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ABSTRACT

*Schools of the Future* is a major management reform of government (public) schools in Victoria, Australia. When fully implemented all schools will have control of 90% of their operating costs, principals will have the power to select and initiate the removal of staff, and schools will have a school charter that details a three year resource and accountability framework. As principals were viewed by the government as central to the reform, this research focussed on perceptions of the leadership role of principals.

Perspectives on principal leadership were gathered from both principals and teachers using a hermeneutic phenomenological methodology without an a priori theoretical framework. Principals and teachers were interviewed at seven schools. In addition, principals only were interviewed at three schools. In total ten principals and thirty teachers from ten schools participated in the research.

The perceptions of principals and teachers were found to be similar. The perceived leadership role of principals was found to be complex and multi-dimensional with 17 leadership themes described. In addition, there were 13 themes where change was noted in the leadership role since the introduction of *Schools of the Future*. Comparing the found leadership description with findings from the leadership literature resulted in a list of 12 recommendations for practice and support for three current conceptions of leadership:

1. Instructional leadership was evident, although there was less direct involvement by principals than suggested by previous research, indicating that the leadership could be better described as indirect instructional leadership.

2. The importance placed in transformational leadership conceptions on cultural and symbolic leadership, and on being future orientated was confirmed in this research.

3. Support was also found for Caldwell and Spinks' description of leadership
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

This research explored the phenomenon of school leadership by principals in secondary schools involved in the Victorian school self-management reform known as Schools of the Future. Principal and teacher perceptions were used to describe the leadership role of the principal, to describe changes to that role since the introduction of Schools of the Future, and to describe the degree of agreement with contemporary conceptions of school leadership. A hermeneutic phenomenological methodology was employed to allow both description and interpretation of the interviews and to allow the research to proceed without the need for an a priori theoretical framework. Using this approach gave the participants considerable scope to raise those areas that they believed were relevant to the topic of research and resulted in a rich and detailed description of the perceived leadership role. The generated description was connected with the wider research literature on school leadership. Areas supported and refuted by this research were acknowledged and current models of school leadership investigated, including instructional and transformational leadership, and the leadership dimensions for self-managing schools proposed by Caldwell and Spinks (1992).

Whilst this research is self-contained, it also forms part of a larger research project that is investigating the Schools of the Future reform as it is being implemented. The longitudinal study entitled "Leading Victoria's Schools of the Future" is a joint effort of the Victorian Primary Principals Association (VPPA), the Victorian Association of State Secondary Principals (VASSP), the Directorate of School Education (DSE) and the University of Melbourne and is investigating the purposes, processes and outcomes of Schools of the Future, giving particular attention to the effects on principals (Thomas, 1993).
BACKGROUND

This research is located in the city of Melbourne. Melbourne is the capital city of the state of Victoria in Australia. It is a large and geographically dispersed city with a population of 3,000,000 people from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds. The school education system consists of primary schools from preparatory year to year six (ages five to twelve) and secondary schools from year seven to twelve (ages twelve to eighteen). Most students (76%) complete 13 years of school and attain a year twelve certificate called the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE). There are free or low-fee paying government and religious school systems (the largest of which is the Catholic system), as well as a number of independent fee-paying schools accounting for approximately 70, 20 and 10 per cent of the student population respectively. The government school system has 1321 primary schools, 296 secondary schools and another 109 settings including special schools, P-12 schools, language schools and ancillary settings (Victorian School News, 3(1), 1995). There are 15,860 primary teachers, 17,505 secondary teachers teaching 302,982 primary students and 225,413 secondary students (VSTA News, January 26, 1995). The school system is operated by the Directorate of School Education which is responsible to the Minister of Education. All the schools involved in this research were secondary schools from the North-West region of Melbourne. The schools included those that served poor, affluent and semi-rural communities.

October 2, 1992, saw a change in government in Victoria; the Labor Government of ten years was replaced by a conservative Liberal-National Coalition Government. The Coalition was swept into power with the promise of instituting major reforms across most areas of government, including education. A feature of the previous government was its trend to decentralising of the education system (Thomas and Caldwell, 1994). One of the key reforms of the new government has been the further decentralisation of the public education system through the introduction of the Schools of the Future project.
Beginning in June 1993, 322 schools were selected to become pilot schools in the first phase of this program; 278 schools were also selected to become associate schools. In total, 31% of Government schools were involved in this initial stage. The key objectives of the Schools of the Future program (Directorate of School Education, 1994a) are to:

1. Encourage the continuing improvement in the quality of educational programs and practices in Victorian schools to enhance student learning outcomes.
2. Foster the attributes of good schools in terms of leadership, school ethos, goals, planning and accountability process.
3. Build on a statewide framework of quality curriculum, programs and practices.
4. Develop appropriate policy and phase the implementation of the program over a three year period.

When fully implemented, Schools of the Future will allow schools to:

1. Set their own curriculum within the broad curriculum and standards framework set by the Board of Studies.
2. Establish accountability through the writing of a School Charter and through the use of an accountability framework being developed by the Office of Schools Review.
3. Have school councils which will have the authority to determine the educational policies of the school within the framework of the school charter.
4. Have control over their financial resources including minor capital works and maintenance.
5. Locally select teaching staff.

(DSE, 1994d)

In effect, schools will have control of about 90% of operating costs, principals will have the power to select and initiate the removal of staff, and each school will have a school charter that details a three year framework for resources
and accountability (Thomas and Caldwell, 1994). In addition during 1994, student services (e.g. counselling, special education) and curriculum personnel have been relocated to schools from school support centres, and District Liaison Principals have been appointed to facilitate changes associated with *Schools of the Future* by providing advice and collegiate support to principals, assisting with professional development of principals and staff, supervising the provision of student services and curriculum support and acting as change agents in school communities (DSE, 1994e). By the start of the 1995 school year 76% of schools had joined the *Schools of the Future* program, with all schools expected to be fully operational as *Schools of the Future* by mid-1995 (Directorate of School Education, 1994a).

As well as the introduction of *Schools of the Future* a new curriculum based on national frameworks, new discipline policies and statewide testing are all to be introduced in 1995. Also coinciding with the implementation of *Schools of the Future* has been a significant program of cost cutting instituted across all areas of state government responsibility. Since the election of the new government, education in Victoria has experienced large cuts in resourcing resulting in the loss of one in six teachers, the closure of one in ten schools, yearly spending reduced by $400 million dollars, and central office staff numbers reduced from 2500 to 700 (The Sunday Age, January 22, 1995). Student to teacher ratios for secondary schools have increased from 11.8 prior to the change in government in October, 1992 to 13.3 in 1994 (VSTA News, January 26, 1995). There has been industrial unrest resulting in a number of teacher strikes, little cooperation between government and unions and the two major teacher unions moving from state level determination of employment conditions to federal level determination. With cuts in staff numbers, increases in class size and teaching allotments, uncertainty about future employment and the introduction of major educational changes, teacher morale was low and there was much anger directed at the government by teachers.

In summary, Victorian government education has undergone major changes resulting in a reduction in resources, further decentralisation of administrative functions to schools through *Schools of the Future*, and the introduction of new
curriculum and testing programs. During this time there has been industrial unrest and low teacher morale. It was within this context that this research was undertaken.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

WORLD AND NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

The changing role of principals in schools has been highlighted by, amongst others, the work of Caldwell (1993), Caldwell and Spinks (1992), Hallinger and Hausman (1993), Leithwood (1994), Murphy (1990, 1994), Murphy and Hallinger (1992), and Thomas (1991). Murphy and Hallinger (1992) describe the principalship as being in an era of transformation. The leadership role of the principal is changing as schools and school systems change. Two recent analyses are used to indicate the extent of the forces that are viewed as impacting on education world-wide.

Whitty (1993) identifies six themes influencing education:

1. Global trends such as changing demographics and world economic climate.
2. The adoption of a market approach in education.
3. Apparent depolitisation caused by reforms such as those influenced by Chubb and Moe (1990) in America that appear to make education less political, but which are heavily influenced by political considerations.
4. Post-Fordism assumptions evident in the trend in England away from general schools to specialist schools.
5. Post-modernity assumptions that emphasise heterogeneity, fragmentation and difference.
6. Reworking of old themes, such as the trend back to specialist schools.

Caldwell and Spinks (1992:3) argue that schools are increasingly being
asked to respond to changing local and world conditions: “The scope and pace of change in education at the start of the 1990’s are nothing short of breathtaking.” They have identified a number of world-wide trends that are impacting on schools and the leadership role of principals:

1. A more sharply focussed role for central authorities.
2. Increasing impact at the school level of national and global considerations.
4. Provision of quality education for the individual.
5. Dispersion of the education function.
6. Increased focus on creativity, problem-solving and capacity for life-long learning and relearning.
7. Expanded role for the arts and spirituality.
8. Increase in female leaders.
9. Increase in parent and community involvement.
10. Increase in the provision of quality support services.

In these analyses the writers have identified the variety of forces impacting on education and the variety of changes that are resulting. Other writers have not only identified forces and trends, but they have attempted to describe the future directions that education may take. Beare (1994) predicts that future education will feature:

1. International education markets.
2. Static or diminished resource allocation with greater demands.
3. Fewer and more highly paid teachers, with increased use of advanced technology to aid instruction.
4. Movement away from “effective schools” to “effective schooling”.
5. Increased emphasis on specific, goal orientated, instrumental learning.
6. Pluralised provision.
Many of the issues implied in these lists of forces and changes are addressed in this thesis. For the present purpose it is enough to indicate that the forces acting on education world-wide are many and varied, and that education may look very different in the future with a greater emphasis on world educational communities, more specialised curriculum offerings and changes in the structure and organisation of schools and teachers' work. Some of the forces are controlled by educationists through the reworking of old themes, or as the result of continued critical analysis of best education practice. However, many of the forces are out of the control of educationists', as Beare (1994:6) notes concerning trends in education, "educators are not in control of the agenda...not driving the bus." For example, Marginson (1993) has detailed the impact of the dominance of economic rationalist thought on Australian public education policy, whilst Beare (1991) has highlighted the political influence on schools and school system restructuring in Australia and overseas.

The major changes to school systems that are occurring throughout the world have been documented in countries such as Australia, Britain, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, and the United States (Beare and Boyd, 1993; Caldwell and Spink, 1992:3; DSE, 1994a; Thomas and Caldwell, 1994). One trend is the adoption of some form of school-based management as a "component of educational reform in most developed and newly industrialised nations." (Caldwell, 1994b:1). The impact of these international changes on the principalship has not gone unrecorded, with Hallinger and Murphy (1992) collecting essays from Australia, Belgium, Britain, Israel and the United States. In the United States, Murphy (1994:4-8) noted changes in the work environment of principals whose schools are undergoing transformational change. At the core of the changes is the turbulent policy environment for principals and schools. Murphy (1994:4-8) believes that this turbulent policy environment is heightened by three reform dynamics influencing the role of the principal:

1 A more complex education system with higher expectations and more players.
2 A scale and pace of change that is often overwhelming and which often occurs in an uncertain environment where the established organisational bureaucracy is disintegrating, leaving schools to fend for themselves, and where the messages coming from Governments are contradictory and schizophrenic in nature.

3 An increase in the workload of principals and in the skills needed to address the expanded role that includes increased flexibility, enhanced autonomy, and shared responsibilities. Associated with role overload is role ambiguity for principals, resulting in a sense of loss of control and professional identity.

Thus, the environment principals work in is more complex and characterised by rapid change. At the same time, more is expected from principals.

In Australia, reform of the public school systems appears to be a continual process and one in which principals and schools are continually having to adjust. For example, all the public systems of education have undergone major restructuring of school management (Harman, Beare and Berkeley, 1991). In reviewing the contribution of authors to their book on restructuring of public school management in Australia, Harman, Beare and Berkeley (1991: chapter 14) identify a number of themes including:

1 The ongoing nature of school system restructuring; restructuring that led to reduced central administrations and increased school responsibilities was a feature of education during the eighties and remains a central feature during the nineties.

2 The decentralisation of authority and responsibility to schools and the trimming and flattening of the central administration structure.

3 The loss by educators of control of the reform agenda and its implementation.

4 The driving of the reform agenda by non-educational forces that are primarily conservative and economic in nature.

5 The influence of business management and personnel practices.

6 The emergence of self-managing schools as the preferred model.
The small positive effects and the large number of adverse effects (morale, career structure, stability).

These themes mirror the world-wide themes listed previously and indicate that Australia is experiencing similar changes in education to those which are occurring elsewhere.

It is this extraordinary time of change in education that gives this research international relevance. The research is focussed on the leadership role of principals as they lead schools in a school system embarking on major school and system restructuring program. It will add further to the extensive body of knowledge that is accumulating on changes in principal role as schools and school systems change (Murphy, 1994; Murphy and Louis, 1994). The further significance of this research is found in the types of issues that are interesting the education community at an international level. For example, in 1995, Sydney is host to the Second International Principals Convention entitled "Principals of the World: Leadership for Learning." The themes of the conference include: leadership in practice; societal changes and education; global patterns in education; and, multiculturalism in education. The current research is easily located within the themes of the conference as it is dealing with leadership in practice and is documenting aspects of the impact of educational reforms.

LOCAL SIGNIFICANCE

The Victorian educational context in which this research was conducted has been discussed previously. Schools of the Future is the central feature of the educational context and principals are key personnel in the reform. The current research is timely as it will help document the type of leadership role principals are adopting as they become leaders in the first of group of Schools of the Future.

Prior to the change in government, principals were concerned about their leadership role in schools. Principals were particularly concerned about their
lack of professional and industrial recognition as demonstrated by their low representation on key Ministerial advisory groups (Stephens, 1989). The eighties saw a decline in the authority and curriculum importance of government school principals. This was especially true of secondary school principals who found themselves having to share decision making with an elected Local Administrative Committee (LAC), whose existence was enshrined within employment awards, and also finding that planning of major reforms involved all stakeholders and not just principals and central office personnel as in the past (Hooper, 1987: 240, 245-250).

The change in government signalled a change in the role of principals. The Minister for Education, Don Hayward, believed that the adoption of *Schools of the Future* would strengthen the role of principals by promoting them as the educational leaders of their schools (Hayward, 1991, 1992); for principals *Schools of the Future* “means that they will be able to become true leaders in their schools with the ability to build and lead their teaching teams” (Directorate of School Education, 1994a).

Within the Directorate of School Education principals were viewed as having the critical role in the successful implementation of self-management in schools (*Victorian School News*, June 1, 1993:7). At the same time, principals were increasing their power and influence through the creation of the Victorian Principals Federation (VPF), this being the industrial arm of the Victorian Primary Principals Association (VPPA) and the Victorian Association of State Secondary Principals (VASSP). The VPF’s role as a lobby group was actively supported by the Government: "The State Government, while excluding teacher unions and other groups from discussions over education changes, has been active in seeking the advice of the principals’ group" (*The Age*, April 17, 1993:1). Also, at the national level, principal associations are increasing their status through such actions as the hosting of the Second International Principals Conference in Sydney in 1995 and the formation of the National Principals Professional Development Council.

Whilst there is evidence that the perceived role of the principal is changing in
response to the *Schools of the Future* educational reform, it is not clear whether there is a preferred leadership role, nor is there much information on the type of leadership role principals are adopting. In the description of the principal role in Victorian Government Schools (DSE, 1994b), principals are expected to "lead and manage the planning, delivery, evaluation and improvement of the education of all students in a community through the employment of resources provided by the DSE and the school community."

Principals are specifically accountable for school education programs, student support, school council functioning, parent communication and involvement, school organisation, planning, review and accountability, personnel, finance, facilities, community representation of the school, and, act as the DSE representative (DSE, 1994b). In selecting principals the core elements that must be included by interview panels are educational leadership; financial, managerial and administrative ability; planning, policy and program development and review; support for staff and students; and interpersonal and communication skills (DSE, 1994c). Throughout these descriptions and criteria there is little indication of how principals actually lead schools. For example, what does educational leadership involve? A description of what principals need to lead schools is found in a document that is recommended reading for all principal class applicants and which was written by a team of eighteen experienced principals from the *Schools of the Future* pilot who were asked to develop a profile of a principal of the future (DSE, 1994d). The key result areas were:

1. School ethos and learning environment.
3. Implementation of school charter.
4. Curriculum overview and monitoring of student outcomes.
5. Resources utilisation and pursuit.
7. Interdependent organisational structure and performance of key teams.
8. Policy development and support for school council.
Competencies and behaviours were described as:

1. Forward thinker - vision sharer, flexible and creative.
2. Educational leaders - broad educational knowledge base, established educational belief, major focus on student learning outcomes and commitment to continued self-learning.
4. Personal qualities - ability to inspire and motivate, networker, sensitive/humane, has integrity, reflective and persistent.
5. Team development - delegator, gives and receives trust, team builder, understands group dynamics.
6. Communicator/listener - receptive, provides feedback, articulate, responsive to community values.
7. Role model - focused, efficient, mentor/coach.

In these descriptions, there is some indication of what is expected of principals, but clearly, there is a need for research in this area; the research reported here partly addresses this need. In chapter five these descriptions are revisited in the comparison of leadership theories to the role description generated from the interviews.

This research also has wider significance as it is located within the project entitled "Leading Victoria's Schools of the Future" as described on page 1. Within this project there are five project teams investigating policy outcomes, leadership, professional development, workplace practice and resource allocation. This research is located within the leadership and workplace practice projects. It will add qualitative data to the quantitative data already collected by the workplace change project (which was reported in Thomas, 1993, and Thomas and Caldwell, 1994).
LEADERSHIP

The broad phenomenon under study is that of school leadership, with the particular focus being the leadership role of secondary school principals. In this section aspects of leadership relevant to this research are explored. Definitions of leadership and the distinction between management and leadership are discussed. For this research an holistic approach is taken to defining leadership, with management and leadership treated as part of the same phenomenon. This is followed by a section that establishes that there is a phenomenon that can be labelled principal leadership.

LEADERSHIP DEFINITION

Leadership has numerous definitions. They range from those centred on the formal authority given to a person to direct and coordinate others (e.g. Fiedler 1967:8) through definitions where a person may not have the formal authority, but still influences others (e.g. Stogdill, 1950:4; cited in Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989:101), to definitions that involve explicit acknowledgement of values where leaders attempt to commit others to the leader’s values (e.g. Greenfield, 1986:142). For the purpose of this research, all of these definitions are acknowledged as appropriate in some circumstances, but not sufficient to fully describe leadership. Other writers ignore the problems of definition and instead provide lists of leadership characteristics. For example, Evans (1994:4) describes important characteristics of principal leadership as including:

1. Providing vision.
2. Developing consultatively a common purpose.
3. Facilitating the achievement of educational and organisational goals.
4. Being responsive to diverse needs and situations.
5. Having a future orientation.
6. Providing educational entrepreneurship.
7. Supporting the school as a lively educational place.
8. Working creatively with and empowering others.
9 Ensuring that the process and content of the curriculum are contemporary and relevant.

This list reflects more the holistic nature of leadership; in this list leadership is concerned with the future and anticipating and adapting to changes in the environment, and leadership is organic in that it is creative, anticipatory, responsive and evolving. It also points to problems of finding concise definitions. Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:102) comment,

Whereas earlier definitions focused on the exercise of formal authority related to the setting and accomplishment of goals, more recent perspectives invite us to consider at a deeper, more personal level what actually transpires when decisions are made and people try to make sense of their work. Concise definitions are difficult, if not inappropriate. As Duke (1986:10) observed, 'Leadership seems to be a gestalt phenomenon; greater than the sum of its parts.'

This conception of leadership fits well with the phenomenological approach used in this research, as a phenomenological approach is by definition holistic in focus. Indeed, in this research the definition of leadership was largely self-generated by the responses of the people who were interviewed; at the end of the interview process there were 40 commentaries on the leadership role of principals which were used to form an aggregate description of the leadership role of the principal. It is the aggregate description, compiled by the researcher, that suggests what leadership is for the 40 participants.

**MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP**

In the literature on leadership there is often a distinction drawn between leadership and management. In the interviews conducted for this research the participants identified aspects that could be interpreted by others as leadership or management. It is therefore necessary to discuss management and compare this to leadership.
In an autobiographical account of his seven years as a principal, Donaldson (1991:3) stated that management and leadership are different phenomena, and that the managing of the day-to-day aspects can stop leadership occurring: "None of us, it seems, can stop school life long enough to understand what it is doing to us or to imagine how we might influence it differently." Kotter (1990: 6) and Egan (1988; cited in Louis and Miles, 1991:92) both distinguish between management and leadership. Table one presents a summary of Kotter's and Egan's conceptions of management and leadership.

Table 1: Conceptions of Management and Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kotter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and budgeting</td>
<td>Establishing direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising and staffing</td>
<td>Aligning people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling and problem solving</td>
<td>Motivating and inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order, producing expected results</td>
<td>Potential for producing effective and constructive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting goals</td>
<td>Creating visions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing clear work programs</td>
<td>Turning visions into workable agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating execution of work programs</td>
<td>Communicating agendas so as to generate commitment and excitement in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing feedback</td>
<td>Creating a climate of problem solving and learning around the agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making and monitoring adjustments</td>
<td>Persisting until the agendas are accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Kotter and Egan emphasise that leadership involves the establishment of a vision or direction and alignment of people with this. They also emphasise that it is management that then makes sure that the vision is implemented.
efficiently and successfully. Thus, leadership and management are both complementary and distinctive (Louis and Miles, 1991:92); complementary because they address similar areas such as planning, but distinctive because the focus is different in, for example, the degree to which planning projects into the future with leadership taking a longer term view than management. Whilst leadership and management are considered separate they are not mutually exclusive and some writers argue that in current and future educational climates, schools will need people that can both lead and manage (Bolman and Deal, 1994), although leadership may be emphasised over management as leadership is more suited to organisational change (Kotter, 1990:12). Hodgkinson (1991:51) argues that leadership can be equated with administration and that management is part of the larger concept of administration, although both administration and management can not exist in isolation from one another.

For all of these writers there is a sense that leadership and management are separate but related phenomena which differ on skills and foci. This raises the problem in studying school leadership of whether it is important to separate leadership and management, or whether the two areas can be treated simply as essential aspects of running a school? To show the difficulty in separating leadership and management, Evans (1993) list of leadership characteristics previously mentioned can be compared with her list of management characteristics. Evans (1993:4) believed that important management characteristics of principals include:

1. Ensuring that management practices reflect leadership actions.
2. Carrying out restructuring so that the school organisation is more effective and efficient.
3. Collaboratively designing and carrying out strategic plans.
4. Meeting accountability requirements.
5. Getting things done.
6. Making sure the organisation is running smoothly.
7. Working effectively with people.
8. Providing effective financial management.
9 Marketing and promoting the school.

Whilst these management characteristics have a pragmatic feel to them, it is often difficult to distinguish between management and leadership as many of the characteristics listed under Evans' description of leadership detailed previously, overlap into the management area. For example, educational entrepreneurship and marketing have many similarities and may be difficult to separate when investigating the way a principal runs a school. Given the previous discussion on leadership definitions and the argument for the use of holistic definitions, a linkage between management and leadership is sought so that the two can be treated as one in this research. With management and leadership linked, no distinction then needs to be made concerning whether the aspects that the research participants reveal are aspects of management or leadership - all that is raised by participants is treated as part of leadership.

A way to link leadership and management conceptually can be found in Sergiovanni's concept of value-added leadership. For Sergiovanni (1990:14-16) school leaders can focus on value or value-added dimensions. Concentrating on value dimensions would result in a school that is competent; with good management being one value dimension that produces competence. However, by concentrating on value-added dimensions a school has the potential to be excellent; leadership is viewed as one of the value-added dimensions capable of producing excellence. In Sergiovanni's model, management is subsumed within leadership; "Leadership combines management know-how with values and ethics" (Sergiovanni, 1990: 28). Sergiovanni was particularly concerned with leadership for school improvement. In his model, the leadership that is required varies depending on the stage of the school improvement cycle. The model will be explained in more detail below, what is important for this discussion is that the requirement for leadership and management varies with the cycles. At stages in the cycle the emphasis is more on keeping the school running well, which implies good management. At other times in the cycle the emphasis is on providing the vision, the way forward, which implies leadership. Whilst this
appears to be conceptually close to Kotter's distinction between management and leadership, in Sergiovanni's model management is viewed more as a component of leadership. Thus, whilst a distinction can be made between leadership and management, they are perhaps different aspects of the same phenomenon, and may need to be employed by principals at different times in the running of schools.

There is recent evidence that management and leadership are opposite ends of a leadership continuum (Leithwood, 1994). For Leithwood (1994:14) there is little value in trying to distinguish between management and leadership through looking at overt behaviours; "most of the overt behaviours of transformational leaders look quite managerial". Leithwood's observation was in the context of transformational leadership and its difference to transactional leadership, which he equated to management; transformational leadership is concerned with engaging others in a commitment to change, whilst transactional leadership is concerned with maintaining the status quo through exchange of job security for job commitment (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:19). For Leithwood, the value-added dimension of transformational leadership is to be found not in overt behaviours, but in the "school leaders infusing day-to-day routines with meaning and purpose for themselves and their colleagues." (Leithwood, 1994:14). However, Leithwood is not arguing that leadership and management are different phenomena; Leithwood (1994) reports on recent studies of educational leadership that confirm that there is a continuum between transformational leadership and transactional leadership, between leadership and management (e.g. Silins, Leithwood and Jantzi, 1994). In these studies the search for distinctions between leadership and management went past simply observing behaviour and searched for differences in the cognitive domain, such as differences in the problem solving algorithms used by principals considered to be leaders and those considered as managers. Leithwood's (1994) research is described in more detail in the phenomenon of principal leadership and transformational leadership sections below. For the current discussion the importance of this research is that it is investigating a link between leadership and management and suggesting that leaders and managers appear to differ across a continuum on the type of
problem solving strategies that they use.

With the conceptual and empirical linking of leadership and management, a distinction between the two concepts was not pursued. Instead, the aspects of the principal role raised by the research participants were considered part of the leadership-management continuum and treated as aspects of the phenomenon of principal leadership.

THE PHENOMENON OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP

It is clear from numerous writings on schools and leadership that the principal role is seen to be an important part of school structure and that principals have an important leadership function (e.g. Anderson, 1991; Bain, Long and Ross, 1992; Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989:99; Caldwell, 1993; Davidson and St John, 1993; Donaldson, 1991; Hallinger and Murphy, 1992; Hayward, 1991, 1992; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; NASSP, 1978a, 1978b; Northfield, 1992). As this literature is explored in the next sections it will become clear that most writers in education still view the principal as the primary leader in schools. Whilst some observers (Sergiovanni, 1992) believe that changes in education, such as increasing teacher professionalism, may reduce the need for principal centred leadership, this world-wide feature of schools does not appear to have been seriously challenged in main-stream school situations. This suggests that there is something about the role of principal that is both necessary and beneficial for schools. Studying aspects of this role, such as leadership, are therefore important.

Establishing that principals are important to schools does not establish that there is such a thing as principal leadership. By investigating principal leadership there is an underlying assumption that there is a set of behaviours, beliefs and affects that can be described as leadership and that can be attributed to principals. Indeed, if this was not so there would be little value in conducting this research. It is therefore important to establish at this stage that there is a phenomenon of school leadership.
Many researchers have studied school leadership. However, for the purpose of this argument, Leithwood and colleagues’ studies concerning transformational leadership are used. The attributional nature of school leadership was demonstrated in studies that indicated that teachers “perceived transformational leadership displayed by their principal” (Leithwood, 1994:9); presumably this display was largely behavioural. Leithwood (1994) describes research that he and Steinbach have conducted that has emphasised the beliefs and affects of principals, rather than the behaviour. This research is based on the premise that “what they [principals] do (their practices) depends on what they think and how they feel” (Leithwood, 1994: 11).

In one of the two studies described, Leithwood and Steinbach (in press; cited in Leithwood, 1994) used a problem-solving model that had three dimensions: understanding, which involves problem interpretation and formulating goals; solving, which involves assessing constraints and the solution processes; and, mental functioning, involving personal principles/values and affect (feelings, mood, sense of self-confidence). There was substantial confirmation of the model used for the studies with particular features found including: problem interpretation that linked the problem to the school goals, deliberate use of problem-solving processes, collection and use of relevant information, clarity about own values (with consequences for students rated highly), deliberate use of these values as substitutes for knowledge in novel problems, positive attitudes to colleagues and to self, and, openness to new ideas. It was noted that these results are contingent, in that high problem solving expertise is found in leaders that are not showing transformational leadership. By confirming this model the research demonstrated the link between behaviour and thinking and feeling with how principals solve novel problems. The thought processes the principals used were similar to patterns found in “experts” observed in other research, leading Leithwood to conclude that expert thinking may be a non-contingent feature of the transformational school principal.
Through this research the phenomenon of leadership is given substance to the point where detailed features of "transformational principals" can be described. It confirms that there is a phenomenon that can be labelled as principal leadership.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

There exists a range of views on what constitutes the principal's leadership role; some of these are discussed in chapter two. It has been suggested above that, with the Victorian school system involved in major educational reform, it is worthwhile gaining an understanding of how principals and teachers view the principal leadership role. This research sought to gain an understanding of how principals in Victorian secondary colleges experience being a principal and how teaching staff of the school view their principal's role. The particular questions investigated were:

1. How is the leadership role of the principal in a secondary School of the Future experienced by the principal?

2. How is the leadership role of the principal in a secondary School of the Future viewed by teachers?

3. Are the principal and teacher perceptions consistent?

4. What model, or models of leadership fit the leadership roles described?

5. What changes in the leadership role of principal have occurred since participating in the Schools of the Future project?
METHODOLOGY

A hermeneutic phenomenological methodology was used. This methodology emphasises description of phenomena (the phenomenological aspect) and interpretation of the description (the hermeneutic aspect). It is based on naturalistic assumptions that are described in chapter three. Interviews were conducted with 10 principals and 30 teachers from 10 secondary colleges concerning their perceptions of principal leadership. Interviews were transcribed and analysed for common themes resulting in a description of principal leadership, description of changes in the leadership role since the introduction of Schools of the Future and analysis of the similarity between principal and teacher perceptions.

Trustworthiness was enhanced through the multiple perspectives of principals and teachers across ten sites, through the provision of details concerning the analysis process including the presentation of interview transcripts and thematic analysis, and through the exposition of the researcher's prior understandings by presenting a comprehensive review of the leadership literature.

The research is delimited by the phenomenon chosen for study, the issues raised by the participants and the descriptive and interpretative nature of the methodology used. The research is limited mainly by the extent to which the findings are trustworthy. A full discussion of these aspects is presented in chapter three.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A theoretical framework was not used to guide this research. One of the features of hermeneutic phenomenology is that it does not rely on having an a priori theoretical framework. In this section the rationale for not employing a theoretical framework is given.
In the area of school leadership there are many current views of leadership that could have been used to construct a theoretical framework including transformational leadership (Leithwood, 1994), matrix of school effectiveness (Cheng, 1994), leadership as drama (Starratt, 1992, 1993), school-centred leadership (Crump, 1993), collaborative school management (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988, 1992), value-added leadership (Sergiovanni, 1990) and instructional leadership (Murphy, 1990). In the general literature recent views that could be used in studies of educational leadership include: framing (Bolman and Deal, 1991); the learning organisation (Senge, 1990); transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). All of these have strengths, weaknesses and overlaps. In studying the leadership role of the principal, the author wanted the freedom to investigate various conceptions and to give the participants the freedom to convey their own understandings. To have adopted a theoretical framework would have meant that the participants would have had their thoughts channelled in a predetermined direction. Using a hermeneutic phenomenological approach means that a theoretical framework does not have to be adopted a priori; researchers can thus minimise the influence of their own understandings in order to allow the participants to speak. It is, however, difficult to remove the researcher’s influence entirely; indeed the very phenomenon being investigated comes from the researcher’s interests and understandings. In this research, aspects of the leadership literature that have been read by the researcher are reported so that the reader can glean the influences that the researcher brings to the study. Also, presentation of a comprehensive review of the leadership literature allows for the findings reported in this project to be compared with established conceptions of leadership.

The use of a phenomenological approach has parallels to Hocking and Caldwell’s (1990) suggestion of the efficacy of employing conceptual frameworks for the exploration of educational problems that do not neatly fit into a particular theoretical frame. They describe a conceptual framework as "a set of concepts which serves to focus the investigation, providing a guide to the formulation of sub-problems and research design as well as to the organisation and analysis of findings" (Hocking and Caldwell, 1990:7). In
this research the underlying philosophy and assumptions of phenomenology act as a conceptual framework by defining how to study phenomena. Within phenomenology there are a number of different methodologies that can be used, with one of these being the hermeneutic phenomenological approach used in this research and described in chapter three.

**SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS**

Chapter two presents a review of relevant literature on school leadership. This serves to both highlight the researcher's understanding of the literature and to allow comparison in chapter five between the research findings and the leadership literature. Chapter three covers methodological considerations with hermeneutic phenomenology described, the analysis process detailed, delimitations and limitations specified with particular emphasis on the establishment of trustworthiness, and presentation of participant characteristics. Chapter four presents the results of the analysis of the interviews. Sections within chapter four are devoted to judging the similarity of principal and teacher perceptions, describing the perceived leadership role, and describing changes in the principal leadership role since the introduction of *Schools of the Future*. The role descriptions presented in chapter four are the end result of the hermeneutic phenomenological analysis. It is chapter four which constitutes the main part of the thesis. Chapter five provides a discussion of the findings. It is in chapter five that the literature on leadership is used to illuminate the interpretations of principal leadership presented in chapter four. In particular, evidence for instructional and transformational leadership is presented. Research directions and conclusions end this chapter. References are then presented followed by the appendices with appendix one containing details of the themes identified in principal and teacher interviews, and appendix two containing the analysis for similarity between principal and teacher perceptions. The interview transcripts and initial thematic analysis for all participants are presented in an accompanying computer floppy disk.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The research on school leadership is wide-ranging, and the review of literature presented in this chapter reflects this. As this research is not employing a theoretical framework, an exhaustive coverage of one or two areas (e.g. transformational leadership) was inappropriate as there is no a priori reason for limiting the scope of the review. Rather, a wide-ranging review is needed, discussing information from a variety of areas (e.g. school effectiveness, school improvement, instructional leadership, business leadership) that may then be developed in the discussion of the research findings.

A summary of the role of the contemporary principal from the foreword of a recent book on the principalship highlights the new emphases being placed on this role:

The principalship continues to change, gaining more attention as the key position in determining the success of a school. The recent trend towards decentralisation of decision making for schools, combined with the move toward school-based management, places even greater responsibility on the principal. The suggestions in the literature encouraging teacher empowerment require the principal to know how to enable teachers to assume more responsibility and assume a greater voice in school decisions. All of this must be balanced against the demand that the principal provide instructional leadership -- have a vision for the school: develop a mission statement in cooperation with the staff, community and students; be able to implement the plan; and provide for an ongoing evaluation of the school's progress towards goals.

It is an exciting time to be a professional educator, especially a principal... we have a decided bias regarding the importance of the principal. There is nothing in the current literature to suggest that this bias is unwarranted. To the contrary, the literature points up the
absolute necessity of creative leadership by the principal for an effective climate and a quality school to develop.

(Ubben and Hughes, 1992: xiii)

It is within this context that the discussion now turns to investigate in more detail the research that is generating summaries such as this. This review begins with an historical overview and continues with a section on the relevance to education of leadership theories from non-education sectors. The effective schools and school improvement movements are discussed for their insights into principal leadership. This leads into discussion of current theories of leadership including instructional, transformational and moral leadership, and leadership for self-managing schools. Principal perceptions of their role conclude this section.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP

Morris (1989:405-408) argues that historically the study of leadership has evolved through five stages:

1. Studying the lives of charismatic leaders in what Morris refers to as "Great men" studies.
2. Investigating the traits and characteristics of leaders.
3. Determining and identifying situational factors that affect leadership.
4. Observing individual leaders' behaviours.
5. Studying leaders' awareness of the future and the societal trends that affect education.

In education Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:102) divide the study of leadership into three categories that can be labelled trait, situational and holistic.
TRAIT STUDIES OF LEADERSHIP

The initial focus was on discovering the traits leaders exhibit. For example, in the Michigan Studies (Likert 1961, 1967; cited in Ubben and Hughes, 1992:1-10) effective managers were found to have a task orientation focussing on administrative functions such as planning, coordinating and facilitating work. Effective managers treated subordinates considerately, allowed some degree of autonomy, set high performance goals and used group methods of supervision. Whilst these studies were not specifically about educational leadership, they have had a significant impact on educational leadership research (Ubben and Hughes, 1992:1-10). Utilising studies of leadership traits over a period of more then twenty years, Stogdill (1981; cited in Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989:103) concluded that leaders show:

1 A sense of responsibility.
2 Concern for task completion.
3 Energy.
4 Persistence.
5 Risk-taking.
6 Originality.
7 Self-confidence.
8 Capacity to handle stress.
9 Capacity to influence.
10 Capacity to coordinate the efforts of others in the achievement of purpose.

SITUATIONAL STUDIES OF LEADERSHIP

The trait studies did not take into account situational differences in which leadership occurs, nor the expectations and normative behaviour of people in organisations. Situational theories of leadership arose that attempted to match leadership styles or leadership behaviours with the different situations in which the leadership may be exercised (e.g. Fiedler, 1971; Hersey and Blanchard, 1982). The theories consistently utilised two dimensions of
leadership behaviour: behaviours reflecting a concern for relationships and behaviours reflecting a concern for accomplishing tasks (Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989:103). The most complete and well researched theory is Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership (Fiedler, 1971). This theory suggests that there is a situational nature to effective leader behaviour. According to Fiedler one can not talk about effective or ineffective leadership without also referring to the situation; it was the interaction between leadership style (task or relationship orientated) and the work situation (personal traits, group beliefs and situational variables) that was important.

HOLISTIC STUDIES OF LEADERSHIP

Both the trait and situational approaches suffer from producing incomplete pictures of what it is that leaders do when they are leading. Listings of traits tell little about how to apply these traits for effective leadership, nor whether it is possible to develop and improve one's disposition of traits. Situational theories, whilst correctly emphasising situational importance, suffer from this emphasis as the leadership dimensions tend to be tied to the situations explored making generalisability difficult. Never-the-less, situational theories do indicate that one leadership style or set of leadership behaviours applied across all situations is not sufficient; leaders need to be multi-skilled and adaptable. Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:106-116) describe how researchers reacted to these approaches by studying leadership in a more holistic way during the eighties utilising a variety of techniques and investigating a larger range of activities. Summarising this research Beare et al. (1989) describe ten generalisations of leadership for schools in which excellence is valued:

1 Emphasis should be given to transforming rather than transactional leadership.
2 Outstanding leaders have a vision of their organisations.
3 Vision must be communicated in a way that secures commitment among members of the organisation.
4 Communication of vision requires communication of meaning.
5 Issues of value -- 'what ought to be' -- are central to leadership.
6 The leader has an important role in developing the culture of the organisation.
7 Studies of outstanding schools provide strong support for school-based management and collaborative decision making within a framework of state and local policies.
8 Many kinds of leadership forces exist -- technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural -- and these should be widely dispersed throughout the school.
9 Attention should be given to institutionalising vision if leadership of the transforming kind is to be successful.
10 Both 'masculine' and 'feminine' stereotype qualities are important in leadership, regardless of the gender of the leader.

