
- *Why is the emphasis so much on dotting “i”s rather than education of kids?*
- *It is the same reason why Assistant Minister is regarded as a better role than Minister.*
- *Changes are constant – legislation etc. all are increasing.*
- *Continually increased reporting requirements together with calls for schools and teachers to take greater responsibility for a wide range of issues that impact children means that a Head has to keep abreast of these, know which have to be mandatorily implemented and correctly consider those that are optional.*

Increasing complexity – Some felt that the Head was able to be proactive in the management of complexity. Generally, increasing complexity was seen as a reflection of a more complex society. A typical response was –

- *The world has become more complex – eg technology; roles within marriage used to be more clear cut (lack of identity for men).*

Increasing ambiguity – All respondents agreed. A typical response was –

- *There is a lot of ambiguity; a lack of clarity, and more and more discernment is needed at all levels – in school, systemic, government wide. The Head needs to manage it.*

Increasing uncertainty – Governors made no specific comments on this.

One respondent linked the concepts together by focussing on complexity as the root cause of the other two difficulties -

- *The huge amount of information (complexity) available today, I think, quite ironically leads to increased ambiguity and uncertainty. Moreover, more options often do not even lead to a better solution.*

Another respondent offered a more positive context in which to view increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty –

- *It is true that on the surface that role of the Head is facing increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty. However, for the Christian Head the scriptures outline some powerful truths that in essence remain unchanged. An understanding of these spiritual realities is the lifeline Heads often need to grasp to deal effectively with the challenges of the future.*

Heads' responses:

General – One Head answered the question in the context of the tenuous situation that was facing his school (falling enrolment numbers and staff morale). Complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity are all increasing, but most particularly in a school that is fragile. As with governors, Heads drew attention to the varied expectation of parents, many having had little contact with the changing nature of education –

- *There are diverse expectations from parents who were educated in a vastly different world to their kids.*
- *The educational environment is increasingly litigious.*
- *As the school grows people want a small school climate in a big school context – it is very difficult for a Head to manage both.*

Increasing complexity – Heads also felt that this was a reflection of a changing society –

- *Things that are done now need to be codified – before they just used to happen.*
- *Sheer number and variety of tasks.*

- *Increasing level of demand with limited resources.*

Increasing ambiguity – Many Heads responded that they have found the role of Head is becoming more and more ambiguous –

- *The term CEO clarifies this – the Head is no longer a teacher.*
- *Governors, Staff, Parents and Students all want different things.*
- *Educational leader vs bureaucrat (compliance and accountability). The role cannot be split – the Head must find a way to be both*

Increasing uncertainty – Pointing to the rapid rate of change, some respondents said that it was difficult to plan when the shape of the future is so uncertain. A number of Heads referred to the tenuous nature of their own roles –

- *Uncertainty – yes – I have no job security.*
- *Uncertainty in the role of Heads leads to a rapid turnover.*
- *Uncertainty – pressure is on the Head to produce the goods or move on.*

One respondent linked the concepts together by focussing on uncertainty as the product of the other two difficulties -

Complexity and ambiguity leads to uncertainty.

Prospective Heads' responses:

General – It was felt that there was increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty but that stakeholders relied on the Head of a school to find a way to be seen as steadfast

–

- *There is a reliance on the Head not to be complex, ambiguous and uncertain*

Increasing complexity – One respondent felt that this was especially true due to the influence of external forces –

- *Definitely – especially in relation to compliance and accountability.*

- *The Head has to maintain knowledge on budgets litigation and OH&S.*
- *The Head needs to manage movement into a CEO role and into a compliance minefield.*

Increasing ambiguity – one respondent pointed out the ambiguity of a Head needing to appear seemingly unambiguous in an increasingly ambiguous world –

- *In an ambiguous world he is asked to not show weakness and to set parameters so that all know what he stands for.*
- *There is increasing ambiguity in people’s perception of the role of the Head – is the Head really “in charge” of the staff like they used to be?*
- *The ground is shifting with compliance and the law. Society is calling on schools to redress the moral imbalance of society.*

Increasing uncertainty – In a similar response pattern to Heads, prospective Heads cited the movement of Heads away from the position as due to uncertainties in the role –

- *Poor governance – communication and unrealistic expectations of the Head leads to the Head’s departure within a short time (Far too many).*

One respondent contrasted the increasing uncertainty of the world with the certainty of the Christian message –

- *The Christian World View presents an opportunity to focus on what is right.*

4.4.11 Compelling reasons to be a Head

After a few of the initial interviews, it became evident that a number of senior staff members who had been identified by their Head as prospective Heads of schools had little ambition or inclination to proceed past the position of penultimate senior manager. Two questions were therefore added to identify one compelling reason to become a Head (by way of encouragement to balance the negative impressions of the position)

and one compelling reason not to become a Head (which most prospective Heads and some Heads were offering anyway).

The compelling reasons to become a Head were thought by governance to be -

The opportunity to affect teachers - *The power of a teacher is profound – we all remember a good teacher in our lives. Heads affect teachers.*

The opportunity for autonomy and to found a school on the principles and practices that you believe will be most effective - *An ultimate chance to serve – chance to exercise that things you aspire to.*

Heads were motivated to apply for and to continue in the position of Head on the basis of –

A sense of calling – *The belief that it is part of the mission God has for you.*

The opportunity to affect teachers - *You can change teachers lives for the better in order to change children’s lives for the better. The privilege to influence a community.*

The opportunity for autonomy and to found a school on the principles and practices that you believe will be most effective – *To shape and control the organisation – to put all the ideas into practice. It is extraordinarily rewarding to make decisions and see the impact that those decisions have. The autonomy to make the final decisions and to implement systems for the benefit of others.*

Prospective Heads felt that the compelling reasons for accepting Headship included –

A sense of calling – *To have a significant influence on the lives of people for God. To contribute to the Christian influence in education. To be in a position to change lives – to do what you think God wants you to do for the better*

The opportunity to affect teachers – *To be influential and to pass on the passion for quality teaching and learning.*

The opportunity for autonomy and to found a school on the principles and practices that you believe will be most effective – *To see the vision become a reality. To*

create a culture. To have an opportunity for real vision and action on that vision – to be able to make a difference.

4.4.12 Compelling reasons not to be a Head

Governors also felt that there were compelling reason not to consider Headship. These included –

No sense of being called by God.

The profound negative effect of Headship on their own families (*Family killer*) and on their own health - *The need to be able to manage stress very well. Heads need the complete skill set otherwise they will damage themselves.*

The frustrations of leading a school - *You are on a hiding to nothing – the Head is on the front line for all issues and is expected to find solutions – even those that can't be resolved. The need to be confident that you can manage the role. There is no turning back.*

Heads themselves gave a number of compelling reason not to consider Headship. In at least two cases, the Heads considered that they had made a mistake in accepting the position. One resigned shortly after the interview. These included –

Self preservation:

- *The role of the Head is destructive.*
- *You must have the temperament to deal with a diverse range of people and their emotions in such a short time.*
- *Impact on you spiritually – prayer time / Bible study.*
- *The school always come first – before God and before family – and this is not who I am.*
- *Affects your relationships with the community – “I've heard bad things about your school; why was that kid suspended?” Can't have a beer at a public function on the weekend without raising eyebrows.*

- *Whenever I get a night off from school I stay home – I don't go to friends places and don't read the paper.*
- *I don't read for pleasure anymore.*
- *The level of stress / responsibility.*
- *The all-consuming nature of the job.*
- *The worry associated with problems at the school.*

The impact on family of late night meetings and a frustrating job:

- *Impact on family life.*
- *Get used to having tea at 10pm at night with your wife.*
- *The lack of time with family and the loss of school holidays when the family has been used to them,*

Frustrated ambitions to make any real difference:

- *You cannot change kids and the classroom as a Head – too many good people have left the classroom and are frustrated Heads. They thought they could change the world but they could not.*

It is like a CEO role but with few of the perks:

- *It is different to running a medium sized business because of all the evening events and you are a leader in the community – there is a moral and spiritual imperative on your behaviour.*

Administration and bureaucracy:

- *The never-ending meetings and paper trails*

Prospective Heads also gave a number of compelling reasons not to consider Headship.

These included –

Self preservation:

- *Lack of protection that a Head has in terms of employment security – they can be at the whim of a poor council.*
- *Amount of time needed to devote to the job.*
- *There are no heroic Christian Headmasters left.*

The impact on family of late night meetings and a frustrating job:

- *Increasing demands on family.*
- *Impact on family.*
- *Time away from family.*

Frustrated ambitions to make any real difference:

- *Being stuck behind a desk too much – I could not be the Christian man that I need to be in such a role.*

Administration and bureaucracy:

- *The never-ending meetings and paper trails.*
- *Uncertainty, Ambiguity, Complexity.*
- *Pressure of accountability.*

The frustration of decisions that have a negative outcome:

- *Decisions (well intended) that have a detrimental effect on people and the College.*
- *It is where the buck stops – responsibility for all decisions (own and others). This is especially true in working with a Business Manager. The head is accountable but somebody else manages the figures.*
- *Hard conversations with parents and teachers (terminations).*

4.4.13 Expectations of Major Stakeholders

School governance was considered as an obvious stakeholder in a school. In this question, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were given the opportunity to outline what the main expectations were of other stakeholders in the leadership performance and priorities of the school. Other stakeholders were nominated as the church, parents, staff and students. The church was referred to in a generic sense. For schools that were established as an outreach activity of one church, the question was generally interpreted as **the** church, meaning their particular founding church. For schools that were broadly Christian and not linked to one particular church, the question was interpreted more broadly. There were no

differences in answers from either group that could be attributed to their frame of reference.

Prospective Heads, Science Heads and prospective science Heads were asked this question in the context of actually being senior staff members or staff members at a school.

Heads felt that the Church, staff and students all had different expectations on what was expected in the priorities and practices in the school. Most linked this to expectations of their leadership.

In their view, the church had a strong expectation that the school would be an evangelistic agency. Typically, *some from the church would have us holding evangelistic rallies in the lunch hour.* There was some debate as to whether the church viewed that school as a separate Christian ministry or as a conduit for students who expressed an interest in Christianity into the church congregation - *One group would see Christian schools as an evangelical mission to produce students to supply churches and the other to support a Christian society the way God intended it to be.*

Parents, in the view of Heads, were seeking a well managed school which provides a quality education and where students are happy and safe. Heads viewed this as a daunting task – *They want the kids to be happy and to be bubble-wrapped; survive puberty with no loss of academic outcome but without pressure.* In another quote – *They think that all independent schools are rich and expect me to offer the same things as a GPS school.* Some also had particular expectations of the Christian stance of the school on Christian matters. One example is - *I explain that we have a Christian influence – for some parents it is not enough and they may go to a school which is more dogmatic – we also pick up some students from schools where parents feel it has been too dogmatic.*

Heads understand that staff are seeking a pleasant and professional work environment – it is no *different to other schools*. Staff want to teach and to enjoy teaching. Staff want – *A Christian leader; accessibility, transparency, honesty and integrity, which is hard when there are financial imperatives that affect staff relationships.*

Heads also regard students as having distinct expectations – *They enjoy the safety that comes with a Christian foundation – like the benefits but without necessarily being Christian themselves. Some simply want to know that you know them and that the Head is approachable, human, warm; making clear decisions with their interests at heart; an example Christian.*

Prospective Heads gave similar responses –

The Church wants the school to take the Christian message seriously: *wants families fed from the school into the church. That things be done in a Godly way and that eternal dimensions are important.* Some felt that the Church would have an expectation that the school has a sense of mission - *providing Christian outreach and evangelism in terms of the Church model.*

Parents want a safe and well functioning school: *That students are taught well – that things are fair; that the students are happy.* Also, *that the Head builds confidence, offers student opportunities and maintains standards and stability.*

Staff want a professional work environment: *To be supported and upheld in their own cause but not to compromise to whingers.* Staff want a good boss – *a Christian Leader.* They want *the boss to connect with them – the Head is interested and knows who they are – that he/she is approachable.* Also, they expect the Head to *continue reiterating and engaging with the shared vision of the school.*

Students want effective learning: *Just want to be taught*, but with the added dilemma of consistency: *they want to be disciplined in the same way as they are at home, where parents often have not developed their own views*. Students want a *safe school with a good reputation and good facilities*. Some see the Head as remote.

Science Heads were also consistent in their views of the expectations of stakeholders –

The church would expect evangelism at the school - *spiritual, pastoral and educational*

Parents would expect academic achievement and a caring environment.

Staff would expect a professional environment - *support and training*

Students would expect to be taught well. One added that a Science teacher has a well constructed view of Science as it relates to Christianity – *Christian students enjoy hearing about a Christian world view – they take a great interest in a Science teacher who is a Christian (most think that Science is opposed to Christianity)*.

Prospective Science Heads agreed –

The church would expect that the school takes a deliberate stance on Science. Typically, that - *Scientific evidence is not taught as truth which contradicts the Bible. The church sometimes sees Science as the enemy but it can co-exist very well if it is seen as a method and as a best explanation. We need to understand that we may not fully understand God's truth at the moment. Again, The Church may be concerned with the Christian elements of Science teaching including teaching Science with a Christian perspective at all times but especially when addressing sensitive issues such as reproduction, creation/evolution and various aspects of current research (e.g. stem cells, cloning) which may have a perceived Christian bearing.*

Parents would expect a quality education – *parents have a priority focussed on learning outcomes and, their child's experience in the classroom, homework & assignment load and academic performance*. Parents are also interested in quality pastoral care and *raising children in a way that is consistent with Christian values such*

as honesty, responsibility, doing your best – fruits of Christianity with or without the belief.

Prospective Science Coordinators had little to say on staff expectations in the context of the whole school.

Students would have varied expectations - *Some will have expectations similar to their parents, others will be entirely concerned with the quality of their classroom and/or homework experience.*

4.4.14 Realities – The Changing Role of the Head

Responses to this section represent the realities faced by Heads and the perception of the Head's reality as seen by prospective Heads.

Heads were reporting on how their role has changed given that the selection criteria required that they be relatively new in the position. They responded by indicating an increase in –

- Business management expectations, CEO role, finances, (5),
- Compliance and reporting to external agencies and to governance (2),
- Bureaucracy (2),
- Expectation of parents and community (2),
- Legal vulnerability (1),
- Christian leadership (1),

Some responded by reporting a diminishing role in –

- Educational leadership (2),
- Management of the day to day (1),

Prospective Heads reported on their perceptions as to how the role of Head has changed. They responded by indicating an increase in –

- Business management expectations, CEO role, finances, (9). *21st century management structures expect a shared leadership culture and greater transparency of decision making,*
- Compliance and reporting to external agencies and to governance (5), *much more scrutiny of independent heads of the strategic planning and financial accountability,*
- Bureaucracy (2). *More removed from being the educator to a manager and administrator,*
- Expectation of parents and community (1). *More transfer of parental responsibility and parental expectations*
- Expectation of a clearly articulated vision (1),
- Technology (1), *Technology is allowing schools to become much more accessible by various stakeholders. There are much greater expectations of the school to be more technologically capable and literate. More opportunities for access to information and instant messaging allow greater involvement of stakeholders in the activities of schools.*
- Legal vulnerability – not mentioned
- Christian leadership – not mentioned

In the same proportion as Heads, some responded by reporting a diminishing role in –

- Educational leadership (2). *This is why people no longer line up for the role. We are all in our positions because we are really good teachers, yet we rarely or no longer teach.*
- Management of the day to day (1),

4.4.15 Headship: Expectations and Realities

The two questions regarding differences between expectations and realities were posed only to Heads. Selection criteria dictated that these Heads had been in the position for

more than six months and less than six years so that they could reasonably compare the realities of the role with what they had expected.

The first question asked whether there was a difference between expectations and realities. All respondents indicated differences and most indicated large differences. The respondent who indicated the least difference had also been in the role of Head for the least time.

In comparison with their expectations of the role, Heads reported that in reality there was –

- The necessity to change perceptions (3), *Change in mental attitude – realisation of legal, moral and ethical dimension of being where the buck stops. Things such as OH&S can be managed as a deputy and can even be enjoyed – as a Head I hate them. Also, when you are there the buck stops with you and you can't turn back – if you mess up as a Deputy, the head will help you fix it. Also, the weight of responsibility was much larger. At the end of the day – the decision ends here – there is nowhere for it to go and all issues must be resolved one way or another.*
- Greater impact on self (3). *We all have ups and downs but the nature of the role drives you mood down. Also, in dealing with the criticism I have become more resilient/hardened and less emotional. Also, I have found that I spend quite a bit of time thinking and worrying about the well-being and future of the school.*
- More complexities in dealing with governance (2). *The lack of understanding of the School Council.*
- A greater pressure to conform to expectations (2), *If you don't fit the "model" of a Head that people expect then you have to either change to fit or justify who you are. There is an unrealistic expectation to be what others think you should be rather than be yourself. Also, you sometimes work very hard towards an end – people not only don't appreciate it – they are often critical.*
- Less influence on the classroom (1),

- An adjustment needed to people's perceptions and expected responses (1), *Statements now carry the weight of an emperor – even though I say the same things.*
- A more negative impact on family (1), *Underestimated the pressure and tension on my family – family make a far greater sacrifice than people realise.*
- A greater sense of separateness from staff that expected (1), *Ill will from staff when the Head expects them to attend things at the expense of family.*
- More pressure on time (1), *Expected it to be busy but it is relentless – cannot have a bad day – cannot be sick or you fall behind. Also - Nothing prepares you for the intensity of it.*
- The severity of inter-school rivalry (1).
- The demands of some parents (1).

Heads who experienced less differences between expectations and realities credited the observation to a quality process of preparation for the role - *Not really – I was blessed with a good mentor who brought me in to things that I did not need to know in order to prepare me for headship – eg summary dismissals etc. Also, no different – because I was promoted from within and was trained on by the incumbent Head at the time. The surprise was the level of stress and the weight of responsibility.*

4.4.16 Realities Resulting from Schools that Change in Size

Heads were asked whether the change in size of a school had any effect on the realities of their leadership, and if so, what aspects of leadership changed. Prospective Heads were asked the same question to determine whether their expectations of change were matched in reality.

The question was actually intended to determine the effects of a growing school as it was assumed that growth would be the focus of heads and prospective Heads. Interestingly, some took the question at face value and referred to schools that were

changing in size due to a decrease in enrolments – shrinking. Some referred to schools that had experienced growth and reduction. Responses from Heads were reflective of their own contexts and experiences.

In the analysis, responses are therefore separated into growth and reduction.

Heads responses – growing schools:

Heads noted the following realities as a result of growth –

- Less interaction with staff, parents and students. Typically, *even less quality time with people. Also, as the school grows, more people can share the roles. Head needs to evolve into a manager/CEO with \$20Million turnover. The Heads role will change to be more of a figurehead.*
- More of a focus on proactive planning. Typically, *as the school grows the Head is more visionary and proactive. How do we respond to growth? Also, it is refreshing not to have to dwell on enrolment numbers, now that the school is growing.*
- Greater expectation of variety of services. Typically, *staff, parents and other stakeholders have a greater expectation of what you will offer and you can't always meet them (cost prohibitive for some ideas).*
- Greater focus on maintaining core values as they are reflected in the essential make-up of the school. Typically, *keep the focus on the gospel – more intentional building of community – pastoral care of individual students so they don't get lost. Ensure that the learning culture grows with the school.*

Heads noted the following realities as a result of reduction –

- More of a focus on reactive planning. Typically, *as the school contracts the focus is on limiting the contraction and maintaining the status quo – finances; pastoral care. Also, as the school shrinks the Head becomes much more money focussed. Some parts of the strategic plan become obsolete. The Head also becomes much more sensitive to staff needs – if staff are having trouble you worry about the students that they are teaching.*

It was also noted that part of the role of Head is to have the skills to predict change and to make councils aware of impending possibilities and strategies to meet them.

Prospective Heads noted the following realities as a result of growth and the resulting expectations of how the Head's role would be affected –

- Less interaction with staff, parents and students. Typically, *it is difficult to remain in touch – need a good team and to get out and about*. Less interaction with staff, parents and students was contrasted with the need for more communication (presumably through others). Also, *instead of dealing with the individuals at the coal-face the Head deals with the individuals who deal with the individuals at the coal face*.
- More of a focus on proactive planning. Typically, *the Head would be less hands on; less minutia; more vision; more preparation of staff for leadership*. Also, *the Head becomes more of a Chief Executive Officer*. Also, *the Head needs to stay one step ahead and to learn to divest responsibility*. Also, *management practices need to change and the limitations of staff need to be realised in the positions they hold*. *More delegation needs to be given to other staff to look after the minutia of day-to-day school life as the Head gets on with vision development, strategic planning, financial management and developing links with the community and other schools*
- Greater focus on maintaining core values as they are reflected in the essential make-up of the school. Typically, *there are several stages – the pioneer; the developer; the establisher*. Also, *the Head needs to maintain vision and culture*. Also, *the Head should maintain relationships and a community focus*. Also, *if it grows it is harder to maintain the sense of community – priorities become compliance related*. Also, *The Head needs to consider how to keep the school together and a sense of community with a school of 1500? Do people still feel cared for?*

Prospective Heads noted the following realities as a result of reduction and the resulting expectations of how the Head's role would be affected –

- More of a focus on reactive planning. Typically, *dealing with a reduction in income; maintaining staff and enrolments*. Also, *the Head must have a total focus on numbers (enrolments)*

It was also noted by prospective Heads that part of the role of Head is to have the skills to predict change and to make councils aware of impending possibilities and strategies to meet them – *Any change in size has a financial outcome and a redistribution of resources naturally follows. The Head needs to have a strategy – what size will we be? Will we be smaller, more elitist, higher fees? What do parents want?*

4.4.17 Prospective Heads: Bringing expectations and reality closer.

There were two questions that sought a Head's perspective on how best to prepare prospective Heads for the realities of Headship. The first asked current Heads what prospective Heads were currently doing at the school that would prepare them for the role of Head and the second asked about different knowledge or activities that would be helpful in preparing them for the role.

Logically, prospective Heads were also asked about what they were currently doing at the school to prepare them for the role of Head. They were also asked about different knowledge that they felt would be useful to acquire or different activities that they thought they should be experiencing.

When Heads were asked about what prospective Heads were doing at the school to prepare them for the role of Head, their responses were –

- Learning to follow – Typically, *doing what they are told*.
- Engaging them in decision making and in some of the Head's roles – Typically, *sometimes I engage them in decision making but sometimes make the decision*

for them. I also give them the option – would you like me to deal with this or do you want me to become involved? Also, attending Council meetings. Run executive meetings. Address the Parents and Friends. Also, bringing them in on sensitive issues where they are not required to be there but need to know what the job is. Preparation of budget. Also, delegation of some tasks – even expulsion interviews. “Take this and run with it.”

- *Allocate a section of the school for them to lead – Typically, running mini-schools where they are responsible for all aspects – distributed leadership. Allow them to become specialists. Also, day to day and at events that the Head cannot attend.*
- *Allow them to be in the role of acting Head – Typically, delegate for the Head in his absence.*
- *Purposeful Professional development – Typically, professional development of senior executive that is run by the Head – eg understanding Gen Y staff and how to retain them, Marketing, Fundraising, Corporate image, Finance.*

When Heads were asked about what different knowledge or activities would help prepare prospective Heads for the role of Head they responded that it would be important for them to –

- *Develop their capacity to consider their responses to different leadership situations faced by the Head. Typically, challenge and provoke them*
- *Spend time talking to and observing other Heads.*
- *Attend governance meetings at the school.*
- *Receive professional development in essential skills. Typically, in financial planning, public relations and marketing. Also, some understanding of legal requirements, especially industrial relations.*

When prospective Heads were asked about what they were doing at the school to prepare them for the role of Head, their responses were –

- *Developing spiritual leadership. Typically, trying to be Godly.*

- Engaging in decision making and in some of the Head's roles – Typically, *interaction with staff – negotiating difficult situations between staff and with parents; budget management. Also, working in a role that gets me to engage with various stakeholders at various levels, heading up committees, leading assemblies and information evenings, running staff meetings, engaging in professional development that encourages teachers to transform themselves, understanding educational policies and procedures, understanding the way that governance works. Also, it is a deliberate strategy of the Head to give me some oversight of budgets Head will say “what would you decide if I was not here?” I am given some autonomy for planning and application of policy.*
- Learning to follow – Typically, *involvement with other Deputies and senior staff professionally at conferences.*
- Leading a section of the school –
- Being in the role of acting Head – Some commented on the limitations of this role as *taking the role as Acting Head (but making decisions as if I had the Head's perspective and views – not my own).*
- Purposeful Professional development – Typically, *professional reading. Also, professional development in Leadership and Management. Also, completion of Masters study.*
- Learning from watching and asking myself can I do it? Do I want to do it? – Typically, *getting a taste of educational leadership and core insight into the school. Watch and learn. Learning that it requires hours of thinking and planning before an idea reaches the executive level. Gaining insights into planning, managing, realising responsibility and building capacity in others. Also, learning all that I can, attending Council meetings, going through every step of leadership in a school (up to deputy).*

When prospective Heads were asked about what different knowledge or activities would help prepare them for the role of Head they responded that it would be important for them to –

- Continue to develop wisdom, even *the wisdom of Solomon*.
- Visit other schools and have contact with other Heads – Typically, *visit other schools to watch and learn*. Also, *I would like more time to talk to other Heads*.
- Engage in more reflection and further study. Typically *a Doctorate or a Masters*. *Professional development medium term courses (not just one day or one week courses)*. Also, *more HR training in building teams and encouraging teacher leadership*
- Develop a better understanding of school management. Typically, *more work on compliance issues and on finance issues*.
- Have more time to understand the position of Head. Typically, *more discussion with the Head about the challenges that he faces – an insight into how close my expectations are to the reality*. Also, *strategic planning processes*.

4.5 Expectations and realities for the Science Coordinator

4.5.1 Science Coordinators and Heads: Differences in roles

Governance, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were all asked how the role of Science Head was different to the role of Head.

It is acknowledged that governors are not directly responsible for the role of the Science Coordinator. Science Coordinators are accountable directly to the Head, often through an intermediary such as the Deputy Head or Director of Studies. Governance views were elicited to identify any specific expectations that they (would have expected the Head to have) sought in the role of the Science Coordinator. These, directly or indirectly, are bound to be ultimately expectantly manifested.

Governors expected that the role of Science Coordinators would be different to the role of Head in that –

- The Science Coordinator is still reporting to the Head (2 responses).
- The Science Coordinator has a more specific role (6 responses). E.g. *still finance but not governance: The Head is responsible for the whole school – Science Head focuses on his area of expertise. Science Head can afford not to be a big-picture thinker: Head is more broad brush. Science Head has some autonomy but within a department: The Head has to have an understanding of the issues facing each function/area within the School. These involve dealing both internally (students, teachers, parents and governing body or bodies) and externally (Government departments, other heads, and prospective parents/teachers). A science co-ordinator has the internal issues but only in their area of responsibility not for the whole school and not externally.*

Heads explained that the role of Science Coordinators would be different to their own role in that –

- The Science Coordinator is still reporting to the Head (1 response). *The Science Coordinator has less opportunity to change the direction of the organisation and is left implementing the decisions of others.*
- The Science Coordinator has a more specific role (6 responses). E.g. *Science Coordinator has similar expectations – pastoral care of staff and students, management – but on a smaller scale: Picture is smaller – Science coordinator has a microcosm: Head has view of whole school. Science Coordinator has more functional and narrow focus.* Most Heads (5 responses) emphasised that the more specific role of Coordinator meant less accountability. E.g. *less accountability and complexity: Their head is not on the chopping block every day*
- The Science Coordinator has much more contact with the students of the school. (1 response).

Prospective Heads expected that the role of Science Coordinators would be different to the role of the Head in that –

- The Science Coordinator has a more specific role (8 responses). E.g. *Head needs to see the College as a whole: A faculty head has their own faculty – it is compartmentalised – all you do is biased towards the faculty: Science coordinator needs to fit in with the vision of the school. They do not develop the vision – they align with it: Head of Science is a solar system in a galaxy.* As with Heads, most prospective Heads (8 responses) emphasised that the more specific role of Coordinator meant less accountability. E.g. *Head has more accountability to governance: Head has responsibility to all stake-holders – especially the wider community: A Science Coordinator can always pass the very difficult issues on. The head is where the buck stops.*
- There is less impact of the pressures of the school on the Science Coordinator (1 response). *The Science Coordinator leads a much smaller part of the organisation and is completely protected by the organisation – there is several levels before a matter reaches the Head – where the buck stops.*

Science Coordinators perceive that their role would be different to the role of the Head in that –

- The Science Coordinator has a more specific role (5 responses). E.g. *My focus is day-to-day, finer details. Head is looking at how it all fits together – overall functioning of the organism: Head has a wider view – we can afford to be focussed on the activity of 10 people: There is a scale difference. The number of staff that need to be considered; the range of classes; the interaction with parents; the promotion of the College vs faculty.* Science Coordinators also acknowledged that they had less accountability (1 response)
- The Head no longer teaches (1 response) and *it is no longer the job that you signed up for.*
- The Head has a stronger focus on pastoral care whereas the Science Coordinator focuses on curriculum matters (1 response).
- There is less impact of the pressures of the school on the Science Coordinator (2 responses). *There is a need for the Head to attend many more functions outside*

of regular work hours, and many more meetings relating to interschool relations: The Head of the school needs to be married to the school and have family as a side interest. They need a brain like an octopus – can't focus on one thing as people come at you from different angles.

Prospective Science Coordinators perceive that the role of Science Coordinator would be different to the role of the Head in that –

- The Science Coordinator answers to the Head (1 response) – *the Head is the final authority within a school whereas the Science Coordinator answers to the Head.*
- The Science Coordinator has a more specific role (4 responses). One prospective Science Coordinators also stated that Science Coordinators had less accountability.
- The Head has less procedures to keep him/her in check

4.5.2 Creation and Evolution

Governors, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Heads and prospective Science Heads were all asked this question. The views of leadership at every level in a school based on Christian philosophy will shape the environment that a prospective Science Head will be placed in. If there are specific philosophical questions that the prospective Science Head might be realistically expected to have an opinion on, and adhere to, the literature review suggests that the Creation/Evolution debate looms among the first and foremost.

There were three responses to the Creation/Evolution issue that emerged from the interviews. The first was to teach both; the second to teach Creation as fact but Evolution as theory and the third that a stance on the issue should be left to the individual teacher or student, according to their beliefs. No respondent felt that evolution should be taught and creation not be taught – one explicitly excluded this notion.

Governance responses were to –

- Teach both Creation and Evolution (4 responses): *Scripture is an account of God's creative and sustaining hand. His methods are not scientifically explained – evolution may be his mechanism, though it may be a punctuated evolution. In one response the “teach both” response was qualified – We must hold that the creation of man is special. Also, Creation and Evolution are not either/or. They are not incompatible. Genes make us all different.*
- Teach Creation as fact and Evolution as theory (3 responses): *Acknowledge that the theory of evolution exists and state its scientific principles. Emphasise that it is a theory. Creation is described in the Bible, and being God's word, is God's instruction to us and hence it is much more than just a theory – it is God breathed: God can do anything – He is not limited – it is important we educate the students that God spoke and it happened: From the Bible – it needs to begin with a sound view of Creation. The Bible is God's revealed will. Evolution is a theory – and also a Board of Studies requirement. The Bible tells us that God spoke and it happened. (I speak and nothing happens). Don't run away from the issue of Creation and Evolution.*

Heads' responses were to –

- Meet Board of Studies requirements (2 responses): *With any topic in any course, treat it in terms of the difference between learnt knowledge and revealed knowledge – these don't exclude each other. God gives us the ability and the understanding to make sense of the world around us.*
- Leave the matter up to the Science Department (1 response): *Have consultation and collaboration between all Science teachers to reach common ground.*
- Teach both Creation and Evolution (2 responses): *Manage it from a Biblical point of view – BUT – also from a compliance point of view – the two can be compatible. Also, a Science Coordinator should explain both the theory of evolution and the story of creation.*

- Teach Creation as fact and Evolution as theory (2 responses): *The Bible is right but we are not told everything. There is evidence in Science for evolution. The Bible is the ultimate authority. Also, teach evolution as the theory that it is (holes and all). Teach Creation as the reality that it is and the certainty that we have in that.*

Prospective Heads' responses were to –

- Meet Board of Studies requirements (1 response):
- Leave the matter up to the Science Department (1 response): *Employ the right coordinator for Science. Look for advice from trusted colleagues who run a similar school.*
- Discuss the matter between stakeholders to reach a position of agreement (3 responses): *Work with governance and staff so that the school position is clear and then with the Science department so that students can examine the issue within a Christian world view: Also, there is a need to be well read before wading into it and consult with the church – seek information.*
- Deprioritise it (1 response): *Deprioritise it. It is possible to have theistic evolutionists and Creationists. It does not matter whether God made the universe in 7 days, 7 years or 7 centuries. Kids need the knowledge of the certainty of the Bible. We don't care what staff believe – except evolution without creation would be an issue.*
- Teach both Creation and Evolution (1 response): *Teach evolution and also present the other view.*
- Teach Creation as fact and Evolution as theory (1 response): *Evolution is a theory – encourage discussion*
- Leave the matter up to the students (3 responses): *Refer to the Bible. Don't pretend to have all the answers. Don't disenfranchise the kids. This is an area where the Science Coordinator needs the support of the Head of the School. If God created the world then he is capable of anything. Also, not as a dictum – we want young people with informed minds. Talk about it and explore the issues – it*

is OK to say what you believe and why. Also, need to support their view theologically and scientifically – intellectual honesty – need to be good intellectually and theological – some are too dogmatic in one or the other.

Science Coordinators' responses were to –

- Meet Board of Studies requirements (2 responses), although one qualified: *While I appreciate the BOS requirement to teach Evolution, I am dismayed at the lack of balanced scientific arguments for and against Evolution, whether it is micro- or macro-evolution.*
- Teach both Creation and Evolution (5 responses): *I explain that there are different views on everything – that we should present both views. If we present all information then it allows for individual choice. In the case of the Big Bang – one view is that “it just started.” We challenge this assumption by saying, “It had to start from somewhere. Energy can’t be created or destroyed”. Also, evidence is strongly supportive of evolution BUT the scriptures are true as well. The Bible is God’s word and points to God. Science is the study of nature (us trying to understand it). Theology is the study of the Word of God. Both are true. Also, ultimately present both sides of the argument to the students and then assist them to make decisions on the basis of evidence. Also, Genesis is a metaphor of a religious text, not a literal, scientific textbook. However, I have always respected those who believe in Creationism and teach respect for this point of view.*
- Teach Creation as fact and Evolution as theory (1 response): *Teach Evolution as a theory – like all theories.*
- Leave the matter up to the students (1 response): *Encourage open discussion. Good theology and good Science are not opposed. We like students who have a strong viewpoint in either area to listen and consider the opposite view. Equip students to be thinkers.*

Prospective Science Coordinators' responses were to –

- Teach both Creation and Evolution (4 responses): *As Bible believing Christians, we must “watch [our] life and doctrine closely” (1 Timothy 4:16). Therefore, the authority of scripture and God’s status as sovereign creator are non-negotiable absolutes. With this in mind, how do we read Genesis 1-2? Some hold that this portion of scripture is to be read literally i.e. creation occurred in 6 days; others read it figuratively i.e. the 6 days are metaphors for longer periods of time. Provided that God’s sovereignty as creator and the authority of scripture are held, either view may bring glory to God. It’s therefore better to “avoid foolish controversies and genealogies” (Titus 3:9). Also, show them both separately AND showing how they can exist as one. Also, Find out what the school’s view is first. Insist on teaching of both. Teach evolution well. Creation is not a scientific concept – it is a belief.*
- Teach Creation as fact and Evolution as theory (2 responses): *Evolution Theory is a consequence of the Scientific Method. It has limitations and does not contradict the Bible. Give students an understanding that conflict is not necessary – although you can see conflict if you wish (it is a personal view). The Bible is a genre of text – not a Science text-book – it is not necessarily literal. Also, I would ask the Head what our policy on creation vs evolution is and how it should be taught. If I was given the freedom to choose, I would instruct my staff to teach evolution as simply a theory, whether they liked it or not. I would then work with them in informal and formal times to help them see the truth that is found in the Bible.*
- Use the question to show the falsehood of Evolution (1 response): *Evolution is a lie and cannot exist if you take a serious theological look at it. I present it as an idea that people have when they try to explain the origins of anything outside the framework of God.*

4.5 3 The Head's Expectations of the Science Coordinator

Heads were asked about the expectations that they had of the Science Coordinator at their school. Responses were given in a general sense that might be applicable to any department coordinator or in a specific sense as they would apply directly to Science.

General responses included –

- Have a gospel focus (1 response)
- Care for staff and students (2 response): *Lead staff to become better Science teachers*
- Manage the department (4 responses): *manage the faculty to be effective: Good administrator: Well organised*
- Be educationally compliant (1 response):
- Curriculum expertise (4 response): *Being a master teacher: Very good knowledge and skills*
- Add to the school culture (1 response): *create a culture that is supportive of and adds to the culture of the school.*

Specific responses included –

- Maintain safety (2 responses):
- Being across all disciplines (1 response): *experience in all Science subjects*
- To make Science fun and engaging (4 response): *Make the subject live: Instil in kids a love of Science: Able to lead a team in exciting and challenging ways so that the learning of Science is seen as worthwhile, stimulating and fun.*

Prospective Heads were also asked about the expectations that they had of the Science Coordinator at their school. In most cases, the Prospective Heads were nominated by Heads from those at their school who were Deputy Heads or Directors of Studies, to whom Science Heads were directly responsible for performance and meeting

expectations. Responses were also given in a general sense that might be applicable to any department coordinator or in a specific sense as they would apply directly to Science.

General responses included –

- Have a gospel focus (5 responses): *Christian leader in the faculty. Also, lead discussion on how to cover the curriculum from a Christian World view. Also, look at programs from a Christian perspective (world view – perfect area like English and History).*
- Care for staff and students (2 responses): *Manage the faculty including staff and students. Also, to encourage staff interaction and student management.*
- Manage the department (5 responses): *manage the faculty to be effective: Good administrator: Well organised. Also, use resources effectively. Also, pull staff together to be the best team that they can – program writing, new ideas.*
- Be educationally compliant (2 responses): *Meet Board Of Studies requirements*
- Curriculum expertise (5 responses): *To be passionate and to know their subject. Also, understands the curriculum. Also, up to date with the latest knowledge*
- Add to the school culture (5 responses): *A coordinator has their own little world so they need to create a sub-culture as a subset of the culture of the school. Also, to be optimistic in her views. Also, to be supportive of the whole school vision. Coordinators who see beyond their faculty are priceless. Also, work hard and be honest in the job.*
- To contribute to a teaching and learning culture (4 responses): *To be a leader in pedagogy – be a subject expert (know HOW to teach); Also, to promote quality Teaching and Learning.*
- To be loyal and teachable (4 responses): *To have a willingness to learn. Also, to support management. Also, to communicate the vision of the executive and the Head and translate this into the classroom.*

Specific responses included –

- Maintain safety (2 responses): *OH&S capable. Also, an administrator – particularly in chemicals and OH&S.*
- Being across all disciplines (2 responses): *Be across all the domains and manage specialists. Also, be across all aspects of Science teaching*
- To make Science fun and engaging (1 response): *Innovator and current - encourage this in staff*
- To be passionate about Science (2 responses): *Passion and knowledge of Science*
- To be financially responsible (1 response): *They have one of the largest budgets.*
- Assist the Junior school where emphasis on Science can be diminished (1 response): *Assist junior school – who does not have this speciality*
- To establish industry links (1 response): *Links with industry.*

In the reverse, sense, Science Coordinators were also asked about the expectations that the Head of the school had of them. Responses were mostly expressed in a general sense that might be applicable to any department coordinator. In only one case was there a specific reference to Science.

General responses included –

- Care for staff and students (3 responses): *To be a leader of the faculty – including people management, meeting deadlines, care for staff, assisting staff, keeping staff happy – this is a key.*
- Manage the department (5 responses): *The coordination of a department – that I am a professional who will know the job and do the job well. Also, run faculty with integrity and efficiency. Also, results.*
- Be educationally compliant (1 responses): *Ensuring that the faculty meets Board of Studies expectations*
- Curriculum expertise (1 responses): *Ensure syllabus programming and that it is taught faithfully*

- To contribute to a teaching and learning culture (3 responses): *Boost student numbers in senior courses and that our subjects “value add.” Also, providing clear direction for the promotion of Faculty subjects. Also, personal quality teaching – demonstration*
- To be loyal and teachable (3 responses): *To support the Head in their decisions – I am the Head’s representative to the faculty not the faculty’s representative to the Head. Also, work hard and be honest in the job. Also, ensuring staff in Faculty understand and follow College policies and procedures*

The specific responses was –

- To be financially responsible (1 response): *Good steward of Science resources*

Prospective Science Coordinators were asked about the expectations which they believed that the Head of the school would have of a Science Coordinator. Again, responses were expressed in a general sense that could be attributed to any faculty (even though the word Science may have been used) or with specific reference to Science functions and practices.