The conceptions of leadership that underpin this list include the ideas of instructional and transformation leadership (e.g. the importance placed on vision). These will be discussed below after some of the influences on these holistic notions of leadership have been identified. Donaldson (1991:6) has described some of these influences:

Our texts, much of our journal literature, and certainly our prescriptions for reforming the principalship characteristically draw their models of principalship from three sources: (1) legal/financial role definitions set in a rational bureaucratic organisational framework; (2) instructional leadership role definitions delineated in effective schools and "best practice" literature; and (3) change-agent role definitions depicted in school innovation literature.

The discussion will now focus on leadership in non-education organisations followed by findings from the effective schools and school improvement movements.
LEADERSHIP IN NON-EDUCATION ORGANISATIONS

Studies of organisations not involved in education have generated much research, some of which has filtered into studies of educational leadership. Indeed, Sharp (1989) believes that the management of schools is increasingly matching the management of business organisations. The purpose of this section is to provide an indication of some of the work on leadership in business that has influenced conceptions of educational leadership.

Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:19-21) discuss four books on excellent companies that have impacted on education. Amongst these books was Peters and Waterman’s (1982) study of 62 leading American companies. Peters and Waterman found evidence of strong leadership, leadership that powerfully shaped the culture and values of the organisations. Peters and Waterman initially set out to find attributes of the companies, other than leadership, that could explain their strong performance. However, consistently they found that associated with excellent companies was at least one strong leader who seemed to have had a lot to do with making the company excellent in the first place; indeed, their study could have been taken to indicate support for the “Great Man” conceptions of leadership that dominated earlier writings on leadership (Morris, 1989:405). The clear implication for schools was that they needed strong leadership. The timing of the publication of this book coincided with a peak in interest in the effective schools movement (see below) which had already noted the presence of strong leadership from principals in effective schools.

With the strong influence of economics on public policy, increasing interest focussed on the business world and how successful companies operate. However, the pace of change is so great that even relatively recent works like Peters and Waterman (1982) quickly become dated; Peters (1992:17-18) likened the current environment to a stormy sea, whereas the environment in the seventies and early eighties was viewed as a calm ocean where companies, such as IBM, were very successful, but are now struggling somewhat in the stormy, changing sea of today. Recent publications by
business analysts such as Senge (1990) and Peters (1992) are being applied to education through professional development activities and graduate courses (e.g. the newly created professional doctorate programs offered by many leading universities).

Senge (1990), building on the work of Argyris (1982, 1991; cited in Zbar, 1994) on single and double loop learning, uses the idea of a learning organisation to promote what he called the “fifth discipline”. Senge (1990:2) argues that for organisations to excel in the future they will have to “tap people’s commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in the organisation” and that this new type of organisation, the “learning organisation”, will be developed through the application of five disciplines labelled systems thinking, personal mastery, congruence of mental models, shared vision, and, team learning in the workplace. Sackney and Dibski (1994:22) argue that for collaborative school cultures to develop in school-based management reforms, “principals will need to transform their schools into ‘learning organisations’. Johnstone (1994:4) asserts that the Schools of the Future reform is an example of team learning in the workplace in that professional development activity is being devolved away from “central or regional provision to the school or workplace”. The emphases that Senge places on vision, explication of organisational values and shared commitment to the values, are features of leadership models that are used in education such as transformational leadership (see below).

Peters (1990) argues that the current climate of rapid change and instability (the “nanosecond nineties”) means that the way organisations are structured and led needs to change. Trends such as the breaking of larger companies into smaller functional units, the impact of technology, the changing state of competition, calls for “bold leaders” and “bold experiments” (Peters, 1990:19). Peters (1992:15-19) uses the metaphor of the carnival to describe running an organisation in the current environment and offers this advice to leaders of organisations: “Constantly using dynamic imagery, thinking of yourself as running a carnival, and stomping out all forms of static thinking and imagery will help point you toward the right structure and strategy for these woozy
times." (p.17-18) The implications for education are obvious -- as the education environment increasingly comes to reflect the business environment, the type of organisational structure and the type of leadership needed to run these will have to change; current conceptions of educational leadership will be discussed below.

Many of the reform movements in business and other sectors are adopted by the education sector. For example, in a recent seminar at the University of Melbourne (July, 1994), Reynolds described a program that he and Stringfield are developing in England where schools are adopting the Highly Reliable Organisation (HRO) model from industry. This model is based on industries that have to run at 100 per cent reliability (such as air traffic control, nuclear power plants, etc.). Reynolds is conducting a program with a number of schools beginning late in 1994, to adopt the HRO model for school improvement and increasing school effectiveness. It appears that much of the work Reynolds will do will be with principals of the participating schools, helping them to understand and adopt the model for their school. The market force mentality of business is another area that is being adopted by schools and school systems. Indeed, the writings on excellent companies meant that when "schools took up the issues of excellence...it was in the context of ideas about market forces, and it is not surprising that the rest of the imagery about markets was also applied to education in the same context..." (Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989:21).

Currently in Victoria there is emerging interest amongst principals and others in a form of management called Total Quality Management (TQM) which exemplifies a market force approach to education. Already this approach has been adopted by the Technical and Further Education sector (Campbell, 1994) and interest by other education sectors is rapidly increasing (Hough, 1994). The recent history of this approach to management arises from the work of Deming (Bradley, 1993:10). It is concerned with management techniques that focus on the quality of a product produced or a service provided. In the school-based TQM model, schools are viewed as hierarchical institutions with students as workers, teachers as first-level
managers, the principal class as upper and middle level management, and school council as the Board of Education. It is a systemic model that emphasises flexibility, continuous quality assurance feedback loops and management by leadership (Bradley, 1993:177). It is also a market driven model where schools are viewed as being in a competitive situation for student numbers. In this model the principal is one of the key people.

In Australia there is demonstrated interest in education by the industry sector through the policies of the National Industry Education Forum concerning goals for, and improvement of, Australian schools (NIEF: 1991, 1992), and its recent commissioning of an investigation into the decentralising of school management (Caldwell, 1993). Apart from showing strong support for decentralising, the NIEF is concerned that principals do not have the appropriate powers (such as selection and removal of staff), training or rewards to manage schools. Caldwell's (1993) work reviewed reforms involving decentralising of the management of schools in Australia and comparable nations and he conducted a survey of eleven companies to draw lessons from business and industry. From the company surveys six lessons were drawn which are relevant to schools:

1. Securing alignment of responsibility, authority and accountability.
2. The use of strategic leadership and long term perspectives.
3. A focus on quality.
4. A clear definition of multiple stakeholders.
5. Priority on human resource management, especially the selection and appraisal of staff.
6. Importance of marketing and image building.

Arising from the report were four specific recommendations for the role of principals in self-managing schools:

1. The principal should have the authority to manage the school, and with respect to school system structure, the line of authority should be from the director of the school system to the principal.
2 The principal should be the chief executive officer for school councils where they exist, and the principal should have the authority to implement school council policy.

3 The principal should have the authority to select staff.

4 The principal should have the authority to determine the structures and processes for decision-making amongst staff.

The report also noted that principals (and other school leaders) should be consultative and be able to manage teams.

Clearly, practices from non-education sectors are influencing education and the sorts of models that education uses to structure schools and school systems. In the next sections, attention is turned to two areas of research that have significantly influenced school structure and the leadership role of the principal; the effective school and school improvement movements.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

During the sixties considerable effort was spent on researching student outcomes, with particular emphasis on determining the aspects of students' lives (including school and social factors) that had the most impact on their school performance. Important studies, such as the Coleman Report, questioned how much influence school had (at least for the achievement of pupils from non-disadvantaged backgrounds) and suggested that home background may be far more important as a determinant of student outcomes (Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989:3; Bliss, Firestone and Richards, 1991:1). Beare (1994) identifies this period as that of the "school effects" movement. In response to this, there was research generated to identify characteristics of schools that were considered to be effective and that produced high levels of learning across all student groups; although the early focus was on improving the basic skills of minority groups (Peterson and Lezotte, 1991:130). This research continues today and forms the "school effectiveness" movement (Beare, 1994) and the continuing interest is evident in events such as the
annual International Congress of School Effectiveness and Improvement. There is now a substantial corpus of work world-wide indicating features of effective schools. The findings of several authors are presented, followed by a summation of the relevance of this research for the current research.

By the beginning of the eighties it was clear that schools did make a difference and that characteristics of effective schools could be described. Edmonds (1978, 1982) and Newmann (1991) summarised American findings, whilst Mortimore (1991) summarised British studies. Chubb and Moe (1991) conducted an influential study involving over 500 American schools identified as high performance using tests of verbal and quantitative achievement. In Australia, the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) conducted a national survey of parents, students, teachers, principals, schools and community members that resulted in over 7,000 responses to questions on areas identified as contributing to school effectiveness (McGaw, Piper, Banks and Evans (1993a, 1993b). Utilising Mortimore's thematic divisions, the characteristics of effective schools identified by these authors include:

1 Leadership

Principal leadership is purposeful (Chubb and Moe, 1991:91), strong, focussed on quality instruction (Edmonds, 1978,1982) and actively recognises and works to solves problems within the school (Newmann (1991). Whilst the principal shows strong leadership, it is neither too authoritarian nor too democratic and the principal delegates and encourages shared ownership (Mortimore, 1991). McGaw et al. (1993) refer to the presence of an organisational culture which has effective educational leadership and a collaborative decision making structure. Principals have been described as "'strong', 'decisive', 'an effective communicator', 'one who shares leadership', 'a facilitator of change', 'visible and approachable' and 'in control of every aspect of the school'" (McGaw et al., 1993b:86). The image of the principal is "one who is strong yet committed to maintaining an organisation which is supportive and democratic." (McGaw et al., 1993b:86)
2 Management of students

Fair behavioural controls are employed, using a structure that involves and rewards students, and having work oriented, challenging classes (Mortimore, 1991). Edmonds (1979, 1982) and Newmann (1991) both emphasise order and fair discipline.

3 Management of teachers

Encouragement is given to teachers to be involved in the school, to adopt consistent discipline approaches, to model appropriate behaviour and to ensure that there is a positive classroom climate (Mortimore, 1991). There is strong administrative leadership with an emphasis on quality instruction (Edmonds, 1979, 1982), using a balanced curriculum that encourages both academic excellence and the acquisition of basic skills, values students with special educational needs, and requires regular homework (Mortimore, 1991). McGaw et al. (1993a) describe the curriculum as relevant, coherent and inclusive. Staff collegiality in planning, teaching and evaluation is encouraged (McGaw et al., 1993a; Newmann, 1991); Chubb and Moe (1991:91) referred to effective schools as being staffed by a community of professionals, whilst McGaw et al. (1993a) describe the staff as committed and professional. There is active solving of found problems and perceived control over teaching and school operation (Newmann, 1991), with ongoing evaluation and review contributing to clear and targeted improvement plans (McGaw et al., 1993a). There is a focus on the professional development of staff (McGaw et al., 1993a).

4 Student care

Students are treated with dignity and encouraged to participate by the use of reward systems, the involvement of parents and keeping of
systematic records (Edmonds, 1978, 1982; Mortimore, 1991). The learning and welfare of all students is emphasised and students are encouraged to realise their potential and attain personal bests (McGaw et al., 1993a).

5 School environment

The school environment is stimulating, attractive, safe, orderly and flexible (Edmonds, 1978, 1982; Mortimore, 1991).

6 School climate

There is a central focus on learning and a school climate conducive to it (McGaw et al., 1993a). There is consensus on whole school values and aims emphasising academic purpose, student accomplishment and good teaching (Mortimore, 1991; Newmann, 1991). School goals are highly focussed and ambitious (Chubb and Moe, 1991:91). There are high, but realistic, expectations for all students, a sense of caring and community within the school, and extensive parental and community involvement (Edmonds, 1978, 1982; McGaw et al., 1993a; Newmann, 1991).

Apart from the explicit mention of principal leadership in the first theme, principals have considerable scope for leadership in all the other themes. For example, establishing an appropriate school climate would be enhanced by a principal that had the vision and the interpersonal skills to ensure that there was a consensus view of the school values and direction.

The importance of the principal was also emphasised in Australian research conducted in the early eighties that lead to an influential model of school organisation (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988) and a corresponding model of leadership (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992). This research involved, amongst other things, a review of the effective schools literature to identify characteristics of highly effective schools in both a general sense and also in
the allocation of resources. Eleven characteristics were specifically noted under the heading leadership (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988:31-33). Schools that were effective were characterised as having head teachers who:

1. Enabled sharing of duties and resources to occur in an efficient manner.
2. Ensured that resources are allocated in a manner consistent with educational needs.
3. Were responsive to and supportive of the needs of teachers.
4. Were concerned with his or her own professional development.
5. Encouraged staff involvement in professional development programmes and makes use of the skills teachers acquire in these programmes.
6. Had a high level of awareness of what is happening in the school.
7. Established effective relationships with the Education Department, community, teachers and students.
8. Had a flexible administrative style.
9. Were willing to take risks.
10. Provided a high level of feedback to teachers.
11. Ensured that a continual review of the school programme occurs and that progress towards goals is evaluated.

Seventeen schools judged to be effective in allocating resources were sampled with principals, teachers, bursars, parents and, in some cases, students interviewed concerning the allocation of resources. The study found that those principals who were effective in allocating resources also had many of the characteristics described previously for effective principals. Thus, they had appropriate personal characteristics (supportive, sincere and committed), good interpersonal skills (friendly, sensitive, good listeners, available), good knowledge of their schools, flexible in decision making yet willing to make decisions, good problem solving abilities, they were efficient in carrying out their duties, provided feedback and follow-up to teachers and parents, and encouraged an open climate (Misko, 1985: 55-56). In terms of effective budgeting, it was concluded that principals need to be both consultative and
directive, so that teachers are encouraged to be involved and make suggestions, without the process stumbling for lack of decisiveness (Misko, 1985: 59). Also, principals demonstrated technical skill in financial management, knew how to locate and secure alternative funding, and used their networks to gather funding (Misko, 1985:56).

The feature of the effective schools literature that is of interest for this research is the consistent identification of leadership as an important variable: "School effectiveness research consistently identifies leadership (by principals) as one of the key variables making a positive difference in students' experience of schools." (Campbell-Evans, 1993:99). Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1989:99) believe that, "Outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of outstanding schools. There can no longer be doubt that those seeking quality education must ensure its presence and that the development of potential leaders must be given high priority." Peterson and Lezotte (1991:133) caution that there are no simple lists of characteristics of effective school leaders, although "it seems clear...that to achieve effectiveness, school and district leaders must have skills in administering the basic institution - technical skills - and skills in building a shared sense of mission and institutional culture - culture building skills."

There are problems associated with the identification of principal leadership as an important feature of school effectiveness. For example, knowing characteristics of effective principals may encourage a recipe approach to leadership which ignores important situational and contextual factors, thus ensuring that some principals who follow the recipe will not be effective. Also, "most of the studies draw judgements about the principal in the effective school, but we do not know whether the principal causes the effective school or whether the effective school creates the effective principal" (Beare et al., 1989:14).

Whilst the connection between school effectiveness and principal effectiveness has not been substantiated empirically, there are numerous case studies and surveys (e.g. Bradley, 1994; Codding, 1994) which indicate
that principals can make a difference to a school (indeed, that it is very difficult for them not to make a difference, be that difference good or bad) and that characteristics of principals in schools that are judged to be effective can be identified.

Recent developments in research have sought to address the methodological problems associated with previous research and to explore the causal connection between school characteristics, such as principal leadership, and student outcomes (Hill, Holmes-Smith and Rowe, 1993; Rowe and Hill, 1994; Rowe, Hill and Holmes-Smith, 1994). Hill and colleagues describe the first phase of a "three year longitudinal study of school and teacher effectiveness being conducted among 13,900 primary and secondary students, and 930 teachers, drawn from 90 Government, Catholic and independent schools in the state of Victoria, Australia" (Rowe, Hill and Holmes-Smith, 1994:i).

Preliminary results on the extent that student, school and teacher/class effects account for variation in students' English and mathematics achievements are reported. What the research is indicating at this early stage is that the variation in performance has a large class/teacher effect (between 28.1 to 45.6 per cent), "whereas school effects over and above teacher effects accounted for a mere zero to four per cent" (Rowe, Hill and Holmes-Smith, 1994:13). This supports recent findings of teacher effects in Victorian primary schools (Ainley, Goodman and Reid, 1990) and across nations in mathematics achievement (Scheerens, Vermeulen and Pelgrum, 1989).

With the relatively large class/teacher effect it then becomes important to determine how this effect is operating. After discounting possible explanations of class streaming and inconsistent assessment methods it was suggested that the class/teacher effect may be due to variations in teacher quality and that if this is so then "it is primarily through the quality of teaching that effective schools make a difference." (Rowe and Hill, 1994:12). What is important for the current research is that leadership support of teachers' work was demonstrated to be important.

Leadership support is overwhelmingly important in establishing a positive working environment for teachers. It is associated with
powerful effects on teacher involvement in professional development activities, on teachers' perceptions of the amount of peer support they receive, on the degree of goal congruence amongst staff within the school, on their involvement in decision-making, and on their role clarity perceptions.

(Rowe, Hill and Holmes-Smith, 1994:9)

If this is the case then "improving the quality of leadership support in the school is the key to positive work environments" (Rowe, Hill and Holmes-Smith, 1994:12). Whilst the concept of leadership support involved the school administration in general and was not restricted solely to the principal (Hill, Holmes-Smith and Rowe, 1993:42), the implications of this for the principal's leadership role are significant; the principal may indeed be the most influential single person on a school's effectiveness through their capacity to promote a positive work environment which can then promote excellent instruction. In their tentative model of school and teacher effectiveness (Rowe, Hill and Holmes-Smith, 1994:21), this indirect relationship between the principal's leadership support and student outcomes mediated through teacher work environment is featured. This model will be tested in the subsequent phases of their three year longitudinal study of school and teacher effectiveness.

In summary, principal leadership is an important part of school effectiveness and there are characteristics identifiable in principals that lead effective schools. There is emerging research that suggests that principal leadership has a causal link to student outcomes. In the next section, attention turns to the school improvement literature and the role of the principal in school improvement.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Whilst considerable attention has been focussed on school effectiveness, there is also a large literature on school improvement. Indeed, it was the
quest to identify characteristics of effective schools that stimulated that search for answers to the question of how schools could be improved, with the two lines of inquiry running parallel for much of the eighties. Recently there have been calls for the merging of the two areas (Reynolds, Hopkins and Stoll, 1993) and there is evidence that this is occurring through initiatives such as the formation of the Journal of School Effectiveness and School Improvement, the conduct of the annual International Congress of School Effectiveness and School Improvement and through research programs that are in progress, or beginning, that incorporate the findings and methodologies of the two paradigms (Reynolds et al., 1993).

Clark, Lotto and Astuto (1989: 169) compared the findings from the school effectiveness literature to that of the school improvement literature and found that:

1. Public schools and school systems can and do improve.
2. School improvement programs (federal, state and local) work; and,
3. Professional educationists are capable of effecting positive educational changes.

Further, they noted that the literature has shown that improvement shown in classrooms, schools and systems is mainly due to the people and that it is often achieved by extraordinary leaders in ordinary situations. In particular, principals "make a difference in school improvement programs by establishing a climate of expectations that teachers will successfully improve practice and by providing on-site coordination, communication, assistance and support" (p. 117) The importance of people and the importance of leadership is a strong feature of the school improvement literature. These findings have great significance as the research on school improvement does not have some of the limitations of the school effectiveness literature (Clark, Lotto and Astuto, 1989). While the school improvement literature suffers from sample bias (tending in the United States towards studying urban schools which are adopting a major federal program), and a lack of longitudinal studies, the research has used broad units and levels of analysis (teacher, classroom,
school and district), diffuse measures of outcome (from adoption to implementation to impact on students), state-of-the-art case study and evaluation designs and tends to account for other potential sources of variability (such as non-school variables). Clark, Lotto and Astuto (1989: 183) assert that good schools show:

1. Commitment to a common purpose.
2. High expectations of students, teachers and principals.
3. An orientation in which they have a bias for action, proclivity for success, and a sense of opportunism.
4. Leadership in which the designated leaders do not do all the leading, but "create an environment for trial and a tolerance for failure so that leaders can emerge and be sustained at all levels of the school system." (p. 183)
5. Focus on the core tasks of student classroom achievement.
6. Maintenance of a climate that suits all members; students, teachers, administrators.
7. A reasonable level of human resources and slack time so that new things can be tried.

This list is supported by the latter work of Peterson and Lezotte (1991) who describe the work in the United States of the National Centre for Effective Schools Research and Development (NCESRD). This body seeks to use the findings of the effective schools literature to aid school improvement. In summarising the work to date on school effectiveness and school improvement, they note that:

It seems clear that culture and leadership are critical; that improvement and renewal are continuous; that restructuring, site-based management, and decentralisation may be key elements of improvement; that equity and quality ought to be sought concurrently; that the student monitoring system and assessment of outcomes are key; that curriculum and teaching must be understood and constantly refined; and that the norms, values and beliefs of teachers, students,
administrators, and central office personnel must be the basis for a culture of improvement focused on quality teaching and equity of learning outcomes.

(Peterson and Lezotte, 1991: 136)

For the purposes of the current research the important features are those that can be associated with the role of the principal as a school leader: setting of a common purpose; establishing high expectations; entrepreneurial orientation; establishing and fostering dispersed leadership; focussing the school efforts on the core tasks; providing and maintaining a suitable school climate; and, gaining and managing appropriate levels of human resources. These features are similar to features of instructional and transformational leadership which are discussed in the next sections of this chapter.

School improvement is also associated with change. The principals involved in leading schools into the pilot phase of Schools of the Future - the subject of this research - are principals leading their schools in school improvement (DSE, 1994a), in change, in restructuring. Principals leading in a climate of change have many challenges. As Deal and Kennedy (1982:157-158) note:

Change always threatens a culture. People form strong attachments to heroes, legends, the rituals of daily life, the hoopla of extravaganzas and ceremonies - all the symbols and settings of the work place. Change strips down these relationships and leaves employees confused, insecure, and often angry.

Possibly the most significant challenge for principals leading a school through a change process is to know what sort of leadership is best. Unfortunately, there is not a simple answer as a number of roles are needed and the type of role varies as the change process progresses. The complexity is illustrated in the following descriptions of research findings.

Northfield (1992:97) argues that in schools implementing change the primary role of the principal is to sanction the change and provide continued support.
Other roles include providing resources, monitoring and follow-up, reinforcement and encouragement, pushing/nudging school members, telling others, and approving adaptations. Training and technical coaching were also mentioned, but they were seen as the least important roles. In describing studies of secondary schools that implemented school improvement programs, Louis and Miles (1991:92) found that "creating more effective schools requires a significant change in patterns of leadership and management at the school level", with the change focusing "most dramatically on the principal." Louis and Miles identified two processes that helped schools implement successful school improvement programs: planning and coping. Planning involved acting then planning, relying more on "inspirational themes" than mission statements to guide the process, and on reflection on the relationship between action and improvement. Coping involved being aware of coping styles and strategies that may be used and matching these to the situation at hand. The principal is seen as the key figure in implementing these strategies; although Louis and Miles note that dispersed leadership is also important to the success of these strategies.

Other evidence of the principal role in school improvement comes from studies by Hargreaves, Fullan, Davis, Wignall, Stager and Macmillan (1992) Leithwood and Steinbach (1993) and Miles (1987, cited in Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:116). Hargreaves et al. (1992) investigated the educational change process in secondary schools in Ontario undergoing de-streaming and they found aspects of principals' leadership which aided the school improvement process included:

1 Leadership that inspires and involves teachers in relation to educational changes and which shares the risks and uncertainties of change with teachers together, as a professional community.
2 Leadership that inspires and sustains a moral purpose to motivate the reform.
3 Leadership that encourages and supports cultures of collaboration.

Miles (1987, cited in Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:116) reported the findings of
case studies of schools across the United States that had shown educational gains after system and school initiated improvement programs. Demonstrable cause and effect relationships were evident. Four factors were identified as preconditions: strong educational leadership, high school autonomy (especially for resource allocation), school appointment of staff, and decentralisation of decision making. A further twelve factors were identified as important: empowerment of staff, provision of staff rewards, vision, control over staffing, control over allocation of resources, staff willingness and initiative in the management of change, evolutionary program development, building of external networks, evidence of deep coping strategies to school improvement problems, good change implementation strategies, institutionalisation of change, and change in organisational structures and processes. Many of these factors, whilst not labelled leadership, could be interpreted as part of leadership such as empowerment of staff, vision, allocation of resources, the provision of staff rewards, development of external networks, change strategies and promotion of change and coping strategies.

Leithwood and Steinbach (1993) demonstrated that leadership practices that foster school improvement can vary and, amongst the twelve primary school principals studied, included direct and indirect instructional leadership, teacher centred management and building centred management. It was suggested that this variation may be due to variations in the problem-solving processes used by principals, particularly the attitudes and beliefs that principals held. Importantly, the study also established that the practices and problem solving strategies used impacted on the school improvement process. Instructional leader patterns were rated more helpful by teachers than the other two patterns, direct instructional leadership had a greater impact than indirect instructional leadership, instructional leadership patterns tended to result in more collaborative teacher cultures than the other patterns, and instructional leadership patterns were more likely to result in teacher attitude and behaviour change than the other patterns.

Sergiovanni (1990:39-40) provides a comprehensive view of leadership for school improvement through the delineation of four stages:
1 Initiation (bartering). In this stage there is a "push" to engage schools members, and bartering or transactional leadership is used to maintain an effective school.

2 Uncertainty (building). In this stage there is a sense of "muddling through" and using symbolic leadership to arouse human potential and to raise expectations, commitment and performance.

3 Transformative (bonding). Here there is a sense of there being a "breakthrough", with cultural and moral leadership used to gain a shared covenant and moral commitment to improvement.

4 Routinisation (banking). This is the "remote control" stage and is characterised by institutional leadership and routinisation of improvements allowing for new challenges and improvements to be investigated.

All but the initiation stage are value-added dimensions that allow for the development of extraordinary performance; the initiation stage is a value dimension that can ensure school effectiveness, but not extraordinary performance. The cycle can begin at different points and it is not necessary that all stages are used. School leaders may be expected to be using all these approaches over the course of principalships. "Each of the stages of leadership comprise one's overall school improvement strategy. However, tactically speaking bartering, building, bonding, and banking comprise leadership styles that can be used simultaneously for different purposes or people within any stage" (Sergiovanni, 1990:33). This view is tied to Sergiovanni's conception of transformational leadership with its emphasis on the value-added dimensions of symbolic and cultural leadership (this is discussed below).

The conceptions of leadership for change and school improvement present a rich and complex view of the type of leadership required and they are closely aligned with the instructional and transformational conceptions of leadership that have dominated discussions of educational leadership in recent years. Indeed, Leithwood (1994) and Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) argue that it is the very nature of leading an organisation through change that marks
transformational leadership as the preferred leadership style for the nineties; this argument will be described in more detail when transformational leadership is reviewed. It is to these conceptions that the discussion now turns.

**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

During the eighties, the focus of leadership studies concerned the instructional leadership of the principal (Murphy, 1990). Often this was tied into the school effectiveness literature: "The initial conceptualisations of effective schools focused on the importance of the principal. The work on instructional leadership...has helped to refine, specify, and focus some of the actions that principals engage in to foster school effectiveness" (Peterson and Lezotte, 1991:134). Indeed, evidence continues to mount on the importance of instructional leadership in school effectiveness with recent work suggesting that the extent of instructional leadership is one differentiating aspect between high and low achieving schools (Bamburg and Andrews, 1991; Heck, Marcoulides and Lang, 1991). Bamburg and Andrews (1991) investigated 10 high achieving schools and 10 low achieving schools. They found that principals in high achieving schools emphasised and engaged in activities related to instruction to a much greater degree than principals in low achieving schools. Using instructional leadership dimensions of defining the school mission, creating a positive learning climate, and supervising the school's instructional program, Heck et al. (1991) were able to demonstrate that it was possible to predict school achievement from a knowledge of principal behaviour on these dimensions. They also noted contextual differences in instructional leadership with respect to both school and culture.

Despite a trend to a transformational leadership style for principals (refer to the next section), Murphy and Hallinger (1992) believe that principals will still need to exercise, and be trained in, instructional leadership which they define as someone who can provide leadership in pedagogy; indeed, in one state in the USA, instructional leadership is mandated as the primary function of the principal (McPherson and Crowson, 1994:61). In a major review of the
instructional leadership literature, Murphy (1990) noted the increasing interest in this area in the last decade:

Research findings from a variety of different fields of investigation - effective schools, school improvement, staff development, program innovations, change - have all converged to reveal the connection between administrative leadership in the areas of curriculum and instruction and important organisational outcomes.

(Murphy, 1990: 163)

Based on the studies reviewed, which included studies of administrative work activities, analyses of administrative training programs, and investigations of administrative coordination and control, Murphy (1990) proposed a framework for viewing instructional leadership which included four major dimensions:

1 Developing mission and goals which included framing and communicating school goals. Effective principals were described as having vision and the ability to develop shared purpose through the way they communicated their vision for their school.

2 Managing the educational production function which included promoting quality instruction, informally supervising instruction, evaluating instruction, allocating and protecting instructional time, active involvement in coordinating the curriculum, extending content coverage by developing and enforcing homework policies that require regular homework, and actively monitoring student progress.

3 Promoting an academic learning climate which included establishing positive expectations and standards, maintaining high visibility in the classroom and around the school, providing incentives for teachers (e.g. increased responsibility, personal support, public and private praise and encouragement) and students (e.g. school-wide recognition systems, special emphasis on academic excellence), and promoting and encouraging professional development of teachers.
4 Developing a supportive work environment which included creating a safe and orderly learning environment through emphasising effective discipline programs, providing opportunities for meaningful student involvement (e.g. system-wide activity programs, formal recognition for successful student participation, use of school symbols to bond students to school), developing staff collaboration and cohesion through having clear goals and opportunities for teachers to be involved in professional interchanges and decision making, securing outside resources in support of school goals, and forging links between the home and the school.

In this description of instructional leadership there is a strong theme of supporting the school instructional program, with emphasis on quality teaching and academic learning. The two issues of developing mission and goals and developing a supportive work environment are seen as necessary for the core activities of teaching and learning to be effective.

Murphy (1990:164) also put forward the following conclusions that are relevant to the current research:

1 Principals and those involved in leadership research see instructional leadership as an important aspect of the job.

2 Teachers do not view instructional leadership as the primary responsibility of principals, do not see much evidence of instructional leadership by principals, and are reluctant to accept principals as instructional leaders.

3 Principals report that they do not spend much time being instructional leaders.

4 Research confirms that both primary and secondary principals do not spend much of their time on instructional leadership activities.

5 "The nature of curriculum and instruction, professional norms, district expectations, and the nature of the principalship itself all contribute to a de-emphasis of the principal's instructional management role." (p. 189)
In the literature on instructional leadership there is "considerable contrast between the descriptions of the preferred role for school principals in the areas of curriculum and instruction and chronicles of how these executives actually behave...In short, most administrators do not act as instructional leaders" (Murphy, 1990: 164-166). There are three contradictions or paradoxes that emerge from these findings:

1. Writers in the field see instructional leadership as being important, yet the research finds little time devoted to it; research on secondary schools cited by Murphy (1990) showed principals spend between 2 and 17 per cent of their time on instructional matters. Murphy and Hallinger (1992) noted that whilst the move to decentralisation is emphasising the instructional leadership role of the principal (e.g. Chapman and Boyd, 1986; cited in Murphy and Hallinger, 1992), researchers are finding that principals are being faced with more administrative tasks that limit what they can do instructionally: Weindling (1992) saw the principal role in Britain as changing from the "leading professional" to the "chief executive"; Sackney and Dibski (1994) found that head teachers in eight London schools saw themselves as managers rather than instructional leaders under the recent Local Management of Schools reform program.

2. Principals see instructional leadership as important, but they do not devote much time to it as confirmed by their own admission and by observation.

3. There is a difference in perspective between principals and teachers on the instructional role of the principal with principals believing that they should have an instructional role, whilst teachers do not; although there is recent evidence that contradicts this (see Wirt and Krug, 1993).

One of the aims of the research is to explore these contradictions by gathering principal and teacher perceptions of the principal leadership role, and by determining whether the principal and teachers of schools agree on how the
principal leads the school (refer to research questions one and two listed in chapter one). It is worth noting that this research focussed on the leadership role in general and was not limited to instructional leadership. Also, the teachers were asked to comment on how they believed their principal leads their school; teachers were not asked for their views on how principals should lead, although many teachers ventured opinions. The contribution of the current research to the exploration of these paradoxes will be through the evidence of whether principals are perceived to be utilising instructional leadership and through comparison of the principal and teacher perceptions.

Whilst instructional leadership has generated much research and writing, many are questioning its usefulness in the current climate.

Adamant support has been lacking, however, to claim that high-quality leadership must be instructional. There are good reasons for this. Teachers differ in training, experience and maturity. Not all teachers can benefit from close supervision; some, of course, may need more direct help than others. The main effects of strong instructional leadership have been unclear. In low-SES schools, the associations are pronounced, whereas in middle-SES or high-SES schools the associations may be non-existent.

(Bliss, 1991:49-50)

Not only is the effectiveness of instructional leadership questioned, but as mentioned previously, there are also doubts concerning whether it is possible for principals to provide instructional leadership in the current educational climate (Murphy, 1990:189).

A study by Bredeson highlighted the problems facing principals in deciding how they should lead. Bredeson (1989) used five principals in a study that involved three interviews and two days of field work with each principal. Bredeson was interested in the metaphorical perspectives that could be ascribed to how principals work. Utilising the metaphors of maintenance, survival and vision, it was found that the major theme that described the five
principals was that of maintenance, with survival and vision being at opposite ends of a bell-shaped curve. It was argued that the maintenance metaphor was dominant because that gives principals some control over part of school functioning and there were not immediate rewards available that encouraged engagement in visionary activities. A confirmation of Murphy's instructional leadership paradox was also found, in that,

Each of the principals expressed frustration at the discrepancy between what the professional literature espoused and what he or she was confronted with on a daily basis. Curricular leadership was recognised as one of the most important responsibilities of their jobs, but none of them was able to spend time or devote the necessary resources to fulfil even conservative expectations for curricular leadership.

Murphy (1990, 1994) and Murphy and Hallinger (1992) highlight the problem of lack of time for principals to provide instructional leadership; teachers from England, New Zealand and the USA report spending more time on school management/administration due to the augmentation of existing responsibilities and the addition of new tasks, and there is correspondingly less time devoted to instructional leadership and to their own professional development. Murphy (1994) was especially concerned about this trend given the link between instructional leadership and school performance established by previous research.

In Australia, most states have implemented major educational restructures (see Harman, Beare and Berkeley, 1991); generally these restructuring efforts have been driven by the need to reduce costs and increase efficiency. A recent report on the effects of educational reform in Tasmania (Hull, 1993) highlights this. Hull (1993) surveyed schools in Tasmania about the effects of the educational reforms resulting from the adoption of recommendations of the 1990 CRESAP report which, at least initially, was driven by the need to reduce costs. One of the findings was a perception by principals that the emphasis of
their work had changed from providing educational leadership to providing business management (Hull, 1993:11-13); this was especially strong for primary principals who do not have the administrative support that a secondary principal has. This shift in principal role has not been clearly planned for, nor supported by appropriate training and is thus generating concern amongst principals (Hull, 1993:13-16). It remains to be seen whether this perceived change in role is long-term or a temporary function of adjusting to the school restructuring. Also, the shift is problematic for schools because it is the type of principal behaviour found in instructional leadership that is perceived by principals and teachers as being one of the factors that affects the working environment of the principal and teachers (Krug, 1993; cited in Wirt and Krug, 1993).

The next section reviews another major conception of leadership, called transformational leadership. Instructional leadership appears restrictive when compared to conceptions of transformational leadership outlined below. A trend is noted whereby the transformational leadership conception is gaining increased favour as the preferred leadership model. This shift does not diminish the impact of the concept of instructional leadership. Indeed, it can be argued that transformational leadership has arisen from a broadening of the instructional leadership concept to overcome the deficiencies of that conception of leadership (Leithwood, 1994).

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

In 1978, Burns articulated a distinction in leadership between transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership can be variously defined, but all definitions feature the notion of bartering where the leader gives the follower something in return for the follower's compliance to directions: "leaders and followers exchange needs and services in order to accomplish independent objectives" (Sergiovanni, 1990:31). Whilst the effective schools movement focussed attention on instructional leadership, increasingly the focus is now placed on transformational leadership as
Peterson and Lezotte (1991:134) describe:

The early work on effective schools found strong instructional leaders, people who actively engaged in shaping the program. Increasingly, research and descriptions of practice are describing the ways school leaders act less directly and more collaboratively with teachers, acting in what Burns (1978) calls transformational leadership. This type of leadership gains much of its power by tapping the shared values of followers and building normative commitment to the mission of the school. These leaders focus on shaping the culture of the school as well as the professional and instructional aspects of the organisation. While this may seem different from the earlier findings, it may be that this more evanescent and subtle aspect of school leaders' actions was not identified.

Hallinger (1992) described the change in the role of American principals as being from managerial, to instructional, to transformational (although Hallinger noted that the trend to transformational leadership is only just beginning). Goldring (1992) emphasised the need for transformational leadership in schools in Israel. In Australia, the trend to self-managing schools is seen as benefiting from transformational leadership (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; refer to discussion in the next section).

In the mid-eighties Sergiovanni (1984; 1990: 86-88) proposed five forces of leadership that helped to promote excellence in schools:

1. Technical leadership which involves sound management techniques.
2. Human leadership which involves harnessing social and interpersonal potential.
3. Educational leadership in which the principal demonstrates expert knowledge about education and schooling (principal teacher concept).
4. Symbolic leadership involving emphasising and modelling of important goals and behaviours.
5 Cultural leadership where the principal helps define, strengthen and articulate enduring values, beliefs, and cultural strands that give the school its identity over time.

For Sergiovanni, the technical and human dimensions of leadership are necessary to ensure that a school is not ineffective, whilst the educational leadership dimension can ensure that a school is effective by meeting its goals. However, it is the emphasis on the areas of symbolic and cultural leadership that can ensure that a school achieves at a high level (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992: 53). For Sergiovanni, the symbolic and cultural leadership dimensions are value-added dimensions that allow schools to achieve more than they otherwise would. A central concept in Sergiovanni’s work is Vaill’s (1984) concept of purposing whereby leaders and followers unite “in pursuit of higher level goals that are common to both” (Sergiovanni, 1990:31). It is through the symbolic and cultural dimensions that purposing is achieved. Indeed, it is this emphasis on developing shared vision through symbolic and cultural leadership that distinguishes notions of transformational leadership from instructional leadership, both of which have been explored and developed in parallel during the eighties. Sergiovanni’s view of leadership has helped to define more precisely the idea of transformational leadership that Burns (1978) had suggested. Sergiovanni’s influence is seen in Caldwell and Spinks’ (1992) work on the type of leadership needed in self-managing schools and it is also evident in other conceptions of transformational leadership such as that developed by Leithwood.

From both quantitative and qualitative research that Leithwood and colleagues have been doing on transformational leadership for a number of years, Leithwood has been progressively refining his view of transformational leadership. In his most recent conceptualisation Leithwood (1994) describes four dimensions of transformational leadership involving:

1 Purposes.
   This includes developing a widely shared vision for the school, building consensus about school goals and priorities and holding high
performance expectations.

2 People.
This involves providing individualised support, providing intellectual stimulation and modelling good professional practice.

3 Structure.
This involves encouraging dispersed leadership and democratic decision making.

4 Culture.
This includes strengthening the school's culture, using a variety of bureaucratic mechanisms to stimulate and reinforce cultural change, using symbols and rituals to express cultural values, direct and frequent communication about cultural norms, values and beliefs, and sharing power and responsibility with others.

This conception of transformational leadership supports Sergiovanni's model. The symbolic and cultural aspects of Sergiovanni are largely contained within the purpose and culture parts of Leithwood's conception, whilst the technical, human and educational aspects of Sergiovanni's model are found in the other conceptions of Leithwood. It also builds upon instructional leadership by including instructional leadership "through modifications to the meaning of intellectual stimulation and individualised support." (Leithwood, 1994:14); this connection is explored further in chapter five of this thesis.

In summarising the collection of essays contained in the special issue of the Journal of Educational Administration devoted to the changing role of the principal in five countries (Australia, Belgium, Great Britain, Israel, USA), Murphy and Hallinger (1992) address transformational leadership from an empirical perspective. "Investigations of how the principalship actually changes in response to extreme political pressures and an exceedingly complex environment" (Murphy and Hallinger, 1992:81) resulted in the following patterns of transformational leadership:
1 Internal leadership.

There is a diminished role for the principal to be a routine-manager and implementer of imported solutions. Instead principals are more concerned with enabling school members to find solutions to locally identified concerns.

There is an increased importance of participatory leadership with consequent emphasis on the principal's interpersonal communication skills. Principals are tending to use democratic and collaborative decision making processes.

There is pressure for increased instructional leadership from principals, but increased administrative pressures may conspire against this.

2 Environmental leadership.

Principals are having to spend more time establishing and nurturing relationships with the larger environment. This involves scanning the wider environment, making and using connections with the wider community, marketing the school, public relations and a more public and visible leadership style.

Increased responsibility and accountability of the principal.

These trends in principal leadership style fit well with Sergiovanni's first three value dimensions of technical, human and educational leadership, but do not indicate support for the emphasis placed by Sergiovanni on symbolic and cultural leadership. This may reflect the pressures placed on principals' time. In a recent qualitative study of primary principals in Western Australia, the principals were aware of the desirability of using the higher levels of leadership, but found it difficult due to the administrative demands involved in
It can be seen from these statements on transformational leadership that the role of principal becomes one of helping to define a cultural identity, of using symbolic language and rituals to reinforce the cultural identity, and ensuring that a school is responsive to changing circumstances. Principals will also need to demonstrate the capacity to engage others in a commitment to change. Two metaphors may help to clarify transformational leadership. The first is from Sergiovanni (1990:71) where he describes the vision needed in transformational leadership as a compass that guides and suggests possibilities, rather than a road map that shows how to get to a destination. The second is from Osborne and Gaebler (1992) who discuss the transformation of the role of governments in the public sector as one where governments are seen to be steering rather than rowing. Transformational leaders are those who steer rather than row their organisations. Both of these metaphors demonstrate the sense of adventure and opportunity through uncertainty that pervades the notion of transformational leadership.

Leithwood (1994) has brought together much of the recent work by himself and his colleagues on transformational leadership and summarised the main implications for transformational leadership theory as:

1. Transformational leadership in schools is a "whole cloth" in that it requires the comprehensive application of all the dimensions listed above.

2. Transformational leadership is value-added, but in terms of individual consideration and not transactional leadership. As noted previously, transformational leadership was found to be the polar opposite of transactional leadership rather than a value-added dimension. In educational settings, individual consideration is believed to be the base of leadership, with transformational leadership a value-added dimension of this.
3 Transformational leadership practices are themselves contingent. "While the dimensions of transformational leadership offer a coherent approach to school leadership, specific practices within each dimension vary widely." (Leithwood, 1994:14)

4 Expert thinking lies behind effective leadership practices and is not contingent.

5 Distinctions between management and leadership can not be made in terms of overt behaviour (refer to previous discussion).

6 Applied to schools the dimensions of transformational leadership theory require modification to include instructional leadership and culture building, and to delete management-by-exception.

The studies that Leithwood has conducted include both sophisticated quantitative studies and state-of-the-art qualitative studies. The first set of seven studies reported in Leithwood (1994) involved testing a model that proposed that transformational leadership influences three psychological dispositions - teachers' perceptions of school characteristics, teacher commitment to change and organisational learning - which, in turn, influences four outcomes - restructuring initiatives, teacher-perceived student outcomes, student participation and identification, and student marks. These studies employed survey methods and path analysis. The results showed substantial support for the model (with the amount of variation explained ranging from 40 to 90 per cent) except for student participation and student marks (where little or none of the variation was explained by the model). Thus, transformational leadership has strong effects on the organisational climate and teacher perceptions of their own work and the performance of students. These data also supported the work of Hill et al. (1993) in that transformational leadership has indirect effects on outcomes through its strong influence on in-school conditions; also, the indirect, but mediating effect of transformational leadership on a transition program has recently be confirmed by Silins, Leithwood and Jantzi (1994).
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The second set of studies reported comprised seven quantitative, survey, path analysis studies investigating in-school variables (school culture, school goals and teacher development) and four qualitative studies that investigated the processes involved in accomplishing the multiple outcomes often found in school restructuring. These studies confirmed that transformational leadership and transactional leadership are not separate phenomena, but polar forms of the one phenomenon. Also, they found that the transformational leadership dimensions with the greatest effect were vision building and fostering of commitment to group goals, followed by provision of individualised support and intellectual stimulation; effects of contingent reward and high performance expectations were found to be context dependent. These studies also explored the behaviours associated with the dimensions of transformational leadership. Interviews were conducted with 74 teachers in six secondary schools on leadership practices that positively influenced their commitment to change and that fostered organisational learning. Analysis of these interviews resulted in behavioural descriptions across the four areas and 12 dimensions of transformational leadership described previously. The final set of studies involved two studies on cognitive and affective states of principals; the findings of these studies were mentioned previously.

Given the current changing, uncertain educational climate, transformational leadership appears to be the dominant model of leadership (Leithwood, 1994; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:20). Leithwood (1994) argues that for school restructuring there are four premises that support transformational leadership as the preferred leadership model:

1 The means and ends for school restructuring are uncertain and in this type of climate what is needed is commitment rather than control strategies; transformational leadership encourages "employee motivation and commitment leading to the kind of extra effort needed for significant change." (p. 3)

2 School restructuring requires both first-order and second-order
changes. That is, it involves changes to the core technology and to the organisation. First-order changes are the domain of instructional leadership, but second-order changes are the domain of transformational leadership.

3 School restructuring is aimed especially at secondary schools where the size and complexity of the organisation works against effective instructional leadership by the principal. In this situation, transformational leadership with its notions of empowering of staff and dispersed leadership, is more viable than maintaining the principal as the instructional leader.

4 The professionalisation of teaching is a centrepiece of the school restructuring agenda and this works against the principal as the instructional leader as professionalisation encourages teachers, themselves, to assume an instructional role. The ideas of staff development, dispersed leadership, etc., found in transformational leadership are more congruent with a professional workforce.

In the next section, attention is turned to the dominant restructuring pattern -- the move to self-managing schools -- and the leadership required.

**SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS**

Restructuring of schools has tended to centre around three areas: parental choice; teacher empowerment; and, school based management (Murphy, 1991:74). In *Schools of the Future* school-based management is the central focus reflecting the world-wide trend in education of the adoption of some form of school-based management. The name given to school based management varies between countries with studies in the USA referring to site-based management, English studies referring to self-governing, or locally managed, whilst in Australia self-managing is often used. However, the essence of the change does not vary, with schools being asked to be more
School based management is a phenomenon in systems of public or government schools in which there has been significant and consistent decentralisation to the school level of authority and responsibility to make decisions related, in particular, to the allocation of resources.

(Caldwell, 1994b:1)

In school based management the degree of independence from central authorities varies. Often the decentralisation of authority and responsibility to schools coincides with increased centralisation of key functions such as the defining of broad curriculum (see below). Thus, whilst there is increased independence from central authority in some areas, in others there may be increased control by the central authority.

Ramirez, Webb and Guthrie (1991:172) distinguish between school-site management involving decentralised decision making (moving selected central office operations to the school) and those involving participatory management (allowing teachers, other employees, parents and/or students a voice in the operation of the school); these features may both be present to varying degrees. From this distinction they identified three strands of site-management reform proposals in the USA: "those primarily aimed at empowering teachers, those primarily aimed at empowering parents and community members, and those that focus on the authority of the site administrator." (p.176) They also note that implementing a school-based management program may mean creating new roles for the people in the school, including the principal (Ramirez et al., 1991:180). It was noted earlier that the status and power of the principal have been significantly upgraded under Schools of the Future. Also, school councils have been given a more significant role and the membership arranged to increase parent and community representation and to reduce teacher representation. Thus, it would appear that the Schools of the Future reform is aimed at empowering parents, community members and principals, but not teachers directly.
Caldwell and Spinks (1992: 4) define a self-managing school as

a school in a system of education where there has been significant and consistent decentralisation to the school level of authority to make decisions related to the allocation of resources.

They note that this definition is broader in scope than initiatives that were mainly decentralising of financial responsibility (site-based management in USA and local financial management of schools in Britain), but not as broad as a self-governing or self-determining school that does not have the centralised accountability features of a self-managing school. Self-management is seen as decentralisation of administrative rather than political functions, with the latter remaining centrally controlled (Caldwell, 1994b). This definition is consistent with the Schools of the Future program. Schools of the Future is devolving considerable authority to schools, such as allocating recurrent expenditure and developing local curriculum, but retaining central control of functions such as broad curriculum, accountability, non-recurrent expenditure (refer to previous discussion in chapter one). This accords with the paradox that Murphy (1989) highlighted when reviewing decentralisation in various organisations - in successful decentralised organisations the success of the decentralisation depends on strong centralisation of certain functions.

Caldwell (1992a) distinguishes four possible scenarios for the management of education in Australia during the nineties:

1 Market model.
   In which schools will be independent, self-governing entities, funded centrally, with national curriculum frameworks and testing (such as is occurring in England with grant maintained schools).

2 Charter model.
   Whereby schools will develop charters as the basis for resourcing and
accountability, staff will be employed by schools under centrally-determined work agreements, there will be minimal central support, with central control retained for certain functions such as curriculum frameworks (this is similar to the New Zealand model).

3 Local support model.
Whereby schools are self-managing within a centrally prescribed framework and have support services provided through district arrangements.

4 Recentralisation model.
In which there is a return to a tightly monitored and extensively supported central system.

Schools of the Future clearly approximates the charter model. The reader will note the paradox of self-management seen in the first three management options; whilst all of these have self-management to some degree, each also includes strong central control of certain functions. This paradox has been raised by Caldwell (1994b) and is explained to some degree by viewing school based management as administrative decentralisation and not political decentralisation; Chubb and Moe (1990:201) argue that this administrative decentralisation is not enough, and that for school based management to succeed political decentralisation is also needed. This paradox has important implications for the principal role. Schools are being given more authority and responsibility, and expected to be more accountable, yet control of various important functions is retained by the central administration. Consequently, principals have increased authority, responsibility and accountability, yet they are not given the full range of powers to do what they want (an example is the debate concerning local selection of staff versus centralised staff selection). The tension between control and autonomy concerns power; the current decentralisation attempts often result in a disguised concentration of power centrally, with limited power given to the local level (Slater, 1993:177). However, the potential associated problems of role conflict, uncertainty and ambiguity (especially for the principal role) can
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be resolved as exemplified in the Edmonton system (Caldwell, 1993c:168).

With the trend towards some type of self-management in schools, an important area to explore is the type of leadership necessary for these schools. There is a developing connection between transformational leadership and self-management of schools (Caldwell and Spinks, 1989, 1992; Leithwood, 1994; Murphy and Hallinger, 1993). Murphy and Hallinger (1992:86) believe that the “self-managed school will require leadership that has moral, technical and educational foundations.” This assertion is supported by Caldwell and Spinks (1992:20) who believe that principals of self-managing schools (which are only beginning to appear in government schools in Australia) will need to be:

1 Transformational rather than transactional.
2 Visionary rather than managerial.
3 Artistic rather than scientific.

For Caldwell and Spinks(1992:50-55) principals in self-managing schools will have the following characteristics:

1 The capacity to work with others in the school community to formulate a vision for the school.
2 A coherent personal ‘educational platform’ which shapes their actions.
3 Ability to communicate their vision in a way which ensures commitment among staff, students, parents and others in the community.
4 Awareness of the many facets of the leadership role (technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural) and the importance of the symbolic and cultural aspects.
5 The capacity to keep abreast of trends and issues, threats and opportunities in the local school environment, as well as nationally and internationally.
6 Focus on empowering others, especially through the use of democratic decision-making.
In particular, they describe in considerable detail (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992: chapters four to seven) four dimensions of leadership that they believe are important for self-managing schools:

1 Cultural leadership.
Here principals help create and sustain a culture of excellence in a climate of change. This entails describing and analysing the school's culture and building a shared commitment to this culture, defining excellence in locally appropriate terms, being aware of educational and societal trends, being able to manage continuing change, being aware of and being able to manage the use of symbols to enhance the culture.

2 Strategic leadership.
In this principals help ensure that the school has a plan for the future that takes into account broad educational trends and issues and which places the school in a favourable position. A culture of sharing of information is established, as are structures and processes that enable the school to plan future directions and to monitor the implementation of strategies and the impact of wider trends and issues.

3 Educational leadership.
Here principals help to nurture a learning community by the enhancement of the role of teachers, parents and students in the school through the use of appropriate professional development (involving all three groups simultaneously, focussing on teaching and learning issues for teachers), by generating mutual support amongst the school community and by ensuring that the school avails itself of educational opportunities. Principals promote and encourage participation in decision making, uses collegial approaches such as mentoring to encourage reflective practice, and extend the school boundaries to actively include the private sector.
4 Responsive leadership.
Here principals are focussed on helping schools to be responsive to community and individual concerns through the use of self-reflection and accountability. Principals are committed to values of the school serving society, the local community and the students, and the right of these parties to have information about achievement of school expectations. They promote critical reflection, are able to identify appropriate accountability indicators, understand the uses and interpretations of different forms of evaluation, and ensure that accountability is used as a means for school improvement.

The dimensions of leadership proposed by Caldwell and Spinks (1992) clearly encompass the ideas of instructional leadership through their focus on enhancing teaching and learning experiences, and transformational leadership through its emphasis on the cultural and symbolic dimensions. In addition they highlight accountability and responsiveness. Caldwell and Spinks' description of leadership will here-after be referred to as leadership for self-managing schools.

Evidence for school-based management effects varies. For example, Caldwell (1994) briefly addressed the impact of school-based management and concluded that with the research available there was no evidence that the introduction of school-based management on its own led to improvement of educational outcomes for students. In terms of resource allocation, the Edmonton school-based management reform has been positive, although in countries where the reform is more recent, the evidence for equitable resource allocation is mixed. There are effects recorded that have implications for principal leadership. In Dade County, Florida (Collins and Nanson, 1991, cited in Caldwell, 1994) and Edmonton, Alberta (Brown, 1990, cited in Caldwell, 1994) favourable outcomes in terms of pupil, parent and teacher satisfaction have been demonstrated; "school-based management is generally valued by principals and teachers and may thus be seen as a factor in strengthening a sense of professionalism." (Caldwell, 1994b:9). Sackney and Dibski (1994) reported an absence of the development of collaborative
school cultures in LMS schools in London. In the early stages of school-based management reform there is evidence that initially there are high levels of anxiety and overload amongst school staff, but that this dissipates within a year or so; this has implications for the current research as the interviews were conducted during the first year of the Victorian school-based management reform. It is the impact of school-based management on the principal role that emphasises the importance of the current research. Indeed this is one of the issues in school-based management identified by Caldwell (1994b) as being important for future research.

Research is appearing that highlights the principal's role in school-based management. In an international study on the implementation and impact of school-based management reform, Odden and Odden (1993) cite preliminary results from a study of eight American schools that indicate that in successful schools using school-based management the principal:

1. Encouraged professional development with respect to management, curriculum content and pedagogy, often seeking outside assistance.
2. Dispersed power throughout the school, often through the use of subcommittees. "The role of the principal under SBM required a change - shifting away from instructional leadership toward that of a manager/facilitator of change. Successful principals motivated staff; created a team feeling on campus; and provided a vision for the school. Successful principals also shielded teachers from issues in which they had little interest or expertise so they could concentrate on teaching." (p. 2)
3. Developed multiple mechanisms for communicating a range of information to various stakeholders.
4. Acknowledged teachers' work with thank you notes, mentions in school newsletters, etc.
5. Encouraged democratic decision making processes.

Murphy (1994) reviewed a large amount of the research on the changing nature of the role of the principal in schools undergoing restructuring in
transformational reform efforts. As *Schools of the Future* is such a reform, these role changes are relevant to the current research. Murphy identifies four major areas of role change:

1. **Leading from the Centre.**
   Rather than being at the top of a pyramid, principals are now viewed as being at the centre of a network. Principals are increasingly dispersing power to teachers through delegating leadership responsibilities, developing collaborative decision making processes, and bringing shared authority to life. Murphy notes that principals need to let go, to model the shared decision making that they are encouraging through their words, actions, and interpersonal relationships; he also notes that this has been found to be difficult for principals to do.

2. **Enabling and Supporting Teacher Success.**
   This entails principals developing an image where they are not seen as a line manager, but as a facilitator and an equal partner. To support teachers principals often help formulate a shared vision, cultivate a network of relationships, allocate resources consistent with the vision, provide information to staff, and promote teacher development.

3. **Managing Reform.**
   There appears to be an increase in the management role of principals with principals from England, New Zealand and America reporting spending more time on school management/administration due to augmentation of existing responsibilities and the addition of new tasks. This corresponds with a decrease in the time devoted to instructional leadership and to their own professional development. Murphy noted problems in defining consistently and unambiguously what management and educational functions were and he also noted the serious implications of this trend given that previous research has established a link between instructional leadership and school
4 Extending the School Community.
School restructuring enhances the boundary-spanning function of the principal through the boundaries becoming more permeable and interactive, the need for the principal to spend more time with parents and community members and through the need to become more attuned to the external environment. The role has changed through the need to actively promote schools, through the need to work with school councils/governing boards, and through spending more time with parents (which may be due to increased accountability concerns associated with deregulation). Murphy also noted the lack of time spent on developing service delivery networks, despite this being emphasised in prescriptive literature.

In the next section, moral leadership conceptions will be described. In moral leadership the connection between values and leadership is emphasised.

MORAL LEADERSHIP

The importance of the moral dimension of leadership has received increased attention over the past decade (see, for example, Evers and Lakomski, 1991; Evers, 1992; Greenfield, 1991; Hodgkinson:1981, 1991). Educational leadership is seen as a moral exercise in that educational leaders should focus not only on efficient and effective use of resources, but also on what is worthwhile and what is worth doing (values of quality, equity and choice).

Evers (1992: 39-41) provides a framework for assessing the extent of moral leadership. Through the use of his own value framework Evers argues that most leadership decisions have a moral dimension and that educational leaders can and should be appraised morally through their:

1 Promotion of a problem solving culture.
2 Encouragement of growth of knowledge within the school through the promotion of differing points of view to question and challenge current thinking.

3 Focus on democratic reform through the use of informed participative feedback to stimulate and provide for change.

4 Concern to ensure everyone has the freedom to participate.

5 Promotion of approaches to learning based on dialogue, conjecture and refutation.

6 Decisions made with respect to the provision of long-term learning.

Evers' approach is concerned with the promotion of a learning culture, one that utilises problem solving as a core method of increasing knowledge. The educative leader is seen to be a person who promotes this approach.

Evers' (1992) work was contained in a book edited by Duignan and Macpherson (1992: 4) whose focus was on educative leadership, a type of leadership which has a strong moral emphasis through being "more concerned with ways of knowing, valuing and altering the organisation."

Duignan and Macpherson's (1992:183-184) holistic model of educative leadership has three metaphysical realms:

1 Activity conducted in a material world. This consists of evaluative and managerial activity that relates expenditure to valued outcomes in the areas of learning, teaching and leading. It incorporates notions of efficiency, effectiveness and achievability.

2 Cultural agency in a social world. This consists of cultural and political activity that seeks the cultural elaboration of policy through the realignment of social reality and the legitimisation of changed professional practices. It incorporates exploration of how shared meanings affect practice, and dominant theories of social reality.

3 Reflective practice in an abstract realm of ideas.
This involves philosophical and strategic activity that appraises abstract issues and problems, and then enables the development of policies that link consequences to material and political contingencies. It is concerned with questions of what is right and what is significant; it has a distinctly moral dimension.

Duignan and Macpherson (1992:183-184) believe that educative leaders must address all three realms by creating, maintaining and developing links between them. "Educative leadership should be, we believe, holistic, pragmatic, values-driven and promote cultural activity intended to enhance performance in the areas of learning, teaching and leading" (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992:184). Through its emphasis on values, culture and links with the external world this notion of leadership is closely associated with transformational leadership models discussed previously. However, it is the explicit concern for moral questions of "what is right?", that distinguishes it from other approaches, although it may be argued that "moral action is unavoidable when transformative leadership is practised" (Sergiovanni, 1990:29). Indeed, Sergiovanni’s (1990:29) work on transformational leadership emphasises the moral dimension of leadership: "what is right is as important as whether it is done well."

The other feature of Duignan and Macpherson’s approach to leadership, one that is not often explicitly stated in other theories, is the political dimension. Indeed, it is the political dimension that is missing from much of the work on educational leadership, but which is apparent in writings on corporate leadership, such as that of Bolman and Deal (1991) who incorporate a political frame in their four-framed model of organisational theory. It is this political reality of organisations that may need more exploration by leadership theorists working in education. Certainly, there is acknowledgement of the politics in educational administration at the system level (for example, the collection of essays in Crowther and Ogilvie, 1992, and in Harman, Beare and Berkeley, 1991), and it can be argued that the explicit use of values in moral and transformational leadership acknowledges the political process (Caldwell, 1992b). Never-the-less, the political dimension probably needs to be more
explicit in educational leadership theories, particularly as it has been identified by principals as a priority area for professional development (Evans, 1993) and as one of the key features of the leadership role of principals in the nineties (Donovan, 1992).

PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP ROLE

Principals are well placed to know what it is that they do and to identify deficiencies in their knowledge and skills. Recently, two studies have appeared which describe these areas. The first is a comprehensive listing of what principals in the USA think that they should be doing. The second is a listing of Australian principal perceptions of professional development needs.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) is an association of ten national United States educational organisations. In consultation with its members it has developed a list of performance domains for principals (NASSP, 1992). There are 21 performance domains over four areas including:

1 Functional.
   This involves achieving school mission, realising educational program and allowing the school to function. It includes the performance domains of leadership, information collection and dissemination, problem analysis, judgment, organisational oversight, implementation, and delegation.

2 Programmatic.
   This area is concerned with the scope and framework of the educational program. It includes the performance domains of instructional program, curriculum design, student guidance and development, staff development, measurement and evaluation, and resource allocation.
3 Interpersonal.

This area deals with the significance of interpersonal connections. It includes the performance domains of motivating others, sensitivity, oral expression and written expression.

4 Contextual.

This area is concerned with the world of ideas and forces within which the school operates. It includes the performance domains of philosophical and cultural values, legal and regulatory applications, policy and political influence, and public and media relationships.

The leadership domain indicated that principals should be involved in formulating goals with individuals or groups, initiating and maintaining direction with groups and guiding them to the accomplishment of tasks, setting priorities for one's school in the context of community and district priorities and student and staff needs, integrating own and other's ideas for task accomplishment, and initiating and planning organisational change. This conception of leadership is narrow compared to transformational or even instructional conceptions; it is very similar to Sergiovanni's technical leadership. However, within the full list of domains, what principals can be expected to do fits with leadership conceptions, such as transformational leadership, in that it addresses Sergiovanni's transformational dimensions of human, educational and cultural leadership in the interpersonal, programmatic and contextual domains respectively. The one area of transformational leadership that is not emphasised is the symbolic dimension, although it is implied in domains such as the dissemination of information, public relations, resource allocation, motivating others, etc. The instructional leadership dimensions of developing mission and goals, managing the educational production function, promoting an academic learning climate, and developing a supportive work environment are represented in the leadership domain, the programmatic area, interpersonal area and contextual area.

Evans (1993) reported the findings from an Australian national review of what
principals believed their professional development priorities were. Principals acknowledged the importance of a number of areas as crucial to their performance. These were, in priority order:

1 Organisational Leadership.
This involved the principal having vision, ability to develop cooperatively a common purpose, showing creativity and inspiration in their interactions with others, and cooperatively setting future directions.

2 Educational Leadership.
This involved the principal ensuring that the learning of students in the school is optimal and also, the principal acting as a community educator who can interpret national and global trends and issues in the school setting.

3 Organisational Management.
This involved the principal ensuring that the school is running smoothly and that goals and common purposes are achieved through collaborative work with staff and parents.

4 Educational Management.
This involved the principal ensuring that the educational ideals of the school are fulfilled through the careful consideration of all educational issues, evaluating these issues and matching them to current trends in curriculum development.

5 Cultural Leadership.
This involved the principal in understanding the ethos of the school and the school community and understanding the organisational culture of the school.

6 Political Leadership.
Viewed as a complement to cultural leadership, this area involved the
principal in negotiating with members of the school and wider communities on the school direction (mission and goals) and resource allocation.

7 Reflective Leadership. This entails principals critically reflecting at a personal and professional level on how they can improve the work that they do. Recently, it has been argued that reflective practice can help in leading a school through a period of restructuring (Cahill, 1993).

Development of shared vision, having a focus on learning and teaching, and maintaining a school climate conducive to learning are areas that are also found in instructional leadership. Further, understanding and use of school culture is found in transformational leadership, while reflective practice is an area mentioned in the leadership for self-managing schools described by Caldwell and Spinks. Thus, the professional development priority areas reflect current conceptions of leadership, suggesting that principals are aware of the need to adopt these approaches in the current educational climate.

These studies demonstrate that principal views of how they should be leading and the sort of professional development they need reflect a view of leadership that is characteristic of the approaches that are being suggested (e.g. Murphy and Hallinger, 1992) as the most appropriate for leading schools in the nineties.

SUMMARY

In this chapter literature concerned with school leadership was reviewed. First, an historical overview was given. Initially, leadership was studied through the lives of prominent leaders, usually adopting the assumption that leaders were born and not made. Then, the traits of leaders were studied so that people could be trained to become good leaders. It was then realised that there were situational factors that impinged on leadership. Thus, the next emphasis in the study of leadership was to match leadership characteristics to
situations; this led to contingency theories of leadership. In the seventies and eighties, conceptions of leadership became more complicated and emphasised a more holistic approach. Two notable leadership perspectives to come from this period were instructional and transformational leadership.

The focus then turned to the non-education sector and the importance placed on leadership during the eighties, and how this influenced educational conceptions of leadership. The discussion ranged from the impact on education of the findings from studies in the early eighties on successful organisations, to the recent trend towards the adoption of quality systems approaches to management and the participation of Australian industry in educational debate.

The effective schools and school improvement literature was then reviewed. Both of these areas have contributed significantly to an understanding of the principalship. From the beginning of the effective schools movement in the seventies, it was clear that one of the characteristics of effective schools was the quality of principal leadership and that there were identifiable characteristics of principals that lead effective schools. These characteristics included technical and culture building skills. However, methodological problems existed with this research which meant that it was difficult to know whether an effective principal helped school effectiveness, or whether the effective school helped principal effectiveness. Recent work was presented that has overcome many of the methodological problems and is indicating that principals do make a difference to student outcomes.

The effective schools movement focussed on the identification of effective schools, giving few indications how schools could become more effective. Studies of school improvement sought to address this problem by describing how schools improved. Again, the principal was found to have a key role. It was also found that the style of leadership needed to be flexible, with different approaches needed for different stages of school improvement. In summarising the findings of the effective school and school improvement literature, it was concluded that the principal's role as a school leader included
setting of a common purpose, establishing high expectations, entrepreneurial orientation, establishing and fostering dispersed leadership, focussing the school efforts on the core tasks, providing and maintaining a suitable school climate, and gaining and managing appropriate levels of human resources.

Arising from the effective school literature, came a focus on instructional leadership. Instructional leadership involved developing school goals, ensuring the provision of quality instruction, promoting academic learning and developing a supportive work climate. Instructional leadership was considered important by principals and those involved in leadership research, but principals spent little time on it, and teachers did not believe that it was a major principal role. However, there are pressures on principal time that mean it is increasingly difficult for principals to be instructional leaders as conceived above, and there is questioning of the effectiveness of it as an across-the-board approach, and whether it is the most appropriate model for the current educational climate.

At the same time as the concept of instructional leadership was being developed, interest was focussed on transformational leadership. In the changing educational climate of the nineties with its emphasis on school restructuring, transformational leadership is being proposed as the most appropriate form of school leadership. Sergiovanni's proposed five leadership forces, technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural, with the last two considered to be value-added dimensions necessary for schools to be excellent and not just effective. Supporting much of the work of Sergiovanni, Leithwood proposed four dimensions for transformational leadership - purposes, people, structure and culture - and indicated that all dimensions had to be applied. He agreed with Sergiovanni that transformational leadership was value-added, but this was in terms of individual consideration rather than transactional leadership. Within the conceptions of transformational leadership, instructional leadership is featured, although there is doubt whether principals can meet this requirement given increases in administrative requirements.
As schools undergo restructuring, the dominant pattern in many countries is to some form of self-managing school. In Victoria, the **Schools of the Future** reform is giving schools control of most of their operating costs and the employment of staff, and, through school charters, schools will have a three year resources and accountability framework. **Schools of the Future** was shown to reflect a charter model for school management in which schools develop charters as the basis for resourcing and accountability, deploy their own staff under centrally determined work agreements, with minimal central support but central control retained for certain functions such as curriculum. Leadership conceptions incorporating transformational leadership were considered to be the most appropriate for self-managing schools. The leadership dimensions for self-managing schools developed by Caldwell and Spinks included cultural, strategic, educational and responsive leadership dimensions. Evidence for improvement of student outcomes through the adoption of self-management is limited. However, whilst improvement in student outcomes has not been substantiated, improvement in pupil, parent and teacher satisfaction has been found, and studies are emerging that highlight the significant role principals have in ensuring that the reform is successful. Murphy noted changes in the principal role in schools undergoing restructuring as including increased dispersion of power, the adoption of a facilitator rather than line manager role, an increased administrative role, and increased time spent in the community and with parents.

The penultimate area reviewed was that of moral leadership. Developed in parallel to transformational leadership, moral leadership highlights concern with what is worthwhile, what is worth doing and what is right. It was shown that leadership conceptions that are concerned with moral issues, such as Duignan and Macpherson's educative leadership, have many similarities with transformational leadership. However, the explicit concerns for moral issues and the political dimension of leadership set moral leadership apart from other leadership conceptions.

Finally, principal perceptions of their role were explored. Two studies, one
from Australia and one from the USA, were used. In consultation with its members in America, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration developed a list of 21 performance domains for principals. One of these domains was labelled as *leadership*. This appeared to resemble Sergiovanni's technical leadership. However, across all the domains, all but the symbolic area of Sergiovanni's transformational leadership model were represented, whilst all the areas of Murphy's instructional leadership model were represented. In Australia, a national survey of the professional development priorities of principals showed that principals were concerned with learning in areas associated with instructional and transformational leadership.

From this analysis it is apparent that increasingly the principal's role is seen by researchers to be complex, with simple notions of leadership proving inadequate. In summary the recent research on school leadership has indicated that:

1. Leadership of schools is multi-dimensional with simplistic conceptions of leadership not sufficient for the role that principals are being asked to adopt in the nineties.

2. Provided the current trends in education are realised, transformational leadership appears to be more relevant to the 1990's than the narrow conceptions of transactional or instructional leadership. Transformational leadership appears to be preferred for self-managing schools and schools undergoing restructuring.

3. Instructional leadership will continue to be important, but will only be part of the leadership responsibilities of principals.

4. Leadership models from non-education areas will continue to influence educational models of leadership.
5. There may be a more explicit acknowledgement in leadership theories of the moral and political dimensions of leadership.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, hermeneutic phenomenology is defined and its use in this research justified. The data collection and analysis methods are described in detail using examples from the research where appropriate. Delimitations and limitations of the research are explored, with particular attention paid to the establishment of trustworthiness in the research findings. Finally, characteristics of the schools and participants are reported.

HERMENEUTIC PHENOMENOLOGY

This research investigated the phenomenon of principal leadership in self-managing secondary schools in Victoria. Two broad research strategies were considered.

One strategy would be to use current knowledge about educational leadership to identify behaviours and attitudes that could then be measured. The techniques of measurement possible are varied but could include questionnaires, structured interview schedules, behaviour checklists, attitude scales, or other research instruments (e.g. construction of an adjective list describing aspects of leadership). Under this strategy could also be included a variety of qualitative techniques that use a priori conceptual categories for organising data (e.g. the approach of Miles and Huberman; Miles and Huberman, 1984). These approaches would generate relevant data. However, within the area of investigation, the scope of the data generated would be defined a priori by the researcher and the particular theories or research used to formulate the research instrument.

Another strategy would be to ignore, as much as this is possible, what is known about educational leadership. The task then becomes one of observing, asking about and documenting aspects of the phenomenon. This can involve collecting information from a variety of sources such as interviews, participant observation, document searches, field notes, self-reflection. The naturalistic inquiry of Lincoln and Guba (1984) is an example of this and
generates rich and complex data. It is however, expensive of time and money and this expense may limit the range of sites that can be studied. An alternative is to focus exclusively on the experiential aspect and let the participants discuss their views on the role of the principal. Adopting this method results in the generation of narrative that is largely defined by the participants. The advantage of this method is that a larger number of sites can be studied. The disadvantage is that it is difficult, though not impossible, to confirm the accuracy of the participants’ perceptions. To analyse narrative for meaning, the main techniques are that of phenomenology, hermeneutics and case study (Tesch, 1990:73).

In this research hermeneutic phenomenology has been used as the basis for gathering and analysing perceptions of principal leadership. The rationale for using hermeneutic phenomenology follows, and a detailed description of the analysis process developed for this research is included in the interview analysis section. Whilst the reporting of the analysis employs a thematic structure, the reporting departs from the typical approaches used in phenomenological research. This aspect is discussed at the end of the interview analysis section.

Hermeneutic phenomenology is concerned with the illumination of human experience by the description and interpretation of subjective experience (Tesch, 1990: 40, 51). Hermeneutic phenomenology addresses the concerns of phenomenologists to describe lived experience and let "things speak for themselves", but it also emphasises interpretation as it is premised on the belief that there is no such thing as uninterpreted phenomena (van Manen, 1990: 180).

Hermeneutic phenomenology is a method of inquiry that can be placed within the umbrella term of naturalistic inquiry which is concerned with understanding the meaning that people give to their experience (Tesch, 1990: 50-51). In naturalistic inquiry it is assumed that realities are multiple, constructed and holistic; knower and known are interactive; only time- and context-bound working hypotheses (idiographic statements) are possible;
causal linkages are impossible to specify due to interaction of entities involved; and, inquiry is value-bound (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; 37). These assumptions can be compared to those of positivist inquiry which has dominated knowledge acquisition in Western societies for a number of centuries. In positivist inquiry it is assumed that reality is single, tangible and fragmentable; knower and known are independent; time- and context-free generalisations (nomothetic statements) are possible; there are causal linkages which can be described; and, inquiry is value-free (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; 37). In psychology differences between the traditional positivist approach and that of phenomenology have been described (Colaizzi, 1978) across four dimensions: experimental versus descriptive method, causal analysis versus identification objectives, calculative versus meditative thinking, and technology-control versus dwelling-understanding life-style. The assumptions used in naturalistic inquiry tend to result in a different type of research process to that found in positivist inquiry. Lincoln and Guba (1985: 39-43) list twelve possible differences including emphasis on natural settings, humans as the primary data-gathering instrument, use of researcher's tacit knowledge, primacy of qualitative methods, purposive sampling, inductive data analysis, grounded theory and emergent design, negotiation of outcomes with research participants, use of case studies to report results, idiographic interpretations and tentative application of findings.

In education the hermeneutic phenomenological approach to research has been explicated by van Manen (1990) and contrasted with other qualitative data analysis approaches by Tesch (1990). The essential reason for using a hermeneutic phenomenological methodology is to both understand the data (text or action) by describing the phenomenon under study (the phenomenological aspect) and to interpret what is found (the hermeneutic aspect). It was employed in this research because:

1. The hermeneutic phenomenological approach seeks first to understand the data and then to ascribe meaning to them; it does not presuppose a meaning to the data. This means that an a priori theoretical framework is not necessary; this is a significant benefit of
using this methodology. As the data generated will not be constrained by any one theoretical position, it can be used for testing different theoretical frameworks of school leadership.

2 Hermeneutic phenomenology lends itself to gathering data from a number of different sites because it is inexpensive of time (at least for the initial collecting of information). This was important for this research so that sufficient principal and teacher participants were interviewed to allow the phenomena to be explored fully and to allow comparison between principal and teacher perceptions (refer to the participant characteristics section for further discussion of these issues).

3 The methodology employed is a useful technique for gaining perceptual data. This research was concerned with self-perceptions and perceptions of others. Perceptual data are important sources of information concerning what people do because the way they see themselves and others influences how they think and act (Bernard, 1986:23).

Phenomenological inquiry emphasises the individual and the subjective experience of being the individual. To some extent, it dictates the data collection method (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:11). Within the phenomenological tradition there are a number of different data collection methods including: personal experience; protocol writing; interviewing; observing; use of literature, biography, diaries, journals, logs, phenomenological literature, or art (van Manen, 1990:53-76); this research used interviewing, which has been described as the most common procedure for data gathering in phenomenological research (Osborne, 1990). van Manen (1990: 66) acknowledges two purposes for interviews in hermeneutic phenomenology:

1 Collection and exploration of experiential narrative material which may then be used to gain new understanding of a human phenomenon.
2 Development of a conversational relation with the interviewee about the meaning of an experience.

Adopting the second purpose, a number of interviews would be conducted with each interviewee, using the interpretations of previous interviews to guide the present interview. Adopting the first purpose would entail interviewing a number of people once and interpreting these interviews. This research adopted the first purpose as the aim of the research was to gather information about being a principal from a relatively large number of people and then use these data to gain insights into the phenomenon.

For each participant the following focussing questions were used to initiate discussion:

1 For the principal: What is it like to be principal, in particular, how do you view your leadership role?

2 For the teachers: How do you see the leadership role of the principal at this school?

The questions were different because the perspectives were different: the principal was being asked to reflect on the experience of being a principal, whilst the teachers were being asked to reflect on their understanding of the principal as contained in their experience of being teachers at the school. The questions were deliberately broad and non-prescriptive. The questions were designed to set the boundaries, but not to constrain or direct the discussion; this type of unstructured interviewing has been referred to as a "controlled conversation, which is geared to the interviewer's research interests [but where] the level of control is regarded as minimal" (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell and Alexander, 1990:93).