General responses included –

- Have a gospel focus (4 responses): *To foster in students an appreciation of the Christian world view (whether they become one or not). Also, the Head of the school would expect the Science Coordinator to lead by example in spreading the good news about God to their students. Also, have a knowledge of the bible and the ability to teach science through it*
- Care for staff and students (7 responses): *Monitoring student progress and addressing identified areas of concern. Also, supporting staff with discipline or other issues as they may arise. Also, providing support, training and assistance to junior or inexperienced staff and staff experiencing difficulties. Also, providing the first and main point of contact for pastoral care of faculty staff. Also, be supportive of their staff, especially new teachers, in all aspects of their*

teaching and careers, including professional development, programs, resourcing etc

- Manage the department (6 responses): *Has a vision for the faculty and promotes goals for continuous improvement. Also, delegation of various tasks. Also, leadership and supervision of Science teaching and technical staff. Also, providing a link in the chain of command between school executive and faculty staff. Also, communication and negotiation with the Head of College regarding budget requirements, upcoming expenses etc.*
- Be educationally compliant (3 responses): *Ensures that administrative and legal requirements of the department are managed – e.g. Board of Studies and OH&S.*
- Curriculum expertise (2 responses): *Oversight of assessment and reporting. Also, good knowledge of the syllabus.*
- To contribute to a teaching and learning culture (8 responses): *Leads faculty staff to produce best learning outcomes for students. Also, oversight of teaching and learning within Science. Also, seek to continually improve the standard of teaching and learning in his or her faculty. Also, monitoring the quantity and quality of Science staff's work. Also, set an excellent example to Science staff in all aspects of his or her duties including teaching practice. Also, make Science a strength of the school.*

Specific responses included –

- Maintain safety (3 responses): *Ensuring OHS compliance in practical work, preparation, storage, training, documentation etc.*
- Being across all disciplines (2 responses): *Ensuring Science staff are teaching the programmes faithfully and well. Also, be well versed in and abreast of all issues relating to the teaching of Science*
- To make Science fun and engaging (2 response): *Scientific literacy – teaching students to analyse questions as adults. Science as a method – best explanation of things but not the answer to everything. Also, oversight of teaching & learning events including competitions, excursions etc.*

- The responsibility for the Laboratory Assistant (1 response): *Management of the technician's workload and oversight of the allocation of tasks to the technician.*
- Extra logistical requirements (2 response): *Ensuring adequate stocks of equipment, consumables etc; Also, ensuring all equipment is being used and cared for appropriately.*

4.5.4 Heads Expectations of Coordinators

Heads responses to this question were succinct. The majority felt that there were no differences between the role of Science Coordinator and the roles of other Coordinators in schools.

No difference (4 responses), although there were others who felt that there were minimal differences who went on to qualify the response with mention of these; typically safety.

Knowledge of Chemical Safety (2 responses) A response was typically; *none – except for risk and safety (same as technology)*

A higher possibility of controversy (1 response) *Not a lot of difference except for touchy issues in a Christian school – The Science Coordinator needs a well defined Christian World View.*

Prospective Heads generally had a higher regard for the specifics of a Science Coordinators responsibility. In particular they were aware of the safety requirements of the position, but also the complexity of some of the issues that Science Coordinators were dealing with. They responded that a Science Coordinator would be expected to be –

- Passionate about Science (1 response) *A passion for Science.*
- Versatile across a range of disciplines (2 responses) *Knowledge of their own subject within the faculty. Broad Science knowledge. Also, a generalist across all areas.*

- Able to manage complex issues (4 responses) *More complexity in programs e.g. the Creation vs. Evolution debate – intelligent design. Also, issues of their worldview – particularly in regard to Genesis (Creation/Evolution) – this is critical for Science Coordinators more than others. Other issues like bioethics and stem cell research flow from their world view. Also, Christian World view – evolution, biology (can be media fodder). Also, need to remain current – more change than History.*
- Able to manage practical aspects of Science (1 response) *Balance of Theory vs. Practical*
- Up to date in safety issues (4 responses) *OH&S – Chemical safety*
- Responsible for extra staff (1 response) *Responsible for the Science Assistant*

One respondent added that the Science Coordinator had one of the more complex Coordinator roles due to its heterogeneous and demanding nature.

Science Coordinators were also able to articulate the difference between their role and that of other Coordinators but with a much narrower focus than that of prospective Heads. The differences they expressed were almost entirely limited to safety issues. They felt that their role needed someone with –

- Safety expertise (6 responses) – *especially if the Head does not have a Science background.*
- An ability to manage controversial issues (1 response). *A well thought out view of Science in Christian context – more tensions in Science – Bio tec, Genetic engineering, Global warming, Creation/Evolution*
- Stack management skills (1 response).
- Skills in time management (1 response). *Managing a detailed and prescriptive syllabus – too much content.*

Whilst safety and the management issues associated with a practical subject were still prominent with prospective Science Coordinators, they expected that there would be

extra expectations surrounding the marketability of Science that would be also be important.

- Science marketability (2 responses). *Science has the opportunity to sell a school. There is the potential for excitement – eg “grab” subjects like Astronomy. There is a higher marketing expectation from those who coordinate practical, hands-on subject areas. Also, Science contains two of the “glory subjects” – Physics and Chemistry where results, along with Extension Maths and Extension English are sometimes used by parents making enrolment choices for academic students.*
- Pressure for results (1 response). *As Science is a compulsory subject for 7-10 students, the Science Coordinator manages a key subject area affecting the majority of a High School’s student population.*
- The practical nature of Science (3 responses). *Science is a practical subject so the Science Coordinator has additional responsibilities in terms of managing equipment, technical staff and OHS.*
- Safety aspects (3 responses). *OH&S implications for systems within the department; chemical safety, lab. safety.*

4.5.5 Balance of Responsibilities

Heads were asked what their expectations were regarding the percentage of time that should be allocated by a Science Coordinator towards administration, pastoral care and teaching and learning. The percentage results are summarised in the following table.

| | H01 | H02 | H03 | H04 | H05 | H06 | H07 | Av |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Administration | 20 | 15 | ** | 25 | 20 | 33 | *** | 22.6 |
| Pastoral Care | 40 | 25* | ** | 25 | 20 | 33 | *** | 28.6 |
| Teach / Learn | 40 | 60 | ** | 50 | 60 | 33 | *** | 48.6 |

* Split 15% staff and 10% students

** Administration 40%

Teaching and Learning 60%

Pastoral Care is not a separate category – core business is the other two

80% of their time is in Pastoral Care

**** I am really interested whether this matches reality (I would guess that maybe more time is spent in teaching and learning*

Prospective Heads' responses are also tabled below.

| | PH01 | PH02 | PH03 | PH04 | PH05 | PH06 | PH07 | PH08 | PH09 | PH10 | Av |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Administration | 30 | 25 | 25* | 30 | 20 | 30 | 30** | 25 | 40 | 30 | 28.5 |
| Pastoral Care | 25 | 25 | 25* | 35 | 20 | 10 | 20** | 20 | 40 | 35 | 25.5 |
| Teach / Learn | 55 | 50 | 50* | 35 | 60 | 60 | 50** | 55 | 20 | 35 | 47.0 |

* Reality is: Admin 33%, pastoral care 33%, teaching and learning 33%

** Reality is: Admin 55%, pastoral care 35%, teaching and learning 40%

On averaging of opinion, prospective Heads, those most likely to be their direct supervisors, would generally expect that Science Coordinators spend 50% of their time dedicated to issues of teaching and learning, 25% to pastoral care and 25% to administration.

Science Coordinators' responses are tabled below.

| | S01 | S02 | S03 | S04 | S05 | S06 | Av |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| Administration | 40 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 31.7 |
| Pastoral Care | 30 | 20 | 50 | 20 | 20 | 35 | 29.2 |
| Teach / Learn | 30 | 50 | 20* | 60 | 50 | 25 | 39.2 |

* *I often need to wing it – it is the last thing I spend time on (other teachers see this and it puts them off – they want to teach. I actually get excited by a chance to plan lessons.)*

Science Coordinators report that, in reality, they spend (on average) 40% of their time on teaching and learning, 30% on pastoral care and 30% on administration.

Prospective Science Coordinators were asked what percentage of time they currently devote to each of the areas of administration, pastoral care and teaching and learning and then asked what their expectations would be of how they would spend their time as a Science Coordinator. Their responses are tabled below.

Current percentage use of time:

| | PS01 | PS02 | PS03 | PS04 | PS05 | Av |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|
| Administration | 10 | 20 | 15 | 30 | 15 | 18 |
| Pastoral Care | 20 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 15 |
| Teach / Learn | 70 | 60 | 70 | 60 | 75 | 67 |

Expected percentage use of time (were they to be a Science Coordinator):

| | PS01 | PS02 | PS03 | PS04 | PS05 | Av |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Administration | 20 | 30 | 33 | 40 | 33 | 31.2 |
| Pastoral Care | 30 | 20 | 33 | 20 | 33 | 27.2 |
| Teach / Learn | 50 | 50 | 33 | 40 | 33 | 41.2 |

Prospective Science Coordinators expectations of the time spent by Science Coordinators are very close to the realities of the role. They expected to spend (on average) 40% of their time on teaching and learning, 30% on pastoral care and 30% on administration. These are the same percentages quoted by Science Coordinators.

4.5.6 Expectations of the Head

Science coordinators have an expectation that the Head will be –

- Supportive (4 responses). E.g. *Support: in all aspects of the role; support for autonomy and understanding that I will work within my skills; support in the community (outside College hours) – support for my decisions.*
- An advisor/mentor (2 responses). E.g. *Maintain clear channels of communication – be able to be interrupted*
- A Provider (2 responses). E.g. *Provision of resources to teach the subject well*
- Trusting and trustworthy (2 responses). E.g. *Some level of autonomy – the Head should not micro-manage. Also; Provide equity – fair treatment and same treatment of all – some variation for individuals.*
- An advocate (1 response) *Represent Science to senior exec*
- A visionary (3 responses). E.g. *Setting the tone and direction of the school*
- Responsible (1 response). *Make a final call on matters that reach that point*

Prospective Science coordinators have an expectation that the Head will be –

- Supportive (3 responses). E.g. *Supportive and understanding of the unique issues facing the Science Coordinator, Science Teachers and the science faculty as a whole, including OH&S requirements*
- An advisor/mentor (1 response).
- A Provider (2 responses).
- An advocate (1 response). *Supportive of all staff in times of need, and (within reason) flexible to accommodate for these times or instances. Also, Uses, professional judgement (backs the Science Coordinators decision).*
- A visionary (1 response).
- Responsible (1 response). E.g. *Whilst the Principal delegates responsibility, he or she is ultimately responsible for all aspects of the school's operation.*
- A Christian (2 response).

- A listener (1 response). *Willing to listen to new ideas and suggestions on methods of improving the teaching and learning of Science*
- A strong presence (1 response). *They have a physical presence/aura which makes people go quiet when they enter a room. They have a professional polish/charisma that can be used to deal with a variety of outsiders.*

4.5.7 Expectations of Science Coordinators in a Christian school

Science coordinators were divided in equal proportion on the issue of whether their role had different expectations depending on whether they led a department in a school with a Christian philosophy or not.

Those who saw the role as different gave their reasons as –

- A stronger expectation for quality pastoral care (1 response) E.g. *The whole mind set would be different. In a Christian school there is more emphasis on pastoral care and less on simply achieving objectives X, Y and Z.*
- The need to alter teaching and learning (2 responses). *Adjustment of programming to incorporate Christian principles.*

When asked about the expectations for Science coordinators of the church, parents, staff and students in schools based on a Christian philosophy, again there was an equal divide between those who saw no difference and those who agreed that there was and gave an explanation.

For those who stated that there were differing expectations, the expectations of the church were considered to be –

- Christianity in programs (2 responses). *Do our Christian ideas contrast with a world view? Why is the school different?*

Expectations of parents were considered to be –

- Christian morals (1 response). *Parents are looking for morals.*
- That it is a better than alternative schools (1 response). *Parents want kids cared for and taught well*

Expectations of staff were considered to be –

- That all staff are Christians (1 response). *All staff are Christians and have the same mindset*
- That the Science Coordinator is there for them (more than for the school) (1 response). *Some staff expect that I represent them (not Headmaster).*

Expectations of students were considered to be –

- That they will be challenged (1 response). *Christian students enjoy hearing about a Christian world view – they take a great interest in a Science teacher who is a Christian (most think that Science is opposed to Christianity).*
- That it is a better than alternative schools (1 response). *Students are interested in Pastoral Care and results (in that order) and in good lessons that engage.*

When asked about the expectations for Science coordinators of the church, parents, staff and students in schools based on a Christian philosophy, there was also an equal divide between prospective Science Coordinators who saw no difference and those who agreed that there was and gave an explanation.

For those who stated that there were differing expectations, the expectations of the church were considered to be –

- Christianity in programs (4 responses). *They expect that scientific evidence is not taught as truth which contradicts the Bible. Also, The Church may be concerned with the Christian elements of Science teaching including teaching Science with a Christian perspective at all times but especially when addressing sensitive issues such as reproduction, creation/evolution and various aspects of current*

research. Also, that the Bible and creation are taught at every opportunity possible and that the Science coordinator is pushing their staff to do the same.

- Christian outreach (1 response). *The church and the Head of the school would have very similar expectations of the Science Coordinator in terms of nurturing the faith of their staff and students.*

Expectations of parents were considered to be –

- That it is a better than alternative schools (4 responses). *They have a priority focussed on learning outcomes. Also, parents may be primarily concerned with their child's experience in the classroom, homework & assignment load and academic performance. Also, parents would reflect the Head of the School's expectation for a Science Coordinator to be well versed in all Science teaching issues. Also, parents would also expect that the Science Coordinator would be available to them to discuss their child's progress if the need arose.*
- A strong personal presence (1 response). *Parents would want a science coordinator to be passionate and knowledgeable about their subject, but also to be firm with their classroom management*

Expectations of staff were considered to be –

- That the Science Coordinator is there for them (more than for the school) (1 response). *A competent leader who is an advocate for their faculty/staff.*
- That it is a better workplace than alternative schools (1 response). *Staff may also expect that the Science Coordinator involved them in the decision making process whenever possible.*

Expectations of students were considered to be –

- That it is a better than alternative schools (4 responses). *Some will have expectations similar to their parents; others will be entirely concerned with the quality of their classroom and/or homework experience. Also, Students would expect that the Science Coordinator was well versed in all issues in teaching of*

Science (so far as it relates to their learning and marks. Also, students would expect that Science Coordinators make themselves available for discussion of any issues that they may be having in relation to assessment due dates and issues relating to them.

4.5.8 Other Aspects of the Science Coordinator Role

Science Coordinators were given an opportunity to outline other realities of their role and prospective Science coordinators were also asked to outline other their expectations.

Coordinators responded that the reality of the position additionally requires –

- Staff professional development (3 responses). *Encouraging staff to explore different methods of teaching.*
- Pastoral care (3 responses). *Wisdom of Solomon in dealing with students (especially when you were not there). Also, a discipline option for Faculty staff*
- To be a visionary (2 responses).
- Administration. (1 response).
- The ability to lead by example (1 response).
- To be decisive (1 response).
- OH&S awareness (1 response).
- Management of a Lab Technician (1 response).
- Work and home and church balance (1 response).
- Resource management (1 response).
- Advocacy (1 response). *Providing an avenue for dialogue between staff and executive*
- Sound curriculum knowledge (1 response).
- Involvement in professional associations (1 response).

Prospective Science Coordinators expected that the role would include –

- Effective classroom teaching (2 responses). *The Coordinator is still a classroom teacher and that part of the role is still very important.*
- Pastoral care (2 responses). *Firm and fair boundaries as a framework for discipline*
- Advocacy (2 responses). *The promotion of Science within the school, including both the Science courses being offered to students and extracurricular Science activities. Also, have a genuine interest in developing an appreciation for science and the scientific knowledge of the student body and community.*
- Communication skills (1 response). *Effective skills for relating to adults and students*
- Earning the respect of students (1 response).
- Work and home and church balance (1 response). *Perhaps more so than some other staff, Coordinators must also ensure their life is balanced.*

4.5.9 Leadership style: realities and expectations

Science Coordinators were asked about the leadership style that is needed to run the faculty (reality) and to reflect on their own leadership style. Leadership styles are highlighted for ease of reference and comparison. Comments from interviewees regarding suitability are in normal type -

S01: Laid back – but also with a high expectation of self and therefore a high expectation of others (who it is hoped will mirror my example). *One example is meeting deadlines – I do this myself and expect others to follow.*

It is a suitable style.

S02: Collaborative – hint of laissez faire – hint of authoritative (this is beneficial for established staff as it gives them free reign). *There is the need to be authoritative at times – sometimes as directed by the head. New staff need guidance.*

Suitability depends on the stakeholder. Some staff want decisions made for them (“deal with my discipline issue”). Head would like more authoritative style.

S03: *Bumbling.* *I have been told that I am the perfect example of a servant leader – I do try to prioritise the needs of others.*

S04: *Consultative* – *I like to hear from people. I am **dogmatic** at times.*

It is a suitable style – there is a certain amount of “the buck stops here” and stakeholders expect that.

S05: *Easy-going, authoritarian* – *let people know what will happen in a friendly way.*

It would work for some, not others.

S06: *Consensus* – *see what others want to do to develop a common view – team leader.*

The style is suitable for most but some people just want you to make the decision – they don’t want to take responsibility for it.

Prospective Science Coordinators were asked to reflect on their own leadership style and on what leadership style they expected would be needed to run the faculty. Leadership styles are highlighted for ease of reference and comparison. Comments from interviewees regarding suitability are in normal type –

PS01: *I am strong in Steadiness and Conscientious. This means I like to get along – to work with people, reliable, helper. I like stability and organisation. I am patient and a good listener. I participate rather than direct. I am diplomatic but with clearly defined expectations. (**Collaborative**).*

Suitability of these traits depends on the wishes of the stakeholders and the dynamics of the existing leadership team. Who are they looking for? If they want a person with strong dominance and influence traits then I am not necessarily going to meet the criteria. Maybe the steady, conscientious leader is required on the team to provide balance and perspective. The downside of my style is that I am not up-front or confident if that is what is needed.

PS02: *I have exercised a mostly **collaborative** leadership style and should I be in the position of Coordinator in future, I would expect to continue in this style. Collaborative in my context would best be described as - asking opinion, discussion of matters, listening, negotiating roles and deadlines within constraints set by the Head.*

Whether this style would suit would depend a lot on the Head and his or her flexibility.

PS03: *Is – flexible – know the expectations but open to ideas on how to get there – encourage contribution. Lead by example in administration. Be approachable. I should be more consistent in expectations of others. (Collaborative).*

I expect that it would be a good style for a Science Coordinator.

PS04: *My strengths lie in my organisation and sensitivity to things around me. This helps with management of students and staff.*

I would suggest stakeholders would want to see me as more of an up-front man rather than a behind the scenes administrator.

PS05: Interviewee unable to articulate a leadership style

If science Head I would meet regularly to discuss issues; be very active - supportive.

4.5.10 The changing role of the Science Coordinator

Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were asked how the role of Science Coordinator was changing. Responses for Science coordinators are collated as follows –

- Compliance issues (4 responses). *Legal measures – work cover, negligence, risk assessments OH&S. Also, Occupational Health and Safety. The hardest thing is to get people to follow up risk assessments / filing. MSDS and Chemical Management – appropriate staff training for Lab Assistant. Also, the role is more complicated and convoluted – new legislation in OH&S, Chemical safety. Also, safety now sucks the life out of the job and limits options.*
- Increasing administration (3 responses). *Documentation for New Scheme teachers – writing supervisor’s reports for them. Extra time required for new staff in the documentation of their work means that they have less preparation time for teaching and more stress – this impacts on the Science Coordinator as their supervisor. Also, there is more administration at the expense of vision and new directions. Also, there seems to be an ever-increasing amount of paperwork. All of it is “reasonable” but it all takes time.*

- Harder to attract experienced staff (1 response). *Harder now to attract experienced staff and therefore more time is spent mentoring new staff.*
- More integration with other faculties (1 response). *Integration across curriculum areas is becoming a larger expectation: literacy, mathematical literacy, ICT literacy, economic literacy, values... Hence, programming becomes more challenging, especially ensuring a balance with knowledge and skills.*

Responses for prospective Science coordinators were also collated –

- Compliance issues (3 responses). *Society has increasingly higher standards expected but time is the issue. Also, Science Coordinators are becoming increasingly accountable for their work. Board of Studies registration and accreditation and OHS requirements are becoming increasingly onerous. Also, all leadership roles are being bogged down in administration and compliance type issues. This has led to less personal/pastoral contact.*
- Increasing administration (2 responses). *Sadly – more administration and less focus on the classroom – there is no incentive to keep good teachers in the classroom – the pay rise happens if you move into admin.*
- Increasing need for out of faculty time (1 response). *As the department is established there is a higher demand on the coordinator to fulfil wider College roles that draw him away from coordinating Science.*
- Increasing need for a business perspective (1 response). *The role also seems to be more in the marketing of the subject to promote the school business.*
- I don't know how it is changing (1 response).

4.5.11 Science Coordinator: Expectations and Realities

This question was directed at Science Coordinators only and sought to address the key question of the research. How are the realities of leadership in schools based on a Christian philosophy different to expectations?

S01 felt that the reality was very different. The major difference was the time that needed to be devoted to programming and paperwork. The paperwork was explained as partly the need to select from the variety of possible activities and excursions that the faculty could be involved in. Another reality was the greater negative impact on classroom preparation and teaching than was expected.

S02 also felt that reality differed from expectations. There was an anticipation of more leading and less administration than the reality that eventuated. Leadership had more negative consequences than was expected – less of an influence than expected; more time for trust to develop; less recognition of achievements and more criticism for mistakes. In this case, the reality was considerably worse than what was expected.

S03 also cited several differences. These were qualified in the context of a different sized school. A smaller staff meant that personnel issues were less than expected but that there was less structure in terms of how a faculty should be run. A smaller school also meant that staff worked harder and this had more associated staff management issues than had been expected.

S04 saw little difference between expectations and reality. The expectation was that it would be important to keep the department running smoothly and that teachers would need to be supported.

S05 cited differences between expectations and reality. The expectations that the role would be very similar to a teacher but with some extra paperwork and direction setting programming were erroneous. The reality was that the extra leadership brief had made teaching harder but that the extra responsibility and trust had been a good compensation.

S06 found it hard to remember the differences.

4.5.12 Reality: the biggest surprises.

Science Coordinators said that the biggest surprises in accepting the position of leading this faculty in a school with a Christian philosophy, compared with their expectations were –

- More time spent on administration (3 responses). *Expectation was that there would be some time spent on programming and paperwork but the reality is that it is much more. Also, a lot of programming.*
- Less time available to prepare for the classroom (3 responses). *This takes the coordinator away from the classroom – preparation, teaching. Also, no time to prepare lessons well and yet being prepared to lead by example.*
- Other delegated responsibilities (2 responses). *Other whole-College roles that take you away from coordinating Science. Also, other College roles spread over less managers.*
- Autonomy (2 responses). *Reality – Surprised to be left to my own devices – no set guidelines. Also, the level of responsibility/trust has been more (a good/pleasant thing).*
- Complex staff personality issues (6 responses). *It was a great surprise to find out how complex people are. There is a huge range of people – need for correction, different confidence levels, different personal lives. Also, small school means that staff work harder and are more stressed. Also, more time involved in getting to the bottom issues that I thought. Also, the lack of time to mentor staff. Also, teachers do not feel the same about the job as you do.*
- More personal frustrations (3 responses). *Not able to achieve what I thought I could and keep life in balance at the same time. Also, the lack of time for significant planning. Also, the hardest part is the lack of recognition – expectation was an expanded sphere of influence but this is not the reality.*
- Job is more reactive (1 response).

4.5.13 Responsibilities as the school changes in size.

Science Coordinators were asked about the changing nature of their role as a school changes in size. This would be helpful knowledge for a prospective Science coordinator who was considering accepting a promotion in a school that was similar in many ways to his/her past or current experience but which may be significantly bigger or smaller.

Prospective Science Coordinators were also asked for their expectation of how the role of Science Coordinator would change as a school grew or contracted.

Science Coordinators noted the following changes in emphasis as a school grew –

- More staff issues (3 responses). *More staff is more diversity and more time in coaching them and drawing them together. Also, expansion of executive responsibilities (bigger staff means more delegation). Also, need to check consistency across a year as the school grows – easy with 2 and hard with 4.*
- More work; more administration (2 responses). *More resources and higher budget. Also, a larger school means more classes and probably more staff. This will require more coordination.*
- More emphasis on course numbers (1 response). *A focus on establishment of Science and increasing the number of students taking Science and the number of courses on offer.*
- Less work (1 response). *As it grows it is likely that the workload actually lightens – bigger school means putting staff in teams so that they can follow each other up.*
- More focus on academic standards (1 response). *As the College develops there is a quality emphasis –to raise the academic standard and to assist teachers in understanding what HSC marker expectations are.*

Prospective Science Coordinators anticipated the following changes in emphasis as a school grew –

- More work; more administration (3 responses). *More resources means greater time needed away from other priorities in order to manage resources.*
- More emphasis on course numbers (2 responses). *There is the need to provide more subject choices and to resource these choices – eg Environmental Science, Agriculture.*
- More focus on academic standards (1 response). *Cater for a greater number of students – abilities become more varied (students do not fit bell curve).*

- More staff issues (1 response). *Growing is more staff to manage and more staff issues.*
- Consolidation (1 response). *Now that the initial set up of the Science faculty is almost complete, the priority is shifting to consolidating, evaluating and improving existing structures, practices and procedures.*
- More visionary and creative practices (1 response). *A longer established school would be more visionary and creative with programming.*

4.5.14 Preparing prospective Science Coordinators for the role

It was thought important to establish what processes and procedures were currently in place in schools to prepare prospective Science Coordinators for the role of leading the department in the future.

Two questions were asked of Science Coordinators. The first asked what prospective Science Coordinators in their department were doing to prepare them for a promotion position and secondly, what other activities or practices would assist.

Prospective Science Coordinators were also asked what they were currently doing and what new practices or procedures would be of added benefit.

Science Coordinators felt that current useful practices for prospective leaders in their department were –

- Developing a whole school perspective (2 responses) *Carry out expectations beyond the classroom – whole school role such as Year Advisor.*
- Delegated responsibilities in,
 - Programming (1 response) *Programming – working in groups with the responsibility for the finished product.*
 - Chairing meetings (1 response) *Chairing faculty meetings.*

- Resource ordering (1 response) *Understanding the paperwork – getting them to follow things through.*
- Faculty activities (1 response) *Running Science Competitions; Running larger excursions.*
- General areas (1 response) *responsibility for a topic, or Science week*
- That they work hard and learn to follow (1 response) *Work hard – think outside the box – be willing to speak their mind – be good followers*
- To be Acting Science Coordinator (1 response)
- Nothing (1 response) *One has the ability and potential but no interest – says “There is no way I want your job.”*

Science Coordinators felt that other useful practices for prospective leaders in their department would also be –

- Delegated responsibilities in,
 - Compliance and Safety issues (3 responses) *BOS and OHS requirements.*
 - Programming (2 responses)
 - Pastoral tasks (2 responses) *Dealing with the grey areas – such as getting to the bottom of a contentious issue.*
 - General areas (2 responses). *It would be good for them to have more opportunities to do different jobs. Also, Opportunity to lead a higher degree of difficulty area.*
- Professional development (2 responses) *Professional development and report back.*
- Developing a whole school perspective (1 response) *Involvement in extra-curricular activities.*
- More mentoring (1 response) *I would like to spend more time mentoring them – it is often easier just to something yourself rather than explain it.*
- Communication skills; listening (1 response)

Prospective Science Coordinators felt that current useful practices in developing their skills to become leaders in their department were –

- To become a better teacher (2 responses) *Working on my craft as a teacher. Also, developing my own teaching strategies.*
- Delegated responsibilities in,
 - Programming (1 response)
 - Chairing meetings (1 response) *Chair faculty meetings*
 - Compliance and safety issues (1 response) *Minor administrative preparation for Registration.*
 - Administration (1 response)
 - General areas (2 responses) *Step up and assist the coordinator when needed. Also, working through the ongoing task of evaluating and improving existing structures, practices and procedures.*
- Mentoring (1 response) *I make observations of leaders that I have respect for and try to implement their strengths.*
- Preparing for the next step (1 response) *I am making a mental checklist of activities I have done which will help my CV/interviews.*
- Professional development (1 response) *Studying a Masters*

Prospective Science Coordinators felt that other useful practices for them to be better prepared to be prospective leaders in their department would be –

- Professional development (2 responses) *Professional development on Team Leading; professional reading. Also, Management training eg STANSW Leadership Professional Learning Courses.*
- Delegated responsibilities in,
 - Pastoral tasks (2 responses). *More exposure to discipline issues. Also, I think a role that involves experience in the management of staff*
 - Administrative tasks (1 response) *Clearer knowledge of database operations – coordination of faculty results*
 - General areas (1 response). *Actually assisting in smaller parts*

- More mentoring (1 response) *Consultation with existing faculty heads*
- Acting Science Coordinator (1 response) *Like to have a chance at Acting Science Head for a while first*

4.5.15 Compelling reasons for becoming a Science Head

This question was a late addition and therefore elicited less response than the others. Both Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were asked for compelling reasons to become the faculty head.

Science Coordinators saw the benefits of the role as –

- Generally, exercising leadership and responsibility (6 responses). *It is good to see a plan go well and be instrumental in seeing the plan come to fruition. Also, a good stepping stone IF you are looking at senior roles in the future and would like some responsibility. Also, helping staff personally. Also, less boredom – teaching becomes boring after a while. Also, working with a team of intelligent people with similar interests.*
- Generally, contributing to a whole school perspective (2 responses) *Sense of the bigger picture. Also, a chance to enjoy the insight into the whole school perspective.*
- Specifically, the intrinsic benefits of engaging people about Science (2 responses) *Science is great and part of who we are and our existence – people like to talk about it. Also, the opportunity to direct Science learning via the Teachers – especially in Year 7-10.*

Prospective Science Coordinators saw the benefits of the role as –

- Generally, exercising leadership and responsibility (3 responses). *Nurture new teachers – facilitation of faculty. Also, an opportunity to use the gifts that God has given me. Also, the opportunity to train/nurture new staff.*
- Generally, contributing to a whole school perspective (1 response)

- Generally, the cash and recognition (1 response).
- Specifically, the intrinsic benefits of engaging people about Science (3 responses) *Opportunity to promote Science and produce programs with more of your own stamp. Also, promote the subjects. Also, have a greater influence on what is happening in the classrooms*

4.5.16 Compelling reasons for not becoming a Science Head

This question was also a late addition and therefore elicited less response than the others. To gather the opposing point of view to the last question, both Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were asked for compelling reasons not to become the faculty head.

Science Coordinators all responded to the question in general terms that might be applicable to any subject coordinator. The main disincentives were–

- A higher responsibility and workload (4 responses). *Takes away from family – time and the mental space (responsibility). Also, it fractures your ideals – there is no time for vision – it is fixing things at the moment.*
- Middle management issues (1 response) *You will be the meat in the sandwich between kids/parent and the Deputy. Also, Safety – responsibility for those in your care – legally and morally*
- Lack of classroom engagement (2 responses) *Takes time away from lesson preparation; lose class time. Also, never have enough time to prepare my own lessons well – always questions and distractions at school*
- Financial (1 response) *In some schools the financial allowance is not enough.*

Prospective Science Coordinators also responded to the question in general terms that might be applicable to any subject coordinator. The main disincentives were–

- A higher responsibility and workload (3 responses). *If you did not like administration; if you don't like dealing with conflict. Also, family commitments*

– *they are still very young; a lack of self-confidence. Also, too much paperwork; a lot of responsibility – what if your department's not performing well.*

- Middle management issues (1 response) *Observations of current middle management already working too hard – makes the job unattractive.*
- Lack of classroom engagement (1 response) *Moving out of the classroom.*

4.6 Summary

In this chapter, a website survey was used to determine those characteristics that delineated schools based on a Christian philosophy from secular schools based on what schools said about their own ambitions for student exit outcomes. These characteristics were then added to other survey questions that sought to both establish the nature of independent schools based on a Christian philosophy and the expectations of existing school leaders and prospective school leaders. Expectations were then compared to realities experienced by the incumbents.

In Chapter Five, conclusions will be drawn based on predominant trends that have emerged from these results.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Following this introduction, there are three other sections in this chapter:

5.2 Conclusions drawn from interviews: Heads – which provides an analysis of the implications of views expressed by various relevant stakeholders for this role in schools which are based on a Christian philosophy.

5.3 Conclusions drawn from interviews: Science Heads – which provides an analysis of the implications of views expressed by various relevant stakeholders for this role in schools which are based on a Christian philosophy.

5.4 Advice for Prospective Heads – is a summative section which encapsulates the most significant findings of the research as they pertain to those seeking an insight into the realities of Headship.

5.5 Advice for Prospective Science Heads – is also a summative section, this time encapsulating the most significant findings of the research as they pertain to those seeking an insight into the realities of leading a Science Department.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM INTERVIEWS: HEADS

5.2.1 Expectations of the role of Head of School

There is a significant difference between the expectations of governance for the Head of a school and the perceptions of the expectations of the responsibilities of the role that Heads and prospective Heads have.

When interviewed, governors focused on the personal characteristics that they sought in a candidate and valued in an incumbent for the role of Head. Governors also placed a relatively greater emphasis on the area of Christian leadership.

Heads and Prospective Heads shared a collective impression that acumen in the areas of business leadership (and management) and educational leadership respectively, were more highly regarded as expected expertise for a Head than Christian leadership and personal characteristics.

There is clearly a mismatch in the expectations of the two groups. It is clear that governance expectations are somewhat shaped by their own function at the school as moral and philosophical gate-keepers. It is a logical consequence that their expectation of the Head will therefore strongly reflect the key delineating feature of the school – a Christian philosophy – and that they will also emphasise the personal attributes that will be required to operationally drive such a philosophy.

Conversely, it is not surprising that those charged with the operational day-to-day functions at the school place greater stock in the belief that governance prioritises business leadership/management and educational leadership above Christian leadership.

The emphasis that governance places on Christian leadership is clearly not being fully transferred to the Head's impression of what is expected of him/her and to those who are prospective candidates for the future. It would be informative to attend meetings involving governance and the Head and chart the amount of time spent discussing the Christian tone of the school compared to the educational direction and business matters related to compliance and finance.

No group of respondents placed the priority in expectations of sound educational leadership above business leadership and management. Perhaps this is a reflection on the nature of independent schools in times that are uncertain for some (the question relating to adapting to change in size, drew out the need to focus on arresting the decline for some schools) and where the need for marketing strategy and positive publicity to attract enrolments has resulted in a more acute focus on financial sustainability. It may

also be the recognition of a natural response to the increasing compliance requirements reflected in the “changing role of the Head” question where most respondents indicated the increasing weight and complexity of accountability to new legislation and government agencies.

There would be a significant difference between the expectations of a prospective Head seeking to focus primarily on teaching and learning, pastoral care and educational leadership (the reasons why many entered the profession of teaching) and the reality of a Headship requiring a clear framework for mature Christian leadership and a dominantly business mindset.

5.2.2 Differences in expectations for Heads with a Christian brief

All schools are guided by a set of principles, morals and ethics – whether explicitly stated or by tacit projection or approval. Schools based on a Christian philosophy are no different. There was an unambiguous consistency of responses from governance, Heads and prospective Heads to the need for a consistent adherence to a Christian base; that in order to have substance and meaning, the Head should defer to a Biblically based Christian world view in matters of philosophy, standards, morals, ethics, service and for decisions made at the school.

Heads and prospective Heads were generally positive about the prospect of leading a school based on Christian principles although, both in answers to this question and those that followed, some lamented the cost to their personal life and the propensity for abuse by governance of a Head and senior management with an attitude to service. Others mentioned the expectation that the Head in such a situation has an expectation, more so than a Head in other schools, of being a moral icon who is above reproach.

5.2.3 Other important areas in the Head's role in Christian schools

This question elicited a series of responses that captured secondary expectations for the Head of a school based on a Christian philosophy.

There was again, a clear delineation between the response given by governance and a consistency in responses given by Heads and prospective Heads. Governors who had not previously listed key personal characteristics as expectations for the Head used this opportunity to provide them. Whilst secondary, governance also had high expectations of the Head in the purposeful development of community.

Heads, on the other hand, felt that governance had a much higher expectation of them in functional roles such as compliance, finances, strategic planning and politics, although acknowledging the importance of community building and personal characteristics.

Prospective Heads also emphasized an expectation that the Head would be required to prioritise management functions, though not diminishing the importance of personal characteristics and community building. Of the latter two areas of expectation, it is interesting to note that prospective Heads see the importance of personal characteristics as worthy of more emphasis than do the Heads. It may be that prospective Heads observe in the incumbent aspects of character and personality that they feel result from the expectation of governance; essential aspects of character in their own personality of which the Head may not be as aware.

It is worthy to note that there is a consistency of responses from governance, Heads and prospective Heads between this question and the first. Heads and prospective Heads again responded with an assumption that governance would have a higher expectation of management and operational performance than is actually the case. This is a key mismatch. There is a trend that the priorities of governance expectations are either not being transferred by them or received by Heads and prospective Heads; perhaps both.

Again, it would be informative to attend meetings involving governance and the Head and chart the amount of time spent discussing the Christian tone of the school, the development of community and the personal development of the Head compared to operational reporting and business matters related to compliance and finance.

5.2.4 Understanding of the term Servant Leadership

There was a consistency between governance, Heads and prospective Heads in response to this question. All had a ready definition or interpretation of the concept of servant leadership – illustrative of the centrality of this concept in the expectations of leadership characteristics in schools based on a Christian philosophy.

The understanding of the term was broadly expressed in the context of working as part of a team and as focussing on others in the team, often at the expense of personal gain or ambition. There were characteristics that were expected to be demonstrated as the fruits of such an attitude. These were consistent across all three groups. These characteristics were based on the servant leadership example of Jesus Christ.

5.2.5 Developing a Christian World View

The question that elicited responses in this section of the survey was asked in two parts. There was a general misalignment between governance on the one hand and Heads and prospective Heads on the other. Governors devoted more time in describing the nature and importance of a Christian World View. Heads and prospective Heads, whilst obviously not disagreeing with the importance of a Christian World View, devoted more time to the second part of the question – how should the Head develop it in a school?

Governors not only referenced the Bible, but tended to define what a Christian was before linking that definition to its logical manifestation in a set of values and beliefs – a Christian World View. This response is probably indicative of a governor's role in a

school as philosophical, policy centred and strategic rather than operational. It would be an interesting matter for a prospective Head to consider when facing a panel of governors at interview for a position whether he/she would be expected to readdress a natural tendency to focus on the second part of the question or to focus on the first part – favoured in these responses by the people who conduct such interviews.

There was no perceived difference between governors, Heads or prospective Heads in their definition of a Christian World View and the importance that should be placed on it, nor was there any disagreement that the Head has an important role in the development of a Christian World View. The only disparity lay in the relative strength of answers to each part of the question – probably indicative of the relative position of governance (philosophical and strategic) and Heads/prospective Heads (practical and operational).

5.2.6 Compassion for others and maturity in faith

Not surprisingly, there is no disagreement between governance, Heads and prospective Heads on the value of developing compassion for others in schools based on a Christian philosophy as part of a natural response to Biblical principles. There would be an expectation for any Head to outline how the school would exercise the Christian imperative to demonstrate and promote compassion. Heads and prospective Heads both generally answered the question by pointing to practical examples of compassion and outreach in their schools.

Maturity in faith was a much more controversial concept. Governance and Heads both dismissed it as a notion that would be unreasonable to expect for reasons that they justified. Phrases such as “development of faith” or “Christian growth” were seen as better descriptors of what a school should be trying to achieve for students. Although incorporated with other concepts in the question (servant leadership, Christian World

View, compassion) that they answered in reference to the students, a number of prospective Heads deferred to assuming a reference to staff for maturity in faith.

Two governors sequenced the concepts of servant leadership, maturity in faith, compassion for others and Christian World View, each with a rationale for their sequence. Whilst each of the rationales was logical, the sequences did not match.

5.2.7 Schools as evangelistic agencies

All governors and Heads agreed that schools are evangelistic agencies though around half qualified their response by adding that the primary purpose of the schools is for education. When asked whether a school should exist as an educational institution that promotes the gospel or an evangelistic agency that seeks to provide quality education, it is clear from this survey that there would be a divided response on where the prime responsibility lies.

5.2.8 Expectations – The Head’s leadership style

Whilst the question specifically asked about the leadership style of the Head, governance and prospective Heads used it as an opportunity to also comment on leadership characteristics.

Generally, governors would prefer that the Head has a leadership style which is a hybrid of people orientated and autocratic. Heads believe that it is expected that they have a collaborative leadership style though it would be understood when an autocratic style was manifested in certain situations. Governance and Heads are in close alignment on responses to the question of expected leadership style. There appears to be an inconsistency between educational commentary on leadership effectiveness and workplace practice, however. Heads report a collaborative style which is a style that seeks to promote a sense of cooperation by working together to create a shared vision.

Educational leadership commentators would view this as incompatible with the final autocratic decision making that is expressed by a number of Heads. It is a curious anomaly that the view of collaborative, yet authoritarian leadership style is so frequently expressed as an operational norm.