The researcher is a trained and registered Psychologist. The interview technique consisted of presenting the opening question and then largely
using an active listening technique (empathic responding) to maintain the conversation until the conversation between interviewer and interviewee reached a natural conclusion; which van Manen (1990:67) calls a "stiliness of reflection". Empathy can be defined as "the act of projecting oneself into a situation as the other person is experiencing it and so fully comprehending how it seems to the other person" (Howe, 1982:27). The use of empathic responding allowed conversation to continue without the interviewer intruding too much; it tells the interviewee that they are being listened to and understood, and it encourages the interviewee to continue the conversation. It is also important in this process to stay focussed; this research is interested in the role of the principal. To maintain focus in an interview of this sort it is suggested (van Manen, 1990:67-68) that direct questioning also be used to bring back generalised discussion to the level of concrete experience. Concrete examples that were common to the staff at a particular school, such as a curriculum reform, were used wherever possible. To ensure that each interview fully explored the phenomenon a number of check questions were used. These were not necessarily asked directly of the participants, but were used as a check by the researcher to maintain focus on the phenomenon of school leadership and particular areas that needed to be explored (such as changes in the role). The questions were:

1. In discussing the leadership role were concrete examples used?
2. Was there discussion of the organisation of the school?
3. Was the principal's relationship with the school curriculum committee described?
4. Was the decision making process described?
5. What changes occurred in the principal's leadership since the Schools of the Future program began in mid 1993?

Each interview was tape recorded on an audio recorder and the tape transcribed. Lincoln and Guba (1985:240-241) and Minichiello et al. (1990:134-135) have highlighted benefits and problems associated with this method. By taping the interview a full and accurate record of the interview was gained, and it allowed the researcher to use a natural conversation style
and attend to what was being said which increased the rapport between researcher and participant. Also, by presenting the full transcripts, trustworthiness of the analysis is enhanced (see below). The potential problem of participant inhibition was minimised by the use of an inconspicuous tape recorder and the guarantee that participants had control of what was included in the final copy of the tape transcript (see below). Also, loss of concentration by the researcher was minimised by the researcher’s professional training in counselling. A significant problem with tape recording interviews is that little of the non-verbal communication is retained and it is difficult to note connections between participants’ verbal and non-verbal behaviour which is an important source of interpersonal information. Generally, non-verbal data were not used, although observations of non-verbal behaviour were noted in some interviews (e.g. principal A).

INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

This section describes how the participant interviews (the data) were analysed. Examples from the research are used to illustrate the process.

BACKGROUND

In interpretational analysis, such as that used in hermeneutic phenomenology, data are segmented and the segments are categorised according to an organising system that is predominantly derived from the data (Tesch, 1992: 113). The categorisation used in this research involved the production of themes, which were labels given to collections of narrative that appeared to be focussed on a common concept, for example, principals having vision. The report of the analysis was written thematically, which is one of six ways that have been identified for the writing of reports based on hermeneutic phenomenological methodology (van Manen, 1990: 168); this is included in the result section. The process used was systematic and comprehensive, although it was not rigid as the themes changed as they emerged during the analysis.
INTERPRETATIONAL ANALYSIS

An interpretational analysis system adapted from Tesch (1990: 92-96) was used which involved:

1. Reading and rereading of the data to become familiar with it.

2. Delineation of all 'meaning units' pertaining to the phenomenon.

Some phenomenologists will extract all meaning units and then decide which ones are relevant to the research questions. In this research, during the initial search of the interviews, decisions were made regarding the relevance of meaning units. This method is efficient time-wise, but may lose some detail. The meaning units may be words, sentences, or phrases (Tesch, 1990: 116). Meaning units are "a segment of text that is comprehensible by itself and contains one idea, episode, or piece of information." (Tesch, 1990:116). This notion of meaning units is also found in van Manen's (1990:92) notion of a selective approach to interpretation. In this approach, statements and phrases that are considered revealing about the phenomenon of being a principal were used to condense the material so that themes could be located. van Manen (1990) describes two other approaches; holistic and detailed. The holistic approach attends to the text as a whole and seeks a sententious phrase that captures "the fundamental meaning or main significance of the text as a whole" (van Manen, 1990:93). The detailed approach looks at every sentence or sentence cluster for clues to illuminate the phenomenon. Neither of these approaches was considered suitable for this research: the holistic approach because it is too general and difficult to describe how the description was arrived at; the detailed approach because it may generate too much irrelevant data. This stage of the analysis resulted in the initial thematic analysis of each interview which is included with the interview transcripts contained on the accompanying computer floppy disk. For example on page 6 of the interview transcript for school A, the principal A1 is discussing the pressures he works under:
Well pressure because I was instrumental in having six million dollars spent here if you see...the whole school is what you see here, every room has the same decor, not just the...we have two new gymnasiums and a theatre and a whole lot of other things. Built with a very clear vision of what we were on about; a small school which provided a window for people in a deprived social-economic area that had no window outside their area, no aspirations outside their area. The Governor-General opened it on the ninth of February 1992. And everything that we stood for has turned on its ear because the Ministry, the Government will no longer allow it to survive. It is now, numbers. Now that's fine, I may or I may not be able to run the school on a number formula, depending a bit on the student resource index and a whole lot of other things. But, when it was built it was cleaned because of its space, now it is cleaned on its numbers. Once it was staffed because it was known to be in a socio­economically disadvantaged area. As principal of the technical school, that's where I came from, I had six special needs. As principal of this school I have got one point eight. How on earth do I run it?

There are a number of meaning units in this passage. The principal's vision for the school is apparent in the second sentence and, to a lesser extent in the first sentence. The first sentence also suggests that the principal has skills that enabled the school to receive substantial resources; these skills may be in negotiation, and the development and use of out-of-school connections. A sense of pessimism pervades the passage as the principal discusses the gulf between his vision for the school and what is able to be achieved with the resources available; sentences 3-11 indicate a belief by the principal that he is not in control of what is happening. So, there are meaning units associated with vision, pessimism, negotiating ability and establishing out-of-school networks. With support from related meaning units, themes of vision and pessimism did emerge from this interview. The meaning unit of negotiating ability did not emerge as a theme, whilst the meaning unit associated with
establishing out-of-school networks was incorporated into a theme labelled wider knowledge. The thematic statement for the vision theme is included with the next part of the analysis.

3. Grouping of the meaning units into common themes.

Using the initial thematic analysis for each interview, common themes were found. Common themes were groupings of similar meaning units. The common themes were researcher defined through careful reading of the text so that the themes accurately reflected the intent of the speaker. The interpretation at this stage did not adhere to a theoretical position. This stage resulted in the production of a set of common themes for each principal interview and sets for each teacher group of interviews; these are included in appendix one. The reader should note that the analysis of teacher interviews for common themes was based on school groupings of teachers. Thus, all the teacher interviews in one school were searched for common themes, resulting in one statement of the teacher description of the principal’s leadership role. Whilst this process emphasised the combined teacher view at the expense of the individual view, it produced a manageable collection of thematic descriptions. Using the example of the quote from principal A given above, the common theme of "vision" emerged and was described as:

The principal has a vision for the school. He wants the school to be seen as a small school that caters for the needs of the local community in providing a window from the deprived socio-economic area to the outside world.

However, whilst the principal has a vision for the school he is despairing of how to fulfil it.

The reader should note that a reference A1-6 refers to school A, interview A1 and page 6 of the school A interviews; the referencing system is explained further in the result section below. At school A the teacher interviews also produced a common theme of vision described as:

The principal has definite plans for the school that he has held for a
number of years A3-17; A5-38. His plans are seen in the hidden agendas that he employs A3-21. The principal was described as being concerned with establishing a strong school image and articulating the school principles A4-24; much of what the principal does was viewed as being for the long-term benefit of the school A4-24 and ensuring that the school not only survives, but is successful A4-27; although this was not always obvious to staff as the principal does not always articulate clearly his vision A4-24. The principal’s vision reflects a community culture focus: because many of the students come from unstable backgrounds the school emphasises the welfare and care of the students A4-25.

4. Reading of the themes in relation to the whole interview transcript and another searching of the transcript to see if new categories needed to be made.

This process of interchanging between a whole and part focus is called the hermeneutic cycle (Tesch, 1990:94) or hermeneutic circle (Kvale, 1987; cited in Hoshmand, 1989).

5. Use of any contextual material pertaining to the text (e.g. social, historical, individual) to reinterpret the categories.

To maintain confidentiality, the amount of contextual material that could be used was limited to happenings in the education system in general, and to material that was raised in the course of the interviews.

The end result of this process was a series of thematic statements for each interview that described the experience under study (parts 1,2,3) and that demonstrated understanding of the meaning of the text (parts 3,4,5). Principal and teacher descriptions for each school were compared to ascertain the extent of agreement between principal and teacher perceptions (refer to the result section for a description of the criteria used to judged similarity). The principal interviews were then analysed for commonalities
and an aggregate description of leadership produced which was added to the teacher analyses to arrive at an overall statement on the principal leadership role. Separately, perceived changes in the leadership role were used to produce an aggregate description of the changes. In the results section separate analyses are reported for the similarity between principal and teacher perceptions, for aggregate perceptions of principal leadership, and for aggregate perceptions of changes to the principal leadership role, although all of these analyses originate from the same information source. Research questions one, two, three and five were directly addressed by this methodology.

Following on from the school A example that was used previously, for the theme of "vision" the aggregate description was:

Having vision was considered to be one of the critical roles for the principal C1-3,4. The principal’s vision for the school was manifest in the directions that the school pursues B3-11; B4-26; D1-3, and these could be set in consultation with others D1-3, or in isolation, based on personal views of education; e.g. one principal believed that Schools of the Future gave principals the opportunity to establish a school that they see as appropriate I1-2,10. In establishing their vision, principals used their understanding of political and educational trends E1-3,4,5,8,9,10, community expectations E1-3, and discourse with teachers and school council members E1-8,9,10. The vision for the school may be formally contained in the school’s charter H1-4,6, and linked to the school finances through the way funds are distributed C1-4; it may project into the future as long as six years I1-6,7.

Some principals described difficulties with fulfilling their educational visions. Having vision was acknowledged as being important, but it was also noted that it was not always apparent how the vision could be fulfilled A1-4. The unsettled educational climate during which the interviews were conducted led one principal to comment that the current focus had to be on the short term rather than on long term
visions, with the emphasis on ensuring that changes in education did not have an immediate and negative impact on the primary tasks of teaching and learning K1-3,4.

There was disagreement concerning the extent to which principals' visions were articulated to staff. Teachers indicated both that their principal's vision was articulated C4-35; C5-34,35; D4-22; D5-30 and that it was not A4-25; C2-23; J4-27; J5-31; E2-30; E3-20; E5-26. Vision was also viewed as not present J3-17,18,21,22, or expressed surreptitiously through hidden agendas of the principal A3-21.

The visions stated involved whole school initiatives such as: promoting a climate of student care and achievement, which reflects community values D4-24,25, encouraging a conservative, technology centred, adult environment l1-5,8; the implementation of the school charter and adoption of a new organisational structure H1-5; catering for needs of local community in a small school setting A1-8; growing and being visible in the community B1-6; E5-26; giving the school an international perspective C1-7; becoming a language school C5-34,35, and, implementing structural reform so that staff have clearly defined roles C1-4.

From this description it is clear how the relatively specific features found in the common theme from one school become a much more detailed theme when all the interviews are included. Principal and teacher views from a number of interviews are used to form the final statement concerning the vision component of principal leadership. Since, the final thematic statement uses information from a number of interviews it does not represent any one person's view, but does represent the various aspects of this theme that participants were discussing.

The description of the theme of vision highlights a significant aspect of this research - the departure from the usual methods of textually organising phenomenological writing. This description is somewhat removed and
abstract from the interviews used to generate it. To arrive at a description that better represented the feeling of this aspect of leadership would need many more words, the use of extensive examples from the interviews and weaving of these examples to form a style of narrative that displays the essence of the phenomenon; van Manen (1990:168-173) describes five different styles of narrative in phenomenological writing. As the transcripts and thematic analysis have been included with this research, and so that the description of leadership was presented concisely, the examples have been omitted from the description, but a reference to the original interview has been included. For the reader, what is missed in terms of the insight that can be generated in the rich narrative aspect of phenomenological writing is gained in the clarity of the concise interpretation of the interviews. Those readers that also want to read the original words of the participants have the opportunity through the reference system that is used.

The final stage in the analysis was to connect the interpretations with the school leadership literature. Using the literature on school leadership allows connections to be made with past knowledge, it places the research in the context of current knowledge, it broadens knowledge and it helps to make sense of the information (Minichiello et al., 1990: 70-73). For example, the theme of vision is used in the discussion of instructional and transformational leadership presented in chapter five. This stage of the analysis departed from the hermeneutic phenomenological tradition because theories of school leadership were used to construct further meaning out of the interpretations; this analysis addressed research question four.

There are other features of the analysis that are worth highlighting. All analysis occurred after the interviews were completed. This is not usually the case in interpretative analysis, as analysis would normally occur with the collection of data so that the analysis could be fed back into the data collection process, creating an interpretative cycle (Osborne, 1990) or emergent study design (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 248). In this research, by asking each participant similar questions, they each had the same opportunity to discuss their perceptions of principal leadership, but as the questions were broad and
open they also allowed the participants to define the limits of the questions individually. The analysis process described in this section has many parallels with quantitative analysis, particularly factor analysis. For example, data were collected in a consistent way across all subjects, the data were searched for commonalities in a flexible but structured manner, and a number of iterations of the search were needed before a good fit was achieved.

**DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

With any research there are delimitations and limitations. Delimitation is concerned with the assigning of boundaries, whilst limitation is concerned with the restrictions and qualifications that are placed on the findings. With this research much of the discussion of these issues arises through the use of a qualitative methodology and the freedoms and constraints this imposes. In this section, benefits and problems associated with the use of qualitative methods in general are identified and related to this research. Then, an elaborate system for establishing the trustworthiness of findings from qualitative studies is described and, again, related to this research. Through these discussions, the delimitations and limitations of the research become clear.

The major delimitations of this research are that it is concerned with the phenomenon of principal leadership and that the boundaries of the research are largely determined by the perceptions that the principal and teacher participants bring to the research (this is the focus-determined nature of naturalistic inquiry that is emphasised by Lincoln and Guba, 1985; 42). The research is further delimited in that the focus is on principals of secondary schools involved in a major educational reform. The findings of this research may have applicability outside of these boundaries, although no such implication is automatically implied by the research. It also needs to be emphasised that only principals and teachers were interviewed. Ancillary staff, teacher aides, students, parents and community members could also have been interviewed to gain other perspectives on the principal leadership
role. The inclusion of members from these groups would have provided a greater variety of views, but this was beyond the scope of the current research which is specifically focused on principal leadership from principal and teacher perspectives. A further delimitation is that the research is descriptive and interpretative rather than experimental and theory building, thus emphasising the distinction between naturalistic and positivist inquiry (Colaizzi, 1978). In this research the principal leadership role was described by the principal and teacher participants, this was interpreted by the researcher and from this emerged a series of findings which were compared to previous research and which indicated further research directions. However, this research is not designed to be able to substantiate causal relationships between perceived principal leadership and individual or organisational behaviour, nor is it designed to test a particular theoretical position, although analysis of the findings did provide support for three current leadership conceptions (see chapter five).

The major limitations are those associated with research employing qualitative methodologies. These will now be explored using a list of benefits and problems associated with qualitative research methods that Miles and Huberman (1984: 15-16) have developed. They describe the benefits and problems as:

Benefits

1. Provides rich descriptions and interpretations of social phenomena.
2. It can lead to surprising findings and to new theoretical integrations, because the research does not have to be constrained by initial preconceptions and frameworks.
3. The findings may be more attractive and more persuasive to many readers because the findings are presented as words, not numbers.

Problems

1. The time and financial demands of the data collection and analysis.
2 The limited degree of sampling means that generalisability is often questionable.

3 Because it relies heavily on the researcher's interpretation there may be increased chance of researcher bias.

4 The methods of qualitative data analysis are not always clearly formulated. This may lead to a lack of guidelines on data collection that make it difficult for the research to be replicated (this criticism is not shared by everyone, especially those phenomenologists that argue that there is no one social reality to measure).

The benefits listed above are all present in this research. Indeed, as discussed previously, a qualitative methodology was chosen so that a rich description of principal leadership could be generated, so that the research could proceed without the constraints imposed by adopting an initial theoretical position, and to enable most of the findings to be presented in words so that access to the findings did not, for example, require specialist knowledge of statistical processes. However, the problems mentioned are also present to varying degrees and are described below.

Time and financial demands were not high during the data collection as each participant was interviewed once, and in most cases all the interviews at each school were completed in one or two visits. The analysis of the data did consume a significant amount of time as all interviews had to be transcribed by the researcher (a one hour interview took more than six hours to transcribe), sent back to participants for checking, then each interview analysed as described above. The extent of the work during analysis is indicated by the more than 500 pages of interview transcripts and thematic analysis included in appendices 1 and 2 and on the accompanying computer floppy disk. The analysis was completed by the researcher using a Macintosh LC 575 computer running ClarisWorks word processing software. The use of a qualitative analysis software program called NUD.IST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing, Searching and Theorising; Richards and Richards, 1993) was explored, but the program was found to be incompatible with the researcher's computer hardware; the authors of NUD.IST could not
supply a fix for the incompatibility problems in time for its use in this research. There may have been a time saving had the NUDIST program been able to be used, although, the analysis process used would still remain time consuming with or without specialised software.

The second of Miles and Huberman's problems concerns generalisability. As discussed previously, generalisability is not part of the assumptions that underlie naturalistic inquiry. In hermeneutic phenomenology, the study of even one person can be revealing of a phenomena. Due to the nature of the research questions -- describing principal leadership from principal and teacher perspectives and comparing these perspectives -- it was important in this research to use a number of participants across a number of sites.

The third problem mentioned by Miles and Huberman, the issue of researcher bias, is addressed below in the discussion of trustworthiness.

The final area of concern is associated with replication. Like the concept of generalisability, replication is not part of the assumptions that underlie naturalistic inquiry. However, within the naturalistic framework the concept of trustworthiness has components that have many parallels to the positivistic concepts of generalisability and replication. Trustworthiness is discussed in the next section.

TRUSTWORTHINESS

In recent years there has been a focus on explicating qualitative methodologies and to addressing the issues of reliability and validity (Hoshmand, 1989; Miles and Huberman, 1984; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Tesch, 1990). In describing the naturalistic research paradigm, Lincoln and Guba (1985) devote considerable attention to the problems of reliability and validity of qualitative research by describing an exhaustive process that seeks to establish trustworthiness in findings derived from qualitative analysis; Lincoln and Guba use the term trustworthiness to indicate the extent to which findings of a qualitative inquiry are "worth paying attention to, worth taking
account of" (page 290). Trustworthiness has four components:

1. Truth value or credibility.
   This is concerned with the extent to which a study is credible to the participants involved in the study and with the context in which the study was conducted.

2. Applicability or transferability.
   This is concerned with the provision of enough information to allow others to judge the extent to which the findings of a particular study can be applied to other participants in similar or different contexts.

3. Consistency or dependability.
   This is concerned with judgment of the extent to which the findings are grounded in the data and would be repeated with similar participants in similar contexts.

4. Neutrality or confirmability.
   This is concerned with the extent to which findings are attributes of the participants and context and not attributes of the researcher.

Lincoln and Guba compare these respectively to the positivist paradigm terms of internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity. They provide arguments for the adoption of the trustworthiness terms over the positivist terms; the terms they use reflect the axioms upon which their naturalistic paradigm is based and which were mentioned above. The hermeneutic phenomenological methodology is also based on the axioms of the naturalistic paradigm. Thus, Lincoln and Guba's concept of trustworthiness is applicable to this research.

Lincoln and Guba suggest the following ways to address each of the components of trustworthiness:

1. Credibility
Credibility is gained through:

1. Prolonged engagement - being involved for a sufficiently long time to appreciate the context of the phenomenon.
2. Persistent observation - being able to identify the most important features to study.
3. Triangulation - the use of multiple and different sources, methods, investigators and/or theories.
4. Peer debriefing - use of a critical reviewer.
5. Negative case analysis - refining of a hypothesis until it accounts for all, or most known cases.
6. Referential adequacy - using a portion of the data as archival data for testing of findings.
7. Member checking - the use of participants to check the data, analytic categories, interpretations and conclusions.

2. Transferability

This is concerned with the provision of 'thick description' (data-base of the time and context of the study) that allows others to judge transferability. Lincoln and Guba (1985: 316) argue that the researcher does not make the judgment of transferability; indeed, it does not make sense for the researcher to attempt to make this judgment given that the naturalistic paradigm assumes multiple realities. It is the responsibility of those who may use the findings to judge whether the findings are relevant to their situation. All the researcher needs to do is to ensure that there are sufficient data available for others to make the judgment of transferability.

3. Dependability and Confirmability

Both of these are achieved by the use of an audit using what is called the Halpern algorithm. Essentially this is a summative evaluation of the study and involves:
1 Keeping of various records of the research: raw data; data reduction and analysis products; data reconstruction and synthesis products; process notes; materials relating to intentions and dispositions; and, instrument development information.

2 Engaging a person(s) to conduct the audit with a view to examining the process and the product of the study; by doing so this establishes the dependability and confirmability of the study.

Assessment of dependability is a judgment of the extent to which the findings of the study would be repeated given a similar context. This judgment is achieved by assessing the processes used in the research including: judging the appropriateness of inquiry decisions and methodological shifts; judging inquirer bias (early closure, not accounting for all data, not looking for negative cases, the extent to which practical matters influenced the data, extent of premature judgments, cooption of inquirer, Pygmalion effect, Hawthorne effect, level of sophistication of the inquiry, homogeneous sampling, reliance on one method of data collection); and, judging the overall design (building-in dependability, ensuring there is purposive/responsive flexibility).

Assessment of confirmability is a judgment of the extent to which the findings are grounded in the data. This judgment is achieved by assessing the outcomes of the research including: sampling of findings and tracing back to the raw data; judging if the inferences made are logical by investigating the analytic techniques used, appropriateness of category labels, quality of interpretations and the possibility of alternative explanations; investigating the utility of the category structures used (clarity, fit and explanatory power); judging the extent of inquirer bias (preponderance of inquirer terminology, over imposition of a priori theoretical concepts and presence or absence of introspection); and, assessing accommodation strategies (confirmability steps used, accommodation of negative examples).
3 Preparation of an auditor's report.

Lincoln and Guba (1985; 327) also suggest the keeping of a reflexive journal to help document the trustworthiness process. This journal would record:

1. The daily schedule and logistics of the study.
2. A personal diary for catharsis, reflection and insight recording.
3. A methodological log for decision and rationale recording.

TRUSTWORTHINESS PROCEDURES USED

In the current research credibility was enhanced by the use of triangulation and limited member checking. Triangulation involved the collection of information from different sources (principals and teachers) across different sites (ten schools). Member checking involved participants checking their interview transcripts for accuracy and providing informal feedback on a summary of the findings given to each participant. Member checking of the analytic categories and of the interpretations was not used due to the need to interview a large number of participants (refer to pages 87 and 107). The other features of credibility mentioned by Lincoln and Guba (1985) are either not applicable (prolonged engagement, persistent observation, negative case analysis), or too expensive of time (peer debriefing) and data (referential adequacy).

Transferability was enhanced by the provision of a discussion of the general context in which schools were operating in, and aggregate summaries of the main features of the schools, principals and teachers.

The audit procedure that was suggested for the assessment of dependability and confirmability was not used in this research due to the cost involved (time and money) of engaging an independent auditor. However, descriptions of aspects mentioned in the audit process are supplied, including the transcripts and derived meaning units of all interviews, clear description of the analysis process and justification of the summaries of the interviews; the provision of
this information follows the trend of phenomenological researchers in providing enough information about the methodology and analysis so that others who do not normally use this research paradigm can evaluate the work (Hoshmand, 1989:29). Also, the provision of a comprehensive literature review details the researcher's prior understandings of the phenomenon under study which can be used to judge the extent of inquirer bias (this process is sometimes referred to as 'bracketing'; Osborne, 1990). Whilst these procedures are not as comprehensive as Lincoln and Guba (1985: 327) specified, they note that their criteria are open-ended and not capable of producing unassailable trust. They also note that the operationalisation of the trustworthiness criteria is still developing. Thus, whilst the procedures adopted for this research may not be as persuasive as a full 'audit', they still provide evidence for the trustworthiness of the findings.

SUMMARY OF DELIMITATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The delimitations of this research are the use of a descriptive and interpretive study of principal leadership using the perceptions of principals and teachers and focussing on secondary Schools of the Future. The limitations of this research concern the trustworthiness procedures used. Whilst these procedures were not as comprehensive as Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest, it was argued that confidence could be placed in the trustworthiness of the findings.

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

All 17 pilot secondary schools in the North-West metropolitan region of Victoria were invited to participate with 10 schools accepting. All schools were single campus. The average number of students was 830, with a range from 463 to 1300. Seven of the schools had increasing or stable enrolments, two had enrolments that had peaked and may possibly decline in the future, whilst one had declining enrolments and concerns that the school may not be able to survive. The average number of teachers was 63, with a range from 48 to 92. Six schools were described as consisting of a multicultural mix of
students, whilst the other four consisted of predominantly Anglo-Saxon students. Two schools were inner-suburban (less than 5 km from Melbourne GPO), three were suburban (5-10 km), three were outer-suburban (10-20 km), and two were semi-rural (these schools were located in satellite townships of Melbourne and had a significant number of students who were bussed to the school from the surrounding country). Two schools reported a low socio-economic status for students' families; three reported low to average, two were average, one school was average to high, and two varied across the range. Thus, the schools are fairly large, come from a variety of residential settings, with a variety of student populations.

The participants consisted of the principal and four teachers from six schools, the principal and six teachers from one school, and the principal only from three schools. All principals were volunteers who agreed to participate after introductory letters from the researcher and from Fay Thomas, the chairperson of longitudinal research Leading Victoria's Schools of the Future, and follow-up telephone contact by the researcher. Principals were asked to help in securing four teachers consisting of one teacher from the AST 2/3 ranks, two teachers who have been at the school for five or more years and one teacher who has been recently appointed, but at the school for at least one year, with a balance in gender and the inclusion of the curriculum coordinator where possible. AST 2 or 3 teachers usually have senior leadership roles and whilst these positions are school defined and school selected, they are positions that are advertised system-wide. The selection of participants gave a cross-section of views with representation from teachers in defined leadership positions (AST 2 and 3 teachers), teachers who had been in the school for several years and teachers who had been recently appointed to the school; the curriculum coordinator was included to provide useful insights into the extent of involvement of the principal in curriculum matters.

It is often the case in studies that use a qualitative methodology for the research sample to be of an emergent design, guided by the analysis of the information already collected (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:234; Minichiello et al., 1990:199). In this process, the sample of people, sites, or things is not fixed at
the beginning of the research. Lincoln and Guba (1985:233) refer to Patton's term of maximum variation sampling to describe this process. It is a fluid process whose form is controlled by the researcher's interpretations of what information needs to be collected to inform the research, with the collection process continuing until information redundancy occurs (that is, when the collection of more information will not reveal new insights). Other sample designs include using extreme or deviant cases, typical cases, critical cases, politically important or sensitive cases, and convenient cases (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 233).

To have described the principal leadership role, it may have been sufficient to have interviewed ten or so principals, Lincoln and Guba (1985:235) believe that a dozen well-executed interviews of members of one group are usually sufficient to exhaust the available information of that group. However, this research was particularly concerned to gather principal and teacher perspectives and to determine the similarity of these perspectives. It was decided to do this on a school by school basis. Thus, there was a need to include a number of schools sites. At each school site a sufficient number of teachers had to be interviewed so that a judgment of similarity could be made, but the number of teachers had to be kept low to ensure that the information collected was manageable. The collection of teacher participants used both typical case and convenient case approaches. The typical case approach was apparent in the selection of the types of teachers that were requested to be involved (e.g. the requirement to include the curriculum coordinator). The convenient case approach was apparent in the actual method of obtaining the teacher samples and is described in the next paragraph. It was decided that the selection of a cross section of four teachers from each school site would allow the data collection and analysis to be manageable, but would still enable the research questions to be addressed. Having forty people (10 principals and 30 teachers) is a large number of participants for describing the leadership role, whilst the use of seven schools where principals and teachers were interviewed allows for comparison of principal and teacher perceptions.

The convenient case sampling of teachers occurred in the techniques
principals used to help select the teachers that were interviewed. Principals at the seven schools where teachers were interviewed were all most accommodating in the teacher selection process. Three allocated a time for the interviews to occur, and then sought cooperation from the curriculum coordinator and other staff that met the requirements. Thus, the staff interviewed at these schools consisted of people who were available for interview during the allotted time, who met the criteria and who were willing to be interviewed. Three principals gained the cooperation of appropriate staff and then arranged interview times. At one school, teacher cooperation was gained by the researcher attending a staff meeting and asking for volunteers; this was the only school in which the curriculum coordinator was not interviewed.

The approach to gathering teacher participants resulted in the selection of teachers that satisfied the selection criteria and who were available for interview. However, the method can be criticised on the grounds that principals may only have selected teachers that were sympathetic to their leadership style. As this research was concerned with teacher perceptions of the principal leadership role and not an evaluation by teachers of their principal's leadership, it does not matter whether the teachers were supportive of the principal or not. Also, when comparing teacher and principal perceptions of the leadership role, whether teachers are supportive or not of their principal should not influence their degree of understanding of the leadership role of their principal; a teacher does not have to agree with a principal's leadership to be able to comment on the principal's leadership role. What is important is that the teachers can comment on the leadership role of their principal. Thus, asking principals to help select teachers should not diminish the research even if they only selected teachers who were sympathetic to them. Had the research an evaluative focus it would have been important to balance opinion by selecting teachers who were both supportive and non-supportive of the way their principal led the school. It should be noted that in all the schools there was at least one teacher who was openly critical of aspects of their principal's leadership; some teachers even expressed surprise that they were asked to participate.
At the three schools where teachers were not interviewed, in two cases this was because the principals felt that their staff was already over-committed, whilst in one case, the principal was a recent appointment and felt it inappropriate for staff to be interviewed. The seven principals that declined to participate all cited work pressure as the reason, whilst three also believed that their teachers were committed with too many other things to enable them to participate.

All interviews were held during the months of May and June in 1994, which coincides with the second term of the Victorian school year. Each participant was informed before interviewing that the interviews would be taped and the transcripts published. Each participant had the right to withdraw from the research, and they had the opportunity to correct any errors of fact, or to delete or add information to the transcripts; ten participants changed their interview transcripts. Anonymity was assured through the use of codes for the teachers and schools involved.

Mean and standard deviations for principal and teacher characteristics are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviations for Principal and Teacher Characteristics of Age, Experience in Role, Experience at School and Experience with Principal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience in role</th>
<th>Experience at school</th>
<th>Experience with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>48.1 (3.5)</td>
<td>7.3 (4.2)</td>
<td>5.2 (2.9)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>39.2 (8.3)</td>
<td>15.0 (8.0)</td>
<td>6.7 (5.6)</td>
<td>4.4 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** standard deviations in brackets, all measures in years.
There were 9 male principals, 1 female principal, 16 male teachers and 14 female teachers interviewed. Principals and teachers were generally well experienced, with the majority of principals having more than seven years experience as principal (all but one having at least three years at their current school) and over two-thirds of teachers having between seven and 23 years of teaching experience. The school and principal characteristics are similar to those of secondary schools in the pilot phase of Schools of the Future in which it was noted that the schools “come from all sectors, are of varying size and structure, and that they are a fairly representative set of schools” (Caldwell and Thomas, 1994:4), with two thirds of principals in the 40-49 age group, two thirds with more than five years experience as a principal, and half with more than five years as principal at their current school. The major difference in the principals used in this research and those from the pilot schools was that female principals are under represented in this research with 11% of principals female compared to 22% in the pilot schools; although the use of one female principal in this research is proportionally representative of the two female principals of the 17 schools asked to participate.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The results reported in this chapter are derived from the analyses of the interview transcripts. The transcripts of the interviews and the initial thematic analysis of the interviews are included on the attached computer floppy disks. Appendix one contains the completed analysis process resulting in the production of common themes for each principal interview and for each set of teacher interviews. A general description of each school and the conduct of the interviews is also given. Appendix two contains the analysis of the similarity between principal and teacher perceptions.

The results of this research are presented in the following order:

1. Summary of Similarity in Principal and Teacher Perceptions.

2. Leadership Role Description from Principal and Teacher Interviews.

3. Changes in the Principal Leadership Role Since the Introduction of Schools of the Future: Principal and Teacher Perspectives.

These constitute the main findings of the research with further analysis provided in chapter five where these findings are connected with the leadership literature.

SUMMARY OF SIMILARITY IN PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

The findings presented in this section are a summary and extension of the analyses presented in appendix 2. In this section it is shown that principals and teachers had similar perceptions of the principal leadership role.

Table 3 shows the degree of agreement between the principal and teacher interviews for the seven schools involved in the full set of interviews; the
analysis on which this table is based is included in appendix two. Table 3 includes three types of analysis: the extent of agreement between principal and teacher perceptions for common themes identified by both principals and teachers; the number of additional themes that either had principal or teacher only support; and, an overall judgment of the similarity in principal and teacher perception for each school.

For each common theme, the degree of agreement in perception between the principal and the teachers who identified that theme was judged as high, moderate or low. High agreement meant that the principal and the teachers were identifying the same features. Moderate agreement meant that there was ambivalence in the teacher support for the principal's view; some teachers may have supported the principal perceptions, whilst others did not, or teachers as a group indicated both support and non-support. Low agreement meant that teachers had differing views to the principal's.

To ascertain whether the descriptions were similar or not within each school, two criteria were used: the ratio of common themes to additional themes (there should be more common themes than additional themes for similar descriptions) and the degree of agreement within the common themes (the majority of common themes should have at least moderate agreement for similar descriptions).

**Table 3: Summary of the Comparisons Between the Principal and Teacher Interviews.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. Themes</th>
<th>Common Themes</th>
<th>Additional Themes</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High agree. Moderate agree. Low agree.</td>
<td>Principal Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Principal and teacher perceptions of the leadership role of the principal were largely the same. All seven schools produced descriptions that were judged to be similar. All the schools had more common themes than additional themes, nearly two thirds of the common themes showed high agreement between the principal and teacher perceptions, and there was close to 90% of the common themes showing high or moderate agreement. The small number of low agreement common themes and the presence of additional themes indicates that, although there is substantial agreement, there remains some minor differences; patterns in these differences will be discussed in chapter five.

Judgments of similarity based on Table 3 do not indicate the depth of teacher support, whether it is one or two teachers who are agreeing with the principal's perceptions, or whether it is three of four teachers. Clearly, three or four teachers supporting their principal's perception provides greater support for a judgment of similarity than does only one or two. Table 4 indicates the extent of teacher support for both the common and additional themes by showing the number of teachers supporting the theme and the number of themes for each category. The categories used are the high, moderate and low agreement for the common themes, plus the additional themes. The extent of teacher support is shown by expressing the number of themes in each category that had support from three or more teachers as a percentage of the total number of themes for that category. A high percentage indicates that the most of the themes in the category were supported by the majority of teachers.
Table 4: Extent of Teacher Support for Common and Additional Themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Category</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Number of Themes</th>
<th>Percentage of Themes with at least 3 Teacher Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Agreement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Agreement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Themes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 For the one school where six teachers were interviewed, the number of teachers was proportionally distributed as though it had four teachers interviewed.

From Table 4 it is evident that there is strong support amongst teachers for the common themes identified. In the high agreement category of the common themes, 61% of the themes identified were supported by at least three teachers. As these themes constitute nearly 44% of the total number of common themes, clearly teachers as a group were identifying leadership characteristics that their principal had also identified. The moderate and low agreement themes constitute 17% and 11% respectively of the total number of common themes, with both showing a high proportion of the themes identified by three or more teachers. For the low support group, this indicates that there were a few occasions when teachers as a group, disagreed with their principal's perception. The strong differences between principal and
teacher perceptions occurred in the themes of decision making at school A, personal characteristics at schools A, E and J, interaction with teachers at school B, and values at school D. For the moderate group, again the majority of themes had three or four teachers identifying the theme. However, in this group, the pattern was for there to be pi-polar viewpoints amongst teachers on some principal characteristics. For example, at schools A, F and J some teachers believed that the principal interacted well with teachers, whilst some took the opposite view.

Also from Table 4, it is evident that support for the additional themes was not strong as over 80% of the themes were supported by one or two teachers only. This may reflect aspects of the principalship that are specific to certain teacher interactions. For example, in five schools interaction with students was identified by one or two teachers as an additional theme. The lack of wide support for the additional themes suggests that the strength of the common themes identified is the main criteria for judgment of similarity.

In summary, whilst the descriptions generated in these interviews have differences, on balance, the similarities are greater than the differences suggesting that the descriptions can be labelled as similar. The findings of this section suggest that teachers and principals have a similar understanding of the core elements of the principal leadership role. Due to this finding, there is little to be gained by presenting separate descriptions of principal leadership based on principal and on teacher perceptions. Thus, in the next section, the description of principal leadership is based on the perceptions of both principals and teachers.

LEADERSHIP ROLE DESCRIPTION FROM PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS

From the analyses of the interviews a complex description of the leadership role of the principal emerged. The leadership role could not be described by referring to only a few features. Rather, the leadership role appears to be
divided into a large number of features which have been described under 17 thematic headings.

Table 5 shows the major themes derived from the principal and teacher interviews. The table indicates whether the themes have been supported by principals and/or teachers, and it indicates the schools where support was found. The themes are arranged in descending order according to the number of principal and teachers interviews that support the theme. Thus, the first described theme is the most widely mentioned, with the last theme the least mentioned.

Table 5: Summary of the Themes Generated From All Interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>X2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td>X T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with teachers</td>
<td>X T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involvement</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with students</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic awareness</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; financial role</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power &amp; political aware.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School council role</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
X - both the principal and teacher interviews included the theme.
P - only the principal interview included the theme.
T - only the teacher interviews included the theme.

Notes:
1 Schools H, I and K had only the principal interviewed.
2 Labelled decision making and communication in the interview analysis.
3 In the interview analyses this theme was usually labelled as public relations and/or school promotion.
4 Labelled as *symbolic and cultural awareness* in the principal interview analysis, but *cultural awareness* in the teacher interview analysis.
5 Labelled *financial role* in the interview analysis.
6 Labelled *business view* in the interview analysis.
7 Labelled *political awareness* in the interview analysis.
8 Labelled *power* in the interview analysis.

Clearly there are many aspects to the principal leadership role. The themes of *wider knowledge, decision making and values* were found in the principal and teacher descriptions of all schools. The themes of *personal characteristics, interaction with teachers, initiating ideas and vision* were found in most principal and teacher descriptions. Apart from the theme of *school council role* which was found in only two principal descriptions, the other themes were found in a substantial number of the principal and teacher descriptions. *Interaction with students* and *marketing* were cited more often by teachers than principals, whilst *symbolic awareness* and *accountability* were cited more often by principals than teachers.

The description of the principal leadership role is an aggregate description derived from 40 interviews. As such, it does not reflect any one principal’s leadership role with total accuracy. However, the description is a fair representation for most principals. From the schools which included interviews with principals and teachers the number of themes ranged from 12 to 17. In the three schools without teacher interviews, the number of themes was 12, 9 and 7; the lower number of themes is not surprising given that the analysis in these schools was based on interviewing one person rather than the five or seven of the other schools. Thus, for most principals, their leadership role covered substantially similar thematic areas to the 17 themes of the aggregate description.

Each of the themes shown above will now be explored in detail. Support for each theme can be traced back to the original interviews, recorded on the attached computer floppy disk, by using the references provided. A reference such as A1-5 refers to person A1, and page 5 of the interviews from school A. The number 1 was always used for principal interviews. Number 2 was
mostly used for the curriculum coordinator interviews (except in school B
where the curriculum coordinator was not interviewed). Numbers greater
than or equal to 3 indicated decreasing experience with the principal; thus,
teacher A6 had less experience working with principal A1 than did teacher A4.

THEMES

WIDER KNOWLEDGE

This theme emerged in all the schools for both teacher and principal
interviews.

The theme of wider knowledge is concerned with the extra knowledge that
principals might bring to a school. The knowledge was gained by: reading
research A1-10; E1-3; E5-29; J1-5; developing external networks (including
establishing business contacts) A1-7; C1-5,6; E2-30; E3-21,22; E4-23; H1-7; F3-26; being
involved in external programs C1-5,6; J1-6; J4-27; using external experts J5-33; K1-2;
visiting other schools A1-10; H1-2; attending professional development programs
F1-3; F3-24; using demographic data 11-6,7; J1-8. Principals are having to spend
more time in the wider community gathering information, promoting their
school C1-3,6 and being involved in DSE programs A3-18; C2-20,23; E3-19,21; J1-6; J4-
27.

By gaining the broad perspective that this knowledge brings, principals were
able to operate within a relatively coherent framework in terms of vision and
direction E1-3; E2-30. Also, external contacts could be usefully employed in
satisfying school needs A1-11,12; E2-30; H1-2,4,7,10, and staff noted that principals
would use their wider knowledge to keep staff informed J4-27,28.

The range of knowledge that was cited covered many areas including:
1. Being aware of, and analysing, educational, political and historical trends in
   Australia A1-11,12; C1-6; E1-3,4,5,14, and overseas E1-5; J1-5; K1-2.
2. Understanding the implications of imposed educational initiatives D1-9,10; D3-
3. Using past experiences to inform the present: e.g. curriculum development

4. Understanding how to use the educational system to obtain that which is desired

5. Understanding and using psychological theories

6. Utilising business management theory and programs (e.g. Total Quality Management)

7. Using demographic trends

VALUES

Values that principals held were gathered from all interviews. The characteristics described are those that were either directly mentioned in the interviews, or could be reasonably deduced from the interviews. In categorising the values, a framework developed by Leithwood and Steinbach (1991; cited in Leithwood, Begley and Cousins, 1994:103) was used. In a review of four related studies on principal leadership they discovered that the most frequently cited value categories were 'professional values' followed by 'basic human values', 'social-political values' and 'general moral values' with 'general moral values' and 'social and political values' having the highest degree of common core values amongst the 34 participating principals (Leithwood et al., 1994:105) The values that the principals in the current research held included:

**Basic human values** (principles, terminal values referring to end states of existence)

Freedom was demonstrated by one principal who wanted total freedom from the central bureaucracy to run the school and who also wanted teachers to be less reliant on the principal.

Respect for others was shown by principals trusting staff and allowing them to
make mistakes E1-7; E1-16, valuing the opinions of others F3-25, and wanting to support staff C1-5; D1-10; E7-41.

Optimism was demonstrated with one principal’s positive school focus H1-4.

Curiosity was demonstrated by a principal’s view that change was exciting, stimulating I1-12 and necessary, and that it needs to happen quickly, within eighteen months before the “window of opportunity closes” I1-2,12. Also, the view was expressed that it is better to be involved in the forefront of initiatives, such as Schools of the Future, than to sit back K1-2

**General moral values** (those relevant to judging the ethical dimensions of decisions)

There was a strong sense of social justice A1-8,8,9,13 and fairness F1-10; D1-5; D2-16; D3-18; D4-25, e.g. “the school has to have a balanced whole school plan that includes curriculum, welfare and extra-curricular activities” C1-8. One principal described himself as a socialist I1-3, who was committed to the idea of State education and who believed that schools were powerful institutions capable of changing people I1-2,11.

**Professional values** (those relevant to guiding decisions at work)

The principal’s role was viewed as a central part of the school, important for school survival A1-8,11,12 and important for curriculum development K1-4. Whilst this role was considered to be different from the role of teacher, it was emphasised that the principal was still a teacher E1-11. The similarity of the principal and teacher roles was shown by principals’ concern for the improvement of teaching and learning H1-5,6,10,14; C1-8; B1-4; J1-8; I1-3,9, which must also be a concern for teachers. However, the principal role is distinguished from that of teacher by the focus of principal responsibilities often extending to the whole school. For example, principals believed that it was their responsibility to ensure that good teaching and learning occurred in the school I1-2, and that an ordered system operated where people can
experience purpose and achievement C1-4.

Many of the aspects that reflect a business orientated approach to schooling were valued by principals including having a client/customer focus B1-4,7, being competitive D5-30, and being focussed on accountability and the capacity to demonstrate continuous improvement B1-6,7; H1-8; E1-10; E5-26; E7-40. Further discussion of the business focus is included below in the Business and financial role theme.

A political dimension was apparent. Some principals described themselves as political E1-1; E5-26, whilst others discussed the importance of power in terms of the manipulation and control used in bringing about change and improvement H1-9. The political dimension was also reflected in the view that as long as students learn and are well disciplined, the community and the Government will not interfere with the running of the school E1-3. Some principals were described as conservative with respect to curriculum D2-12,15 and in their approach to change J3-17,23. Others were described as wanting to be at the forefront of education C2-17 and providing an exciting place for students B5-13,17,18,22.

Other professional values included:
Fostering constructive myths E1-16.
Big schools were seen to offer the most advantages B5-15.
The challenge of keeping the school "running on an even keel through this period of turmoil"; this was a challenge that the principal was looking forward to K1-5.

Social and political values (those that recognise social nature of human action)

Sharing and participation were two values that were demonstrated by the emphasis some principals had on consulting and involving people in a team approach J1-3,9; J2-12; J4-27; J5-31 which empowers others H1-2. Thus, principals valued working closely with teachers and union branches H1-9; fostering good
relations with staff B3-10; using open door policies H1-12; valuing collaboration and team work F1-8; F4-16; D1-3; D4-25; keeping staff informed A4-27; having high regard for the opinions of others F3-25; and, family support for school success A1-10.

Commitment to the school and local community was also evident A1-5; C2-17; D4-25. Principals displayed pride in their school A1-8 and sought to satisfy parental expectations B5-13,17,18,22. They also believed that schools reflect society C1-5 and that there is a need to explicate this within the school through greater contacts with the external world C1-6.

The centrality of people was shown in principals relying on the people in the school to achieve the school goals C1-7, and in the desirability to have new blood in the school D1-7. Principals had respect for teachers F3-25, saw them as professionals K1-4 and wanted to have good relations with the staff and not be seen as “that little bastard who sits up in the office and tells them what to do” K1-8. Principals were visible both around the school D1-3; l1-2; J4-26; J5-32 and in the classroom J1-6,7.

DECISION MAKING

This theme emerged in all the schools for both teacher and principal interviews. This is a large theme containing three sub-themes labelled decision making method, communication and control.

Decision making method

The typical style of decision making did not rely on the principal making decisions in isolation. Although the principal was central to the process, the active involvement of others was a feature of most of the schools. The type of decision making was variously described as using: negotiation K1-4; consensus A2-30; E1-6,12; K1-5; collaboration E4-24; E5-26; H1-3; D1-4; consultation J1-9; open and democratic processes involving the whole school F1-3,5; F2-9; F3-24;
For example, there were committees described where the principal was actively involved, but which made decisions based on consensus, with the principal accepting the decisions without modification. Principals believed that the staff must be allowed to make decisions without having to seek the endorsement of the principal, yet, in some schools staff were not willing to make decisions by themselves, and they believed that principals were too consultative and not decisive enough. Teachers appear to want more direction from their principal, and this may be due to increased workload and stress levels in teachers. Principals encouraged staff participation in decision making by modelling appropriate behaviours and by ensuring that staff had the necessary skills and attitudes. Participatory decision making was viewed as advantageous for the principal because it increased ownership and acceptance of decisions, and it helped to spread responsibility and accountability.

Although participatory decision making was a strong feature, it was considered that principals had to be directive at times, and that some decisions could not be subject to veto. Whilst principals believed there were times when they had to be directive, they were also concerned that the majority of staff supported their decisions, and that some decisions could not be subject to veto. One principal described the process as "bringing people with you in the...directions that the school has to move." Examples of situations where the principal had to be directive, but still gather staff support, included: introducing sport, restructuring pastoral care, adopting a staff appraisal system, and changing meeting schedules. Occasionally principals were authoritarian (e.g. if the administration committee could not make a decision), however, making unilateral decisions usually led to other problems such as lack of ownership that were considered to be worse than not having made a decision. However, some teachers believed principals were more directive and, with reductions in regional and central support, principals were having to make more decisions in isolation. Also, it was believed that increased administrative demands on principals was leading to a lessening of the time they have to devote to...
participatory decision making processes \( B4-26; B5-15 \).

In some schools the principal and a small group of senior staff operated as an additional and influential group to the normal decision making structures \( A1-6; B1-5; B5-22; C1-7; D1-5; D2-13,15; D5-31 \). This small group typically consisted of the principal and vice principal(s), along with AST3 teachers.

The overall style of decision making can be summarised as one that involved others, not only in the discussion concerning decisions, but in the accepting of decisions. This could be labelled as democratic decision making because relevant parties are involved in the process of accepting decisions (either through voting or consensus). However, there were times when principals withheld the right to vote on decisions. They still wanted to involve teachers, seek their views and have them understand the reasons behind decisions, but they believed that some issues were too significant to be subject to veto, even though they acknowledged the problems associated with this. Thus, the most appropriate term to describe the overall decision making style is that of participative decision making. To paraphrase DePree (1989), the emphasis was on having a say rather than having a vote.

One principal described a style of decision making that was at odds with the other principals; this principal considered schools to have hierarchies in which democratic processes would not work \( H1-3 \). In this school the principal gave the impression that he made decisions independent of teacher input. Thus, in discussing the school direction there was no sense of staff involvement in the process of deciding the direction, it appeared that it was the principal's vision that would be implemented \( H1-11 \). Control and manipulation were important aspect of this principal's work \( H1-7 \). As no teacher interviews were conducted at this school there is no confirmation of this principal's decision making style. Also, as this principal had occupied the principalship of this school for only one term, there was no indication of the current success of the principal's decision making approach.
Communication

If the dominant decision making style is to involve others, then communication is an important component. Principals need to gather information from teachers and others, and they need to convey information. In most schools in this research information flow was an important feature of the principal leadership role and integral to decision making. To gather information, principals employed open door policies F1-6, and used informal and formal meetings F1-6,7; F4-18; F5-14, such as the weekly staff and administrative committee meetings D1-4. Some principals wanted to know about everything that occurred in the school J1-7, whilst others did not A1-5. However, with increased work pressures experienced by principals there appeared to be less time for principals to spend with students and teachers which was making communication flow more difficult J4-26. To transmit information, principals used weekly bulletins, journal subscriptions, staff briefings, staff meetings J1-5 and informal groups E5-26. At one school the principal wanted the staff meetings to be for discussion of issues, but the staff preferred that they were information sessions J1-5. Teachers wanted the principal to keep them informed E6-33 and to allow open discussion B2-30; B3-9,10; B5-18; E7-39,40. Because teachers have fewer opportunities to work outside schools there was an increased need for principals to keep teachers informed F2-23. In some schools the communication process was viewed as too cumbersome and time consuming and in need of modification F1-7; J1-3. Examples of the sorts of communication structures schools use will be provided in the section on Initiating Ideas.

Control

Principals had considerable control over decision making. Principals were perceived to have ultimate authority and the power of veto over decisions made by the various school committees B1-5; B3-10; B4-25; C1-3,4,5,6,8; C2-22; C3-12; C4-26; C5-34; F1-10; H1-9. One principal believed that principals not only had decision making authority, but were expected by parents and the Directorate of School Education to exercise it H1-3,8. To demonstrate the control
principals have, one principal described how she changed, without consultation, the job descriptions for AST3 teachers after the appointments were made C1-4.5. This manipulation of the decision making processes was also noted by teachers C3-10,11,12,13; C5-33, with some teachers noting that their principal often had hidden agendas A2-32; A3-16,21; A5-37. However, this potential for control is not generally used as a matter of course. For example, one principal overruled the school administrative committee once in twelve months H1-9, whilst another principal, although having decided to introduce after-school sport, also sought teacher opinions B1-4. In general, principals and teachers emphasised collaboration and sharing rather than manipulation and control.

Whilst principals have considerable control, they are also bound by school council decisions D1-5 and are accountable to the Minister of Education and to Parliament D1-8,9.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Personal characteristics of the principals were gathered from all interviews except for the principal interview for school B. The characteristics described are those that were either directly mentioned in the interviews, or could be reasonably deduced from the interviews. The characteristics are divided into two broad categories: those that describe personality features and those that describe job-related personal skills.

**Personality features**

Fair D1-5; J1-9
Supportive D1-10; F1-7,9,10; F2-19
Trusting E1-7; E4-23; E5-27,28; E7-38
Forgiving of mistakes E1-7; E7-41; acknowledges own mistakes C4-26.
Honest E1-8; E7-39,40
A risk taker E-18
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Self-directing A1-4
Encouraging E4-23; E5-27,28; J1-3; motivating E2-30; E7-38
Enjoys working in teams H1-2,3,9
Positive H1-4
Ambitious: personally C4-28; C5-34; for the school B5-18.
Seeks self-improvement H1-10
Enjoys rapid and dynamic changes I1-2,12
Conscious of the image portrayed I1-3
Wants to know everything I1-7
Introspective, reflective K1-8
Tough K1-8
Pragmatic A2-30; E5-26; J3-18; K1-8.
Adaptable E5-28; K1-8
Decent human J3-17,21
Approachable E6-33,35; easy to be with J4-29
Well liked E7-42; friendly F2-19; F3-24
Weak personality A5-37
Complacent J3-24
Pessimistic A1-10,12
Lonely, due to isolation from staff A1-14; C1-8 and perceived differences in the role of the principal compared to the teaching staff I1-8.

Job-related personal skills

Views business management skills as necessary I1-5
Political E1-11
Wanting to discuss educational issues A1-4
Having a vision and staying focussed on the vision C1-3,4,7; C2-16,21,22; C4-27.
Being able to cope with time demands A1-5; being frustrated by the lack of time F1-12; not in control of time J1-7
Making hard decisions C1-8; comfortable with having and using power I1-8
Being an expert in many areas C1-3
Working hard, enthusiastic and wanting to do the job well D1-3; F1-12; a workaholic H1-7; energetic A1-5; A3-18,22; interested in all aspects of school F3-26;
hands-on B2-33; B5-19,20. Some principals felt that they could not do all that they wanted to J1-7,8.

Can identify strengths in others D1-5

Listens and works well with others F1-6; F3-24,25; K1-4; good team leader J5-34; wheeler and dealer A3-16,18,21,22.

Visible around the school F1-12; F3-26; F5-14 works up-front and has an open door policy H1-10,12; J5-32, and encourages open contact with the school community F1-6; not all principals saw themselves as being out in front J1-3

Good at running the school B5-13,17,18; C3-12,13; C4-26,28; C5-36.

Good communicator; good salesman E4-23,24; E7-41

Comfortable in managing finances K1-5.

Tight with money A2-34.

A feature of both sets of characteristics is the low rate of negative characteristics. Apart from the last four characteristics of the personality set, and the frustration with time and control of time expressed in the skills set, all other characteristics are positive and desirable.

A further exception to the overall positive nature of the personal characteristics was principal A's sense of pessimism concerning the future of his school. This principal led a school that, unlike the other schools in the research, had a declining enrolment and a poor image in the local community. The principal presented a picture of a person that was compassionately concerned with what the school offered, where it was heading and what he could do to influence the direction in the way he believed it should go. However, in many respects the interview had very pessimistic overtones with a sense of desperation that is evident in the transcript; desperation in trying to cater for the local youth, desperation in trying to ensure that the school didn't close, desperation in trying to make a difference to the direction in which the school appeared to be heading. Thus, there were a range of negative views expressed that indicated that the school was not successful A1-5,6, that the principal wasn't sure how to alter current school situations A1-8, 9, 10, that the principal felt isolated from principal colleagues and teachers A1-14, 15 and that the principal had serious concerns regarding his ability to handle the tensions
In the initial analysis of the interview of principal A this characteristic was isolated as a separate theme and labelled *pessimism* because of the very strong pessimistic overtones. However, it is perhaps better considered as a personal characteristic rather than a leadership theme as it appears to be largely dysfunctional in terms of the purposes of leadership such as ensuring school survival and growth. Never-the-less, pessimism may be a personality characteristic that is readily observed in schools where the principal perceives that the school has an uncertain future, and although dysfunctional, further research may uncover pessimism as part of the leadership of many principals in this type of situation. Although there is not conclusive support for the view, it would be logical to assume that most of the schools selected to be involved in the pilot program had secure futures, at least in the short to medium future. In the case of a school experiencing decline, the pressures on the principal may lead to a situation where the principal adopts a dysfunctional role such as promoting a pessimistic view.

**INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS**

This theme was apparent in nine of the principal interviews (schools A,B,C,D,F,H,I,K,J) and in all seven of the teacher interviews in the other schools (schools A,B,C,D,E,F,J).

In a number of interviews, principals emphasised the need to ensure that staff, who were experiencing increased workloads and low morale, could remain focussed on the core school tasks of teaching and learning C1-9; F1-7,9; H1-5; J1-3,8; K1-3. Principals were not prepared to institute initiatives, or take actions that would increase teacher workloads too greatly E4-23; H1-8; J1-3,8, they were reviewing current school commitments, especially those associated with charter implementation H1-13; K1-3 and meeting schedules F1-7, and they were concerned to reduce the impact of morale sapping procedures such as naming excess staff F1-9.
The interaction with staff was often complex and included: being professionally and personally supportive A1-4; A4-26,27; A5-39,40; B5-19,20,21; C3-10,14; C4-30; C5-33; D3-19,20; D4-25; E5-26,27; E7-37; J2-13; J5-32; encouraging staff to take on new roles B3-9; B4-26; C2-17,21,22; C4-25,26; C5-33; D1-5; D3-19,20; E4-23; E5-27; targeting staff for jobs D1-5; boosting morale by praising staff and creating a positive climate D1-10; J2-15; J5-33; attending informal gatherings D1-10; listening to staff and addressing staff complaints D1-10; F2-19; discussing educational issues with staff and keeping staff informed A1-4; F2-19; F3-24; F5-14; trusting staff A1-5; E4-23; E5-27; being approachable A1-5; B4-24; supporting female teachers E5-27, and demonstrating awareness of the pressures facing teachers A1-8; B2-33. Some principals were distant from staff A2-34; A4-28; C1-4,5,8; C2-17; C3-12,13; C4-30; D2-16; D5-33; J1-5, but they were still supportive by including staff in decision making C1-7; J1-9 and by protecting staff so that the teachers could concentrate on the core tasks of teaching and learning C1-9; J1-3.8. Some noted increased work pressures leading to greater isolation of the principal from teachers B5-14,15,18 and increased reliance on senior personnel B5-26; B5-22.

There were some negative aspects noted concerning principal interaction with staff. In some teacher interviews, principals were portrayed as de-valuing staff by not acknowledging the work of teachers J3-17,18,19,20,21, and not demonstrating care for the staff A2-34,35. Principal relations with staff were also described as: uncomfortable D2-16; D5-28; lacking awareness B2-31; B4-24,25; B5-14,16,18; D3-17,18; D4-26; non-supportive B3-11; D5-28,29; insensitive C2-17; antagonistic C2-22; and, negative B4-26.

One principal was concerned with the professional development of the staff; the principal wanted teachers to view teaching as a social construction, and he also wanted to establish a consistent, collective and focussed teaching culture I1-6,9. However, there was no sense in this interview of this being a collective vision; it was the principal stating his view of the sort of professional development staff needed and which he will try to provide. At another school, professional development of staff was considered to be one of the principal’s strengths E7-37,42.
Personnel management was an area where the principal role was changing with more flexibility and more responsibility being given to principals (refer below to the personnel theme of the description of the changes to the leadership role). Principals were concerned about the disappearance of industrial agreements and the consequent need for principals to make decisions on industrial matters. These changes may result in increasing differentiation between principals and teachers as principals may be seen more as "the boss" than a colleague.

**INITIATING IDEAS**

This theme emerged in the principal and staff interviews of seven schools (schools A,B,C,D,E,F,J) and in the principal interviews of two other schools (schools H and I).

Most principals described programs that they had initiated. Schools of the Future was viewed by one principal as the catalyst for principals to introduce change and establish schools that reflect the principals' visions. The range of initiatives that principals were involved in was large and diverse including initiatives that are curriculum, teacher, community, process and school environment centred. Examples included:

**Curriculum centred initiatives**

- Exploring the introduction of streaming.
- Establishing an after school sports program.
- Adopting an international school focus.
- Instituting co-education in what had been a single-sex school.
- Shifting school priority from curriculum to student welfare.
- Increasing LOTE.
- Establishing music.
Introducing sport J4-28.
Defining and refining the curriculum D1-6.
Reform of years nine and ten curriculum E1-9.
Establishing sport, syllabuses, uniform and general assemblies I1-10.
Establishing sports education, houses, house captains, school captains, and a Student Representative Council I1-8.
Making the school technology centred I1-5.
Involvement in important educational initiatives A4-25; involvement in Schools of the Future C1-5,6; C4-26,28,29; D1-3; J2-12.
Supportive of initiatives that support the school direction D1-8.
Participation in major research studies or educational initiatives that will impact on the schools' educational provision C2-20,21; E1-9,10.

**Teacher centred initiatives**

Encouragement of staff to be innovative by challenging, questioning, making suggestions and giving staff opportunities to understand educational trends C2-16,17, C4-31.
Challenging the staff's educational views C2-17, E1-11.
Development and implementation of a locally based staff appraisal scheme H1-10.
Restructuring teacher meeting schedules F1-7.

**Parent and community centred initiatives**

Revamping school council and increasing parent involvement C4-26.
Surveying community members A1-6; A3-17,21,22; A4-24.

**Process centred initiatives**

Implementing new processes, structures and procedures C2-24; C3-14; C4-25,26,27,29.
Adopting TQM ideas B1-4; H1-4.
Becoming involved in Schools of the Future C1-5,6; C4-26,28,29; D1-3; J2-12.
Employing a business manager $H1-11$.

**School environment centred initiatives**

Implementing building and refurbishment programs $A1-6; A3-16; C4-26,28,29; D1-6$.

The processes involved in having an idea implemented varied. Directive approaches were described that involved raising an idea (either directly through the principal, or indirectly through the vice principal), allowing staff discussion, and then, with or without staff support, selecting a staff member to implement the idea $B1-4; J1-4$.

One principal believed that the principal had to force people to adopt that which was wanted; e.g. forcing teachers to access computers by insisting on extensive documentation of what they are doing, but concurrently withdrawing secretarial support $I1-5$. Other principals were less directive and actively sought teacher support. For example, one process involved the principal becoming personally familiar with a new program, informing staff, listening to and alleviating staff concerns, then seeking staff support $D1-8$. Another involved a similar process: the principal seeds an idea using discussion papers and presenting alternative models, lets the idea germinate, presents the principal's position (this may be a deliberately extreme position designed to generate discussion), allows discussion and modification, and if there is enough support, will push for the idea to be adopted. Whilst this process emphasises joint ownership, unity, collaboration $F1-8$, this principal was criticised for not initiating enough ideas and for being too easily influenced $F5-15$. The most collaborative description involved the principal in: writing a discussion paper; seeding the idea with senior staff and getting feedback; placing the revised plan before the various school groups; presenting the plan to staff and school council; and, if accepted, implementing the plan $H1-8$.

Whilst principals were described as initiating ideas, there were a number of critical points from teachers. Some teachers believed that their principal initiated new ideas as a reaction to what other schools were doing rather than being based on educational rationales $D3-17; D5-30; E8-34$ and that the principal's
initial reaction to staff ideas was negative (possibly so as he could have time to consider the idea) D5-29. Uncritical acceptance of new ideas was mentioned as a problem at two schools D5-30; E2-30. At one school, it was believed that the principal did not have to initiate ideas because the staff would raise the ideas themselves F4-17.

VISION

Vision emerged as a theme in eight of the ten schools. In the schools that included principal and teacher interviews, five of the schools had both the principal and the teachers describe vision (schools A, B, C, D, E), one school had only the teachers include vision (school J) and one school had neither the teachers nor the principal describe vision. Of the three schools that included principal interviews only, vision emerged as a theme in two schools (schools H and I).

Having vision was considered to be one of the critical roles for the principal C1-3,4 and one that was increasingly important C1-3 with, for example, more pressure on principals to find solutions to ensure school survival A1-8 and to anticipate educational trends K1-7. The principal’s vision for the school was manifest in the directions that the school pursued B3-11; B4-26; D1-3, and these could be set in consultation with others D1-3, or in isolation, based on personal views of education; e.g. one principal believed that Schools of the Future gave principals the opportunity to establish a school that they see as appropriate H1-2,10. In establishing their vision, principals used their understanding of political and educational trends E1-3,4,5,8,9,10, community expectations E1-3, and discourse with teachers and school council members E1-8,9,10. The vision for the school may be formally contained in the school’s charter H1-4,8, and linked to the school finances through the way funds are distributed C1-4; and it may project into the future as long as six years H1-6,7. School charters appeared to help principals implement their vision B1-4; H1-4.

Some principals described difficulties with fulfilling their educational visions. Having vision was acknowledged as being important, but it was also noted
that it was not always apparent how the vision could be fulfilled. The unsettled educational climate during which the interviews were conducted led one principal to comment that the current focus had to be on the short term rather than on long term visions, with the emphasis on ensuring that changes in education did not have an immediate and negative impact on the primary tasks of teaching and learning.

There was disagreement concerning the extent to which principals' visions were articulated to staff. Teachers indicated both that their principal's vision was articulated and that it was not. Vision was also viewed as not present or expressed surreptitiously through hidden agendas of the principal.

Visions involved whole school initiatives such as promoting a climate of student care and achievement, which reflects community values; encouraging a conservative, technology centred, adult environment; the implementation of the school charter and adoption of a new organisational structure; catering for needs of local community in a small school setting; growing and being visible in the community; giving the school an international perspective; becoming a language school; and, implementing structural reform so that teachers have clearly defined roles.

DELEGATION

This theme emerged from the principal interviews in eight schools (schools A,B,C,D,E,F,J,H) and the teacher interviews in six schools (schools A,B,C,D,E,J). There were two aspects to this theme concerned with the extent of delegation and the type of monitoring used by the principal.

Extent of Delegation

Delegation was considered to be an important part of the principal role.
staff interviews across six schools). It was acknowledged that the principal could not do everything and needed to delegate E1-6. Delegation involved: a collaborative, team approach to running the school in which there was mutual dependence between the principal and staff D1-3,7,8; identifying abilities in staff and encouraging staff to assume leadership roles J1-3; J4-26; establishing a leadership thick school with key people involved in addressing the challenges identified by the principal A3-17; E1-3,67,16; the use of goal focussed teams H1-7; giving staff clear descriptions of responsibilities and expectations B3-11; B5-13; C1-3,4; D2-14. With the increase in work demands (see below) principals were using delegation more C4-28,31 and increasingly becoming overseers rather than doers E1-7. Delegation resulted in much of the principal’s work load being decreased F1-3, allowing for more involvement in the teaching and learning process H1-12. One principal noted that the greater use of delegation also increased the principal leadership role through the sharing of leadership with others D1-7,8.

Type of Monitoring

Generally, when tasks were delegated principals did not want to interfere in the task A1-4,7,8; C1-3,4; D1-7; E1-7; F1-6. Some principals explicitly trusted staff to do the delegated jobs B2-30,32; C4-25,27; E1-7; E4-23; E5-27; F1-6; staff were not only trusted, but they were also allowed to make mistakes with E1-7. Teachers were expected to be responsible for their own performance levels B1-6; C1-3,4, however principals gained feedback by linking with people throughout the school C1-3,4; C4-25,27 using official and unofficial channels E1-7; E3-21; E4-23; J5-31 and seeking information from staff B1-7. Apparent lack of formal monitoring was interpreted by some staff as showing a lack of follow-up C3-10, or seen as a function of poor interpersonal skills on the principal’s behalf D5-33. Other principals wanted to interfere little, but found that teachers needed constant reminders to do the job because they were otherwise occupied with teaching-related duties A1-4,7,8.
CURRICULUM INVOLVEMENT

This theme emerged from the principal and teacher interviews in five schools (schools B,D,E,F,J), in the principal interview only in one school (school H) and in the teacher interviews only of two schools (schools A,C).

Curriculum development was described as the key role for the principal. Principals were involved in curriculum through identifying deficiencies, selling ideas, challenging methodology and talking to staff. This included active participation on the school committee responsible for curriculum; one principal described their role on curriculum committee as giving advice, guiding, encouraging, supporting, warning and, if necessary, overruling decisions. The principal as a formal member of the curriculum committee did not guarantee involvement in curriculum matters; one principal, a member of the curriculum committee, but did not have a strong curriculum involvement, in part due to an inability to attend committee meetings due to time pressures. On the other hand, at one school the principal was not a member of the curriculum committee, despite requests from the staff for the principal's involvement, yet retained considerable influence on committee decisions through working closely with the curriculum coordinator.

Concern was expressed by principals that they did not have enough involvement in curriculum matters. One principal wanted to become more visible and more involved as an educational leader "embroiled in the teaching and learning process, working with teachers and kids and parents, on curriculum programs, working with teachers, working in the classroom with teachers and providing support." Time was the problem here, but the principal was hoping to change administration structures so that there would be more opportunity to be an educational leader. Time was also a problem for another principal who, despite a strong background at a senior level in system wide curriculum development, felt that he should give more attention to curriculum matters.
Teachers did not always view their principal as involved in curriculum matters. Principals delegated curriculum responsibility to curriculum coordinators. Lack of curriculum knowledge was cited as a hurdle to principal involvement.

Examples of curriculum involvement included:
- Defining and refining the curriculum such as increasing LOTE and establishing music.
- The process of consultation, feedback, discussion and debate used to become involved in Schools of the Future.
- Leading the school through the charter writing process.
- Successfully implementing DSE initiatives in a hostile climate.
- Instigating a review of the year nine and ten curricula.
- Challenging the teaching methodology.
- Seeking involvement in major projects; e.g. Hill, Rowe and Holmes-Smith's (1994) research.
- Formulating welfare and discipline structures.

INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

This theme emerged in all the teacher interviews (schools A,B,C,D,E,F,J), but in only one of the principal interviews (school H), perhaps reflecting increased time pressures taking principals away from direct involvement with students.

Principals often had little interaction with students. Teachers described their principals as not knowing the students, not being a strong leader in the students' views, and as having less to do with students. Principals did maintain some contact with students through involvement in discipline matters which teachers viewed both positively and negatively. Some teachers believed that their principal gave students access and had regular contact with students and that they celebrated student successes with formal processes such as principal awards. One principal (principal B) deliberately retained a small teaching load to maintain contact with students in a
classroom situation; other principals had taught in the past, but increased time pressures did not permit this any longer (e.g. principal C). However, it appeared to be more difficult for the principal to find the time to teach and to be with students; some believe that the principal is now not expected to teach.

MARKETING

This theme was teacher-driven to some extent as it emerged in teacher interviews in five schools (schools A, B, D, E, J), but in principal interviews in only three schools (schools A, B and F); although aspects were mentioned in the principal interviews of schools E and I in relation to symbolic imagery and market competitiveness respectively.

Marketing of schools usually involves both school promotion and public relations, which were the labels that were given to the themes found in the principal and teacher analyses that relate to this theme. It was decided to label this theme as marketing to emphasise the customer orientation that was found in many interviews.

In a competitive climate schools were viewed as having to become more responsive to parent and community values and the principal's role in the marketing of the school was increasing and becoming more important. Some schools promoted themselves by presenting a public image that meshed with community expectations, and which also addressed negative views of the school. This was achieved through the use of the symbolic imagery inherent in the actions of the school, and also, by ascertaining via surveys what the community attitudes were to the school and then attempting to address any problems uncovered. School promotion also occurred through the organisation of opportunities for parents and the public to view the school. For example, one principal discussed the need to have a customer focus and to communicate with the parents, and he described how he got people to phone the homes of students.
to ensure that parents would attend an information night $B_{1-4}$. The issue of
customer focus also occurred in relation to increasing enrolments; there was
an assumption that by having a customer orientation and presenting the
school as the clients wanted it, the school's enrolments would increase $11-3,4,7,11$. Indeed, some principals were credited with their school's success
through their ability to promote the school $B_{2-30}; B_{4-26,27}; D_{2-12}$. For some
principals their public relations role was limited; one principal indicated that
public relations mainly occurred in discussions with parents when helping to
enrol students $F_{1-6}$. Whilst some staff believed that their principal was good at
promoting the school $D_{2-12}; D_{5-30,31}; E_{7-36}; J_{5-33}$, other staff believed that their
principal did not have the necessary abilities to promote the school $A_{3-21}; J_{3-21}$,
or that they paid too much attention to promotion and not enough to what was
actually occurring in the school $B_{2-30,31,32}; B_{4-25}$. Principals placed high
importance on marketing their school with one principal employing a public
relation expert $B_{2-30}$ whilst another was investigating the feasibility $H_{1-11}$.

SYMBOLIC AWARENESS

This theme was principal-driven as it occurred in principal interviews in five
schools (schools A,B,C,E,J,H), but only in the teacher interviews of two
schools (schools B and C). This may reflect the hidden nature of many
symbolic acts, and the importance principals place on them.

The actions of the principal and the school were seen to give either
constructive or destructive symbolic messages. Constructive symbolic acts
included those that reinforced school values. Some examples included:

1. Principals used the school communication channels to applaud what the
school was doing well, to indicate what must be done and to indicate what did
not work $B_{1-3,4}; B_{3-9}$; e.g. principal awards were used to reinforce pursuit of
excellence amongst students $H_{1-12,13}; C_{4-28,31}$, and student successes were
celebrated in newsletters and newspapers $A_{1-10}$.

2. Principals retained traditional aspects of schooling to reinforce the
conservative nature expected by the local community; e.g. retaining school uniform, having strong welfare and discipline and the type of curriculum offered \( E1-3,4,5 \).

3. If there were positive myths about the school present in the community, these were encouraged, rather than discouraged; e.g. the community of one school believed that the school was wealthy and this view was encouraged by the school \( E1-16 \).

4. In assessing school performance in implementing the charter, principals were aware that the choice of areas measured also indicated those areas that were valued most by the school \( H1-11 \).

Other symbolic acts described included: having all the principal class personnel teaching to emphasise the school focus on teaching and learning and to indicate that these people were still in touch with the classroom \( B1-5, B2-33, B3-12 \); enrolling of the principal's children at the school \( A1-8 \); the principal being available to teachers and others \( A1-14,15 \); concern for the physical appearance of the school and the organisation of school open days \( C4-29,31 \).

The symbolic messages in what the principal does can also reinforce the wrong values and act destructively. A number of examples were given that centred on the actions of the principal devaluing the work of members of a section of the school. These examples included:

1. If the principal could not spend time in classrooms it suggested to staff that the classroom was not important \( J1-7,8, C2-18,23 \).

2. If the principal was too available, it indicated that the principal's job was not important, but if the principal was not available it indicated that the work of others was not important \( J1-7 \).

3. To cope with falling enrolments teaching allotments could be increased to maintain student subject choice, but with the consequent devaluing of teachers. Alternatively, if allotments remained stable this indicated the value
placed on teachers, but then subject choice would have to be reduced with the potential for enrolments to decline further as students and parents choose schools that offer a broader curriculum. J1-B.

4. If the principal was away from school often, this suggested that school was not important. J1-7.

5. The appointment of staff to higher duties could result in some teachers feeling devalued. J1-B.

6. Being negative about the perceived school image and the school’s future A1-6,10.

CULTURAL AWARENESS

This theme emerged in the interviews of both principal and teachers of four schools (schools A, E, F, J) and in teacher interviews only in one school (school D).

There were three aspects to this theme: staff, community and school culture.

Staff culture

The staff culture was viewed as being a strong determinant of the leadership style that will be accepted by staff F1-3,7. The principal’s leadership style in one school was modified to suit the perceived staff culture: ie. being less up-front and directive in a school that had experienced multiple short-term principal placements; and, not pushing open communication when resisted by the staff culture J1-4,5. Changing the leadership style may include having to change the staff culture; e.g. for the principal of one school to be able to delegate tasks more effectively, the staff had to accept more responsibility for making their own decisions F1-3,7.
Community culture

Awareness of the local community culture was considered important if schools were going to be successful in attracting students. Principals had to ensure that school and community cultures were closely aligned so that the community would be more accepting of what the school did, and so there was more effective and informed involvement of community members. Staff did not always believe that their principal had good understanding of the community culture.

School culture

Understanding of school culture was used by principals. For example, at one school that had a long and proud academic tradition the principal was viewed as supportive of this culture and the principal used it to promote the school.

ACCOUNTABILITY

This theme was evident in the principal interviews of four schools (schools B,E,H,I) and in the teacher interviews of two schools (schools B and C).

Accountability was viewed as multi-dimensional involving hierarchical accountability (teachers - principal - DSE) and internal accountability where individuals are accountable to their own, to school and to community expectations. Increased accountability requirements were evident for both schools and principals. Accountability was viewed as having a whole school focus in that both the principal and teachers were accountable for how they allocate budgets. Principals were not only accountable for their own performance, but they were also accountable for what staff did; by trusting staff to do delegated tasks, it was considered that the principal was placed at risk, albeit an acceptable risk.

An area of concern for principals is that they are not necessarily in control of the...
resources that affect the measures that they will be held accountable for E1-12; K1-5,6.

Accountability was an important part of the principal leadership role, and it was achieved in one school by directing teachers to produce syllabus statements I1-5, and by documenting what the school does (e.g. documenting the management structures) I1-7. The use of documentation was also noted in another school that had documented its curriculum and used program budgeting C3-1; C5-36. In another school, staff accountability was achieved surreptitiously by the principal asking staff to supply information B1-7.

Accountability helped to improve school performance by encouraging the measurement of performance indicators such as student outcomes, community support and customer satisfaction H1-5,6. Also, accountability was related to improved student outcomes through documentation of teaching programs I1-7; C5-36, and through staff appraisal leading to improved teaching H1-10.

**BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL ROLE**

This theme emerged from the principal interviews of schools E and I, from the teacher interviews of school F, and from the principal and teacher interviews of school J. Although they were not evident as school-based themes, aspects relevant to the business and financial role were also found in interviews from schools A, B, D and H. Two sub-themes emerged concerning business orientation and the financial role of the principal.

**Business orientation**

School was viewed as a business by some principals I1-5,11; J1-5,6,7; J4-25 and the role of the principal was thought to have changed due to increased administrative pressures (such as financial management and personnel responsibilities) resulting in less time spent on educational matters J1-5,6,7.
One principal believed that principal training needed to reflect the business orientation and include training similar to that found in Master of Business Administration courses H1-5, 11. Reflecting this new orientation, the principal had developed a business plan that included structural development, marketing, policy development, data and current action H1-12, and emphasised the need to attract students and to make teachers realise that their actions will be reflected in enrolments H1-4, 7, 11. Also, being able to demonstrate continuous improvement H1-6, E1-10, E5-26, E7-40, being continuously accountable to one's own and to the school's standards B1-6, 7, having a client/customer orientation B1-4, 7, and being competitive D5-30 were aspects that were valued that perhaps reflect a trend towards a more business like orientation in other schools. However, whilst schools were using business approaches to marketing and accountability, it was emphasised by some that schools were not businesses H1-7 with the centrality of students in schools B3-9, 11; C2-17; D4-22, 24, 25 indicating a human focus that can be contrasted with the typical business focus on profitability.