There was a significant gap between the expectations of governance in regards to a Head's development of advanced interpersonal skills and the degree to which this characteristic was emphasised by Heads. It could either be concluded that Heads assume this development as a tacit, inherent and obvious characteristic of their leadership style or that governance places higher value on the development of personal skills than does the Head. Given the crucial nature of the relationship between governance and Heads, this reality gap would need to be closely monitored. It would be important to periodically set aside time and ponder whether their interpersonal skills, particularly when interacting with council, are well enough developed or developing. Continued employment prospects could well hinge on the accuracy and reality of the answer.

Prospective Heads had a dominantly consultative style (rather than collaborative), most realising that there would be an expectation that, as a Head, they would be required to be more autocratic than they currently are. The view that there is an expectation of an autocratic style is consistent with the views expressed by Heads and governance. Whilst Heads describe a collaborative and autocratic leadership style for their leadership, it is noted that prospective Heads generally expect the role to favour a combination of consultative and autocratic styles. A workplace where the Head consults opinion from stakeholders with the understanding that he/she would make the final decision based on opinions and information gathered seems a greater predictor of a united workplace than a style which seeks to empower decision making by others whilst at the same time reserving the right to overturn that decision by the Head.

Most Heads understood parents and not governance or staff to be their chief stakeholder.

5.2.9 Reality: Time spent by the Head

Governance are of the opinion that the Head devotes most time in the areas of compliance to government agencies and to council; to dealing with staff issues and to dealing with student discipline and other associated issues.

In contrast, prospective Heads are of the opinion that the Head spends most time on budget issues, strategic planning issues and compliance.

Whilst both groups correctly identify compliance issues as a central aspect of the Head's role it is clear that governance overemphasises the time spent by the Head in dealing with staff and student issues. It is also clear that prospective Heads overemphasise the time spent by the Head on budgetary matters and on strategic planning.

There is also a misunderstanding of the time spent by the Head in the management of customer contact and in dealing with disgruntled parents. It is a notable, in this context, that the Heads mentioned the significant time that is spent in building (and no doubt rescuing) the image of the school at public functions – a part of the role mentioned less by prospective Heads and not at all by governance. It is also evident that the significant time spent by Heads in management and administrative tasks would also surprise both governance and prospective Heads.

Prospective Heads have a higher expectation of the time that the Head of a school is able to dedicate to cultivating collegial networks or to developing teaching and learning.

5.2.10 Complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty

When asked to comment on the changing nature of leadership for Heads in terms of increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty, there was no disagreement between governance, Heads and prospective Heads. All agreed that complexity, ambiguity and

uncertainty were increasing and that there were significant implications for the Head's role in leading a school. Most respondents agreed that parental expectations and uncertainty about their role in relation to the Head and the school added to the complexity. Most agreed that the Head needed to find ways to manage increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty whilst reflecting the opposite of these characteristics to a fickle and fragile community.

Governance lamented the emphasis on compliance with regulations over the education of students. There was some feeling that the role of Head could become less attractive.

Increasing complexity was seen as a reflection of a more complex and litigious society. Heads in particular reflected on the bureaucratic processes that now govern situations which were once entirely devoid of process or reporting.

Increasing ambiguity was interpreted as the changing face of the Head as the position moves from educator to bureaucrat, CEO and compliance manager.

Increasing uncertainty was particularly seen by Heads through the filter of their own tenuous expectations of job security. Both Heads and prospective Heads referred to a disconcerting number of Heads who had been "moved on" as a disincentive for those who may aspire to leadership. Governors did not mention this as an area of concern.

Some brought a Christian perspective to the issue of increasing complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty, contrasting this evident trend with the steadfast, unchanging simplicity, transparency and certainty of the Christian faith as evidenced in the Bible.

5.2.11 Compelling reasons to be a Head

There was general agreement between governance, Heads and prospective Heads on the compelling reasons for becoming a Head.

All considered the opportunity to affect teachers (and therefore affect the students) as a significant reason for becoming a Head. All considered the opportunity for autonomy and the opportunity to be the driving force behind principles and practices that the Head believed would be most effective as a second compelling reason.

Whilst Heads and prospective Heads mentioned a sense of being called to the position by God as a third compelling reason, this was not mentioned by governance. It would, however, be incongruous with responses to other questions not to assume agreement by governance with a sense of being called to the position as a compelling reason for accepting it. The most obvious indication of this was in answers related to the next section where governance felt that a good reason not to accept Headship was a sense of not being called by God.

5.2.12 Compelling reasons not to become a Head

Sadly, there were an inordinate number of answers given for not taking on the role of Head when compared with answers for accepting the position. This imbalance was evident in responses from governance, considerable in responses from Heads and alarming in responses from “prospective” Heads. In the context that a number of prospective Heads who were identified by their Head were flattered to be nominated but indicated that they were not intending to seek Headship, it could be expected that there would be some imbalance towards a negative response, but the trend was across the sample of responses and not restricted to those individuals. The scale of the imbalance towards reasons for not accepting Headship by existing Heads was also alarming. It was evident during the interviews that at least two beginning Heads considered their acceptance of the position a grave mistake given the realities of the effects of the position on their personal and family life and the disappointments of the position amongst other compelling reasons not to continue.

Broadly, governors identified a profound negative effect of the role on the Heads own welfare, in conjunction with the negative effect on the Head's family. They also identified the frustrations of leading a school.

Heads' responses reflected those of governance. Collectively, they raised issues of personal health and stress related issues, the taxing nature of maintaining an even temperament and sense of calm, an impact on personal spirituality, breakdown of friendships, social-life and leisure and, most significantly, the consuming nature of continually thinking about the school and problems associated with the school. Most also lamented the effect on relationships within their own family of having an absent parent – whether physically not present, or present but thinking about the school and not focussing on relational or practical family matters.

Whilst governors were certainly aware of the frustration of leading a school, Heads expanded on the reasons for the frustration. In contrast to two of the compelling reasons for accepting Headship, Heads cited frustrated ambitions to make any real difference, both in the autonomy to introduce principles and practices against the reality of a resistive workplace and also in making any real impact on teachers or on influencing teaching and learning. Bureaucracy and management issues were seen as oppositional dynamics in this regard.

Prospective Heads provided the greatest imbalance between compelling reasons to accept Headship and compelling reasons not to accept it. Even though most interviewees were relatively new in their senior positions, their more intimate insight (by greater association and awareness), had given them less rather than greater incentive to pursue Headship.

Perhaps because of a sense of being one step removed from regular association with governance, some prospective Heads were quite apprehensive about school councils given their experiences of the number of competent (in their view) Heads that had been

suddenly moved on. Added to the effect of Headship on personal welfare, these prospective Heads added that the Head needs to be constantly vigilant about the potential effect on tenure of the decisions of a poor council. The potential negative effects on family were seen as even more compelling reasons for not pursuing Headship, particularly in responses from those prospective Heads who were the parents of small children or teenagers. Prospective Heads also nominated the frustrations of Headship in the ambition to make a difference, linked with administrative pressures and bureaucracy. Insightfully, prospective Heads added a dimension that had not been intimated by governance or Heads. Some noted a real sense of dissatisfaction and melancholy in Heads resulting from unanticipated or unavoidable negative outcomes resulting from well intended decisions that had resulted in a destructive outcome for colleagues, friends or the school's reputation.

Interestingly, the Head who provided the most expansive list of reasons for not accepting Headship felt that one good reason, the opportunity for autonomy, outweighed all the bad. He also cited an unwillingness to go back to a position of senior management other than Head and so felt somewhat trapped.

5.2.13 Expectations of major stakeholders

School governance was considered as an obvious stakeholder in a school. In this question, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were given the opportunity to outline what the main expectations were of other stakeholders in the leadership performance and priorities of the school. Other stakeholders were nominated as the church, parents, staff and students.

Prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators were asked this question in the context of actually being senior staff members or staff members at a school.

There was little variation between the views of Heads and their staff on the expectations of stakeholders.

All expected that the church would view the school as an evangelistic agency although some churches viewed the school as a supply of students into their congregation whereas others felt that the school had a separate and distinct role. Prospective Science Heads spent most interview time referring to the expectations of the church.

Parents were viewed as expecting that the school provided a quality education and where students are happy and safe. The distinct group of Christian parents were identified as having extra expectations of the school in terms of how and how much Christianity was taught. Heads spent most interview time relating the expectations of parents.

Staff expectations were of a pleasant and professional work environment but that school executive, and the Head in particular, were to be an exemplar of Christian leadership, understanding and behaviour. Prospective Heads spent the majority of interview time responding to the perceived needs of staff – some in positive and others in negative ways.

Each group expressed similar expectations from students regarding quality education and consistency. Interestingly, a number of Heads identified that desire from students that the Head know them personally. This response was absent from other groups, especially in connection with the Head, whom at least one prospective Head referred to as “remote”. Science Heads spent most interview time referring to the expectations of students, particularly as they would pertain to science.

5.2.14 Realities – The changing role of the Head

Responses to this section represent the realities faced by Heads and the perception of the Head's reality as seen by prospective Heads.

Both Heads and prospective Heads were of the view that there had been a significant shift in the nature of the role of Head towards business management expectations and away from educational leadership. The second most significant shift in the role was an increase in the amount of compliance to external agencies and both external and internal (governance) reporting that is now required. Again, both Heads and prospective Heads agreed on this shift.

In reality, headship requires a larger emphasis on managing the expectations of parents than prospective Heads seem to be aware of. Heads also mentioned increasing legal vulnerability and an anticipation of advanced and improving Christian leadership which were issues of increasing expectation not mentioned by prospective Heads.

Two Prospective Heads believed that the Head had an increasing responsibility for the management of technology and clear articulation of a Christian vision. These issues were not raised by Heads.

5.2.15 Headship: Expectations and realities

The two questions regarding differences between expectations and realities were posed only to Heads. Selection criteria dictated that these Heads had been in the position for more than six months and less than six years so that they could reasonably compare the realities of the role with what they had expected.

The first question asked whether there was a difference between expectations and realities. All respondents indicated differences and most indicated large differences. The

respondent who indicated the least difference had also been in the role of Head for the least time.

In comparison with their expectations of the role, the greatest surprise that reality held for Heads was the necessity to change their mental construction to support the notion that final responsibility rested with them – that all problems needed solutions and that they bore final responsibility for all decisions made in connection with the school. Equally surprising to most Heads was the detrimental effect that the role had on them personally.

The next most cited difference was the complexities involved with dealing with governance. Whilst this could, in part, be put down to the nature of different governance members at different schools, it is certainly a matter of great surprise to some Heads. Of equal status was the sense of having to fit a prescribed mould of what others believe a Head should be.

Other surprises that were mentioned included – less influence on the classroom than expected, adjusting to the influence and autonomy of the position, the degree of negative impact on family, separation from staff, relentless pressure on time, inter-school rivalry and parental demands.

Heads who experienced less difference between expectations and realities each credited the observation to a quality process of preparation for the role through the influence of a competent mentor who was an existing Head.

5.2.16 Realities resulting from schools that change in size

Heads were asked whether the change in size of a school had any effect on realities of their leadership, and if so, what aspects of leadership changed. Prospective Heads were

asked the same question to determine whether their expectations of what aspects of the Head's role would need to alter to react to change bore similarities to reality.

In regard to realities that result from schools changing in size, there is a high correlation between the reported realities faced by Heads and the expectations of the effect of change on the Heads role as reported by prospective Heads.

It is clear that the impact of a growing or contracting school and the implications for the role of the Head is something that is commonly shared at senior management level.

There were two emerging issues that resulted from the question. First, the purpose of the question was to determine the effects of a growing school. Some Heads and prospective Heads referred to schools that were shrinking. Some referred to schools that had experienced growth and reduction. Responses from Heads were reflective of their own contexts and experiences. Secondly, some Heads and prospective Heads referred to the Head's role as a predictor of change.

For growing schools, both Heads and prospective Heads saw that a consequence would be less interaction with stakeholders, particularly parents, staff and students. Both saw that the Head would focus more on proactive planning, vision and strategic planning. Heads commented on the expectation of parents for more services and options in a bigger school whereas prospective Heads did not. Both commented on an essential aspect of the Head's role as a keeper of the vision, spiritually, academically and pastorally.

For schools with declining enrolments, both Heads and prospective Heads highlighted an essential focus on restoring enrolments and on careful management of the human resources of the school.

5.2.17 Professional development of prospective Heads

Heads felt that, by far the most common (useful) activity for preparation of prospective Heads for the role of Head was engaging them in decision making and in having experience at some of the Head's roles at the school. This immersion extended to acting as Head from time to time in the Head's absence. This was only partially reflected in the responses of prospective Heads. Whilst a few did reflect that they had experienced the Head's role at the school, most described this as simply a "watch and learn" experience. There were even limitations that were expressed by prospective Heads about the role of acting Head. Whilst some appreciated that the experience provided insights into the role, mention was also made of the limitations of acting in a position where decisions made are in the context of what the Head would normally do rather than what I would like to do.

Some Heads described a deliberate allocation of a section of the school to enable autonomous decision making by a person who was a prospective Head in the context that this mini-school or other autonomous area would provide a microcosmic experience of Headship. Prospective Heads, some of whom were responsible for these autonomous areas, were unaware of the head's intent or did not relay any benefits of such responsibilities in introducing them to the realities of Headship. Presumably, most felt that, even though they were responsible for a discreet unit within the school, the Head still bore final responsibility.

Heads highlighted the need for professional development of prospective Heads in areas such as marketing and finances. Prospective Heads agreed that these were worthwhile activities in order to better understand the realities of Headship, though many felt that they would also need to undertake further post-graduate qualifications, typically a Masters or a Doctorate. Heads made no mention of this.

When asked about different activities that would help prepare prospective Heads for the role of Headship, both Heads and prospective Heads mentioned the benefits of being able to visit other schools and talk to, and observe, other Heads in action. It is interesting, therefore, that no school had a program where this was happening. Both Heads and prospective Heads were too busy with their current roles to accommodate this unanimously considered high worth activity.

Both Heads and prospective Heads acknowledged the worth of a prospective Head having some exposure to governance, particularly at Council meetings.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM INTERVIEWS: SCIENCE COORDINATORS

5.3.1 Comparing the roles of Science Coordinators and Heads

All five groups of respondents, governance, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators all responded that the Head had a much broader brief for leadership and management in the school when compared to that of the Science Coordinator.

Not surprisingly, governors had the highest percentage of respondents who pointed out that Science Coordinators were not directly responsible to governance.

Prospective Heads' and Heads' responses strongly emphasised the degree of extra accountability that the role of Head entails. This emphasis on accountability was less evident in the responses of Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators.

Science Coordinators noted the difference between the time commitments required in leading a Science department when compared to leading a school.

5.3.2 Creation and Evolution

Governors, Heads, prospective Heads, Science Heads and prospective Science Heads were all asked a question to clarify their stance on the Creation/Evolution debate. The views of leadership at every level in a school based on Christian philosophy will shape the environment in which a prospective Science Head will be placed. If there are specific philosophical questions that the prospective Science Head might be realistically expected to have an opinion on, and adhere to, the literature review suggests that the Creation/Evolution debate looms among the first and foremost.

There was a strong view from governance that both Evolution and Creation should be taught in the school. Some qualified this by a preference that Evolution was taught as theory and Creation as fact.

Heads were certainly less committed to a particular viewpoint on the issue. Whilst there was some agreement along similar lines to those expressed by governance, a number of Heads showed ambivalence towards the question. These Heads were clearly more concerned that the requirements of the Board of Studies be met than on whether there was a definitive leadership position on the issue of Evolution and Creation. One Head saw the matter as the exclusive province of the Science Department.

Prospective Heads showed even greater ambivalence towards the issue (or non-issue). It was certainly not viewed by many as a priority. The most common response was to leave the matter up to a consensus decision between stakeholders, including students. Again there was a view expressed that as long as the Board of Studies requirements were met, the matter could be left to the Science department for a stance (if one was needed).

Interviews with Science Coordinators saw the re-emergence of the need for a common view on the matter. It was noted by some that it is an issue that is regularly raised by

parents, students and other staff. Unlike most Heads, and prospective Heads, most Science Coordinators felt that the issue was very relevant in a Christian school. All urged that both Evolution and Creation be taught, some included compliance reasons (with the Board of Studies) but all felt that it was a topic of great interest and generated class discussion.

Prospective Science Coordinators agreed with Science Coordinators. All agreed that both Evolution and Creation should be taught, although one from the perspective that evolution needed to be presented so that it could be discredited. It was interesting that, like Science Coordinators, the answers from this group were often passionate and lengthy, reflecting a comprehensive doctrinal and scientific position, characteristic of and consistent with, an issue which they believed to be of significant relevance.

There is a curious conclusion from the evidence generated by asking this question to the five groups who were interviewed. For schools that are based on a Christian philosophy, governors accept that there will be an issue concerning evolution and creation that is worthy of the attention of the Head and senior management at the school. Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators also accept this premise. Each of the three groups generally are of the view that both evolution (perhaps as a theory) and creation be taught. The leaders of the school, Heads and (particularly) prospective Heads, in stark contrast, generally view the issue as one of diminished or subsidiary relevance, if relevant at all. There is a curious situation where Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators who generally believe the issue to be important are accountable to the Head who does not and, Heads (and potentially prospective Heads) who generally do not believe it to be important are, in turn, accountable to governors who do.

5.3.3 The Head's expectations of the Science Coordinator

When Heads were asked about their expectations of Science Coordinators, they interpreted the question in two ways. Some interpreted it in a general sense and answered it as if the word "Science" was eliminated from the question. They outlined the expectations that they had of all coordinators. Others answered the question with a specific reference to Science. It could be concluded, therefore, that some Heads believed that Science coordinators had no specific role, or that Heads had not thought through what that role might be.

Heads who answered the question generally favoured a role description for Science Coordinators as department managers with specific subject curriculum expertise. Prospective Heads gave a similar emphasis to effective management of the faculty and curriculum expertise, but placed equal value on adding to the school culture and on creating a gospel focus in the faculty. They were also concerned that Coordinators in general contribute to a learning culture at the school and that they be loyal and open to instruction. Surprisingly, almost all Science Coordinators also answered the question in a general sense. They answered that the Head's primary expectation would be for them to manage the department well. Other common responses were to care for staff and students, contribute to the learning culture of the school and to be supportive of the Head. Prospective Science Coordinators believed that the Head expected that a Science Coordinator would care for staff and students and contribute to the learning culture of the school. There was less, but still strong, emphasis in their answers on a capacity to manage the department

Heads who answered the question with a specific reference to Science were seeking a Coordinator who would make Science interesting or fun for the students. Prospective Heads were much less clear about any specific role that they saw the Science Coordinator playing at the school. The few specific references involved occupational health and safety issues and a capacity for versatility in teaching several Science

subjects. Science Heads did not respond to the question in terms of subject specific expectations. The minority of prospective Science coordinators who answered the question with a specific reference to Science mentioned attention to safety, versatility in subjects they could teach and a capacity to engage students in Science and the study of Science as important aspects of the role of Science Coordinator that a head would expect to be manifested.

There seems a surprising general correlation between Heads, prospective Heads, Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators. All generally believe that the Head expects that the Science Coordinator is most valued for sound management of the faculty and contributing to the teaching and learning environment before any subject specific considerations like safety or versatility across disciplines.

5.3.4 Heads expectations of Coordinators

Following the surprising reaction of respondents to the last section where few regarded the role of Science Coordinator as different to that of other Coordinators, it was helpful to have a question in the survey that sought to probe again for any differences.

Despite the nature of the question being somewhat leading (“What **are** the differences?”), Heads responses were still very direct. Almost all felt that there were no differences between their expectations of a Science Coordinator and their expectations of any other Coordinator. Again it is now even more reasonable to conclude that some Heads believe that Science coordinators have no specific role, or that Heads have not thought through what that role might be.

Heads had quite an entrenched consensus given that the request for differences between the role of Science Coordinators and other Coordinators elicited several insightful responses from prospective Heads. Foremost among these were again the inherent aspects of safety but also an insightful understanding of the complexity of some of the

social and moral issues that a Science Coordinator would need to be addressing. Foremost among these were issues surrounding creation, evolution, stem-cell research and other bio-ethical issues. Prospective Heads generally had a higher regard for the specifics of a Science Coordinator's responsibility.

The view of prospective Heads was generally not shared by Science Coordinators. They returned to a much narrower band of difference between their role and the roles of other Coordinators. They expected that the Head would only expect additional expertise in safety.

A diverse pattern was completed in the responses of prospective Science Heads. Two respondents highlighted the marketability of Science along with the ubiquitous safety issue.

Answers specific to the role of Science Coordinator would suggest that the role has a skill set that is different to those required for other Coordinators. There is evidence to suggest that these differences are not well understood by Heads or (surprisingly) even by Science Coordinators. This research would suggest that there is much professional development needed in order that Science Coordinators fully understand the potential for their role in a school for marketing, ethical debate and learning leadership, especially in regard to academic results. The role is far more than a glorified safety officer. It is evident that Heads would also benefit from a broadening of their understanding of the untapped potential of the Science Coordinator role.