Financial role

Associated with the trend towards a business orientation is the increased demands placed on principals concerning the financial aspects of schools. Principals have increased financial responsibilities B1-3; C2-21; C3-12; D1-6, 7; D2-12, 14; E2-32; E5-28; E7-39; F1-10; F3-25; J1-6; J4-26, 27; K1-5, with more time spent on financial functions and less time on educational matters J1-5, 6, 7; J2-14; J3-18; J4-25, 26, 27, 29. However, this does not necessarily mean that the principal has to do the financial work; delegation of financial tasks was important C2-21 and some principals were either employing or considering employing business managers to relieve them of the time-consuming aspects of school finances A3-23; H1-11. For one principal the role in the school finances was not overly demanding of time. This principal structured the role to be one of monitoring the processes that were in place to allocate funds rather than to be involved in the actual allocation; this principal was not involved in all the decision making aspects which were left to teachers and the bursar E1-7, 8. Principals appear to be comfortable with their financial role D2-12, 14; D-33; E1-16. Whilst principals did
not express concerns about their ability with respect to managing the school global budget, one teacher noted that the principal was not confident with financial management and that the principal employed expert help when necessary F3-25,26. The responsibilities of the financial role may increase if, as one principal observed, principals have more flexibility to alter the pay of teachers by using incentive payments 11-4,5.

POWER AND POLITICAL AWARENESS

This theme was apparent in the teacher interviews of schools D and F, and in the principal interviews of schools E and K. Principals were described as political, aware of political trends, and aware of the political nature of decision making E1-4,10,11, and politically aware D4-22,23,26. Their power was viewed as having increased A1-11; A2-32,33; B3-10; B4-25,26,27; B5-13; D1-8,9; D3-20; E2-32; E6-35; J3-22; K1-6 in the areas of authority A1-11; decision making B3-10; B4-25,26,27, setting own directions free from DSE control D1-8,9, and staffing D2-15; K1-6. Whilst principals have been given more power and responsibility, they have been hobbled by bureaucratic requirements and lack of resources; e.g. having the capacity to appoint staff, but being restricted to choosing staff from amongst teachers placed in excess K1-6; having fewer resources to do more with K1-5; wanting to form school-based curriculum, but being unsure of the degree of prescription imposed on the curriculum by the Board of Studies K1-4. The power of the principal as the ultimate authority and the head of the school was emphasised by some teachers D3-17; D4-23. Some teachers believed that their principal did not enjoy exercising power and that their principal found it difficult to support both teachers and the DSE F2-19,22; F5-15.

SCHOOL COUNCIL ROLE

This theme emerged from the principal interview of school E. The principal's role on school council was that of executive officer, responsible to ensure that the school council is aware of educational trends and the broad implications of
them E1-8. This role was proactive and honest, indicating both positives and negatives in reports to Council E1-8. Having a supportive school council was an important aspect for the efficient running of this principal's school E1-3. Other principals mentioned aspects of their work with their school council such as accountability to the school council D1-5, and involving parents and ensuring that they have the appropriate training and support to be genuinely involved F1-11. A teacher noted an increase in time that their principal spent on school council matters A3-18. However, these interviews did not generate a separate theme for the school council role of the principal.

LEADERSHIP ROLE SUMMARY

In total 17 themes were identified in the leadership role description. The main features of each theme are summarised below.

WIDER KNOWLEDGE

* Educational knowledge gained through a range of external activities.
* This knowledge helps principals operate within a coherent vision framework.
* Wider knowledge used to keep staff informed.
* External contacts used to satisfy school needs.

VALUES

* Basic human values included freedom, respect for others, optimism, curiosity.
* General moral values included social justice and fairness.
* Professional values included centrality of principal role, the similarity and uniqueness of the principal role compared to that of teachers, adoption of business practices, centrality of students, political awareness, conservative/non-conservative approach to reform.
* Social and political values included sharing and participation, commitment,
and centrality of people.

DECISION MAKING

* Decision making tended to involve others, with principals ensuring that staff had opportunities to participate. Decision making was best described as participative, although where possible democratic decision making was used.
* Some teachers indicated that their principal was too consultative and not decisive enough. Principals acknowledge that there are times when they have to be directive.
* Involving others was viewed as helping to spread ownership and accountability.
* Principals collected information about their schools from a variety of sources; the amount of information principals desired varied.
* There were formal and informal processes for disseminating information; whilst teachers wanted to be kept informed, they did not want the process to be cumbersome and time consuming.
* Principals were considered to be the ultimate authority, with power to overrule decisions, although they were reluctant to do this.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

* The large numbers of personal characteristics were divided into those that were personality features and those that describe job-related personal skills. In either category there were few negative characteristics reported, although pessimism pervaded the interview of one principal.

INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS

* Principals were protective of teachers.
* Interaction with teachers was complex, with some principals forming close working relationships and others more distant.
* Some teachers were critical of their principals staff relationships.
INITIATING IDEAS

* Principals were involved in initiating programs.
* Both directive, non-collaborative approaches and non-directive, collaborative approaches were used by principals to implement their ideas.
* Staff were sometimes suspicious of principals' motives for introducing ideas, believing they were being introduced for non-educational reasons.

VISION

* Critical role.
* Either set in consultation with others or in isolation. Principals usually developed their visions through their understanding of educational and political trends, community expectations and discourse with teachers.
* May not be fulfilled.
* Not always clearly articulated to teachers.

DELEGATION

* Delegation was used extensively; principals believed that it was necessary to delegate to reduce their workload and allow them to be more involved in the teaching and learning process.
* Delegated tasks tended to be monitored, either formally or through surreptitious methods. Principals expressed trust in their staff.

CURRICULUM INVOLVEMENT

* Curriculum involvement was viewed as important, and may have included active participation on the school committee responsible for curriculum.
* Principals wanted to become more involved in curriculum matters, although lack of time was a problem.
* Principals were viewed by staff as often delegating curriculum responsibility, and principals were seen by some staff as lacking curriculum knowledge.
INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

* Mainly present in teacher interviews.
* Ambivalence from teachers concerning the degree of principal and student interaction.
* Student contact maintained through principal involvement in discipline matters, through celebrating student successes and through direct classroom contact.

MARKETING

* Mainly derived from teacher interviews.
* School promotion was considered important in advertising what the school did and in addressing any negative images.
* Customer orientation.
* Role of principal in public relations varied, and teacher perceptions of principal effectiveness in the role varied.

SYMBOLIC AWARENESS

* Mainly derived from principal interviews.
* The actions of the principal can either be constructive or destructive. Constructive actions tended to be those that reinforced school values. Destructive actions tended to be those that sent messages that certain groups within the school were not valued.
* Principal driven theme.

CULTURAL AWARENESS

* Staff culture influences leadership style and changing leadership style may include having to change the staff culture.
* Awareness and ensuring close alignment to the community culture was important for school success.
* Principal understanding of school culture was used to benefit school.
ACCOUNTABILITY

* Mainly derived from principal interviews.
* This involved individual accountability to organisation and own values.
* Principals were accountable for their own and staff performance.
* Documentation of school processes and curriculum were used by principals to achieve staff and school accountability.
* Principals used accountability to improve school performance.

BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL ROLE

* Some principals viewed their school as a business with increased emphasis on accountability and marketing issues. However, the student focus of schools was used to distinguish schools from businesses.
* The financial role of principals was increasing. However, principals appear comfortable with this and many are coping by increased use of delegation; e.g. employing business managers.

POWER AND POLITICAL AWARENESS

* Political awareness was emphasised by some principals.
* Principals have considerable powers, although there are limitations placed formally and informally. Some principals were not comfortable exercising their power.

SCHOOL COUNCIL ROLE

* The principal was considered to be the executive officer of school council whose main function was to ensure the Council was aware of educational trends and the broad implications of them. Principals were viewed as being accountable to the school council.

Thus, the principal leadership role is complex and multi-dimensional,
requiring a range of interpersonal, planning and organisational skills. This description suggests that simple conceptions of leadership may be inadequate to explain the leadership role principals are adopting. In the next chapter these leadership themes are connected with the leadership literature and a leadership model is constructed which shows possible connections between the leadership themes. This leadership model graphically illustrates the complexity of the leadership role of principals.

This concludes the detail of the thematic statements derived from the interviews. In the next section changes to the leadership role since the introduction of Schools of the Future are presented. It should be noted that these changes are not necessarily due to Schools of the Future, and may be caused by other factors that have occurred at the same time (such as the deliberate elevation of principal status by the Directorate of School Education).

CHANGES IN THE PRINCIPALS LEADERSHIP ROLE SINCE THE INTRODUCTION OF SCHOOLS OF THE FUTURE

This research was conducted during a turbulent time in Victorian education. All government schools had experienced in the twelve months prior to the research being conducted a number of major changes including the reduction of teacher numbers, increases in class size and periods taught, reduction in some services provided to students, state-wide reviews of curriculum, assessment and teacher career structures, restructuring of the central and regional offices, and industrial turmoil. Within this climate Schools of the Future was established which introduced major reforms of school management. Thus, there were many changes occurring in the schools system and schools. Some of these changes impacted on the leadership role of the principal. From the interviews, a number of themes were evident that related to changes in the leadership role. Most of the changes described here will have been already mentioned in the appropriate leadership theme
description of the previous section.

THEMES

VISION/PLANNING

The principal having a vision was viewed as increasingly important C1-3. School charters allowed principals and schools to develop school visions B1-4; H1-4. Schools now operate on longer term planning B1-3, with some schools developing ten year plans H1-7. However, cutbacks in regional and central office support staff have meant that principals have lost external networks A1-14; D1-9 and they have to anticipate and plan early for new educational trends K1-7. One principal described increased pressures on the principal to find solutions to ensure school survival A1-8.

BUSINESS ORIENTATION

Schools were viewed as businesses H1-2 with principals operating in a business mode A3-16; F3-25; H1-11. Some schools were investigating employing business managers A3-23; H1-11. Principals saw themselves as more executive in style, focussing on the school direction rather than daily matters A4-24; C1-3; C3-12; C4-30.

FINANCIAL ROLE

Principals have increased financial management responsibilities B1-3; C2-21; D1-6,7; D2-12,14; E2-32; F1-10; F3-25; J1-8; J4-26,27; K1-5. However, this does not necessarily mean that the principal has to do the extra financial work, but they do have to use delegation more C2-21, and set-up budget processes, and monitor these to ensure that they are operating correctly E1-7.
WORK DEMANDS

Increases were noted in the "pace of work" \cite{A3-19;A4-28,29;I1-11}, the demands placed on principals \cite{C3-10;D3-21;E3-19,21;H1-7}, the range of skills needed \cite{D3-21;E2-32;E5-28}, the time spent on administrative tasks \cite{A1-5,6;A4-24;C3-12;D1-8,11;J1-6,7;J4-25,26,27,29;J5-36}, and pressure, from the DSE and others, for principals to be involved in work outside the school \cite{A3-18;C2-20,23;E3-19,21;J1-6;J4-27}. This is leading to less time as an educational leader \cite{B2-32;J1-5;H1-12,13;J4-26,29} and it is more difficult for the principal to find the time to teach \cite{H1-12} and to be with students \cite{J4-26;J5-36}; although, some believe that the principal is now not expected to teach \cite{I1-12}. Some principals are now less hands-on, spending more time in the wider community and long-term planning \cite{C1-3,6}. Others noted that there are now more assistant principals available to spread the workload of the principal (at least in large schools) \cite{B4-26;B5-22;D1-8,11;E1-7}, and that delegation is used more \cite{C4-28,31}; although it was noted that the increased use of delegation also results in increased leadership demands \cite{D1-8,11}. These changes have not necessarily resulted in more time to be out of the office \cite{D1-8,11} and support the view that principals need to become overseers rather than doers \cite{E1-7}. Principals were having to redefine the roles of those around them, to ease the pressures of work for the principal \cite{A3-18,19}.

PERSONNEL

There is increased responsibility and flexibility in the personnel management area \cite{A3-17;D1-6,7;D3-21;D4-25;D5-31;E1-7;E5-28;F1-10;F3-25;H1-3;J1-6;J4-29}. Schools of the Future was viewed as allowing principals to alter the work situation of teachers through incentive payments \cite{I1-4}, alter the junior/senior staff balance \cite{A3-19,20;I1-4}, alter the permanent/short-term teacher balance \cite{I1-5}, locally select staff \cite{C1-9;D4-25;H1-3}, and institute staff appraisal \cite{D3-20;D5-31}. In some interviews the belief was expressed that there would be more flexibility and control over staffing, but that there were system constraints that were hampering this; e.g. having to use teachers who have been declared in excess at another school \cite{D1-7,9;E1-12;K1-6}. Principals were viewed as having
to make more industrial relations decisions themselves due to the disappearance of industrial agreements $B1-5,6;K1-4,5$ which may cause future concerns $H1-9$. The principal has increased responsibility for staff welfare $E4-24$ and professional development; for example, they will need to ensure that teachers are multi-skilled (which may be tied to staff appraisal) $I1-5$. Also, there appears to be an increasing differentiation between principals and teachers due to the exercising of power that is expected of principals $I1-8$, and the perception by teachers of the principal as line manager $K1-6$.

**MARKETING**

In a competitive climate, schools are having to become more responsive to parent and community values $A1-6;B1-4;B3-10;H1-3,4;I1-11$. At one school, the principal believed that the school was becoming an autonomous provider, much like a private school, and dependent on satisfying community wants $B1-3,4$. *Schools of the Future* allowed one principal to gain the confidence of the community $H1-9$. Supplying information to school communities was viewed as increasingly important $H1-11$. Public relations was viewed as a critical area, and one in which the principal's responsibilities were increasing $E5-28;F3-25;K1-5$; with some principals having, or considering employing, public relation experts $B2-30;H1-11$. Principals are now more accountable to their community, but they also have fewer resources to use, which means that good public relations are increasingly important in retaining parental support $K1-5$. Principals need to increase linkages with other schools and the community $C4-25;F3-25$. It was observed that there is an increased need to ensure good publicity so that enrolments will increase $D2-12;D5-30$; one teacher described this as the increased need to impress people $C5-34$.

**POWER**

The power of the principal was viewed both as having increased $A1-11;A2-32,33;B3-10;B4-25,26,27;B5-13;D1-8,9;D3-20;E2-32;E6-35;J3-22;K1-6$ and decreased $K1-6$. 
Areas in which power had increased included: perceived authority \textit{A1-11}; decision making \textit{B3-10; B4-25,26,27}, setting own directions free from DSE control \textit{D1-8,9}, and staffing \textit{D2-15; K1-6}. Areas in which it had decreased included: control of the criteria upon which principal accountability is judged \textit{K1-6}; freedom to act (the DSE was perceived as exerting more control over principals) \textit{D5-29; E6-35}. Even though principals had increased powers, they had elected to retain collaborative decision making processes \textit{E2-32}. Some believed that principals do not have more power, however they are now expected to exercise the powers they have \textit{I1-8}. The waning of the power of the union was viewed as increasing the power and authority of the principal \textit{A1-11; A2-32,33; B4-25; D2-15}.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

There is increased pressure for schools and principals to be more accountable for their performance to the Government and to the school community \textit{D1-8; D4-22; D5-29; H1-5; K1-5}; increased accountability was attributed, in one interview, to the principal not being able to use the LAC as a cover for controversial decisions \textit{D4-22}. Whilst accountability to the community has increased, the resources available have decreased and principals have had to become more politically astute in understanding community wants, in allocating resources and in explaining to the community the school's actions \textit{K1-5}. Also, principals are not necessarily in control of the resources that affect the outcomes that they will be held accountable for \textit{E1-12; K1-6}.

**REINFORCING PAST LEADERSHIP STYLE**

A number of interviews indicated that \textit{Schools of the Future} reinforced the leadership style principals' already had \textit{B1-3,6; C1-4,5; C2-23; D1-6; D2-14; E1-12; E2-32; E5-28; E7-39; F4-17; H1-9}. One principal found that his leadership style had not changed substantially, although it had gained focus and there were more challenges present \textit{H1-6}. Teachers commented that their principal may not
experience major changes to their role because the school is growing and well-run E4-24, or the culture of the school is so defined that it will not change and, therefore, the principal will not have to change his/her style of leadership D2-14; F4-17.

DECISION MAKING AND COMMUNICATION

Teachers want more direction from their principal F2-22; this may be due to work overload and increased teacher stress J2-11,15,16. Principals are less pragmatic, more directive and, with the reduction in regional and central support, have to make more decisions themselves J5-35,36. There is an increased need for principals to keep staff informed, because teachers have fewer opportunities to work outside the school F2-23. Due to increased administrative pressures, there is less time for principals to spend with students and teachers, which means that communication flow is more difficult and there is the potential for principals to make ill-informed decisions J4-26. At one school the principal was viewed as deliberately distancing himself from staff and the union, so that there would be fewer constraints in making decisions B5-14,15,18; this may be due to the increased administrative demands leaving less time for democratic decision making processes B5-15; B4-26.

SCHOOL COUNCIL

An increase in the time principals spend on school council matters was noted A3-1B. Also, as school councils have to make more decisions, it is increasingly important for the principal to ensure that school council members have the appropriate training and support to be genuinely involved F1-11.

INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

It is more difficult for the principal to find the time to teach H1-12 and to be with
students J4-26; J5-36; although, some believe that the principal is now not expected to teach 11-12. One principal was described as showing less tolerance to disruptive students; possibly because the principal wants to protect the school’s image, and/or because the school is successful in attracting students and can afford to be less tolerant B3-10.

INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS

Principals are increasingly isolated from the majority of teachers B5-14,15,18, although there appears to be increased reliance on senior personnel B5-22; B4-26. The principal is viewed as different from staff B5-16,17 with staff at one school viewing their school as factory, with the principal as the boss B5-13,14,16,17. Increased pressures have meant that principals increasingly can not please all teachers A2-32; A4-28,29. There is a change from a focus on management and control of students to a focus on curriculum with Schools of the Future challenging principals to ensure that teachers are changing the way they operate 11-2,3.

MANAGING CHANGE

The educational climate was described as a period of rapid and dynamic change 11-2, which involved cost- reduction for school programs A1-6,10,11; K1-5 and tripling in the speed of work for the principal 11-11. It was considered important that principals be able to manage change in this environment H1-14.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

The leadership role of the principal is becoming more complicated with increased flexibility in terms of personnel, finances and decision making, and increased responsibilities in terms of personal and school accountability,
personnel, community and public relations, school direction and school survival. Principals are becoming less hands-on and more involved with external networks. Consequently they are relying more on delegation and senior staff support to cope with daily demands. Many of the changes strengthen the evidence for transformational leadership (see chapter 5). Whilst there have been changes to the leadership role, there was strong confirmation in Schools of the Future for the way principals had been leading their school; Schools of the Future was viewed as giving principals the opportunity to extend what they were already doing. In other reform efforts, the role of the principal has changed in response to the reform and continued to change as the reform progressed (see the chapters in Murphy and Louis, 1994). A future survey of the principals involved in this research would help to identify how the leadership role changes in response to the progression of the Schools of the Future reform.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Since the election of a conservative government in October, 1992, Victorian state education has experienced large cuts in expenditure resulting in the loss of one in six teachers, the closure of one in ten schools, yearly spending reduced by $400 million dollars, and central office staff numbers reduced from 2500 to 700. Coinciding with these cuts has been an acceleration of the trend towards decentralisation of responsibility, authority and accountability through the introduction of the Schools of the Future reform (Thomas and Caldwell, 1994). When fully implemented Schools of the Future will give schools control of 90% of operating costs, principals will have the power to select and initiate the removal of staff, and each school will have a school charter that details a three year framework for resources and accountability (Thomas and Caldwell, 1994). Beginning in June, 1993, 322 schools were selected to become pilot schools in the first phase of this program; 278 school were also selected to become associate schools. In total, 31% of government schools were involved in this initial stage, with a further 500 schools joining the scheme every six months until all state schools are involved by the end of 1995. At the start of the 1995 school year 76% of schools had joined the Schools of the Future program. This research focussed on the perceived leadership role of principals of secondary schools involved in the pilot phase in one metropolitan region of Melbourne.

Principals and teachers from selected pilot schools were interviewed and their perceptions used to describe the leadership role of the principals. The perceptions were compared to ascertain whether principals and teacher perceptions differed. Also, perceived changes in the role since the introduction of School of the Future were described. The description generated was compared to current educational leadership theories. The methodology chosen, hermeneutic phenomenology, allowed the phenomenon of principal leadership to be both described and interpreted without using a priori assumptions concerning leadership; the participants defined the scope of what was included in the role description and the researcher interpreted their views by looking for common themes. Chapter
four presented the findings of the research. This chapter provides further analysis of the findings by relating these to the educational leadership literature. The similarity in principal and teacher perceptions and the themes from the leadership role description are discussed further. The findings are explored for evidence of three dominant leadership conceptions - instructional leadership, transformational leadership and leadership in self-managing schools - and there is an analysis of the contribution of this research to leadership knowledge. A leadership model was constructed that combined the findings of this research with these three leadership models. This is followed by a discussion of the usefulness of the methodology, issues for further research and recommendations for practice.

SIMILARITY IN PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTION

One of the main findings of this research is the high degree of similarity in the perceptions of principals and teachers. Whilst principal and teacher attitudes have shown agreement on the leadership perceptions (Wirt, 1993; cited in Wirt and Krug, 1993) and philosophic stance of principals (Donaldson, 1990), differences in perception have been noted with respect to the extent and desirability of principal instructional leadership (Murphy, 1990), the type of decision making processes used and consensus on the most appropriate principal leadership style (Donaldson, 1990; Hallinger, Murphy and Hausman, 1993; Weindling, 1992).

In this research, which investigated principal leadership as defined by the participants, principal and teacher perceptions of the principal leadership role were found to be similar. Across the seven schools where principal and teacher interviews were conducted, the principal and the teachers at each school produced similar descriptions. There were 64 common themes across all schools, and 57 of these had high or moderate agreement. Of the seven themes that recorded low agreement, three were concerned with personal characteristics where differences were due to the greater range of features noted by teachers rather than disagreement with the principals' perceptions.
Most of the differences that did occur were generally due to the 32 additional themes found across the seven schools, rather than disagreement on the common themes. In these additional themes, the strongest pattern that emerged was that teachers consistently commented on principal interaction with students, whilst principals did not. Also, there was a minor pattern where teachers commented more often on school promotion and public relations than did principals. These patterns were confirmed when the perceptions of the other three principals were included in the aggregate description. In the aggregated description, two other differences between principals and teachers emerged with the themes of symbolic awareness and accountability cited more often by principals. Thus, there are differences, but the strong differences reported in previous studies were not found; this may be due to the narrower focus of those studies, or it may reflect differences in schools in Victoria where the decade-long trend towards school and teacher empowerment has resulted in principals and teachers developing common perceptions of the principal leadership role.

The agreement between teacher and principal perceptions provides strong support for the description of leadership reflecting what is actually occurring. If this research had relied on principal perceptions only, there would have been no confirmation of whether the perceptions were expressed in practice. With teachers also commenting on the principal role and largely agreeing with their principal's perceptions, there is independent confirmation that principals are enacting the leadership role they perceive. Through this process of triangulation (obtaining more than one perspective on a phenomenon) the findings have increased credibility and trustworthiness (Lincoln and Guba, 1985:290-327).

**LEADERSHIP THEMES**

The description of the leadership role and the changes to this role have a number of features that warrant further discussion. The following discussion
highlights areas that have been found in other studies that directly relate to the findings of this research. Also, the discussion covers findings from both the leadership role description and the changes to the role. As a consequence, the sub-headings used do not always coincide with those used in the result section.

VISION

This research supports the importance placed on principals having vision (Beare et al., 1989:106-107; Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:112). Principal vision has been found to be important in improving the quality of the work environment of both teachers and principals (Krug, 1993, cited in Wirt and Krug, 1993; Rosenblum, Louis and Rossmiller, 1994). Vision building and fostering commitment to group goals have been identified as key transformational leadership dimensions (Leithwood, 1994), whilst helping to formulate a shared vision was one of the important factors identified in enabling and supporting teacher success in schools undergoing restructuring (Murphy, 1994) and institutionalisation of vision is a feature identified in schools showing collaborative cultures (Telford, 1994: 114). The role of the principal in defending and keeping the school vision alive is viewed as critical (Conley and Goldman, 1994). In the current educational climate “there is the expectation that all school leaders will be visionary leaders, and certainly that is the case for self-managing schools” (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:112). Vision was one of the stronger themes found in this study; the theme arose in eight of the ten principal interviews and in many of the teacher interviews. There was increased importance placed on the principal having vision, particularly as schools now have to have three year school charters, with some schools adopting longer term plans. Also, cutbacks in central and regional office support staff have meant that the onus has increased on the principal to anticipate and plan for new educational trends. In this research, whilst principals had strong views on the direction their school should follow, most were concerned to develop the vision in collaboration with others and to have it formalised in the school charter.
Implementing vision has been shown to be a complex process that may generate interpersonal tensions and lead to fragmentation and factionalisation in school personnel (Conley and Goldman, 1994). Problems and difficulties with the process of developing support for vision were not highlighted by participants in this research; the process of charter development may have given principals in this research a way to develop a school vision that overcame many of the difficulties that can be experienced.

Other principal leadership factors identified by Murphy (1994) were cultivating a network of relationships, allocating resources consistent with the school vision, providing information to staff, and promoting teacher development. All of these factors were also present in the leadership description found in this study and they will be discussed below. Regarding the vision component, one principal in this research explicitly mentioned that her vision was manifest in the way resources were allocated and it was clear in a number of other schools that resources were allocated to school identified priority areas.

SYMBOLIC AND CULTURAL DIMENSIONS

Within the conceptions of transformational leadership and leadership for self-managing schools the understanding and use of symbolic and cultural dimensions of leadership are emphasised (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992; Leithwood, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1990). The principal has been shown to have a major role in promoting and maintaining a culture that will support school restructuring efforts (see chapters in Murphy and Louis, 1994). In this research, principals were aware of the power of the symbolism inherent in what they and the school did, and how this could be constructive or destructive. Principals used their understanding of the school culture to benefit the school and they were aware of the need to align the school with the community culture. A connection between staff culture and leadership style was proposed by some principals in that they believed the way they lead is influenced by the staff culture and vice versa.
WIDER KNOWLEDGE

As previously mentioned, Murphy (1994) has identified a number of leadership dimensions for principals leading school undergoing restructuring. One of these factors was the provision of information to teachers. Other writers have also identified this as an important facet of school leadership (e.g. Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:50-55; DSE, 1994c; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; NASSP, 1992). Louis and Murphy (1994) noted an emerging role for principals as providing intellectual leadership in which principals are informed about current research and, most importantly, use this knowledge to stimulate teachers and to benefit the school. Odden (1995: 2-3) describes principals involved in effective school-based management programs as "serving as broker(s) of information, knowledge and resources between the faculty and the broader community." Principals in this research were concerned to ensure that teachers were given information, and they used their wider knowledge gained through networks, reading, etc., to satisfy this. Also, they used their networks to help their school by, for example, using business contacts to gather expertise for school council, or to help with sponsorship. The establishment and nurturing of relationships with the larger environment was seen as an increasingly important role for principals; it is also part of the marketing of the school described in the next feature.

MARKETING

Principals have been identified as having a role in public relations, and promoting and marketing their schools (DSE, 1994a; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; NASSP, 1992). In the current research, principal involvement in school promotion and public relations was found to be important in some of the schools, with some principals being very involved (too involved in the opinion of some teachers) and others not mentioning it. The role of the principal in public relations and developing community linkages was viewed as increasingly important, especially as resources were decreasing whilst
accountability was increasing, placing greater importance on the need to explain the reasons behind school decisions. Often, school promotion and public relations were viewed as driven by the need to market the school and to be competitive in attracting student enrolments. This was increasing in importance, with some schools devoting considerable time and energy to the process; one school had employed a public relations consultant, another school was considering this, whilst another school had commissioned a survey of the school’s parents.

INITIATING IDEAS

Murphy and Hallinger (1992:81) describe how principals have changed from being managers of imported initiatives to being concerned with enabling school members to find solutions to locally identified problems. In this research principals appeared to be innovative and they often introduced major curriculum and school structure initiatives. The techniques used by principals to initiate ideas varied with them using directive and non-directive approaches that had various levels of teacher participation in the development of the idea. Principals also viewed curriculum involvement as important and were often actively involved on the school curriculum committee; some principals lamented that they could not become more involved in curriculum due to time pressures. Whilst principals were themselves innovative, they were also supportive of teacher initiatives and encouraged teachers to be innovative.

INVolVEMENT IN INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS

In England, principal involvement in instructional processes is also reported as low (OFSTED, 1994, cited in Whitty, 1994), and in England, New Zealand and the United States, trends have been found whereby principals are more involved in administration and less involved in instructional leadership (Murphy, 1994); further discussion on instructional leadership is presented below. In this research monitoring of instructional process was not a feature of
the principal's leadership role. Some principals expressed concern that increased demands on their time meant that they could not be involved in classrooms more, and some teachers were concerned that their principal was becoming less visible around the school. Moves to implement local staff appraisal programs developed in collaboration with teachers were indicated in some of the schools, and principals were concerned to ensure that teachers received appropriate professional development.

POWER

Ambivalence concerning changes in principals' power was found in this research and has also been reported in other restructuring efforts where both decreases (e.g. more joint decision making) and increases in power (e.g. staff selection) have been noted (Hallinger et al., 1993). There is evidence from England that unions in devolved systems are becoming marginalised (Barber and Whitty, 1994, cited in Whitty, 1994; Whitty, 1994). This trend was also reported in this research. The power of the unions was viewed as waning, whilst in some aspects the power of principals increased, or at least, principals were now expected to exert their powers; one male principal was believed to be deliberately distancing himself from the teacher union to allow his decision making to occur unhindered. Louis and Murphy (1994) have noted a trend whereby principals will need to have well-developed political skills for both within their school and between school and the community. This research indicated some support for principals having political acumen, with a number of principals clearly aware of, for example, the importance of managing conflict and the importance of developing and utilising external connections.

DECISION MAKING

In this research there appeared to be a high degree of teacher involvement in decision making with most principals concerned to ensure that staff had genuine opportunities for input through the use of formal and informal
communication channels. Murphy and Hallinger (1992:81) identified increased participatory leadership as one of the features of transformational leadership. Indeed, a consistent feature noted in overseas reform experiences has been the concern to empower teachers and involve them in decision making (Hallinger et al., 1993; Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; Odden and Odden, 1993; Odden, 1995); this is also one of the characteristics found in principals leading school restructuring (Murphy, 1994; Odden, 1995) and postulated as necessary for leading self-managing schools (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:50-55). However, there has also been a fear that increased involvement will take teachers away from pupil-related activities and lead to over-work (Hallinger et al., 1993; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; Whitty, 1994), and whilst teachers have welcomed increased participation, some principals believe that all teachers do not want the responsibility for decision making (Hallinger et al., 1993).

There is some indication from this research that at this stage of Schools of the Future teachers are less inclined to be involved in decision making and to let, and in some cases expect, the principal to make decisions. The different perspectives between Victoria and overseas possibly reflect the decade-long history in Victoria of increasing involvement of teachers in decision making; teachers in Victoria are used to involvement in decision making, but with the increased workload due to the introduction of Schools of the Future and cuts in staffing levels, they are now wanting less involvement and wanting principals to make decisions without significant teacher input.

DELEGATION

Associated with involving teachers is the use of delegation. In most schools, delegation was featured, with principals indicating a high degree of trust in staff; this supports the assertion of Clark, Lotto and Astuto (1989: 183) that one feature of good schools is the creation of an environment where teachers are encouraged and failure tolerated. Indeed, one principal lamented that whilst tasks were delegated extensively, teachers still wanted to be supervised; the
principal found this puzzling and would rather have teachers do the allocated jobs and report to the principal only when necessary. Delegation was one of the aspects that Murphy (1994) argues is part of the change in conception of the principal role from that of leading from the top, to leading from the centre, and it is one of the aspects that is necessary for the fulfilment of the requirements for collaborative school cultures (Telford, 1994: 114). Delegation was viewed as a necessity to ease the workload of the principal, although it creates its own work through increased leadership demands in terms of setting priorities and monitoring. In some of the larger schools, there were more assistant principals available which meant that some principals were redefining the roles of their principal class staff to ease the work pressures placed on the principal.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

An increase in the responsibility and accountability of the principal was found in this research and supports patterns from overseas (Murphy and Hallinger, 1992). Accountability as reported in this research involved many facets including school accountability to the DSE and the community, principal accountability to the DSE and school council, teacher accountability to the principal. Accountability was related to improved student outcomes through documentation of teaching programs and teacher appraisal leading to improved teaching. Tension was evident in that there was increased accountability to the community and the DSE, yet available resources had diminished and principals were not necessarily in control of the resources that affect accountability measures. Concerns about principal accountability have been raised in relation to restructuring efforts in the United States where principals are increasing the involvement of teachers in decision making, whilst principals remain accountable for what occurs in the school (Glickman, Allen and Lunsford, 1994: 216), with no clear method of assessing teacher accountability (Hallinger et al., 1993). The development of teacher appraisal processes is one way that principals in this research were addressing teacher accountability.
INTERACTION WITH TEACHERS

The discussion here involves principal concern for teacher workload, differentiation between principals and teachers, principal-teacher relationships and professional development of teachers.

The concern of principals in this research to protect their teaching staff from further increases in workload seems to be well founded. In the United States, England and New Zealand there have been reported increases in teacher workload associated with concurrent moves to decentralise school management and centralise control of curriculum (Hallinger et al., 1993; Whitty, 1994:8-9). In the United States it has been reported that teachers want to be involved in decision making, yet they also want uninterrupted instructional and planning time, thus creating pressures for principals to ensure participation whilst protecting instructional time (Hallinger et al., 1993). Odden and Odden (1993) found principals in successful schools sought balance between participation in decision making and protection of instructional time by encouraging democratic decision making, and, at the same time, shielding teachers from issues in which they had little interest or expertise so they could concentrate on teaching; principals in this research confirmed this behaviour.

In a number of countries that have introduced devolved systems, reports of increasing differentiation between principals and staff have been found (Halpin, Power and Fitz, 1993, cited in Whitty, 1994; Sinclair, Ironside and Seifert, 1993; cited in Whitty, 1994). Increased isolation of principals from teachers was found in this research, although principals were still considered to be supportive of staff. The increasing isolation was viewed as a negative aspect by both principals and teachers, and at least one principal was hoping to use self-management to alter their work situation so that they could be more involved with staff. The perceived isolation found in this research may reflect the increased work pressures found with the introduction of Schools of the Future, such as the preparation of school charters, increased budgetary
responsibilities, etc. An area for future study is whether Schools of the Future encourages deterioration in the relationship between principals and teachers that has been found in some New Zealand schools (Wylie, 1994, cited in Whitty, 1994); there is not evidence to suggest this has occurred so far in Schools of the Future.

In schools in the United States undergoing restructuring, the quality of relationship with staff has been found to reflect the orientation of the principal (Rosenblum et al., 1994:116-117). Increased teacher quality of work life was associated with principals who were involved in the daily life of the school, empowered teachers through formal and informal methods, ensured professional development was available for teachers, emphasised their vision through actions (such as gaining funding for appropriate programs) and gained shared commitment to their vision. Cultivating a network of relationships and promoting teacher development have been identified as important leadership dimensions in schools undergoing restructuring Murphy (1994). Teacher networks were established in the schools involved in this research by the principals ensuring that there were opportunities for teachers to be involved in decision making, and teacher development was promoted through the targeted development of teachers for leadership positions, and through challenging teacher knowledge and encouraging teachers to broaden their knowledge. Provision of individualised support to teachers and intellectual stimulation of teachers has been identified as high effect transformational leadership dimensions (Leithwood, 1994).

**STAFFING**

There was anticipation by most principals of the greater flexibility in staffing that Schools of the Future would allow. Principals viewed this positively, although they complained that much of the promised flexibility was not yet present and that system constraints continued to frustrate their efforts (some of the delay was due to unresolved industrial negotiations occurring with the DSE and the teacher unions at the federal level). The increased flexibility has
been found to be a negative experience in situations where schools have had funding cuts (Maychell, 1994, cited in Whitty, 1994). It remains to be seen if this experience is repeated in Schools of the Future; at present there is little indication that schools in Victoria will have funding levels reduced still further. It was also noted that principals have increased responsibilities for staff welfare due to the pressures resulting from change and for professional development to ensure that their staff has the skills needed for the future.

INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS

In much of the writing on the principalship there is little emphasis given to their role with students. This is also true of this study. Principals did not see direct involvement with students as a crucial aspect of their leadership role. Usually, principals delegated student management and evaluation functions to others, although they often retained symbolic functions such as giving student awards. However, some principals and a number of teachers believed that the principal should be more directly involved with students and more visible around the school; time pressures appear to work against this. Increases in the amount and type of work demands experienced by principals were reasons given for their limited direct contact with students. Increasingly, principals are involved in administrative tasks and in work that takes them out of the school. This allows less time to be in direct contact with students; some principals believed that the need for direct involvement was diminishing.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

There are a number of personal characteristics that have been found to be desirable in principals. The performance domains of principalship developed by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA, NASSP, 1992) listed ability to motivate others, sensitivity, and good oral and written expression as desirable interpersonal skills. Murphy and Hallinger (1992) emphasised the interpersonal communication skills needed to adopt
participatory leadership successfully. Odden and Odden (1993) found principals in successful schools communicated well and acknowledged staff using a variety of means such as thank you notes and mentions in newsletters. McGaw et al. (1993b:86) also emphasised effective communication, with other descriptors including strong, decisive, facilitator of change, visible and approachable, facilitating change and in control. The Effective Resources Allocation in Schools Project (see Caldwell and Spinks, 1988:31-33; Misko, 1985) identified a number of principal characteristics that were found in effective schools including being responsive, supportive, encouraging, sincere, friendly, sensitive, good listeners, available, committed, aware, flexible, willing to take risks, providing feedback and follow-up, and encouraging an open environment. Similar interpersonal skills are emphasised in the selection criteria for principals in Victorian schools (DSE, 1994b) and in the competencies and behaviours for future principals (DSE, 1994c). The list of personal characteristics found in the current research supports all the above features. The overwhelming list of positive characteristics compared to negative characteristics found in the current research suggests that principals are highly skilled in working with people and in coping with the demands of being a principal.

The conclusion from the above findings are clear: principals need and tend to have good interpersonal skills such as communication skills and openness, and they demonstrate personal qualities that allow them to cope with the demands of the role and, at the same time, support and encourage those around them. Indeed, the current research has supported the findings of leadership trait studies summarised by Stogdill (1981; cited in Beare et al., 1989:103) and discussed previously. One proviso to the above conclusion concerns the degree of pessimism that pervaded the interview of one principal involved in this research. This is an indication that principals do not always display positive characteristics. The impact of this principal’s sense of pessimism is not known, nor is the cause of it, although it appeared to be influenced by circumstances that were making it difficult for the principal to ensure that the school had a secure future. However, it may also be an enduring personality trait rather than a temporary personality state induced by
environmental circumstances. An implication for further research is the exploration of principal personal characteristics of principals who are working in hostile environments (e.g. declining enrolments, non-supportive staff, non-supportive community).

VALUES

The importance of values in leadership has been emphasised by, for example, Beare et al. (1989:106-116), Caldwell and Spinks (1992:71-75), Duignan and Macpherson (1992), Evers (1992), Greenfield (1986), Hodgkinson (1981), Senge (1990), and Sergiovanni (1990). Values held by principals have been found to relate to job performance in terms of the type of problem solving strategies used (Leithwood et al., 1994:104-105).

In this research values held by principals were categorised into basic human values, general moral values, professional values, and social and political values following the framework of Leithwood and Steinbach (1991; cited in Leithwood, Begley and Cousins, 1994:103); whilst the framework was able to be used, the specific values found in the Leithwood and Steinbach work were largely not confirmed by the current research. However, the values found would most likely influence the work of the principal and are therefore important. For example, equity and empowerment have been described as central values underpinning a school culture of excellence (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:72). If these are values that are present in a school culture, then the principal has a central role in ensuring that these values are expressed in what occurs in the school (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:85-86). In this research, principals demonstrated empowerment through their concern to ensure that school community members were effectively involved in decision making. Equity was shown through concern for social justice and fairness in, for example, catering for a broad range of students.

In a recent study of collaborative school cultures (Telford, 1994: 100-103) school leaders were found to protect and promote shared values of diversity,
community, participation and intrinsic valuing of individuals. Whilst this research did not focus on school values in particular, the emphasis in principal values on sharing and participation, school commitment, people, social justice, fairness and respect for others indicate that similar value systems are found in the principal description of this research and those of principals that have established collaborative school cultures where power and decision making are shared and there is a sense of common purpose. There was an element of overt manipulation and control in the values of some principals. However, for the majority of principals whilst they acknowledged the power they had, they emphasised the collaborative and sharing potential of this power rather than manipulation and control.

As most of the values were implied rather than explicitly mentioned in the interviews, questions arise concerning the principals' awareness of their own values. Leithwood et al. (1994:104) argue that expert school leaders are relatively clear about their values. This may also be true of the school leaders involved in this research, although this would require further investigation, possibly by directly checking with the principals as to the values that guide their view of educational leadership. This process would only determine if principals can articulate the values they believe they have; it would not determine if these espoused values match with the values embedded in the actions of principals.

BUSINESS ORIENTATION

The view of schools as businesses found in the interviews of some of the principals in the current research supports the changing perceptions of the principal role where principals are now being described as chief executive officers (Odden and Odden, 1994). Although, this trend has to be balanced against principals expressed desires to reassert their role as educational leaders, and in the assertion by some principals that whilst schools were embracing concepts from business, they still remained educational enterprises that were distinct from business.
Whilst an increase in the financial management responsibilities of principals was noted, principals were not greatly concerned about their financial role. It was seen as a necessary part of being a principal. Principals appear to be coping with the increased financial responsibilities, and the extra time this entails, by assuming an overseeing role of the budget process and delegating tasks to others. Some schools were even investigating the employment of business managers to ease the amount of time principals needed to give to this task. The lack of concern about financial matters is interesting given that managing the global budget was the second highest rated area by pilot school principals for issues to be addressed in further research (Thomas, 1993).

**SCHOOL COUNCIL ROLE**

The role of the principal in relation to school councils did not feature greatly in the themes. It featured in the interview of only one school principal, although aspects of this role were mentioned by some of the other principals and teachers with, for example, a teacher noting that there was an increase in time spent on school council matters. With the importance of school councils increasing (Beare, 1993), it is surprising that this theme wasn’t supported more strongly. Also, it has been a feature of *Schools of the Future* that principals have had to work closely with their school council in, first, deciding to become involved in the pilot program and, second, preparing the school charter (Thomas, 1993). Thus, working with school council would have been expected to feature in the leadership role of the principal. Follow-up research may be needed to explore the relationship of the principal to school council in *Schools of the Future*.

**REINFORCING PAST LEADERSHIP STYLE**

At this stage of the *Schools of the Future* reform, there is little evidence from this research that principal leadership style is being fundamentally changed.
Instead, *Schools of the Future* is viewed as enhancing the leadership style that principals already had. For example, one principal noted their leadership had gained focus and that there were additional challenges present. Leading a growing school or one with a very strong culture were reasons given by teachers for why their principal had not experienced great changes to their role. One of the deficiencies in research on leadership is the lack of longitudinal studies that have begun along with the start of a major reform. With this research being located in a larger research project investigating *Schools of the Future* (Thomas, 1993), it offers the potential to track changes in the leadership role as the *Schools of the Future* reform progresses.

**SUMMARY**

In summary, this research supported the principal leadership literature with respect to principals having vision, understanding and using symbolic and cultural dimensions, using information networks, marketing their school, protecting teacher instructional time, balancing teacher participation in decision making with instructional time, establishing teacher networks, educationally challenging teachers, supporting and encouraging teacher initiatives, being involved indirectly in instructional processes, having some powers increased and others decreased, increasing power with the waning of union power, using delegation extensively, showing trust, showing increased responsibility and accountability, becoming more isolated from teachers, having good interpersonal and coping skills, de-emphasising extensive involvement with students, experiencing pressure to be more like a chief executive officer, and having a range of values that encourage empowerment, equity and collaboration.

Some of the findings from this research have less support in the literature. The principal leadership role concerned with school council and with managing the school financial resources were not emphasised in this research. Also, it was found that teachers are expecting principals to make more decisions without teachers being involved.
Whilst this research has generated a rich description of the principal leadership role, comparison with theories of leadership is also appropriate. In chapter two it was suggested that instructional and transformational leadership, and leadership for self-managing schools were important areas to explore. The instructional leadership dimensions of Murphy (1990) and the transformational leadership characteristics developed by Leithwood (1994) will be used to investigate the presence of instructional and transformational leadership. Also, evidence for Caldwell and Spinks' (1992) view of leadership for self-managing schools will be examined.

**INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

In chapter two instructional leadership was discussed by using Murphy's (1990) instructional leadership dimensions. These dimensions were development of mission and goals, managing the educational production function, promotion of an academic learning environment, and development of a supportive work environment. These dimensions are used below to explore evidence for the presence of instructional leadership in this research.

**DEVELOPMENT OF MISSION AND GOALS**

For Murphy, this dimension was concerned with leaders having vision and communicating their vision. In this research principals had vision and this was developed through their understanding of political and educational trends, their understanding of community expectations and through discourse with teachers and school council members. Their vision influenced school directions with the school directions usually being set in consultation with others. The requirement for schools to write school charters was used by some principals to formalise their educational vision and gain consensus on school directions. Whilst the vision held by principals was usually developed in consultation with others and formalised within the school charter, the vision
was not communicated clearly to all teachers. Principals were viewed as having a major role in the marketing of their school and this role included publicising the school directions to the school and wider community.

**MANAGING THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTION FUNCTION**

There was little evidence for principals having direct involvement in this process which, as described by Murphy, involved promoting quality instruction, informally supervising instruction, evaluating instruction, allocating and protecting instructional time, active involvement in coordinating the curriculum, developing and enforcing homework policies, and actively monitoring student progress. Coordination of the curriculum and monitoring of student progress was typically achieved via delegation of these tasks. For example, whilst principals were involved in curriculum initiatives, they relied on teachers to coordinate curriculum planning. Principals were involved in allocating and protecting instructional time, but they were not involved directly in promoting quality instruction and in the supervision and evaluation of instruction. Some of these aspects may occur with the introduction of staff appraisal, which some schools were planning to do, and which the government is investigating on a state-wide basis, although the emphasis at the school level appears to be more on the principal ensuring that structures are in place, rather than being involved in appraising staff directly (which, as one principal noted, would involve too much of the principal’s time).

**PROMOTION OF AN ACADEMIC LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**

In this dimension principals are involved in establishing positive expectations and standards, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers and students, and promoting professional development. This research provided support for this dimension. Principals used symbolic actions to reinforce school values, and some principals provided incentives to students (e.g. principal awards) and teachers (e.g. “teacher of the week” awards).
However, maintaining high visibility was increasingly difficult due to internal and external work pressures, and few principals were directly involved in promoting professional development (this may reflect the current problems in resource provision in this area), although some principals were noted as being very supportive and encouraging of staff to try new roles and pursue further training.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SUPPORTIVE WORK ENVIRONMENT

This dimension includes creating a safe and orderly learning environment, providing opportunities for meaningful student involvement, developing staff collaboration and cohesion through having clear goals and opportunities for teachers to be involved in professional interchanges and decision making, securing outside resources in support of school goals, and forging links between the home and the school. Support for this dimension was found in principals’ awareness of the need to protect staff from external pressures, in having clearly communicated school goals, in the emphasis on participatory decision making and formal meeting structures, in the use of external networks to help the school, and in awareness of the importance of establishing good linkages with parents and the community. Emphasis was not given to student discipline policies; whilst principals were directly involved in reviewing welfare and discipline policies, many principals left daily discipline responsibilities to level coordinators.

Thus, there is evidence that principals were involved in instructional leadership, although the involvement was not always direct; in some aspects of instructional leadership, principals were only involved through the delegation of task and responsibilities to others. Indeed, Odden (1995:2) has described one of the features of principals involved in effective school-based management as “providing opportunities for teachers to engage in curriculum and instructional leadership.” This finding also confirms a similar finding from Odden and Odden (1993, 1994) who found that whilst principals in self-managing schools motivated staff, created a team feeling on campus, and
provided a vision for the school, their role was more akin to that of manager/facilitator, or Chief Executive Officer responsible for broader, strategic concerns, rather than that of instructional leader; this conception of leadership reflects a transformational orientation which will be discussed below.

The type of instructional leadership that is evident in this research could be called indirect instructional leadership. Peterson (1989) and Kleine-Kracht (1993) have utilised the term indirect instructional leadership to signify leadership that involves facilitating leadership in others, shaping the conditions of teaching, utilising symbolism to set school values, and connecting with the external environment. Support for the indirect instructional leadership model was found in the current research in that principals tended to rely on delegation and symbolism, they encouraged and supported teachers, they emphasised and protected instructional time, and they were actively involved in making connections with the external environment. The indirect instructional involvement found in the current research may reflect recent historical patterns in principal leadership in Victoria in which principals have not been directly involved in managing the educational production function, but rather work with their staff via delegation and trust, often through the use of Local Administrative Committees (LAC) and curriculum committees. The emphasis of indirect over direct instructional leadership may indeed reflect the changing forces acting on the principalship. However, earlier it was reported that direct instructional leadership has more impact and is rated as more useful by teachers than is indirect instructional leadership (Leithwood, 1993). This suggests that there may be some disadvantages associated with a trend to indirect instructional leadership. Also, the previously noted positive relationship between instructional leadership and school performance may be altered by a move to a more indirect instructional leadership style.

There may be little choice for principals with regard to whether they adopt a
direct or indirect instructional leadership role. The increased workload experienced by principals and the other pressures mentioned previously, mean that it is difficult for principals to be involved in all aspects of instructional leadership directly, although principal involvement in instructional leadership is still emphasised as being important (McPherson and Crowson, 1994; Murphy: 1990, 1994). It is worth noting that some principals in the current research were concerned about the extent of their instructional leadership role and they believed that *Schools of the Future* may allow them to restructure their roles and the roles of others so that they can become more involved in instructional processes; this may mean, for example, that assistant principals will be expected to carry out the technical administrative functions necessary to keep schools running (Rosenblum, Louis and Rossmiller, 1994:111). However, Leithwood (1994) argues against this. He believes that the size and complexity of secondary schools works against effective instructional leadership. Instead, he argues that for principals of secondary schools to fulfil instructional leadership expectations increasingly they will have to rely on empowering staff and dispersing leadership; this view reflects the findings of this research on indirect instructional leadership.

As discussed previously, the comparison between principal and teacher perceptions of the leadership role did not produce substantial differences. Those differences that were apparent were concerned with the themes of student interaction, marketing, symbolic awareness and accountability. However, these differences are not of sufficient importance to conclude that principals and teachers have different perceptions of the principal instructional leadership role. Thus, the way principals believed they lead their school was transparent enough for teachers to confirm their principal's perceptions of their instructional leadership role. This finding is in contrast to Wildy and Dimmock (1993) who found in a sample of 4 secondary principals, 5 deputy principals and 74 teachers that the principals perceived themselves as more involved in instructional leadership tasks than did the staff members; larger discrepancies have been found for principals of primary schools (Hallinger and Murphy, 1985; Wildy and Dimmock, 1993). In the earlier discussion of Murphy's (1990) review of the instructional leadership literature it was noted that
teachers believed that instructional leadership was not the primary responsibility of principals. Although this research did not specifically ask teachers for their opinion of how principals should lead, there is evidence to suggest that they support the principal in having an instructional leadership role. For example, many teachers wanted their principal to be involved in curriculum matters, to be more obvious around the school, and to be more involved in supporting the work of teachers. To some extent, teachers wanted their principals to be more directly involved in instructional leadership activities than their principals could manage or wanted; in one school the teachers on the curriculum committee manipulated the committee to force their principal to attend. Thus, teachers support the leadership perceptions of their principal, and, in terms of instructional leadership, there is a tendency for teachers to want their principal to be more directly involved than they are.

In the next section, attention will be focussed on evidence for transformational leadership.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transformational leadership continues to receive considerable attention in the literature, especially through the work of Leithwood and his colleagues. Leithwood's most recent conceptualisation of transformational leadership will be used to explore evidence for this model in the leadership description generated in this research. Leithwood's (1994) framework of transformational leadership characteristics included purposes, people, structure and culture categories.

PURPOSES

This dimension included developing a widely shared vision for the school, building consensus about school goals and priorities and holding high performance expectations. In this research all the schools have been
involved in the development of school charters. All the principals (except for one who was appointed after the school charter had been prepared) were careful to ensure involvement of staff and the school community in the charter development process. Often, the educational vision that principals had was incorporated into the school charters. Building consensus about school goals occurred in many schools through the process of review that is part of the school charter and through the many symbolic acts that occurred (e.g. principal awards for outstanding student effort). High performance expectations were evident in most schools, again through the use of symbolic acts, and through the expectations placed on delegated tasks to teachers.

PEOPLE

This dimension involved providing individualised support, providing intellectual stimulation and modelling good professional practice. In this research most principals provided strong individual support to teachers through encouragement, being available, and being concerned to protect teachers. However, others were either not concerned about it, or perceived by staff as offering little support. Some principals provided intellectual stimulation through challenging teachers educationally, through involvement in research and new educational initiatives, and through bringing in information and ideas gained through their experiences outside of school. Some principals noted the need to model good professional practice, whilst most, through activities such as encouraging democratic decision making, demonstrated the behaviours that they wanted in others. However, the effectiveness of modelling may be reduced through the lack of time principals have to interact with all teachers.

STRUCTURE

This dimension involves encouraging dispersed leadership and democratic decision making. In this research, with one notable exception, principals were
concerned to ensure that teachers were involved in decision-making with democratic decision making being used whenever possible. Principals used delegation extensively, trusting and giving freedom to staff to do the jobs delegated. The sincerity and effectiveness of this involvement were questioned by some teachers at some of the schools, but the presence of dispersed leadership and staff involvement was a strong feature of the interviews.

CULTURE

This dimension includes strengthening the school culture, using a variety of bureaucratic mechanisms to stimulate and reinforce cultural change, using symbols and rituals to express cultural values, direct and frequent communication about cultural norms, values and beliefs, and sharing power and responsibility with others. In this research many of the principals were aware of their school’s culture, and concerned to promote a positive school culture through the use of symbolic actions and effective communication with both parents and the wider community. Power and responsibility were shared in most schools through the democratic decision making processes and the extensive use of delegation. Bureaucratic mechanisms were used to stimulate and reinforce cultural change. This was evident in the decision of the school to become a School of the Future and in the time and resources devoted to charter writing and the implementation and review of the charter.

Thus, there is strong evidence for the presence of transformational leadership. The presence of transformational leadership is encouraging as it is this type of leadership that is believed to be necessary for leading schools in the current turbulent educational environment (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:20; Leithwood, 1994; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; refer to Gronn, 1995, for a dissenting view). The evidence that principals are involved in instructional leadership is also encouraging as the transformational leadership model subsumes instructional leadership (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992:62; Leithwood, 1994:14; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992:81). Thus, principals in this research appear to
be operating in a leadership role that is similar to that which is believed by many educational commentators to be most suitable for the current educational climate. However, there are important differences concerning the need for principals to be directly involved in all aspects of instructional leadership. It appears that principals are not directly involved suggesting that it may be enough for principals to ensure that instructional leadership processes are in place, rather than be actively involved in the processes themselves; this supports the findings of Odden and Odden (1994) who, in a sample of four pilot and four non-pilot Schools of the Future, found a trend away from direct instructional leadership to broader, strategic concerns. This suggests that trends reported elsewhere (McPherson and Crowson, 1994; Murphy 1990; Murphy and Hallinger, 1992; Murphy, 1994) in which principals do not appear to have enough time to fulfil the instructional leadership role that they would prefer to have and which the literature suggests is a factor in school effectiveness, may need to be reinterpreted; principals may effectively fulfil their instructional role in an indirect way through delegation of certain functions to others.

LEADERSHIP FOR SELF-MANAGING SCHOOLS

With the trend in education for educational systems to adopt some form of school self-management, leadership conceptions are being developed that specifically focus on self-managing schools. Caldwell and Spinks (1992) include cultural, strategic, educational and symbolic leadership dimensions. In the following discussion evidence for the presence of these dimensions is explored.

CULTURAL LEADERSHIP

Here the principals' role is concerned with the creation and sustaining of a culture of excellence in a climate of change. In this research the themes of symbolic and cultural awareness demonstrated understanding by principals of
the school and community cultures, and knowledge and use of symbolism. There was concern to ensure that the school was responsive to both community needs and expectations. The theme of wider knowledge demonstrated a commitment by principals to ensure that their schools were kept well informed of educational and societal trends. There appeared to be good management of change as exemplified by participating in the pilot phase of *Schools of the Future*. All but one of the principals were optimistic about the future of their school which indicates a confidence on the part of principals to manage future change.

**STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP**

This dimension is concerned with the principal ensuring that the school has a plan for the future that takes into account broad educational trends and issues, and which places it in a favourable position. In this research strategic leadership was evident in the vision displayed by principals, in their wider knowledge and political acumen, and in the early positioning of their school in *Schools of the Future* and in other educational initiatives. Principals were concerned that teachers were kept well informed concerning local and wider educational issues, and they emphasised giving teachers the opportunity for open discussion on most issues. The charter writing process and the finished charter were often cited as being useful in giving the school a clearly defined direction and in helping to establish monitoring and evaluation processes. All of these features fit with Caldwell and Spinks (1992: 91-92) notion of strategic leadership as having a longer term focus on predominantly school-wide issues that are not only local in scale.

**EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Here the principal helps to nurture a learning community by the enhancement of the role of teachers, parents and students in the school through the use of appropriate professional development, by generating mutual support amongst
the school community and by ensuring that the school avails itself of educational opportunities. In this research there was evidence that principals were educational leaders. School promotion to ensure that schools gained community support was evident in most schools. Many principals were concerned to ensure that parents had access to the school and that they had worthwhile involvement in decision making forums such as school council. Principals were concerned that teachers receive appropriate professional development; some were actively challenging the teaching methodology of their staff. Many principals were exploring the introduction of staff appraisal processes as a way to improve teaching and learning. Principals tended to delegate responsibilities for curriculum coordination and student monitoring to teachers. All principals were aware of the need to ensure that their schools took advantage of educational opportunities; e.g. participating in *Schools of the Future*. However, there was little mention of the involvement of students in the educational decision making process. Student involvement may be a process that is viewed as the responsibility of teachers and not principals. It was, for example, noted that principals were becoming more distant from students due to time pressures. Nonetheless, the absence of concern for student involvement would be worth exploring in subsequent studies.

**RESPONSIVE LEADERSHIP**

In this dimension the principal's role is to help the school to be responsive to community and individual concerns by encouraging and implementing self-reflection and accountability processes. In this research principals were aware of the need for personal and school accountability to the school community. Some principals emphasised this process, particularly as available resources were being reduced at the same time as accountability was being increased, with the resultant increase in the explanation to the school community of the decisions made. Thus, greater importance was placed on justifying how resources were allocated. The school charter process was viewed as a vehicle for school reflection and accountability. Principals held values concerned with social justice and school improvement
which reflect the values that Caldwell and Spinks believe are necessary for the effective use of accountability by responsive leaders; specifically, that informing others about how the school is performing is viewed as an important school function, and that accountability is used for school improvement.

Caldwell and Spinks have had considerable impact in Victorian schools, initially through extensive professional development workshops concerned with program budgeting (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988), through the publication of two books on self-managing schools (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988, 1992) and more recently with Caldwell's involvement in the inservicing of principals involved in the Schools of the Future program. Many principals would be familiar with the work of Caldwell and Spinks and they may be well aware of the leadership dimensions and support these in principle. However, they may or may not be implementing the leadership dimensions in practice. The support from teachers suggests that principals are, in practice, leading in ways that support the four leadership dimensions.

In summary, the principal description suggests that principals are adopting leadership approaches that fit the conception of leadership for self-managing schools proposed by Caldwell and Spinks. As this model draws heavily from instructional and transformational leadership conceptions the support for it is not surprising. However, it extends the instructional and transformational models by emphasising accountability and responsiveness to the community.

**COMBINED LEADERSHIP MODEL**

From the discussion of instructional leadership, transformational leadership and leadership for self-managing schools, there are three principal leadership trends that are suggested by this research. First, instructional leadership appears to be an important part of the principal leadership role. However, the emphasis is on indirect instructional leadership and the use of delegation. Second, transformational leadership also appears to be important. The trend to indirect instructional and transformational leadership are not competing
trends but complementary. Indeed this research provides evidence for the assertions by Murphy and Hallinger (1992) and Leithwood (1994) that both instructional and transformational leadership are important leadership styles. Thus, principals have assumed the multiple roles of ensuring that their schools are: focussed on learning and teaching; emphasise the symbolic and cultural aspects to promote a culture of excellence; and, future orientated and responsive to the changing educational climate. Third, in exploring evidence for Caldwell and Spinks' view of leadership for self-managing schools, not only were the previous roles confirmed, but it was also apparent that principals were concerned with accountability issues and being responsive to community expectations.

In chapter four the leadership role demonstrated by principals in this research was shown to be complex and multi-dimensional. A model of principal leadership has been developed by utilising the leadership description generated in this research, the support for this description from the principal leadership literature, and the three principal leadership trends identified above. This amalgamation of the findings from this research and the principal leadership literature is presented in figure 1 on page 192.

In this model principal leadership is viewed as comprising four broad leadership roles: learning and teaching, future orientation, symbolic and cultural awareness, and accountability. Beside each of these roles are listed appropriate leadership functions derived from the leadership description generated by this research. The leadership functions are elaborated in figure 2 on page 193. Each of the four leadership roles and their respective leadership functions will now be described in more detail.

LEARNING AND TEACHING

In this role the principal ensures that students are given quality learning opportunities. The role comprises four leadership functions concerned with supervising instruction, teacher support, wider knowledge, and decision
The principal is responsible for the standard of instruction and relies heavily on delegation of tasks and responsibilities to others to supervise the instructional process. The tasks delegated include promoting quality instruction, supervision and evaluation of instruction, monitoring student progress and coordinating the curriculum. Most of these tasks are delegated to level coordinators, subject coordinators, the curriculum coordinator and the professional development coordinator, although the principal is directly active in initiating and supporting new ideas. The principal's leadership is one of monitoring what is happening and participating in setting directions for the delegated roles. The principal is responsible for protecting and allocating instructional time. For example, in response to falling enrolments the principal may decide that it is better to increase the teaching loads of teachers rather than reduce student subject choice at the senior level.

Principals are involved in supporting teachers through instituting teacher appraisal, supervising professional development, educationally challenging teachers to reflect on what they are doing, encouraging teachers to accept new opportunities, keeping teachers informed, and being available to teachers. Both the teacher appraisal and professional development responsibilities are mostly delegated to others to implement. However, the principal is responsible for protecting teachers from, for example, over-committing themselves to non-teaching programs.

Principals are well informed about educational trends through their reading and networks. The principal is the key person in the school for constructing external networks and community linkages, and this role is taking more of the principal's time. By doing this the principal is able to ensure that the school takes advantage of new opportunities and new educational trends, and that it is able to enlist community support as needed.
Figure 1: Principal Leadership Model
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### Figure 2: Details of Principal Leadership Model

#### Learning and teaching

**Instruction focus**
- promoting quality instruction
- supervision of instruction
- evaluation of instruction
- monitoring student progress
- coordinating the curriculum
- allocating and protecting instructional time
- initiating ideas

**Teacher focus**
- teacher appraisal
- professional development
- educationally challenging teachers
- encouraging teachers
- protecting teachers
- keeping teachers informed
- being available to teachers

#### Symbolic and cultural awareness

**Symbolism**
- awareness that constructive and destructive messages can be sent by principal and school actions

**Values**
- equity, empowerment, participation, school commitment, people orientation, social justice, fairness, respect

**Parent and community focus**
- communication with parents and the community
- parental access and involvement
- responsive to community expectations

**Student and teacher focus**
- high expectations of teachers and students
- establishing positive expectations and standards
- trust placed in teachers for fulfilling designated roles
- modelling desired teacher behaviours
- use of incentives for students and teachers
- use of bureaucratic mechanisms to stimulate and reinforce change

**Wider knowledge**
- external networks and community linkages
- informed about educational trends

**Decision making**
- clearly communicated school goals
- participatory decision making used
- formal meeting structures

**Future orientation**

**Vision**
- shared vision
- communicating vision
- consensus on school goals and priorities based on vision
- process in place to develop and review school goals and priorities (e.g. school charter)

**Responsive to changing educational climate**
- periodic review of school goals and priorities (e.g. through school charter)
- awareness of educational, political and social trends

**Accountability**

**Principal to school council and government**
- evaluation of school programs (e.g. annual report associated with school charter)

**School to community and government**
- evaluation of school programs (e.g. annual report associated with school charter)

**Teacher to principal**
- teacher appraisal
- informal and formal monitoring of delegated tasks

---

*Note: an * indicates that this is a delegated leadership role.*
Principals have an important role in constructing effective decision making processes through ensuring there are clearly stated school goals and directions, ensuring participatory decision making is used and through having formal meeting structures so that people know how and when decisions are made. Whilst encouraging participation in decision making, principals are aware of their power to veto decisions and they will, sparingly, use this power if necessary.

SYMBOLIC AND CULTURAL AWARENESS

This leadership role is concerned with awareness and use of school and community cultures and the symbolism inherent in actions.

Values held by principals influence the sort of leadership that is exercised. Principals in this research held values of equity, social justice, empowerment, encouraging participation, commitment to the school, people orientation, fairness and respect for others. These values suggest an open style of leadership that values and encourages the participation of others, has a focus on people and the school and is driven by issues of fairness and equity.

In this leadership role principals use the overt and covert messages that are sent by their actions to influence the behaviour of others constructively. For example, the celebration of student academic success is valuable in encouraging academic excellence. Principals are also aware that their actions can send negative messages.

Principals have a focus on the parents and community of the school by ensuring that parents have access to and involvement in the school, that there is effective communication between the school and the parents and the community, and that the school understands and responds to parental and community expectations.

As well as a parent/community focus, principals use symbolic actions focussed towards students and teachers. High expectations are placed on the
performance of students and teachers; positive expectations and standards are established to encourage behaviour will help achieve the school goals. Teachers are trusted to do their jobs and principals try to model the behaviour they expect from teachers. Incentives, such as public recognition, are used to encourage appropriate student and teacher behaviour. Principals also use bureaucratic mechanisms to stimulate and reinforce change; for example, the school charter clearly indicates the goals and priority improvement areas and how these will be evaluated.

Through school promotion, public relations and community linkages the school is marketed to the community. The principal has a key role in ensuring that the image that the school projects is positive and one that will attract student enrolments. For example, principals ensure that there are opportunities for the community to view the school programs and they ensure that their school receives positive publicity in local newspapers.

**FUTURE ORIENTATION**

This leadership role is concerned with ensuring that the school is well placed to take advantage of future possibilities. To achieve this the principal ensures that there is a shared school vision, that the vision is communicated to the school community and that there is consensus on the school goals and priorities arising from the shared vision. The school charter process led by the principal facilitates this through the construction of a three year plan for resource allocation to priority areas identified and agreed upon by the school community. The principal is also aware of and responsive to changes in the educational climate. This awareness arises through the wider knowledge that the principal gains through external activities and networks. Establishment of a process such as that involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of a school charter may help the principal to ensure that the school is responsive to changing educational climates by ensuring that current priorities are evaluated and new ones set.
ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability is the last leadership role to be discussed. Accountability has three levels. First, the principal is accountable to the school council and the government for his/her own performance and that of the school. Second, the principal has to ensure that the school satisfies the accountability requirements of the school community and of the government. Along with annual reports and triennial school reviews, in Victoria the school charter is a public accountability mechanism that principals can use to satisfy this accountability aspect. In a period of resource reduction explaining resource allocation decisions to parents is a difficult but important aspect of the leadership role of principals. Third, teachers are accountable to the principal. Principals achieve this through establishing teacher appraisal programs and through informal and formal monitoring of teacher performance in completing delegated tasks.

SUMMARY

In this principal leadership role model the complexity of the leadership role of principals is readily apparent through the four leadership roles and 15 leadership functions described. This model is complimentary to the three conceptions of leadership previously discussed as it combines the instructional emphasis of instructional leadership with the symbolic and cultural aspects from transformational leadership and responsiveness and accountability from leadership for self-managing schools.

There are two additional features worth noting. Both exert considerable influence on the leadership roles although they are not highlighted in the model.

First is the usefulness of the school charter process as a leadership tool. In this research the school charter emerged not as a leadership theme, but as a tool that allowed principals to express aspects of their leadership such as vision, curriculum involvement, delegation, and school accountability to the
community. In the development, implementation and evaluation of the charter there was direct involvement of the future orientation and accountability leadership areas, and aspects of the learning and teaching, and symbolic and cultural areas were evident such as being responsive to community expectations and educationally challenging staff. Similar effects have been noted in other reforms that involved the development of shared vision and goals, and the evaluation of progress (Goldman, Dunlap and Conley, 1993).

The second aspect is the range of personal characteristics that principals use in their leadership role. Principals need to have good interpersonal skills and be able to encourage others to extend themselves and try new things. Also, principals need to have good personal coping strategies, especially as the time pressures on principals increase and the role becomes more complex. These personal characteristics are important for all four of the leadership roles described above, and they may be a precondition for the successful performance of the leadership roles.

RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The findings from the current research and the indications from the reviewed literature suggest a number of research directions that could be explored. This section describes research directions concerned with investigating change in the principalship over time, establishing causal relationships between principal behaviour and school outcomes, exploration of various leadership models, the influence of District Liaison Principals on principal leadership, gender and school type effects on the principalship, further exploration of principal leadership characteristics and the effect of changes at the district level on the principalship.

One of the methodological problems associated with research on school leadership has been the lack of longitudinal studies (Clark et al., 1989; Mortimore, 1991). In Victoria Leading Victoria's Schools of the Future (Thomas, 1993) is one of the examples of a new emphasis on large scale
longitudinal research. In three years the schools used in this study will have been through their first three year charter cycle. Assuming that the principals have remained in their current positions, revisiting these schools would provide some indication of changes that have occurred in the principal leadership role as the *Schools of the Future* reform progresses.

Another major problem has been establishing causality. The research on school effectiveness and school improvement clearly demonstrated that outstanding leadership was a characteristic of good schools. There have been few studies that have been able to demonstrate conclusively that leadership practices resulted in effective schools (Firestone, 1991b). The current research did not attempt to map causal relationships although the methodology could be used to map connections that are grounded in the experiences of principals and teachers. There is recent work in Victoria where principal behaviour has been shown to influence student outcomes (Hill et al., 1993). This research is indicative of new quantitative research methodologies where causal relations of complex phenomena can be mapped.

With the current research indicating that principals appear to be adopting a transformational leadership role, future research should explore this role further. Leithwood (1994) lists four recommendations for future studies of transformational leadership:

1. Subsequent empirical research should compare the explanatory power of competing images of leadership (e.g. instructional and transformational).
2. Subsequent research should systematically vary the type of change being attempted as a critical determinant of effective leadership practices.
3. Subsequent research should emphasise grounded methods.
4. Subsequent research should clarify the thinking of transformational leaders and the variables mediating leadership effects.
Leithwood’s call for the use of grounded methods is important even though it echoes the earlier cries of others such as Greenfield who argued ten years ago that researchers need to explore the wealth of understanding that administrators have about administration (Greenfield, 1986). Further grounded work, like the current research, not only allows the people being studied to speak, but it also compliments research that is more removed from the people under study (e.g. the previously mentioned work of Hill et al., 1993). Also, the methodology employed in this research could be used to explore the thinking of transformational leaders.

This research has identified a number of different aspects of the principal leadership role. It would be worthwhile for future research to explore the complexities of these dimensions, how they are connected and how these dimensions relate to current theories of leadership. Amongst other methods, this could be achieved through the use of theory-driven grounded methods, through the use of powerful quantitative methods such as path analysis, and through large scale explorations of leadership style. Large scale explorations of leadership style could be achieved through the construction of an appropriate leadership scale, with items selected to gain evidence for the presence of various leadership styles; the Instructional Leadership Questionnaire developed by Wildy and Dimmock (1993) is an example of such an instrument. The section below on recommendations for practice provides an indication of generic areas that could be used to develop scale items that could then be used to test for instructional, transformational and other leadership styles. For example, scale items that explore the features of vision could be used to test a variety of leadership conceptions as vision is a common feature of most.

The analysis of the principal and teacher perceptions of the leadership role produced a rich description of this role. In future research it would be useful to extend this description by including the perspectives of others involved in schools. Thus, the parents, students, ancillary staff and community members could be included. This may result in further understanding of the leadership themes that emerged in this research and/or the addition of new leadership
themes.

One of the features of *Schools of the Future* has been the creation of District Liaison Principals (DLP) positions. A District Liaison Principal is someone who has been a principal and is now responsible for facilitating changes associated with *Schools of the Future* working with a group of approximately 30 schools. One of their functions is to provide advice and collegiate support for the principals. These positions were filled during the first term of 1994. In this research there was little mention made of DLP's and they were not featured in any theme from the leadership description. DLP's could be expected to feature in a number of the identified leadership themes. For example, they should be able to facilitate principals' connections with the wider environment. That they were not mentioned in the interviews perhaps reflects the newness of the DLP positions. At the time of the interviews, most DLP's had been in their position for less than three months. Clearly the early impact of DLP's on principal leadership has not been great. However, the impact on principal leadership would be worth exploring in future research as would the leadership role of DLP's.

An emerging feature of *Schools of the Future* is the emphasis on student outcomes. In 1995, statewide testing of primary school students in English and Mathematics at years 3 and 5 was begun, whilst at the secondary level a general achievement test (GAT) was used to verify Year 12 student performance. Also, it is planned that schools will be produce annual reports that detail student performance against state-wide achievement expectations. In the current research, student outcomes did not feature significantly as a principal leadership role, although this may be because principals delegated these responsibilities. However, the increasing emphasis on student outcomes may impact on the principal leadership role and be demonstrated in future research as an additional theme or as part of the accountability theme.

With the increasing number of women gaining principal appointments and the findings of gender differences in leadership style in *Schools of the Future* principals (Thomas, 1993), there is a need for exploration of gender
differences in leadership. In the current research, it was not possible to make any conclusions regarding the one female principal compared to the nine male principals except to acknowledge that whilst the female principal was participatory, she was perhaps less so than some of the male principals. Some teachers at the female principal’s school were concerned that the principal made decisions without consultation. However, one male teacher at the school acknowledged that the principal brought to the school female leadership qualities that were not evident in the previous school principals who were described as traditional male principals. The question that would be of interest concerns whether female leadership characteristics are different from those of current male principals who are tending to adopt a transformational leadership model; the current research suggests that principals are striving for participation and collaboration, which are the very qualities that females appear to bring to leadership to a greater extent than males. For future research, a qualitative study of the perceived leadership role of female principals would be worthwhile to allow comparison with the current research.

The effect of school type on the perceived principal leadership role was an area that this research did not explore. As Schools of the Future also includes primary schools and schools in country and remote areas, the potential is there to repeat this research using samples from these school types. Varying school type may produce a different leadership description as there is evidence that leadership style varies according to school type. For example, Wildy and Dimmock (1993) found that instructional leadership tasks were perceived as being performed less by principals in secondary schools compared to primary schools, and less in schools of middle size (300-500 students) when compared to smaller or larger schools.

Louis and Murphy (1994) have identified a number of emerging issues for the principalship. Louis and Murphy (1994:274) predict that principals will need to be educational leaders in terms of having a proactive instructional stance "in surfacing and resolving problems that may deflect attention from pedagogy...helping people see possibilities, confront barriers, and construct
their own solutions", and in terms of being the intellectual, the person who is connected with educational research and who can intellectually stimulate school members. They also identified the importance of principals understanding, using and forming cultures that enhance schools and effectively being able to work politically both within schools and between schools and communities. All of these dimensions received support from the current research and the findings will not be reiterated here. However, their predictions and the indications from this research clearly support further research that attempts to identify these characteristics of the principalship. Louis and Murphy also predicted that the district/regional level of school systems will remain an important influence on the principalship. There was little support from this research for this idea, although, as indicated in the principal and teacher interviews, the regions were perceived to be in disarray, due to restructuring and staffing instability. As the reforms to the administration of the Victorian educational system continues, the relationship of the regional level to the school and its effect on principals may be an area that needs to be monitored.

CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The research has made a number of contributions to the school leadership knowledge base. This section will highlight six contributions without unnecessarily repeating the findings in detail.

1. Description of the principal leadership role

The principal leadership role was described using the perceptions of the principals and teachers. Few studies have sought to understand principal leadership through interpretative inquiry such as used in this research. A rich description was generated and the leadership role was shown to be complex and multi-dimensional. This suggests that views of leadership which use one or two dimensions are inadequate to describe the leadership role. Also, contrary to indications from past research, there was substantial agreement
between the principal and teacher perceptions.

2. Documentation of the early stages of a major educational reform

The description of the perceived leadership role of principals involved in the early stages of a major educational reform is a primary contribution of this research. This research is part of a larger longitudinal research that is specifically focussed on the Schools of the Future initiative (see Thomas, 1993). By providing a description of principal leadership at the beginning of the initiative this research will enable changes in the leadership role to be monitored, and it may help to guide practical issues such as the professional development support offered to principals involved in later stages of the initiative; 12 recommendations for practice are given later in this chapter.

3. Comparison with the educational leadership literature

Although the description of principal leadership is the main finding of the research, the description was also connected with the leadership literature. This analysis was divided into two parts. First, the research demonstrated varying degrees of support for previous research findings (refer to prior discussion in this chapter). Second, this research has enhanced understanding of a number of important leadership conceptions. Evidence was found for indirect instructional leadership, transformational leadership and leadership for self-managing schools.