It is interesting to speculate that if the role of the Science Coordinator is so understated in schools, perhaps there would be a similar response from Heads in regards to English, Mathematics or other Coordinators and possibly even from these Coordinators in regard to their own roles.

5.3.5 Balance of responsibilities

There was a consensus of opinion between Heads and prospective Heads that Science Coordinators should be spending approximately half of their time on matters pertaining to teaching and learning. Whilst not stark in contrast, the reality experienced by Science Coordinators is that administrative functions and time spent in the pastoral care of staff and students is more significant than expected by their supervisors by around ten percent.

There is a strong awareness among prospective Science Heads that taking on the leadership of the faculty would significantly reduce the proportion of time that they were able to devote towards teaching and learning. Their expectations of the ratios of time spent proportionally between administration, pastoral care and teaching and learning were an accurate reflection of the reality as expressed by incumbent Science Coordinators.

5.3.6 Expectations of the Head

There was little difference between the responses of Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators on their expectation of the Head. Both groups expected the Head to be supportive and to provide the faculty with the resources that they needed.

Both groups also answered the question by outlining personality traits such as trustworthiness, listening, presence and responsibility as well as functional expectations that they had of the Head including a capacity for vision, communication and advocacy for the Science faculty.

It may be concluded that the expectations that a prospective Science Coordinator has of what could be desired or assumed from the Head of the school does not differ from a Science coordinators expectations.

5.3.7 Expectations of Science Coordinators in a Christian school

Whether the respondents were Science Coordinators or prospective Science Coordinators, there was a common divide between those who saw no difference in the responsibilities of being a Science Coordinator in a school with a Christian philosophy and in one without. Not surprisingly those who responded that there was no difference also, generally, did not see any particular differences in expectations of the Science Coordinator from different groups of stakeholders such as the church, parents, staff and students.

This leaves a large gulf in expectations, a gulf that would be problematic if a prospective Science Coordinator accepted a position at a school based on a Christian philosophy where a clear understanding of particular nuances of leading in such a school, and of the different expectations of stakeholders was acutely felt by the Head and either tacitly or implicitly expected from middle managers.

Those respondents who articulated different expectations of different stakeholders went on to succinctly (and vigorously) outline the differences. There was quite a degree of agreement and coherence between Science Coordinators and prospective Science coordinators in these different expectations.

Both groups felt that there was a strong expectation from the Head and from the church to include Christian principles and the explicit teaching of the Bible, where appropriate into teaching programs.

This contrasted with their dominant view that parents' expectations were simply that the school provide a better quality education than other alternative schools (all be it with **some** Christian ethics and morals).

Both groups felt that staff expectations of the Science Head were most closely aligned with providing them with a quality workplace and for advocacy.

Both prospective Science Coordinators and Science Coordinators felt that students' expectations were closely aligned with those of parents – a quality school delivering a quality education.

A summary of the importance of understanding the different expectations of different stakeholders was provided in an insightful comment by one prospective Science Coordinator who said that *the Principal or Science Coordinator should be able to address the specific expectations of each group and, if necessary, educate groups as to the less obvious aspects of a faculty's operation.*

5.3.8 Other aspects of the Science Coordinator role

There was a significant gap between the realities of leading a Science department and the expectations of prospective Science coordinators in the broader nuances of the role.

Science Coordinators emphasised the importance of staff management, including their professional development, assisting and supporting them in their own lives, advocating for them but also providing strategies for managing students.

Coordinators also underlined the necessity for the development of direction and vision for the faculty.

Whilst emphasising the importance of pastoral care and advocacy, prospective Science Coordinators also focussed on the importance of the Science Coordinator as an example of exemplary classroom teaching and earning the respect of the students. This was an interesting response as demonstrated competence in the core area of business, teaching and learning, would be an expectation that leadership research showed to be vital in order to encourage others. The surprise is that it was not present in response from practicing Science Coordinators. Perhaps in the business of managing the department and assisting other staff with pastoral concerns, there is a danger of overlooking an important central aspect of their role – setting an example for others as an experienced and competent teacher.

5.3.9 Leadership style: realities and expectations

It was clear in response to this question that there is a substantial difference in the expectations of prospective Science Coordinators and the realities faced by Science Coordinators. It would seem self evident that candidates for the position of Science Coordinator would be considering aspects of their own leadership and the suitability of their own style for the promotion position. There was only limited evidence for this being the case. Most responses were honest yet vague descriptions of what might be considered as a collaborative style, though some did not use that descriptive expression (or any of the leadership style descriptions outlined in the Literature Review – Chapter Two). There were no other styles in evidence.

Science Coordinators, in contrast, were able to quickly and clearly articulate a preferred operating style and sometimes a combination of styles. Descriptive words included, laid back but also with a high expectation of self and therefore a high expectation of others; collaborative – hint of *laissez faire* – hint of authoritative; consultative – I like to hear from people; dogmatic; bumbling; servant leader; easy-going, authoritarian; leader by consensus. The clarity of their answers and the quality of their reflections on whether it was a preferred operating style for their school would reasonably be assumed to be a

response predicated on close examination and consideration of a necessary part of their own leadership responsibilities. This vital aspect of the role is absent, or barely present in those nominated by Heads as prospective Science Coordinators (who nominated “collaborative” or nothing) and would seem to be a matter of some urgency for professional development.

5.3.10 Changing role of the Science Coordinator

Prospective Science Coordinators have a good sense of the changing functional realities of leading a Science department. There was a strong alignment with the views of existing Science Coordinators that the Science Coordinator is responsible for increasing compliance issues and a growing burden of extra administration. The role is expanding to cover areas such as reports for work cover, negligence, risk assessments, OH&S, MSDS forms, chemical management and there is concern from both Science Coordinators and prospective coordinators over the loss of quality teaching and learning that has resulted.

The “*New Scheme Teacher*” paperwork that has resulted from this initiative in addressing concerns about raising the professionalism of teachers in independent schools has added to the burden of administration and again is perceived to have diluted the Science Coordinator’s time available for leading the faculty. Board of Studies inspections, which are annual events in a new school, are also viewed by some as administrative distractions.

5.3.11 Science Coordinator: Expectations and Realities

Most Science Coordinators found that the role they had accepted was very different to the role that they thought they had applied for. Whilst there had been a general anticipation of more programming and paperwork, the quantity of both was a surprise and more than they had expected. This management burden had reduced the effective

time available for classroom preparation. The extra responsibility of leadership had led to other negative outcomes for some including less influence than expected, poor recognition of achievements, the personal cost of managing overworked staff and an increase in criticism from school management. It had also led to positive outcomes for others in the ability to decide the direction of the faculty without unnecessary constraint and the extra trust from school management.

One respondent described little difference between expectations of leading a Science faculty in a school with a Christian philosophy and the reality of the position currently held. The reason given was consistent with similar findings when Heads were asked for differences between their expectations and the realities that they faced. This Science Coordinator explained that much of the gap had been narrowed by observation and conversations with a Science Coordinator who acted as a mentor whilst they were still a prospective candidate for leading a faculty.

One respondent stated not being able to remember the difference between their expectations and the realities that they faced in the position. This was a most helpful response as it validated, to some extent, the decision to ask Heads to nominate Science Coordinators who had been in the position between six months and six years. The Head in this case had nominated someone who he thought fitted this criterion but during the interview, the interviewee stated that he was now in his eighth year in the position.

5.3.12 Reality: The biggest surprises.

When recalling their expectations of the position and comparing these to the realities that they faced, Science Coordinators found the biggest surprise by a large margin was the complexities associated with being responsible for personnel. This should not be surprising. Whilst many have been in intermediary leadership positions involving the management of staff such as musical director, year patron, sports organiser, often the position of faculty leader is the first time that management of staff becomes leadership

of staff and direct responsibility for their welfare and professional performance. Dealing with the complexities of personalities, work ethics, confidence levels, experience and maturity, whilst impelling a team towards a performance standard and faculty goals are among the challenges that confront a newly appointed Science Coordinator, often for the first time.

This is a steep learning curve when combined with the dual frustrating realities of increased administrative duties and decreased time available for devotion towards the core business of educating students, particularly one's own classes. In some schools, and particularly smaller schools where management functions beyond the classroom are shared amongst fewer people, there is also the added burden of responsibilities outside the Science faculty that consume time that some faculty members may not be aware of.

5.3.13 Responsibilities as the school changes in size

Science Coordinators reported that the chief concern for schools that were growing was the employment of new staff and, therefore, the addition of new complexities associated with people management. A secondary consideration was the imposition of a larger amount of time that was devoted towards administration and associated management requirements that came with an increased budget and larger faculty.

Not surprisingly, given the gulf between the expectations of Science coordinators (whilst they were still prospective coordinators) and the realities of the position in regard to the unexpected emphasis required on people management issues, prospective Science Coordinators poorly anticipated the need to focus on staff. Their primary anticipation paralleled Science Coordinators secondary consideration – an emphasis on administration as the school grew with the added expectation of a need to broaden course offerings to students. Increasing difficulties associated with a growing faculty and associated personnel issues, in line with a growing school, were anticipated by only one respondent.

5.3.14 Preparing prospective Science Coordinators for the role

There was a broad range of activities outlined in describing how prospective Science Coordinators were being prepared for the role of Science Coordinator. There was generally a good correlation between Science Coordinators views on what was happening and the views of prospective Science Coordinators. Most attention centred on the benefits of having experience in delegated sections of running the department such as programming, chairing meetings or acting as Science Coordinator in his/her absence. The need for professional development in areas of management and leadership along with the provision of an external or internal mentor were seen by both groups to be important. Likewise, there was also general agreement from both groups on the types of activities that would be helpful in better preparing for the role.

Notably, in reflecting on the realities of the role, Science Coordinators felt that prospective Coordinators should be engaging in activities that would provide a broader whole-school perspective. In keeping with the findings in other sections of this research, prospective Coordinator's expectations generally did not include an understanding of the extent of the whole-school perspective required of an effective Coordinator.

Also notably, prospective Science Coordinators felt that they needed to focus on being a better classroom teacher before applying for the role. This is a reasonable and considered response given that the Science Coordinator spends a much less proportion of their time in preparation for class.

Perhaps from their own experience on taking up the role, Science Coordinators felt that prospective Science Coordinators should be well educated on compliance and safety issues.

5.3.15 To be or not to be a Science Coordinator

Both Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators saw the major benefit of taking on the role of Science Coordinator as the opportunity to exercise leadership and responsibility. Existing Science Coordinators again reflected on the added dimension of contributing to the whole school perspective whereas prospective Science Coordinators did not.

Most responses were not specific to Science though there was mention from Science coordinators (only) of the added value of coordinating a department where the subject matter is of interest to many people.

Both Science Coordinators and prospective Science Coordinators also stated that the **most** compelling reason for accepting the position of Science Coordinator was also the **least** compelling reason for accepting the role. The reasons given included the extra time required and the subsequent deleterious effect on family of less time and more responsibility.

Both groups generally lamented the amount of time that was lost in actually teaching students as attention was drawn away from the classroom.

5.4 ADVICE FOR GOVERNANCE

Based on the findings of this research, this section provides a succinct summary of a few of the most prominent conclusions in the form of advice for prospective and incumbent governors at a school based on Christian principles.

- Governance will value the selection of a mature Christian Head with sound knowledge of Biblical principles and strong personal characteristics.
- Whilst it is important that the Head be an educational leader, business leadership and management skills are likely to be more necessary in the role.
- Be wary of the phrase “maturity in faith” regarding students when considering the mission of a school. A number of governors and Heads prefer “development of faith” or “Christian growth.”
- Consider the balance between the school as an evangelistic agency and an educational institution. Is the Head aligned with the desired emphasis?
- Does the Head have the capability for autocratic decision making that is people orientated and has case specific skills in collaboration and consultation?
- The Head will be spending more time on compliance, administrative and management functions and on parent grievances in order to build and protect the image of the College than you may be aware of.
- The Head is often managing the increasing, complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty of the role whilst at the same time appearing uncomplicated, unambiguous and confident. He/she may need support and understanding.
- Some Heads feel that their tenure is uncertain. This can be a deterrent for decision making and a disincentive for others to consider Headship. Genuine support, reassurance and encouragement from governors would assist.
- For Heads, a compelling reason to lead a school is the chance to drive principles and practices. Governance plays a vital role in framing policies that will allow this to happen.

- The responsibilities of Headship have a reported deleterious effect on a Head's wellbeing and on their family. Given that governance bears the responsibility of supporting and encouraging the Head, there are implications for custom and practice that could serve to minimize this situation.
- Parents, senior managers, staff, students, community leaders, regulatory authorities and other Heads all have different expectations of a Head. Governance may wish to consider these expectations in framing their own.
- There should be clear guidelines established as to why and when governors would approach a Head with matters of concern.
- It is worth asking a new Head about the extent to which he/she engages a more experienced Head as a mentor.

5.5 ADVICE FOR PROSPECTIVE HEADS

Based on the findings of this research, this section provides a succinct summary of a few of the most prominent conclusions in the form of advice for prospective Heads considering Headship at a school based on Christian principles.

- Governance will expect a mature Christian with sound knowledge of Biblical principles and strong personal characteristics. This is their highest priority.
- Whilst experience in educational leadership is important, business leadership and management skills are likely to be even more necessary in the role.
- As a Head in any school, there are high community expectations of exemplary behavior and moral conduct. In these schools it is even higher.
- You will be responsible for the purposeful development of community.
- Leadership styles differ from one individual to another but an attitude of Christian service is expected by everybody to pervade all your leadership decisions.
- Governance will expect a well constructed understanding of a Christian World View and of how it would be developed in students, staff and parents.
- Develop a practical process whereby compassion for others could be manifested at a school.
- Be wary of the phrase “maturity in faith” regarding students. A number of governors and Heads prefer “development of faith” or “Christian growth.”
- Christian schools are seen by governance and Heads as evangelistic agencies. Some see education as the prime consideration whilst others see it as secondary.
- You may need a leadership style that is autocratic but which is people orientated and has case specific skills in collaboration and consultation.
- You will spend most time on compliance, administrative/management functions and on parent grievances in order to build and protect the image of the College. Governance and staff will only be partly aware of this.

- As Head, you will need to manage the increasing, complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty of the role whilst at the same time appearing uncomplicated, unambiguous and confident.
- You will be entering a position of responsibility where tenure is quite uncertain.
- The compelling reasons to lead a school are – autonomy (the chance to drive principles and practices), the effect on teachers (and therefore students) and both within a sense of being called by God.
- Consider the potential for a deleterious effect of Headship on your wellbeing and on your family. Autonomy and ability to affect others may be less than you think, and the cost of being inevitably unpopular, more than you think.
- Governance, parents, senior managers, staff, students and no doubt community leaders, regulatory authorities and other Heads all have separate and distinct expectations of a Head.
- The gap between increasing business management and decreasing educational leadership is growing and will continue to widen.
- Compliance, bureaucracy and administration are growing as a percentage of time spent by the Head and will continue to grow.
- The expectations that parents have of the Head continue to grow.
- There may be an unexpected adjustment to the extent to which problems will need a solution and that it is with the Head that the buck stops.
- Be aware of the potential difficulties of dealing with governance.
- Be aware of the tension between being yourself in the role as a Head and fitting into the mould that others have for you.
- The significant gap between your expectations of Headship and realities will be reduced by adopting a serving Head as a mentor.
- There are different realities for the Head in a school that is growing or contracting. Do you have the skills to manage either or both?
- Ask to be included in the decision making at your current school. This should be more than a “watch and learn” exercise.

- Ask to visit other schools and to talk to other Heads about the differences between your expectations and their realities.
- Ask to visit and observe the Head at meetings of governance at your current school.

5.6 ADVICE FOR PROSPECTIVE SCIENCE COORDINATORS

Based on the findings of this research, this section provides a succinct summary of a few of the most prominent conclusions in the form of advice for prospective Science Coordinators considering taking up this position at a school based on Christian principles.

- It is likely that you will regard the issue of Evolution/Creation as worthy of debate and may have reached a view. Governors would expect this though the Head and senior staff may not.
- Heads and supervisors will expect you to be a loyal, teachable, efficient faculty manager who will contribute to the teaching and learning culture of the school and maintain a gospel focus. Versatility across Science disciplines and a good understanding of safety aspects of the role are valued but of secondary importance.
- A Science department has a potential role to play in the life of a school in regard to ethics, academic results and marketing. Most Heads and most Science Coordinators do comment on this.
- Classroom teachers are able to focus on teaching and learning. For Science Coordinators, the proportion of time spent is almost halved as attention to administration and pastoral care is almost doubled.
- There are different expectations from different stakeholders for the role of the Science Coordinator. Parents and students would expect a quality Science education; staff would expect care and advocacy; the church, that teaching is Christian based and the Head, all of these combined.
- People in the faculty you lead will expect you to be an exemplary teacher. So will the Head and other stakeholders.
- There is an urgent need to read literature on educational leadership, to examine your preferred leadership style and to consider how that would play

out in the role of Science Coordinator. “Collaborative” is not the only realistic or preferred method of leading a department.

- The role of Science Coordinator is changing. There is a growth in administration and extra responsibility for increasing compliance issues.
- Science Coordinator is a leadership position. There will be less hand-holding, less time for class preparation, more paperwork, more criticism and more trust, commensurate with the extra responsibility (and extra salary) that you have applied for.
- Whilst still a prospective Science Coordinator, it is important to have a leadership mentor who is/was a Science Coordinator and who is someone who will assist you and whom you can rely on and trust.
- (For the first time) you will be responsible for the welfare and professional performance of staff with complex personalities, work ethics, confidence levels, experience and maturity, whilst impelling a team towards a performance standard and faculty goal.
- The bigger the school, the more staff in the Science faculty and the more issues (time) associated with personnel.
- The major benefit of accepting a promotion to the role of Science Coordinator is the opportunity to exercise leadership and to accept responsibility. The effect that less free time and more responsibility has on family responsibilities and personal life is the single biggest drawback.

5.7 SIGNIFICANCE

At the outset, the purpose of this research was to provide advice to prospective Heads of independent schools and prospective Science Coordinators on how the realities of the position that they aspired to hold may differ from their expectations. It sought to provide practical advice, based on the expectations of, and realities faced by, governance, Heads and Science Coordinators in schools based on a Christian philosophy. The research also sought the opinions of the expectations of the role of Head and Science Coordinator from other prospective Heads and prospective Science Heads.

In 2010, for New South Wales alone, there were over 30 new Heads of Independent schools appointed. Whilst it is difficult to ascertain the number of Heads who moved on by choice, those who sought early retirement through dissatisfaction or those who were forcibly removed, the change in leadership and the dilution of knowledge and skills is a cause for concern.

Approximately one third of these Heads left in the first three years of their tenure. The average tenure of Heads is estimated at around six years for Heads of Independent schools. Of the seven Heads interviewed in this survey in 2009, one has since been asked to leave, another has moved schools after falling out with governance over “unreasonable” financial expectations, another is considering moving schools for the same reason and another is on a temporary contract, still uncertain of any future in Headship. Whilst their expectations for the role may have differed in extent and detail, it is evident from their unfolding circumstances that the expectations that they held for the position of Head, did not match the reality of the position (predicated on the expectations, tacit or explicit, of governance).

The Association of Independent Schools in New South Wales, partly out of concern for this trend, has embarked on a proactive scheme where experienced Heads of

Independent schools volunteer to undertake a coaching course and are assigned a new Head to assist through the early part of their Headship. Despite a pilot scheme in 2009 being very well received, there were not enough experienced Heads in 2009 or 2010 to match the number of new Heads.

Courses are also now available for prospective Heads who are considering Headship. This is a significant development and a response to a perceived need in educational leadership. When this research began, there were no such courses available. It is significant that there has been an expression of interest from the Association of Independent Schools, N.S.W., in the findings of this research (for Heads) and its inclusion in these courses.

Independent schools are now a significant educational provider. The percentage of students attending independent schools rose from four percent in 1970, to almost 12 percent of enrolments in 2002. In 2009, the percentage had increased to fourteen percent, and whilst sector growth has slowed in recent times, it continues to generate greater market share (Independent Schools Council of Australia, www.isca.edu.au). The percentage of students attending these schools has led to a commensurate number of Heads being appointed to lead them and Science Coordinators to run Science faculties. There is an obvious demand for these new and different schools. In turn, there is also an obvious need for research into the aspects of leadership that make these schools significantly different so as to inform prospective candidates.

The most significant outcome of this research will lie in its application to individuals. A prospective Head reading the “Advice to prospective Heads” section may be well aware of the expectations of governance and the priority placed on Biblical principles in leadership, for instance, but may be informed by the expectation for purposeful development of community. It is entirely possible that a second prospective Head may, in turn, be informed by the former and yet, be already well aware of the latter. Much of the individual significance will be based on a prospective Head’s prior experience, the

type of school in which he or she currently serves, the philosophy of the schools to which they are applying, the degree to which they have been mentored by a variety of Heads from a variety of schools and their own diligence and maturity in leadership.

Whilst there are now courses for prospective Heads that seek to manage the gap between expectations and realities, there are no such courses for prospective Science Coordinators. Whilst some courses have emerged that seek to provide skills for middle managers, there is not yet the demand for specific Science Coordinator professional development. For every Head of an independent school, and with Science as such a prominent subject, indeed a mandated subject for K-10, every secondary school with a Head would also have a Science Coordinator, or for smaller schools, a person bearing some responsibility for Science as a subject. The need for research findings that inform prospective Science Coordinators of expectations and realities of the role is therefore also significant, if not more significant than that for Heads.

5.8 LIMITATIONS

The author acknowledges that there are several limitations with this research. These limitations include the number of participants who met the criteria of being a relatively new incumbent and the number of possible interviewees who were available or who agreed to participate in the research.

5.8.1 Sample Size

The sample size was expanded from five in each research category to eight governors, seven Heads, ten prospective Heads, six Science Coordinators and five prospective Science Coordinators. The purpose of the larger sample size was to improve the richness of data used to source conclusions from. For some questions, there was a consistency of answers evident. For other questions, no real consensus was evident. In the latter case, a larger pool of respondents may have led to a clearer trend emerging. It was a matter of

concern that in eleven independent schools, only five individuals were identified as prospective Science Coordinators. Some schools had up to six members of the Science faculty.

The small sample size was somewhat compensated for in the research by the richness of data that was collected through the capacity to spend more time with each applicant and to explore responses in greater detail, this contributing greater depth to the findings.

5.8.2 Heads selecting

There was an inherent risk in asking Heads of schools to identify members of their school community who would be the most suitable to interview. It is conceivable that the Head would rather nominate a person who would provide a positive impression of the school and of the Head than a person who was likely to relate expectations that the Head did not agree with, or could contradict the Head's understanding of the role.

In anticipation of this limitation, the researcher sought to reassure the Head that responses from those interviewed would not be used to identify individual schools, Heads, or in any way cast aspersions on whether a school was being well led or not. In practice, questions on expectations and realities of Headship or leading the Science faculty did not lend themselves to comment on leadership ability and so this reassurance was well founded.

Whilst the selection of participants was at the discretion of the Head, and this was an inherent flaw in the methodology, I can conceive of no better or more accurate way of identifying prospective Heads or Science coordinators at a school than to ask the leader of that school. The nature of independent schools dictates that any research, particularly as it involves interviewing governors, senior staff and staff, should always be directed through the Head.

5.8.3 Sample selection

In setting the parameters for those characteristics that delineate Independent schools from other schools, a survey of web-site statements was conducted. Schools were chosen by selecting rural towns or cities from a map of Australia and looking at websites; selecting those who had a vision or mission statement. In some cases, there was no obvious mission statement and so these schools were passed over. This method would be less random than alternatives such as scanning a list of all Australian schools, Government, Catholic and Independent alphabetically but an effort was made to balance rural schools with city schools, co-ed with single sex to obtain a comprehensive sample. In the end, the delineating features evident in what independent schools said about themselves were so pronounced as to eliminate a less representative but more random sample.

Whilst there was a sample of 36 respondents for interviews, it is acknowledged that all were drawn from within a radius of 300 kilometres of Sydney. Whilst the research has implications for independent schools nationwide, and even Christian leadership in organisations outside education, it is acknowledged that all interviewees were gathered from a small part of the geography of Australia, limited by the researcher's capacity for travel and a preference for face to face interviews. If the findings are to be projected on a national scale, it should therefore be a preface that all interviews were conducted in or near Sydney, N.S.W.

5.8.4 Nature of the schools

Every effort was made to have representative views from a range of schools. Types of schools varied from systemic denominational schools, to stand alone denominational and non-denominational Christian schools; co-educational to single sex; high fee

(\$20,000 p.a.) to low fee (\$4,000 p.a.); established schools (100 years plus) to new schools (five years old); urban and rural schools.

With a sample size of eleven schools, however, it is acknowledged that not all types of schools received equitable coverage. There were ten co-educational schools and only one single sex school for instance. There were no boy's schools or boarding schools. It is conceivable that school types, other than those in the sample, would have particular expectations and different realities for both Heads and Science Coordinators.

5.9 IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There are particular expectations and realities that have been established in this research for Heads of Independent schools based on a Christian philosophy. Whilst these schools make up the most significant proportion of Independent schools, there are others based on significantly different philosophies. Australia wide, these include Islamic schools, Jewish schools, Montessori schools, Rudolf Steiner schools, Schools constituted under specific Acts of Parliament, Community schools, Indigenous community schools, schools for students with disabilities and those that cater for students at severe educational risk (Community attitudes towards independent schools: a nationwide survey, 2010). It is probable that these independent schools will have different expectations and different realities for Head and Science Coordinators.

Boarding schools also make up a significant part of the Independent school sector. It is likely that there would be different expectations and realities in these schools.

There is scope for this research to be extended outside New South Wales for schools similar to those studied. Whilst the concept of a Christian school should have an inherent consistency nationwide, there may be inconsistencies with the extent of Biblical scholarship as a precursor for educational philosophy or a more obvious delineation between the functions of the church and its outreach ministries.

Greatest scope for further research exists in the area of leading a faculty. If the surprising lack of specific functionality associated with the role of Science Coordinator, as opposed to the role of any other Coordinator is apparent for Science, then it may be equally apparent in other departments.

Beyond the educational spectrum, some thought could also be given to researching the expectations and realities faced by leaders in other Christian based organizations.

5.10 SUMMARY

This research was predicated on the need for more information to be accessible for those who were seeking the role of Head or Science Coordinator in a school based on a Christian philosophy. It was my own concern as a prospective Science Head, and then again as a prospective Head, that most of the information I had gathered about these promotional roles was based on anecdotal evidence and what I had gathered from conversations, sometimes accidental with incumbents in both of these roles that I had coincidentally been acquainted with.

There was a need to establish what potential candidates for these roles thought would be the realities of taking up the position and then to compare these expectations with what the position reportedly entailed.

The results are expected to be most useful for candidates for these positions, not only in the provision of a set of expectations that provide the opportunity to address perceived weaknesses, but also a realistic set of guidelines that serve to better prepare candidates for the realities of the position. I know that as a prospective candidate myself, I would have been most grateful for such a broader sweep of educational opinion.

Even with nine years as a Science Coordinator and seven years as a Head, it was refreshing to gather the reflections of fellow Heads and Science Coordinators and to ponder anew on the expectations of those who sought to take the promotional step.

It was unnerving to interview disarmingly honest Heads who were questioning whether the gulf between their expectations of the role and the torment of the reality with its consequent cost on their personal welfare and family life was a life-changing decision that may or may not have been a correct one for them.

It was intriguing to interview stakeholders who, in my view, greatly undervalued the role of Science Coordinator and the specific contribution that they could make. It challenged me to consider whether the Science Coordinator and other Coordinators at my own school fully realize the specific extent and potential of their leadership portfolio. What followed for me was a series of interviews and public debrief for all coordinators about the profoundly important role that each plays, or has the potential to play.

I was forced to reconsider the expectations of my own Council in the light of what had been expressed for similar schools elsewhere.

Perhaps most significantly of all, it may seem self evident given the nature of this research and the perceived need for findings that would assist prospective Heads or Science Coordinators to better understand the realities of the role, but I found myself confronted, particularly when interviewing prospective leaders who had expectations that were significantly different from reported realities, with the prospect that there may well be people at my own school who are not being adequately prepared for leadership. I have had to ask myself the question, even as an experienced Head: Who are they and what can be done to better match their expectations of leadership with the realities that they may face? This research and its findings have been very useful in that regard.

Literature Review References

Organisations

Association of Independent Schools New South Wales; Independent Schools Queensland; Association of Independent Schools of South Australia, (2010). *Community attitudes towards independent schools: a nationwide survey*.

Independent Schools Council of Australia, (2010), www.isca.edu.au. *Independent Update, Issue 3*.

Macquarie Dictionary, (1994). *The Pocket Macquarie Dictionary*. Bernard, J. (ed.). Sydney, NSW: Jacaranda

National Academy of Sciences, (2000). *Science and Creationism: A view from the National Academy of Sciences*. Washington, US: National Research Council.

National Centre for Science Education, (1999). NCSE Recommended Policy Statement on Science and Evolution. *Reports for the National Centre for Science Education*. 19 (7), 23.

New South Wales Education Department, (2000). *Quality Matters: Revitalising Teaching; Critical Times, Critical Choices*. Ramsey, G, (ed.) November.

Authors

Allison, D. (1997) Coping with Stress in the Principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 35 (1), 39-55.

Ashton , J. (1999). *In six days*. Australia: New Holland Publishers.

Bartlet, K. (1998). Changing the public's perception of evolution – Christian origins of evolutionary thought. *Reports for the National Centre for Science Education*. 18 (1), 12-15,18.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation*. New York, US: Free Press.

Belbin, R. (1998). *Management Teams: Why they succeed or fail*. Merseyside, UK: Heinemann.

Blumberg, A. (1974). *Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war*. Berkely, USA: McCutchan.

Bolin, F. (1989). Empowering leadership. *Teachers College Record*, 91(1), 81-96

Bridges, J. (1992). *The Crisis of Caring*. New Jersey, USA: P&R Publishing.

Brooker, P. and Mulford, B. (1989). Is a high school promotion system designed for the '50s good enough for the '80s and '90s? *The Practising Administrator*. 11 (3), 12.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York,US: Harper Torch.

Caldwell, B. (1994). The Principal as the Leader of the Self Managing School. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30 (3), 8-19

Carver, J. (1990). *Boards That Make A Difference : A New Design for Leadership in Nonprofit and Public Organizations*. San Francisco, USA: Josey - Bass

- Cheng, Y. (1991). Leadership style of principals and organisational processes in secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 29 (2), 25-37.
- Childs-Bowen, D; Moller, G; Scrivner, J. (2000). Principals: Leaders of leaders. *NASSP Bulletin*; 84 (616), 27-34
- Connell, R.W. (1985). The school as a workplace. In R.W. Connell, *The Teacher's Work*. Sydney: George, Allen & Unwin.
- Conrath, J. (1987). *NASSP Bulletin*. The amazing role of leadership: You do have a choice. October, 126-132.
- Covey, S. (1989). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York, USA: Simon and Schuster.
- Crimmins, P.(2001). In Linnell,G. *God's Classroom*. The Good Weekend Supplement - Sydney Morning Herald, February 24.
- Daresh, J. & Playko, M. (1994). *Journal of Educational Administration*. Aspiring and Practising Principals' Perceptions of Critical Skills for Beginning Leaders. M.C.B. University Press. 32 (3), 35-45.
- Decoux, B. (1999). Some aspects of leadership in independent schools in Alberta. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 45 (1) 67-84
- Di Stephano, C. (2002). Taking science to the primary school. *Educare News*. November. 52-53.
- Drucker, P. (1996). *The Leader of the Future*. San Francisco, USA: Jossey Bass.

Duignan, P. (1997). *The Dance of Leadership : At the Still Point of the Turning World*. Australia: Monograph Series, A.C.E.A.

Farrelly, K. (2003). Follow the leader. *Sydney Morning Herald*. My Career March 29-30.

Friskin, R. (2003). *Which school for your child?* Sydney, Australia: New Hope International

Friskin, Rev. R. (2003). *Christian Schools: a priority for parents who care*. Sydney, Australia: New Hope International

Gagen, M. (1997). Support For Survival: Time Out for Administrators. *The Practising Administrator* (2), 10-13.

Glasser, W. (1994). *The Control Theory Manager*. New York, USA: Allen and Unwin

Gower, D. (1999). In Ashton, J. *In six days*. Australia: New Holland Publishers.

Greenleaf, R. (1991). *Servant Leadership*. The Robert Greenleaf Centre: Paulist Press.

Greenwood, K. (2001). In Linnell, G. *God's Classroom*. The Good Weekend Supplement - Sydney Morning Herald, February 24.

Gusdane, J. (1999). Strengthening the school leader's evangelizing role. *Momentum*. 30 (2) 26-28.

Hackling, M. Goodrum, D. and Rennie, L. (2001). The state of science in secondary schools. *Australian Science Teachers Journal*. 47(4).

- Harrison, A. (2002). More real Science needed. *Directions in education*. 11 (12), 3
- Hastie, P. (2003). Reality Check – Dr R. Mohler Jnr talks to Peter Hastie. *Australian Presbyterian*. (546) 4-8
- Hawkes, T. (1992). How to select and evaluate heads of department in your school. *The Practising Administrator*. 14 (2), 42-44.
- Hersey, P & Blanchard, K. (1988). *Management of Organizational Behaviour : Utilizing Human Resources*. California, USA: Prentice Hall
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, UK: Belthrop.
- Holden, S. (2002). What's up with Science? *Educare News*. April 6-10.
- Hollingworth, P. (2001) (1). In Crabb, A. *School vital in church revival*. The Age, April 19.
- Hollingworth, P. (2001) (2). In Linnell,G. *God's Classroom*. The Good Weekend Supplement - Sydney Morning Herald, February 24.
- Jacobs, R. (1994). *Real Time Strategic Change*. California, USA: Berrett - Koehler.
- Jones, L. (2001). Do we need to dismiss Creationism to teach Evolution? *Educare News*. September.
- Kirby, C., Paradise, & King, M. (1992). *Journal of Educational Research*. Extraordinary Leaders in Education: Understanding Transformational Leadership. 85 (5), 303-311.
- Lambert, J. (1997) *The Servant Leader*. Australian College of Education.

Laws, K., Smith, D. & Sinclair, K. (1992). *Leadership Styles, Skills and Technology*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Leithwood, Kenneth, & others. (1997). Distributed leadership in secondary schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Research Association.

Littleford, J. (2001). Understanding faculty and school cultures. Los Angeles, US: Unpublished.

Lunenburg, F, & Ornstein, A. (1993). *Educational Administration - Concepts and Practices*. California, US: Wadsworth.

MacKenzie, D. Unnatural Selection. (2000). *New Scientist*. April. (2235), 35-39

Mallison, J. (1998). *Mentoring: to develop disciples and leaders*. Adelaide, South Australia: Scripture Union/Open Book.

Manasse, A. (1984). Principals as leaders of high performing systems. *Educational Leadership*, 41 (5), 42-46

Marcus, J. (1999). In Ashton, J. *In six days*. Australia: New Holland Publishers.

Marlow, E. (1999) i. *Leadership in the Science curriculum*. ERIC NO: ED426863 Missouri, USA: Unpublished.

Marlow, E. (1999) ii. *Role of the principal in the Science curriculum*. ERIC NO: ED436852. Missouri, USA: Unpublished.

Martin, M. (1997). Is Christian education compatible with Science education? *Science and education*. 6 (3), 239-49

Maslen, G. (2003). New NSW Hotline established to help stressed school principals. *Education Review*. 13 (7), 32.

Matsumura, M. (1998). What do Christians really believe about evolution? *Reports for the Centre for Science Education*; 18 (2) 8-9.

McCallum, T. (2001). Staff Motivation: How well do you score? *Prime Focus*. December. 34-35

Miller, K. (2000). In MacKenzie, D. Unnatural Selection. *New Scientist*. April. (2235), 35-39.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, (1992). The Principalship in an Era of Transformation. *Journal of Educational Administration* 30 (3) 77-88

Nolan, B. (1989). *Management of Change*. ACAE Publications. Armidale, Australia.

Osif, B. (1997). Evolution and Religious Beliefs: A survey of Pennsylvania High School teachers *American Biology Teacher*. 59 (9) 552-56.

Palmer, K. (2001). Heads Up. *Inform*. 4 (6), 8-10

Paterson, F. (1999) "Chained to the Devil's throne": Evolution and creation science as a religio-political issue. *American Biology Teacher*. 61 (5) 358-64.

Pell, G. (2001). In Linnell, G. *God's Classroom*. The Good Weekend Supplement - Sydney Morning Herald, February 24.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982) *In search of excellence*. New York, USA: Harper and Row.

Plimer, I. (2000). First Person Ian Plimer. *New Scientist*. April. (2235), 43

Plimer, I. (2001). In Linnell, G. *God's Classroom*. The Good Weekend Supplement - Sydney Morning Herald, February 24.

Posner, G., Strike, K., Hewson, P. & Gertzog, W. (1982). Accomodation of a scientific conception: Toward an understanding of conceptual change. *Science Education*. 66 (2), 211-227

Ramsey, G. (2000). *Quality Matters. Revitalising teaching: Critical times, critical choices*. Sydney, Australia: NSW Department of Education and Training

Ridden, P. (1992). *School Management : A Team Approach*. London, UK: Ashton.

Ritz, W; Cashell, L; Martin, F. (1981). The effectiveness of Science supervisors and their membership status within a faculty. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 18 (33), 229-240.

Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the Twenty First Century*. USA: Prager.

Saulwick, I. (1998). *What parents want from their children's education in independent schools*. Victoria: Condensed Report, Association of Independent Schools of Victoria.

Scott, E. (1997). Dealing with anti-evolutionism. *Reports for the National Centre for Science Education*. 17 (4) 24-30.

Scott, E. (2000). In MacKenzie, D. Unnatural Selection. *New Scientist*. April. (2235), 35-39.

Senge, P. (1992). *The Fifth Discipline : The Art and Practise of the learning Organisation*. New York, USA: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. (1990). *Value added leadership - The Nine Dimensions and Two Corollaries that lead to Extraordinary Performance*". San Diego, US: Harcourt.

Sinclair, A. (1997). The relationship between college Zoology students' belief about evolutionary theory and religion. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. 30 (2), 118-25.

Skekhan, J, & Nelson, C. (2000). *The creation controversy and the science classroom*. Arlington, US: NSTA Press.

Tracy, M. (1997). Making the possible real. *Momentum*. 28 (4) 7-9.

Walderssee, R, & Eagleson, G. (1996). *The Efficacy of Distributed Leadership in Implementing Change*. Sydney, Australia: The Centre for Corporate Change.

Waller, W. (1932). *Sociology of Teaching*. New York, USA: John Wiley

Walter, J. (1999). In Ashton, J. *In six days*. Australia: New Holland Publishers.

Whitaker, P. (1990). *Managing change in Schools*. Buckingham, UK: Open University.

Willis, T. (2000). Take me to your leader. *New Scientist*. April. (2235), 41-43.

Every reasonable effort has been made to acknowledge the owners of copyright material. I would be pleased to hear from any copyright owner who has been omitted or incorrectly acknowledged.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

Interview transcripts are provided as an example from one each of the Governors, Heads of schools, prospective Heads of schools, Science Coordinators and prospective Science coordinators who were interviewed. Questions asked and responses given are recorded.

The number of years of experience is included in brackets and answers given by the respondents are shown in italics

Governor: (6 years experience)

Expectations

1. What are three chief expectations that you have of the Head of your school?
 - a. *A Christian ethos: Implement a Christian world-view. Decisions, both personal and public need to be made in the light of the saving work of Christ. The Head should assist others in this also.*
 - b. *The transfer of educational theory into practice: that the Head has worked out and thought through educational theory and has the skills to implement it into practice. This will directly influence his decisions regarding buildings, staff, staff allowances etc.*
 - c. *That they will develop good relationships with all stakeholders – from the Kindergarten student to the Council Chair.*

2. How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?
Point a. would not be important (although all schools implicitly or explicitly reflect their own view and there is a great danger on not have some answers to these directional questions. The other two expectations would be the same in any school.

3. What other areas are important in the role of Head of school?
 - *Selection of staff and the ongoing care for staff*
 - *A strength of conviction and character, but able to listen to find a better way and collaborate where appropriate,*

4. What is your understanding of the term Servant Leadership?
A servant leader works along-side others. He/she models service and has a giving nature (not always taking). Is willing to get his own hands dirty – not always delegating.

5. What is a Christian World view and how should a Head seek to develop it?
Christ is our saviour and sustainer. He is our life-giver. A Christian allows what Jesus has said, done and who he is influence every facet of their lives. For a school to have a Christian world view, it is essential that the Head is a Christian

and that he seeks the counsel of other Christians. This is part of the role of the College Council and of the Chair – to support, encourage and counsel.

6. Some Christian schools emphasise Compassion for others, Servant Leadership, the development of a Christian world view and maturity in faith. What is the importance of each of these outcomes?

A Christian world view is the first priority. The second is the development of a maturity in faith. Servant leadership and compassion for others flow from these.

7. Should the school be an evangelistic agency?

The priority of the school is education but as a Christian school it is encouraged that Christians evangelise.

8. What would be the leadership style that you would expect from the Head?

Open to ideas and change. Interact with staff – listen – be approachable.

9. How should the Head manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?

Teach both.

Scripture is an account of god's creative and sustaining hand. His methods are not scientifically explained – evolution may be his mechanism, though it may be a punctuated evolution. We must hold that the creation of man is special.

Realities

10. What three major areas consume most of the Head's time?

Three areas that consume much of the Head's time are –

- a. Compliance – reporting to the Board of Studies, government agencies and to Council and the Board (governance of the school).*
- b. Budget issues*
- c. Facilities and design*

11. How would the role of the Head be different to that of a Science Coordinator?

Science Coordinator is still reporting but to the Head. Still covers Board of Studies issues, still finance but not governance.

12. It has been stated by researchers that the role of Head is facing increasing “complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty.” How accurate is this statement?

Very accurate but the story is similar for all CEOs and General Managers of organisations. They are all driven by more compliance to government – eg Occupational Health and Safety, Child Protection.

The ambiguity lies in the answer above – we need to ask: Why is the emphasis so much on dotting “i”s rather than education of kids?

The complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty that is being created for leadership is the reason why Assistant Minister is regarded as a better role than Minister.

Head of School: (1 year of experience)

Expectations

1. What are three chief expectations that School governors have of the Head of school?
 - a. *Lead the school (as opposed to manage the school) – Head is leader*
 - b. *Manage the school effectively – world view, values*
 - c. *Manage the school efficiently – fiscal connotation*
2. How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?
Creation of culture, Christian world view – based on a different value set. Independent school provides more scope for leadership.
3. Are these expectations the same or different from other stakeholders such as the church, parents, staff and students?
Different.
4. If different, what would be the three main expectations from –
The Church: *Expectation of leadership.*
Parents: *Manage the school – kids are happy and content – good communication – responsible planning.*
Staff: *Similar to Council – expectation of leadership.*
Students: *Manage the school – safe and secure place with good teaching.*
5. What other areas are important in the role of Head of school?
Strategic planning; compliance.
6. How would you best describe your leadership style? Would this be similar to the style that stakeholders would expect?
Decisive; consultative within parameters – significant consultancy with some people. My role is to lead and manage the school and that is what I will do. I don't consult with everybody on everything but I will consult with some people on some things. If I consult and do something different – I still value your opinion.
A story that I use with staff to illustrate the difference between leadership and management is “the little child bobbing down the river”.
If the staff was having a picnic and a little child came past – bobbing down stream – what would you do? Staff response is typically to rescue the child – good. What if another child came bobbing down the river? Rescue him or her too – good. What if another one came down? The manager keeps rescuing the children – the leader sends someone upstream to find out what has happened.

Realities

7. What three major areas consume most of the Head's time?

- a. *Strategic planning*
 - b. *Financial management*
 - c. *Compliance*
8. How is the role of Head changing?
Very little management of the day to day. Change from educational leader and manager to an educational leader and business manager (CEO). A CEO with teaching and learning leadership interwoven.
9. Before beginning the role, what were your expectations of the role of being a Head of a school and is the reality different?
Reality different – but had a good lead in to the role.
10. If the reality is different, what were the three biggest surprises?
*Change in mental attitude – realisation of legal, moral and ethical dimension of being where the buck stops. Things such as OH&S can be managed as a deputy and can even be enjoyed – as a Head I hate them.
 People’s perception of you changes – statements now carry the weight of an emperor – even though I say the same things.*
11. As the school changes in size, are there different priorities for the Head?
*Size is more a function of the environment.
 As the school grows – the Head is more visionary – how do we respond to growth –more proactive.
 As the school contracts the focus is limiting the contraction – finances; pastoral – more reactive – more focus on managing the status quo.*
12. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?
Science coordinator has a much higher proportion of management. Don’t like the term “middle manager” I want them to embrace leadership. Coordinator has less opportunity to change the direction of the organisation and are left implementing the decisions of others.
13. What are prospective Heads at your school doing now that will prepare them for the role of Head?
Attending Council meetings. Run executive meetings. Address the Parents and Friends (while I am there). Invite them to comment on the Head’s leadership. Chair staff meetings – to build an understanding and a comprehension of the whole school
14. What different knowledge or activity would be helpful in preparing them for the role?
Still thinking.
15. What is your understanding of the term Servant Leadership?

I explain this to students. What does the Prime minister do? What does prime mean (number one)? What does minister mean (parliament). What does a minister mean? (servant). Prime Minister is Australia's number one servant – to serve others through your leadership – it is not a style – it can be authoritative. It is a principle – to lead for others. It is the paradox of the Christian life – the paradox that God's Son actually died friendless. Servant leadership is a choice.

16. What is a Christian World view and how is it developed at this school?

Underlying principles on which you base everything you do. At a staff level – frequent topic at PD days. Christianity underpins all that you do – we cannot be Sunday Christians. We have an overlay of denominational expectations. Don't force God into the curriculum but don't deny obvious opportunities to celebrate God's influence. Knowledge can be revealed as well as acquired.

17. Some Christian schools emphasise Compassion for others, Servant Leadership, the development of a Christian world view and maturity in faith. How are each of these outcomes promoted here?

Maturity in faith – firstly need to personalise faith – students need the freedom to express it individual – it is not a corporate concept - you are saved by personal involvement not by association.

Compassion for others is not exclusively a Christian world view. Tolerance is a Christian world view and Christianity does not promote tolerance – Christ did not come to accept all views. Compassion is a value that those for social justice displays – some denominations are extraordinary in compassion as are the Uniting church.

18. Is the school an evangelistic agency? Why/Why not

Evangelical – personal relationship with God. Evangelical church promotes personal faith. Evangelist promotes personal faith and the gospel therefore the school is evangelical but not an evangelistic tool – it is a school.

19. It has been stated by researchers that the role of Head is facing increasing “complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty.” How accurate is this statement?

Complexity – yes – things that are done now need to be codified – before they just used to happen.

Ambiguous – the term CEO clarifies this – no longer a teacher?

Uncertainty – yes – increasingly uncertain – no job security.

Science Coordinators

20. What are three chief expectations that you have of the Science Coordinator?

Lead staff to become better Science teachers; manage the faculty to be effective; create a culture that is supportive of and adds to the culture of the school

21. In what ways are your expectations of a Science head different to those of other Heads of department?

Not

22. How should the Science Coordinator manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?

With any topic in any course – treat it in terms of the difference between learnt knowledge and revealed knowledge – these don't exclude each other. God gives us the ability and the understanding to make sense of the world around us.

23. What percentage of time should a Science Head devote to the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?

Administration 15%

Pastoral Care of staff 15%

Teaching and Learning 60%

Pastoral care of students 10%

Prospective Head: (Head of School Section 10 Years)

Expectations

1. What are three chief expectations that School governors have of the Head of school?

Competency in leadership and management

To understand people and to communicate well with them

Vision, drive, energy, passion, motivation

2. How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?

Mostly in the area of motivation and regarding alignment with the faith declaration of the school

3. Are these expectations the same or different from other stakeholders such as the church, parents staff and students?

Different – governance is about the viability and sustainability of the school.

4. If different, what would be the three main expectations from –

The Church: Promulgation of the gospel and to be a good school – we cannot fall down here and be left with any credibility

Parents: Listen and accept them. Lead children, staff and the school in the best way. To have wisdom – wisdom is accepted even if it is not in the best interests of their kids

Staff: Integrity and wisdom. To be competent and to communicate well. To be firm and not to compromise to whingers.

Students: to be understanding and to have an affinity – is the Head grumpy?

5. What other areas are important in the role of Head of school?
To be a great reader of people – to be one step ahead of the tsunami. To have high Emotional Intelligence. To have the ability to lead – the days are gone where the Head is the font of all wisdom.
6. How would you best describe your leadership style? Would this style change if you took on Headship?
*Personable; unflappable; a change agent; not conforming; pastoral; high expectations; encourager; sometimes need to pull the gun
These would not change fundamentally but I would have to develop more political grunt and a thicker skin.*

Realities

7. What three major areas consume most of the Head's time?
*Trouble shooting – being one step ahead of the wolves at the door – being trapped in the chair and on the phone anticipating difficulties
Administration and paperwork
Vision*
8. How is the role of Head changing?
More compliance
9. As the school changes in size, are there different priorities for the Head?
*Becomes more of a Chief Executive Officer
There are several stages – the pioneer; the developer; the establisher
Needs to stay one step ahead and to learn to divest responsibility*
10. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?
Higher responsibility – the Head is where the buck stops The Science Coordinator is a middle manager with a much narrower focus.
11. What are you doing now that will prepare you for the role of Head?
Learning from watching – asking questions. I ask myself : can I do it; do I have the drive. At the moment the answer is NO.
12. What different knowledge or activity would be helpful in preparing you for the role?
*Time for self reflection and analysis. Development of a whole school perspective.
More study.*
13. What is your understanding of the term Servant Leadership?

Aptitude and attitude of working with others based on the modelled life of Jesus. The greatest among you shall be the least. Servant leadership does not assume authority.

14. What is a Christian World view and how should a Head seek to develop it?
Seeing life as a member of God's family by faith. All things are under Jesus.
15. Some Christian schools emphasise Compassion for others, Servant Leadership, the development of a Christian world view and maturity in faith. How would you develop each of these outcomes?
Employ good staff – build the capital of the school and develop consistency. Develop a reputation amongst parents who will accept the Christian bit because they want their kids to be well rounded. These are developed through corporate integrity.
16. It has been stated by researchers that the role of Head is facing increasing “complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty.” How accurate is this statement?
Very true – especially compliance: federal and the Board of Studies. We are all still unsure what is happening with the National Curriculum

Science Coordinators

17. What are three chief expectations you would have of a Science Coordinator?
To be passionate and to know their subject. To be optimistic in her views. To have a willingness to learn.
18. In what ways would the expectations of a Science head differ to those of other Heads of department?
Need to be a generalist across all areas.
19. How should the Head manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?
Not as a dictum – we want young people with informed minds. Talk about it and explore the issues – it is OK to say what you believe and why. Talk about it and explore it – throw in a few red herrings.
20. What percentage of time should a Science Head devote to the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?
- | | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| <i>Administration</i> | <i>25%</i> |
| <i>Pastoral Care</i> | <i>25%</i> |
| <i>Teaching and Learning</i> | <i>50%</i> |
- It is seasonal – sometimes more admin and sometimes more Pastoral Care but Teaching and Learning is a constant.*

Science Coordinator: (3 Years experience)

Expectations

1. What are three chief expectations that you have of the Head of your school?
Support: in all aspects of the role; support for autonomy and understanding that I will work within my skills; support in the community (outside College hours) – support for my decisions
Mentor and advisor
2. What are three chief expectations that the Head of your school has of you?
The coordination of a department – that I am a professional who will know the job and do the job well
To be a leader of the faculty – including people management, meeting deadlines, care for staff, assisting staff, keeping staff happy – this is a key.
3. How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?
The whole mind set would be different. In a Christian school there is more emphasis on pastoral care and less on simply achieving objectives X,Y and Z
Adjustment of programming to incorporate Christian principles and a Christian world view.
4. Are these expectations the same or different from other stakeholders such as the church, parents staff and students?
Other groups have a different emphasis
5. If different, what would be the three main expectations from –
The Church – *How we adjust our programming – do our Christian ideas contrast with a world view? Why is the school different?*
Parents – *depends on their views (whether they are a Christian or not). Some are not Christian. Parents want academic achievement – want the best for their kids – want a caring environment*
Staff – *All staff are Christians and have the same mindset re ideas*
Students – *very individual. Christian students enjoy hearing about a Christian world view – they take a great interest in a Science teacher who is a Christian (most think that Science is opposed to Christianity). (It is a popular media vie that a person can't be both a Christian and a scientist.*
6. What other areas are important in the role of Science Coordinator?
Encouraging staff to explore different methods of teaching – to make learning fun and exciting. Encouraging staff to think outside the curriculum – perhaps a demonstration of something interesting.
7. How would you best describe your leadership style? Would this be similar to the style that stakeholders would expect?

Laid back – but also with a high expectation of self and therefore a high expectation of others (who it is hoped will mirror my example). One example is meeting deadlines – I do this myself and expect others to follow. It is a suitable style.

Realities

8. What three major areas consume most of the Science Coordinator's time?

25% Mentoring young staff – classroom management – use of equipment – we are a beginning school and there is a higher proportion of inexperienced staff

25% programming and registration

10% own classes – preparation and teaching

9. How is the role of Science Coordinator changing?

Harder now to attract experienced staff and therefore more time is spent mentoring new staff. A growing school means new staff all the time.

*Documentation for New Scheme teachers – writing supervisor's reports for them
Extra time required for new staff in the documentation of their work means that they have less preparation time for teaching and more stress – this impacts on the Science Coordinator as their supervisor.*

10. Before beginning the role, what were your expectations of the role of being a Science Coordinator at a school and is the reality different?

Reality is very different.

Expectation was that there would be some time spent on programming and paperwork but the reality is that it is much more

Reality: Volume of the paperwork – staff reports, selecting things to get involved in from the variety of options that the College receives via flyers and advertising, which excursions. This takes the coordinator away from the classroom – preparation, teaching.

11. If the reality is different, what were the three biggest surprises?

1. Time for preparation

2. Volume of paperwork

3. Other whole-College roles that take you away from coordinating Science.

12. As the school changes in size, are there different priorities for the Science Coordinator?

Yes.

Originally there is a focus on establishment of Science and increasing the number of students taking Science and the number of courses on offer. A focus on quantity saw us double the uptake for Science

As the College develops there is a quality emphasis – a challenge to raise the academic standard and to assist teachers in understanding what HSC marker expectations are.

13. In what ways would the expectations that the Head would have of a Science Coordinator be different to those of other Heads of department?

Chemical Safety expertise

14. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?

Administration of the whole College

Greater responsibility

Lack of teaching – it is no longer the job that you signed up for

15. What are prospective Science Coordinators doing now that will prepare them for the role of Science Coordinator?

Programming – working in groups with the responsibility for the finished product

Chairing faculty meetings

Understanding the paperwork – getting them to follow things through – eg if they order something they can understand how much it costs and are more likely to care for it in class.

16. What different knowledge or activity would be helpful in preparing them for the role?

I would like to spend more time mentoring them – it is often easier just to do something yourself rather than explain it.

It would be good for them to have more opportunities to do different jobs (but this also requires assistance from the coordinator – time)

17. How do you manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?

I explain that there are different views on everything – that we should present both views. If we present all information then it allows for individual choice.

In the case of the Big Bang – one view is that “it just started.” We challenge this assumption by saying, “It had to start from somewhere. Energy can’t be created or destroyed”

18. What percentage of time do you devote to the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?

Admin 40%

Pastoral Care of staff and students 30%

Teaching and Learning 30%

Prospective Science Coordinator: (5 years teaching)

Expectations

1. What are three chief expectations that a Science Coordinator would have of the Head of a school?
 - a. *Holds a Christian/Biblical world view*
 - b. *Communicates effectively: Expectations (written and verbal). Makes people feel valued. Listener. People skills. Personable.*
 - c. *Offers wise council/leadership*

2. How would these expectations differ from a school with non-Christian brief?
 - a. *Head of school would not be expected to hold a Biblical world view.*
 - b. *Effective communication is still a priority.*
 - c. *The style of leadership may be different and wisdom will lack a perspective of grace and eternity. Grace incorporates forgiveness (does not eliminate dealing with issues or consequences). Grace allows people to move on, does not hold a grudge and is non-judgemental. Eternal perspective sees that people are precious in God's eyes; that consequences of actions are eternal; that due care must be taken not to create stumbling blocks that would cause others to question the gospel.*

3. What are three chief expectations that the Head of a school would have of a Science Coordinator?
 - a. *Ensures that administrative and legal requirements of the department are managed – e.g. Board of Studies and OH&S.*
 - b. *Leads faculty staff to produce best learning outcomes for students*
 - c. *Has a vision for the faculty and promotes goals for continuous improvement; Vision for students of*
 - *Scientific literacy – teaching them to analyse questions as adults.*
 - *Science as a method – best explanation of things but not the answer to everything*
 - *An appreciation of the Christian world view (whether they become one or not).*

4. Are these expectations the same or different from other stakeholders such as the church, parents staff and students?

For some YES, others NO.

5. If different, what would be the three main expectations from –

The Church – expect that Scientific evidence is not taught as truth which contradicts the Bible. The church sometimes sees Science as the enemy but it can co-exist very well if it is seen as a method and as a best explanation. We need to understand that we may not fully understand God's truth at the moment.

Parents – have a priority focussed on learning outcomes

Staff – *no difference*
Students – *no significant difference*

6. What other areas are important in the role of Science Coordinator?
 - a. *Effective skills for relating to adults and students*
 - b. *Is an effective classroom teacher*
 - c. *Has the respect of students*
 - d. *Firm and fair boundaries as a framework for discipline*
 - e. *Consistent but able to discern when a situation needs consideration on merit before making a judgment*
 - f. *Offers encouragement to students and staff*

7. How would you best describe your leadership style? Would this be similar to the style that stakeholders would expect if you were the coordinator?

According to the DISC Dimensions of Behaviour Map, I am strong in Steadiness and Conscientious. This means I like to get along – to work with people, reliable, helper. I like stability and organisation. I am patient and a good listener I participate rather than direct. I am diplomatic but with clearly defined expectations. Suitability of these traits depends on the wishes of the stakeholders and the dynamics of the existing leadership team. Who are they looking for? If they want a person with strong dominance and influence traits then I am not necessarily going to meet the criteria. Maybe the steady, conscientious leader is required on the team to provide balance and perspective. The downside of my style is that I am not up-front or confident if that is what is needed.

Realities

8. What three major areas consume most of the Science Coordinator's time?
 - a. *Teaching*
 - b. *Leading the faculty team. This depends on the staff that they have to lead. If staff are independent, professional and responsible and clear about expectations and goals, time will be freed up for other projects. If you have some staff that are struggling to deliver learning outcomes and fail to meet expectations, a drain on time can occur.*
 - c. *Attending meetings of various kinds.*

9. How is the role of Science Coordinator changing?
 - a. *More dynamic – greater expectations. Society has increasingly higher standards expected but time is the issue.*
 - b. *There is more and more emphasis on professional development and continuous learning*
 - c. *As the department is established there is a higher demand on the coordinator to fulfil wider College roles that draw him away from coordinating Science.*

10. As the school changes in size, are there different priorities for the Science Coordinator?
*Yes – there is the need to provide more subject choices and to resource these choices – eg Environmental Science, Agriculture
 More resources means greater time needed away from other priorities in order to manage resources.*
11. In what ways would the expectations that the Head would have of a Science Coordinator be different to those of other Heads of department?
Science has the opportunity to sell a school. There is the potential for excitement – eg “grab” subjects like Astronomy. There is a higher marketing expectation from those who coordinate practical, hands-on subject areas.
12. How is the role of the Head different to that of a Science Coordinator?
More administration; leader of staff; clear expectations of students; strength and consistence; confidence and clarity in direction and the ability to communicate this.
13. What are you doing now that will prepare you for the role of Science Coordinator?
*a. Working on my craft as a teacher
 b. Step up and assist the coordinator when needed
 c. Minor administrative preparation for Registration
 d. Chair faculty meetings
 e. Just ask questions about how the faculty works*
14. What different knowledge or activity would be helpful in preparing you for the role?
*a. More exposure to discipline issues
 b. Clearer knowledge of database operations – coordination of faculty results
 c. Professional development on Team Leading
 d. Professional reading
 e. Consultation with existing faculty heads*
15. How should a Science Coordinator manage the issue of Creation and Evolution?
Evolution Theory is a consequence of the Scientific Method. It has limitations and does not contradict the Bible. Give students an understanding that conflict is not necessary – although you can see conflict if you wish (it is a personal view). Use God talk in programs. Other issues arise like Cosmology and the Big Bang vs. the 7 day creation. Cosmology can quote the speed of light indicating the age of the universe (also geology time-lines). The Bible is a genre of text – not a Science text-book – it is not necessarily literal.
16. What percentage of time do you devote to each of the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <i>Teaching and Learning</i> | 70% |
| <i>Pastoral Care of Staff</i> | 10% |
| <i>Pastoral care of Students</i> | 10% |
| <i>Extra Administration</i> | 10% |
| <i>But it is hard to separate some of these – really</i> | |
| <i>Teaching and Learning</i> | 90% |
| <i>Pastoral Care of Staff</i> | 10% |

17. What percentage of time should a Science Head devote to the three areas of administration, pastoral care of staff and students and teaching and learning?

| | |
|------------------------------------------|-----|
| <i>Administration</i> | 20% |
| <i>Pastoral Care staff</i> | 20% |
| <i>Pastoral Care/discipline students</i> | 10% |
| <i>Teaching and Learning</i> | 50% |