4. Description of a leadership model.

From the comparison of the research findings with the leadership literature, a leadership model was constructed. This model is perhaps the first to illustrate the concurrent trends towards indirect instructional leadership, transformational leadership and emphases on accountability and community responsiveness. The model describes four principal leadership roles: learning and teaching, symbolic and cultural awareness, accountability and
future orientation. Indirect instructional leadership was contained mainly within the learning and teaching role, transformational leadership was emphasised in the symbolic and cultural awareness and future orientation roles, whilst accountability and responsiveness were found in the accountability and symbolic and cultural awareness roles. In addition the personal characteristics of the principal were found to be important across all the leadership roles. Also, a planning, resource allocation and accountability process, such as found in the development of school charters, cut across many of the leadership areas.

5. Research directions

An important contribution of any research is the directions that are indicated for further research. This study has suggested a number of directions which were described previously. Important research directions include gathering further evidence regarding the leadership role description and the efficacy of the leadership model, particularly in relation to gender and type of school.

6. Methodology

A final contribution to knowledge concerns the methodology used. Aspects of this are discussed in the next section.

REFLECTION ON THE METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this research is worth commenting on as it is to some extent an atypical methodology for this area of research.

One of the features of the methodology was the lack of a theoretical framework to guide the collection of the information. However, the research gathered a substantial amount of information from the participants and the analysis of this information produced a detailed description of principal leadership which was also able to be compared to a number of leadership models and to the
leadership literature in general. The benefit of rich description which is not dependent on a theoretical position was demonstrated in this research. Indeed, one of the useful features of this research is that the information gathered could, with the approval of the participants, be used by other researchers investigating a variety of areas.

In this research a description of the phenomenon of principal leadership has been constructed from the perceptions of 40 people. The separate observations each contributed understanding of the phenomenon to the point that collecting further observations would most likely not have added more to the description; this is what Lincoln and Guba (1985:234-235) term redundancy. Thus, whilst the description obtained is a rich description that defines the broad parameters of the phenomenon, it does not mean that any one principal's leadership role is defined by the description. It does however help to define the phenomenon in broad terms and to guide further research by indicating the features that are part of the phenomenon.

This research has produced results that may be interpreted as being locally specific and not generalisable. For example, a similar study in another Australian state may result in a description of leadership that is different to the one described in this research. However, there is evidence to indicate that this research has produced a description that is not necessarily confined to principals of Schools of the Future, but which may also be applicable to, at least, principals of Melbourne metropolitan secondary schools. Principals and teachers in this research noted that, in many cases, participating in Schools of the Future had not changed the principal leadership role so much as it had enhanced what was already present. Thus, the description generated in this research may also reflect the leadership role already being used by other secondary principals in Melbourne.

A criticism of the methodology is that it might produce a leadership description that is a product of the time in which the interviews were conducted. The second term of the 1994 school year was a period of relative calm after the tumultuous year of 1993 when Schools of the Future and other initiatives
where first introduced, and when severe cutbacks in staffing levels and funding had occurred. There is evidence from the interviews that there were special features about the period of the interviews. For example, one principal discussed having to protect teachers from work overload. Indeed, two of the interviewed principals would not allow their teachers to be interviewed because of the workload and stress teachers were experiencing. However, whilst there were contextual features of the period of the interviews, there is little evidence that the major features of the leadership description would change. Thus, the protection of teachers from high workloads was an aspect of the theme Interaction with Teachers. It indicates that principals are aware of aspects of their teachers’ work, that they care and respect the effort teachers expend and that they are concerned with protecting the quality of teaching and learning. It is difficult to imagine that these features would not be part of the leadership role of principals in schools as they are now structured, even though the examples used that indicate these features may be different in a different context. To confirm the stability of the leadership description generated by this research, further research would be needed to either replicate this research or to investigate evidence for aspects of the leadership description.

It should be noted that the issue of the stability of leadership characteristics is not confined to the methodology used in this research. Any study of leadership characteristics faces problems associated with determining whether the characteristics described are states or traits. That is, are the characteristics relatively temporary in nature and time and context dependent, or are they enduring leadership characteristics that transcend time and context? This research cannot answer this question definitively. However, in this research it has been argued that in the current educational climate certain types of leadership appear to be favoured over others and that this research indicates that principals are adopting the features of instructional and transformational leadership conceptions. Thus, for at least the short term, there appear to be stable features of the leadership role of principals that can be identified; this research has generated one description of these features.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE

From the findings of the research presented in chapter four and the further analysis presented in this chapter, there are a number of recommendations that can be made concerning the leadership role of principals in Schools of the Future. Whilst these recommendations are stated as musts, the limitations of this research constrain the power of these recommendations; the recommendations are indicators of the leadership role principals should be considering.

1. Principals can no longer be expected to be directly involved in all aspects of instructional leadership. Rather, principals should be encouraged to delegate and use others to help fulfil this role. In many respects, the principal is the person who ensures that appropriate processes are in place, and who monitors the processes. Principals need to understand this and not condemn themselves when they can not find the time to supervise teaching and learning directly. Principals will be directly involved in instructional leadership through having high expectations for the teaching and learning that occurs, with an emphasis on quality instruction. They will use a variety of symbolic acts to emphasise this, such as direct and public reinforcing of appropriate student and teacher behaviour. Also, modelling of appropriate behaviour and constructing activities that force appropriate behaviours should be used. Principals will need to be directly involved in protecting instructional time, by, for example, limiting the range of educational initiatives that their school is involved in.

2. The leadership conceptions discussed in this chapter - instructional, transformational and leadership for self-managing schools - are all relevant for the leadership role of principals. All three should be used to inform the practice of principals and aspiring principals.

3. Vision is an important attribute for principals. The vision will most likely be developed through a variety of processes including discussions with others,
understanding of political and educational trends and awareness of community expectations. It should be clearly defined and articulated to the whole school community. Also, there should be congruence between the principal’s vision and the directions of the whole school community, possibly by gaining consensus on school directions through the charter development process.

4. Delegation is an essential tool. As mentioned previously, principals can no longer be directly involved in all that they are expected to do. Areas of delegation may include curriculum coordination, monitoring of student progress, student welfare and discipline, and improving instruction (evaluation, support, professional development). Although principals retain considerable power and authority, dispersed leadership is needed. When functions are delegated the principal has to monitor progress (formally and/or informally), but also has to demonstrate a high degree of trust and high expectations of those that are given the tasks to do.

5. Monitoring of what occurs in schools is a responsibility that principals must assume, although they do not have to be directly involved in all the processes. Monitoring has a number of aspects centring on summative and formative evaluation, and accountability. First, there is evaluation of the school programs, with this evaluation being used to inform the community and to suggest improvements. The principal is responsible for ensuring that the school fulfils community and system accountability expectations. This evaluation of school programs will most likely be incorporated into the school charter with principals having direct influence on this through their central role in the charter process. Second, there is evaluation of teachers in terms of their instructional focus and in terms of their delegated roles, with the information gained being used to monitor and improve performance. Principals are not directly involved in teacher evaluation, but are responsible for the formation of processes that allow this to happen. Teacher evaluation is also closely connected to the principal encouraging individual teachers to be involved in professional development activities, although formal school-wide professional development responsibilities will usually be delegated to others.
Third, there is monitoring of student performance. This is a role that the principal delegates to teachers, although again the principal is responsible for ensuring that suitable processes are in place.

6. Principals should encourage participatory and, where possible, democratic decision making. Formal meeting structures will be used and open discussion of issues encouraged. These will help ensure that power and responsibility are shared as much as possible, although principals will still retain the power to override staff decisions. Keeping teachers informed and involving them in decision making should be seen by principals as central to school functioning. Also, there is a need to keep parents informed, to give parents access to the decision making process, and to encourage and support their genuine involvement in decision making.

7. Principal involvement in initiating ideas is an important leadership function. Amongst other areas, this could include ideas that are curriculum, teacher, parent and community, process, or school environment centred. Principals need to have a central role in introducing initiatives that are likely to have a major impact on their school, such as involvement in Schools of the Future. This may be achieved using directive methods where the principal has an idea and implements it with or without discussion and consultation. However, non-directive methods should be used where possible to gain maximum support. Non-directive methods employ discussion and consultation to gain general support for a new initiative. Due to time pressures, the extent of principal involvement will most likely be limited to flagging a new initiative, and supporting its introduction, with implementation and monitoring left to others. Principals should also be supportive of the teacher initiatives and encourage teachers to be innovative.

8. Change is acknowledged as a feature of the current educational climate and principals will use change as a way to school improvement. It is the principal’s role to help the school through the change processes, both in protecting the school from changes that may have a negative impact and in embracing appropriate new initiatives.
9. Principals need to be involved in external educational and business networks to help keep themselves, teachers, school council members and others informed and to allow their school to respond early to educational trends; e.g. becoming involved in *Schools of the Future*. Principals also need political acumen to be able to effectively use their networks and to connect with their school. Principals in many ways are the key link with the external world and the main representative for their school. They need to be actively involved in the marketing of their school, emphasising a positive school image with a clear customer orientation.

10. Principals need to be effective communicators with very good interpersonal skills. They need to demonstrate openness to others, and have personal qualities that allow them to cope with the demands of the role and, at the same time, support and encourage those around them.

11. Awareness of the school culture, of how it can change (deliberately or not, for better or worse) and how it effects the present are all important leadership attributes. The leadership style principals use will almost certainly be influenced by the school culture with, for example, the adoption of certain leadership styles either necessitating changing the school culture, modifying the leadership style to suit the school culture, or, most likely, changing both. Principals need to be aware of the community culture and to ensure that their school is aligned to this; this seems to be particularly important as competition for student enrolments increases.

12. Mentioned previously was the need for principals to be aware of the symbolism inherent in what they do and what the school does. They are careful to manage this to create a positive culture which reflects the values inherent in the school community. The importance of understanding and using symbols pervades many of the previous points especially in the use of the three leadership models, in the formulation and articulation of vision, in the what, how and use of evaluation and delegation, in the decision making and communication structures that are used, in how change is viewed, in the
information that principals give teachers and in their response to the school culture. This point was deliberately kept until last to emphasise its importance in most aspects of leadership.

CONCLUSION

This research has demonstrated that the perceived leadership role of principals in pilot *Schools of the Future* is complex and multi-dimensional and that even though the role has been subject to a number of changes since the introduction of *Schools of the Future*, principals believed that their role remained substantially the same. In many respects the range of roles and responsibilities that principals need to assume is overwhelming. There were 17 leadership themes that emerged and 13 areas where change was noted in the leadership role since the introduction of *Schools of the Future*. The list of 12 recommendations for practice arising from this research further attests to the complexity of the role. Principals involved in this research were responding to the demands of their role with enthusiasm. To both cope with the work demands and to involve others, the principals relied on delegation of significant tasks to others. The extent of this showed when the findings were analysed for evidence of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership was present, but it involved much more indirect contact by the principal than much of the previous research suggested. This indicates that there may be a trend towards indirect instructional leadership where the principal will ensure that all the functions included in this model are accounted for, but where the principal will not do all the work. The research also indicated support for transformational leadership. The importance placed in transformational leadership models on cultural and symbolic leadership, and on being future orientated was confirmed in this research. Also, the additional foci of accountability and responsiveness highlighted in Caldwell and Spinks' description of leadership for self-managing schools were confirmed. A model of leadership was proposed that had four leadership roles labelled learning and teaching, symbolic and cultural awareness, future orientation and accountability. A number of possibilities were suggested for further research.
including the investigation of the effects of type of school and gender on perceived leadership role, and the conduct of a large scale investigation into perceived leadership role using an appropriate survey instrument. This research also demonstrated the practical use of employing a hermeneutic phenomenological methodology to generate rich information that did not rely on having an a priori theoretical framework.
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APPENDICIES

APPENDIX ONE: THEMES IDENTIFIED IN PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS

For each school, the themes identified in the principal and teacher interviews are presented. These were derived from the interview transcripts and the thematic analyses of the interviews, both of which are contained in files on the accompanying computer floppy disks. The referencing system is the same as that used for the thematic analysis described under table 3 in the results section of the main report. Thus, a reference such as A1-5 refers to person A1, and page 5 of the interviews from school A.

SCHOOL A

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

This interview was characterised by a concern for the future of the school. The school has a declining enrolment and is still overcoming a turbulent history that included a difficult recent amalgamation of three schools into one, and including staff and students from a nearby school that was closed in the year prior to the interviews.

PRINCIPAL A1

Vision

The principal has a vision for the school. He wants the school to be seen as a small school that caters for the needs of the local community in providing a window from the deprived socio-economic area to the outside world A1-6. However, whilst the principal has a vision for the school he was despairing of how to fulfil it A1-14.

Pessimism

The principal gave a picture of a person that is compassionately concerned with what the school offers, where it is heading and what he can do to influence the direction in the way he believes it should go. However, in many respects the interview had very pessimistic overtones with a sense of desperation that is evident in the tape; desperation in trying to cater for the local youth, desperation in trying to ensure that the school doesn't close, desperation in trying to make a difference to the direction in which the school appears to be heading. Thus, there were negative views expressed such as: “I am told that schools where things are really kicking on, the principal knows everything about everything, controls everything, runs it with an iron fist.” A1-5

Taj Mahal image of the school; beautifully built, but empty. A1-6

“You wanted me to give you the answers well I haven’t got them.” A1-8

Despairing about efforts to address the level of violence amongst students. A1-9

“I am still fiddling while Rome is burning.” A1-10

“Between you and me, one day I won’t be able to manage and I will have to quit.” A1-12

There is a sense of isolation: “Well that is why I haven’t got colleagues, I haven’t got friends. The others are all out there being successful.” A1-14

Wider knowledge

The principal has a wider view of education gained by talking to business people A1-7, reading research A1-10, visiting other schools A1-10, being aware of historical patterns and their influence on the present A1-11,12, and using a range of external contacts to get what he wants for the school A1-13,14. This wider view reflects his belief that principals need to be able to talk about educational issues A1-4.
Cultural awareness

This principal emphasised the local culture and how the school had to respond to and acknowledge that. Many of the students are difficult ("some of the most difficult kids in Melbourne" A1-7) and the parents have little money A1-7, lack social skills A1-4 and the homes do not have an educational culture A1-9, 10. The principal believed that the school served a social function for many parents which was akin to the local doctor providing a reliable base for general help and support A1-5. The perceived student cultural background influenced the expectations that teachers had of students; one of the problems he faced was getting the teachers to believe that the students they taught can achieve high academic performance A1-8, 9, 10.

Symbolic awareness

He was aware of the use of symbols to promote the school; examples included the celebration of student successes A1-10, having his own children attend that school A1-8 and making himself available to staff as much as possible (even if that means calling the staff at night to discuss an issue) A1-14, 15. However, he also expresses negative views concerning the schools image and its future A1-6, 10 and he seems unaware of their powerful symbolism.

School promotion

Related to symbolic awareness is the need to promote the school by presenting a public image that emphasises academic standards, good discipline and good facilities A1-10, 11 and which will counter negative images the community is perceived to have as a result of the history of the school (amalgamation, incidents of student violence A1-10, 12).

Decision making and communication

Although decision making and communication is not directly discussed by the principal, from his discussion of how businesses run and his emphasis of delegating tasks to people, there is a sense that he runs the school in a hierarchical manner where he delegates extensively and expects the delegated jobs to be done A1-6, and where he will make decisions for the school, such as securing funding or involvement in programs from external sources A1-11, 12, 13. Yet, he clearly states that a business model does not apply to the school situation A1-6. It is also apparent that the principal believes that the staff will not make decisions without his approval and that he needs to keep checking on them to ensure that the jobs allocated to them are completed A1-7. Overall, his decision making seems to involve little consultation and he will allocate people jobs and expect them to be done with out the need to get feedback.

Delegation

Delegation of tasks was emphasised by the principal. He wanted to give people a job and allow them to do this with little input from him unless needed A1-4. However, he found that he couldn't do this because his staff needed constant reminders to do the allocated jobs A1-8, which he attributed to teachers' natural focus on their primary function of teaching rather than the delegated roles A1-7.

Initiating ideas

The inability to delegate effectively perhaps reflects his own desire to be involved as evidenced in the descriptions he gives of some of his major initiatives A1-6, 9, 10. He described three initiatives that he has instigated or considering: a major building and refurbishment program which is still in progress; a survey of families that will allow the school to plan future strategies to attract enrolments; and, the possible introduction of streaming to better cater for academic students and to improve the school's image. There was a clear sense that he was in control of these ideas: for example, with the refurbishment of the school he believed that he "was instrumental in having six million dollars spent here." A1-6.

Interaction with teachers

Staff support was evident through concerns about motivating staff by discussing educational issues A1-
4, personally encouraging staff A1-4, explicit trust in the staff to do their job A1-5, willingness to give staff time if they need to talk A1-5, and knowledge of the pressures facing teachers A1-8.

**Personal characteristics**

The principal described himself as wanting to talk about educational issues A1-4, being self-directing A1-4, being energetic A1-5, and trying to cope with the overwhelming time demands of the job A1-5. There was also a sense of pessimism and despair about the future of the school (see above).

**Values**

The principal had a strong sense of social justice A1-6, 8, 9, 13, commitment to having a school that serves the local community A1-5, having pride in the school A1-8, belief in the importance of family support for school success A1-10, and belief that his role as principal is of central importance to the survival of the school A1-9, 11, 12.

**Changes**

Changes noted included: the pressure of work, especially the increase in time spent on administrative tasks A1-5, 8; increase in competition with other schools for student numbers A1-6; increased pressure for the principal to find solutions to ensure the survival of the school A1-6; decrease in the resources available to schools A1-6, 10, 11; decrease in the time spent with teachers A1-13, 14; collapsing of his external networks A1-14; and, restoration in the principal’s authority as the power of the unions has diminished A1-11. Thus, whilst the principal’s authority has increased, the increased demands on his time, the increased pressures to succeed (as measured by the number of students in the school) within a cost-reduction environment, all impinge on his ability to lead.

**TEACHER INTERVIEWS - TEACHERS A2, A3, A4, A5**

The teachers involved in these interviews were volunteers gained after the investigator addressed a staff meeting; this was the only school where this procedure was used. It should be noted that the curriculum coordinator did not volunteer and so this is the only school where the curriculum coordinator was not interviewed.

**Vision**

The principal has definite plans for the school that he has held for a number of years A3-17; A5-38. His plans are seen in the hidden agendas that he employs A3-21. The principal was described as being concerned with establishing a strong school image and articulating the school principles A4-24; much of what the principal does was viewed as being for the long-term benefit of the school A4-24 and ensuring that the school not only survives, but is successful A4-27; although this was not always obvious to staff as the principal does not always articulate clearly his vision A4-24. The principal’s vision reflects a community culture focus: because many of the students come from unstable backgrounds the school emphasises the welfare and care of the students A4-25.

**Wider knowledge**

The principal has gained experience through his time in education system, particularly his experience of leading a school through a difficult amalgamation of three schools and the subsequent gaining of the new school’s principalship A3-16. He has an extensive external network he uses to get grants and help for the school A3-21 and to promote the school A2-31. He also has knowledge of other industries A3-22.

**Cultural awareness**

The principal is aware of the local culture and giving local kids access to the school A2-31. However, there is a conflict apparent between supporting the local kids and emphasising academic values A2-31, 34.
School promotion

With the emphasis on gaining student enrolments, the principal has to be good at school promotion and he sees this as one of his main roles A2-30. Some staff believe that he is good at promoting the school A2-31, whilst others are not sure A3-21. A difficulty in promoting the school is that whilst it has a large number of disruptive students it is difficult promote, yet the school gets rid of the students it is going against the value of caring for all students; there is no clear position on this A2-31. The principal has employed a consultant to help the school determine the reasons behind the falling enrolments A3-21.

Decision making and communication

The principal was described as wanting to use committees and to be seen to be fair in making decisions A3-16; A4-26; A5-37. There are many committees for staff to have input into decisions and the principal encourages staff to have input, although he is not always successful in generating input from staff A4-25 and his leadership of meetings is not strong A5-38. The school has retained an LAC which the principal relies upon for ideas and support, but which the staff feel lacks direction and is merely there to ratify the principal's ideas A2-33. Whilst the principal tries to appease staff factions and achieve consensus A2-30; A4-26, he will make his own decisions, even if these are unpopular A4-26,27 and he will overrule staff decisions A2-30. One teacher believed that because the principal tries to achieve consensus, it is often difficult for him to make decisions and resolve the conflicting advice he get A2-30; the principal was viewed as overly cautious and lacking in confidence to make quick decisions A5-37. Often he will let committees decide on controversial issues, and he will use staff in positions of responsibility to raise issues, so that he is not seen to be driving an initiative A2-32; A3-17; this means that he spreads the accountability amongst the staff and shares responsibility for both the good and the bad decisions A3-17,20. His involvement in the decision making processes is driven by numerous hidden agendas A3-16,21; A2-32; A5-37. One teacher believed that the principal was not very hands-on, tending to leave decisions to staff A2-30 and avoiding some decisions by hiding behind bureaucracy A2-35,36. Also, the principal was viewed as collecting people's opinions and using them selectively to support his ideas A2-33,34. It was noted that the principal is influenced by the bursar who is primarily concerned with budgetary constraints and not educational issues A2-34.

Delegation

The principal will have an idea and then delegate staff to implement it; eg, the cross-linking with TAFE A3-17. In delegating tasks he trusts staff to do the job and assumes that they will do it with minimal supervision; he will want to know what has happened, but he relies on the people given the job feeding back information to him A3-18, 22.

Initiating ideas

The principal has been involved in major projects at the school. The principal was viewed as being largely responsible for the excellent facilities that the school has A3-16. Recently the principal convened a sub-committee of school council to investigate the falling school enrolments and he arranged for the engagement of a consultant to help in this process A3-17,21,22; A4-24. He also instituted an SRP for school promotion; although without a time allowance the teacher involved has had limited effect A2-31. He is encouraging cross-linking with the local TAFE A3-17, he is supportive of the primary to secondary transition program A2-31; A5-38,39, and he implemented a whole-school discipline program A5-38. The principal continues to be involved in attempting to unify the staff of the amalgamated schools; choosing a number of new staff recently has helped this process A3-22; A4-24. The principal is a supporter of Schools of the Future; this may reflect enthusiasm for the initiative, or simply a pragmatic approach that it can not be avoided, so it is better to be in it A4-25; the principal implements his vision by importing and trying new initiatives A4-24. It was noted that the principal and deputy principal work closely together in initiating ideas A4-25.

Curriculum involvement

The principal may know little about some curriculum areas as he is satisfied to delegate curriculum tasks to people and for those people to be totally responsible A3-18.
Interaction with students

Whilst he has been criticised for not knowing the students well, he has also been criticised for becoming involved in student discipline before he has been asked to; clearly there is a conflict of expectations by staff A2-30. In dealing with students for discipline matters, he is not firmly in control A5-37.

Interaction with teachers

Two recently appointed teachers to the school believed that the principal was supporting and encouraging of staff as much as his job would allow A4-26,27; A5-39,40. However, other staff view the principal as not relating well to people A3-22; A2-35 and acting in ways that indicate that he doesn't value staff; the principal’s rhetoric of care for staff is not supported by his actions A2-34,35. Whilst the principal does not socialise with staff A2-34; A4-28, he is accessible provided staff go to him A4-28, A5-40. One area of difficulty is that the principal does little to appease people he has upset with the decisions that he has made; this may reflect a lack of awareness, his reaction to too much stress, a clash of personalities, or being too concerned with his own curriculum/agenda A4-27,28.

Personal characteristics

1. The principal is a "wheeler and dealer" who is use to making deals and employing hidden agendas A3-16,18,21,22.
2. He is a workaholic and puts a lot of thought into his work A3-18,22.
3. He is pragmatic A2-30.
4. He is concerned to keep tight control of the school finances A2-34.
5. He does not have a strong personality A5-37.

Values

The principal is concerned with:
1. Establishing a sound value system and encouraging a positive school image A4-27.
2. Having an informed staff through promoting internal communication and encouraging staff input A4-27.
3. Ensuring that the school is at the forefront of educational trends A4-27.

Changes

1. The role of the principal has changed from liaising between parents, staff and students, to being the business manager in charge of the budget, staff, resources and general running of the school A3-16. This change reflects the view that schools are now businesses competing for students A3-16 and the school is investigating employing a business manager to relieve the principal of some of the non-educational duties A3-23.
2. Because the principal is involved increasingly in business management, he is having to redesign the roles of other people, such as the deputy principal, to do assume some of the roles that he used to do A3-18,19.
3. There is an increase in the time the principal spends with school council since school council is responsible for all decisions made in the school A3-18.
4. The principal spends more time out of the school "wheeling and dealing" A3-18.
5. The job of principal is not as relaxed as it was A3-19; A4-28,29.
6. The employment of staff will be more involved in terms of having selection panels A3-17 and balancing the cost/experience dimensions of employing new staff A3-19,20.
7. The principal is more involved in establishing policies and implementing them which was described as the bureaucratic side of the school A4-24.
8. The increased pressures have meant that the principal does not always please the people around him A4-28,29; A2-32.
9. The principal's view of his role may have changed so that he believes that he has more power; this is the result of the change in government and the diminishing of the union power A2-32,33.
SCHOOL B

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

When the principal was appointed to the school, the school had falling enrolments and an uncertain future. In his time there, the school has grown and is now very large and a very successful school in terms of student enrolments and reputation. The principal exudes confidence in his ability to lead the school and he displayed a high level of energy and enthusiasm for his work.

PRINCIPAL B1

Vision

He has employed one vision to guide the school since his appointment and that is for the school to “grow and be as visible as we [can] in the community” B1-8. Given that the school is now at maximum capacity, it appears that his vision has been met.

Symbolic awareness

Awareness of symbols featured in the interview. Thus, he discussed using a variety of means (such as newsletters, meetings, interviews, informal discussions) to applaud things that the school is doing well, to indicate what must be done, what the “key game” is, and to indicate what the “no-no’s” are B1-3,4. The principal talked about a “lived accountability” in which the good is celebrated and the poor identified B1-7. To emphasise the focus on teaching and learning, all principal class personnel teach; this also means that the principal class people are seen to be “part of it” by the rest of the teaching staff B1-5.

Wider knowledge

Whilst the principal does not appear to have strong external networks in the present, he did mention networks that he has used in the past B1-3. Also, he described wanting to encourage a customer/service orientation by adopting aspects of Total Quality Management; this demonstrates extra knowledge that the principal has gained and is using to benefit the school B1-4.

Decision making and communication

The principal is aware of the power he has and he exercises this. Thus, he can be decisive and override advice to him from the various decision making groups; he discussed a decision making protocol he has written which emphasised that the role of all committees was to provide advice to him or to school council, and that he had the power of veto B1-5. He has also initiated a structure to cover curriculum, operations and student management involving four principal class teachers served by a group of AST3 teachers; he controls these by asking “critical” questions of the team leaders, who will then have to ask questions of their staff B1-5. In the interview there was little emphasis on the decision making process involving staff. He chose to emphasise his power of veto and his ability to be decisive B1-4,5. Thus, in introducing after school sport, the principal raised the idea, allowed discussion at a staff meeting, appointed a teacher to organise it and found money to run it B1-4. Clearly, the principal exercised a great deal of power in pushing through an idea that he had. Again, it is not clear how staff would go about pushing an idea that they had; from the description of the principal, the decision making in the school is centred on the principal and the senior group of principal class and AST3 personnel.

Accountability

Accountability is central to how the principal leads. He identified the hierarchical system accountability in which teachers are accountable to him and he is accountable to the DSE B1-6, but he also identified internal accountability in which individuals are accountable to their own standards B1-6 and to community expectations B1-4,7. Thus, accountability is seen to be client focussed and involves the school values of wanting the school “to be a successful place to work in” B1-7. He achieves accountability in a surreptitious way within the school by asking staff for information on aspects of how the school is going B1-7.
Delegation

Associated with the emphasis on accountability is the principal's use of delegation. Whilst he did not use delegation to describe what he did, he never-the-less described his reliance on the principal class group of people to attend to daily operations, curriculum and student management B1-5. Each of these principal class people have an AST3 teacher assisting them and they have people reporting to them B1-5. So, the principal delegates tasks through the hierarchical system he has established and he checks on what is being done by asking questions of the key people (as described previously).

Initiating ideas

The principal is involved in initiating ideas and programs, even though he has recently appointed a 0.5 vice-principal to be responsible for curriculum matters. Examples that he gave included: the after school sports program; the use of Total Quality Management ideas to improve service provision B1-4.

Curriculum involvement

The principal did define any direct involvement in the curriculum. He did, however, describe how the curriculum policy committee operates; his role is to ask the critical questions that will ensure that the things that need to be done are completed B1-5.

Public Relations

The principal emphasised a client/customer orientation and the need to ensure that the school communicates well with parents and has parents in the school B1-4.

Interaction with Teachers

His interactions with staff included his involvement in normal teaching duties (teaching a class and taking yard-duty) B1-4,5, asking for information from teachers about what they are doing B1-7, and trying to instil a customer orientation focus into teachers rather than a superior, do-gooder orientation B1-7.

Values

The principal mentioned a number of explicit values including: having a client/customer orientation B1-4,7 (as evidenced in his idea of extending the school day to provide a voluntary after school sport and recreation program B1-4); being continuously accountable to his own and school standards B1-6,7; wanting total freedom to run the school B1-3; and, focussing on the core tasks of "teaching and looking after kids" as shown by his insistence that all staff members, including the principal class personnel, teach so that they are seen to be "part of it" B1-4,5.

Change

In terms of changes to his leadership role as a result of Schools of the Future, the principal noted that he had already been running the school along self-managing lines and that the new system simply allowed him to do more of what he was already doing B1-3,6. Never-the-less some changes were noted including: there is a need to get money into the school and to use it more effectively B1-3; planning is more important with an emphasis on three year planning B1-3; less alignment with the wider bureaucracy and more a sense of being an autonomous provider, much like a private school B1-3,4; the charter is providing a focus on what has to be done B1-4; there is more pressure on schools to succeed by increasing enrolments and this carries more risk for the principal, in that, if the school doesn't respond to community needs it will not maintain enrolments and the principal will be accountable B1-4; the principal is having to make more decisions as, for example, in the industrial area, there are now only guidelines for action rather than specific requirements that spell out what was to be done B1-5,6.
TEACHER INTERVIEWS - TEACHERS B2,B3,B4,B5

Vision

The principal has an overview of the preferred school direction, but he does not actively interfere with the school's progress until he believes it is not going in the correct direction B3-11. The principal's vision would include the school being large, being the "best", increasing student outcomes B5-13,15,17,22; B2-30, having the widest range of VCE subjects B4-28, having an Arts focus B4-27 and concerned with self-promotion B4-26,28. The principal is attributed with having built up the school through his ability to see a direction for the school B4-26.

Wider knowledge

The principal has experience of what does work in schools and he has developed external networks which he uses to help the school B5-19,20; he knows the system well and knows how to manipulate the system to get what he wants B2-30.

Symbolic awareness

Through providing feedback on how the school is performing, the principal emphasises values of academic success and good discipline; the principal uses this technique to "set the pace" B3-9. By teaching, the principal is demonstrating that he is participating in the ground level educational process B3-12; B2-33; although not all staff believe that he should teach B4-29. The principal has managed to create an environment which is learning focussed B5-18.

School promotion

One of the reasons attributed for the school's success is the principal's ability to promote the school B4-26,27 and to give it a customer orientation B2-30. However, this was also noted as being one of the principal's failings; he was described as being too concerned with promotion and not concerned enough about what was actually happening in the school B4-25; occasionally the image does not match the reality B2-30,31,32.

Decision making and communication

The principal attends meetings, such as union meetings, and communicates his opinions B3-9; although he is decided not to attend union meetings recently B5-14. The principal encourages an open environment for the raising of issues, staff are welcome to put forward ideas and to challenge the principal's views B2-30; B3-9,10; B5-16; it was noted that currently the discussion forums are not as open as they once were with the curriculum committee having a set membership, the union power diminished and the staff meeting having become a reporting session rather than a discussion forum B5-17. The principal can be influenced by staff and he is open to new ideas B2-33. The principal is not authoritarian and he is willing to negotiate B3-10, even though he has the ultimate authority B3-10; B4-25; another teacher suggested that the principal encourages an image of democratic decision making, but that he uses his assistant principals to get his ideas through B5-22. The principal was described as being less consultative and more willing to by-pass and overrule established decision making processes such as in the appointment of responsibility allowances; this may be due to increased administrative demands and the decrease in union influence B4-25,27. It is worth noting that the principal has allowed a small team of senior teachers to review and construct more collaborative processes B2-31. It was suggested that the principal needs to consider issues more before making decisions B2-30.

Delegation

Staff are given roles that are clearly defined B3-11; B5-13 and people, including the principal, do not extend themselves out of that role B3-11. The principal was viewed as trusting staff and allowing them room to do the delegated jobs; the principal is aware of his weaknesses and understands that he needs other people to do certain tasks; eg. curriculum is left to the curriculum coordinator B2-30,32. Occasionally the principal will try to interfere with a teacher's job, but in these cases he can be reasoned with B2-30.
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Initiating Ideas

The principal has ensured that the school is promoted well and this has included the employment of a professional public relations person B2-30.

Curriculum Involvement

The principal no longer has a curriculum focus with the curriculum coordinator is given the primary responsibility for curriculum; the principal will discuss issues with and accept the advice of the curriculum coordinator B2-32.

Interaction with Students

Students don’t see him as a strong leader because he is prone to uncontrolled outbursts B4-24; although he is viewed as approachable and aware of what is happening in the school B4-24. The principal has an allotment of one class, however this is not viewed favourably by staff as they do not believe he can give the class adequate priority B4-29.

Interaction with Staff

He encourages staff by taking an interest in what staff are doing and by giving them “pats on the back” B3-9; B4-26; the principal will encourage teachers to take on new jobs and challenges B5-20,21. He can be supportive of teachers in terms of personal matters and in dealing with parents B5-19,20,21; although, another teacher believed that in conflicts between teachers and parents the principal supported parents more B4-24, and an example was given where the principal did not support a staff member on a student discipline matter B3-11. Whilst the principal is viewed as approachable and partially aware of what is happening with staff B4-24, he is also viewed as being more distant from staff and not providing as much unsolicited reinforcement; he needs to provide teachers with more feedback B5-14,15,19 and he needs to reconnect with the staff and support such initiatives as a work survey on teacher attitudes to school B2-31; B5-14,16,19. The principal’s knowledge of what staff do may be limited: the principal was viewed as not being aware of what was happening in the classroom B4-24,25, although another teacher believed that because he taught and was involved in taking extra duties, that he did know what was going on B2-33. Any inaccurate awareness may be because the principal gains much of his information on staff from his senior administration; this is a problem as the principal was described as someone who bad-mouths people and when this is based on inaccurate information the potential for difficulties is obviously great B4-26,28. The principal was described as being very negative about staff B4-26 and a bad manager of staff, especially in getting staff to collaborate B2-30; B4-26.

Personal Characteristics

1. A teacher described the principal as the most successful principal he has seen, leading the best educational act he has seen B5-13,17,18. The principal was described as the leader of the staff B4-25.
2. The principal’s background - he was an active and staunch unionist, whilst his father was a successful business manager - was believed to influence his desire to make the school large and successful B5-18. Also, his work with the union has given him good skills at resolving conflicts, but poor collaboration and team work skills B2-31.
3. The principal is a hands-on person, involved in teaching and extra-duties B5-19,20; B2-33; some staff perceive this as the principal “checking up” on them, although the principal is not seen as being intimidating B5-19,20. One teacher believed that the principal shouldn’t teach as it is not fair to the kids because the principal does not have the time to make them his priority B4-29.

Values

1. The principal is concerned for the best interests of the students and the school B3-9,11; he likes success and wants the school to be successful B2-30. The school is the principal’s passion, his major focus is ensuring its success through making it exciting for kids, improving educational outcomes, equipping it well and encouraging and involving staff B5-13,17,18,22. The principal believes that the parents are the school clients and they are the ones that have to be impressed B4-24; B2-30.
2. The principal is concerned with fostering good working relations with staff B3-10.
3. In the current educational environment, he believes that big schools are best B5-15.
4. He adopts a high work ethic; if a teacher is a hard worker they will gain his respect B5-18,20; B2-30

Changes

1. The principal’s power has increased in that he is making more unilateral decisions, taking short-cuts and by-passing established processes B3-10; B4-25,26,27.
2. The principal is showing less tolerance for disruptive students; this may be to protect the schools image, or because the school is successful in attracting students and can afford to be less tolerant B3-10.
3. The principal is distancing himself from staff and the union so that he will have less constraints in making decisions B5-14,15,18; this may be due to the large size of the school and the increased administrative demands B5-15; B4-26, to government initiatives such as contracts for principals that clearly signify that principals are different to teachers B5-16, and to the weakening of the union B4-25.
4. The staff culture is changing and the staff perceptions of the principal are changing; staff morale and camaraderie are low and there is a factory mentality prevalent in the school with the principal only giving staff attention when they have done something wrong B5-14,16; the principal described the school as a factory B5-16 and a teacher described it as having a clear hierarchy with superiors laying down agendas B5-13. The principal was described as changing from a principal to a manager, and not confiding in staff, and staff feeling like they are being managed B5-16,17.
5. The principal now has more senior support in that there are four assistant principals B5-22, B4-26; two of these positions were recently created, by using his capacity to pay staff differentially, to free the principal from daily operation and curriculum responsibilities so that he can move around more, both inside and outside the school environment B2-32,33
6. The principal has less curriculum involvement B2-32.
SCHOOL C

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

The interview was conducted on the principal's last day at the school; she had obtained a senior position in the central administration of the D.S.E. The principal is the only female principal in the sample that was interviewed. The interview emphasised the principal's role in guiding the school through having a sense of vision, through building structures and processes that allow for effective decision making and the delegation of responsibilities, and through bringing the world outside of the school into the school.

PRINCIPAL C1

Vision

Vision was viewed as a critical role for the principal C1-3,4. The principal articulated her vision for the school in terms of promoting the school as an international school C1-7 and ensuring that structures were in place to enable all staff to have defined roles that fit into the school's direction C1-4. The principal also described the linkage of her vision to the school finances: the school direction is manifest in the way funds are distributed C1-4.

Wider knowledge

The principal had well developed connections with organisations and people external to the school and she believes that developing these connections is becoming more important for schools C1-6. She was involved in external programs that she believed might be beneficial to the school such as the pre-pilot stages of Schools of the Future C1-5 and she demonstrated awareness of the impact of external factors such as historical trends C1-8.

Decision making and communication

Decision making featured in the interview. There was an emphasis on the power of the principal to make decisions C1-4,5,6,8 the ultimate responsibility of the principal for decisions made in the school C1-3 and how the principal gave people 'clear tasks as to what is required of them' to implement her vision for the school C1-4. The power aspect is evident in her manipulation of processes such as: defining the AST3 roles in which she changed the roles after appointments were made C1-4,5; convincing the teaching staff that the school needed to be involved in Schools of the Future by managing "the thought processes in a positive way" by providing staff with information, giving her view, letting discussion proceed and then conducting a secret ballot C1-5,6. The principal emphasised that she is willing to make "the hard decisions" and she made the observation that whilst some of these decisions may be unpopular in the short-term "in the long-term the accolades have fallen upon me for being so wise" C1-8; examples given were deciding to keep the school out of amalgamation talks, and using set criteria to name teaching staff in excess. The principal acknowledges that she is ultimately accountable C1-3. Despite the perceived control that the principal has over decision making, the principal emphasised a team approach in which she acknowledged that "you are only as good as your team" C1-7. However, in her description of the team approach, it is evident that the principal is still exerting control: "you have got to make sure that your team is well trained and that you are a good model for your team and that you use your team; there is no point in having a team if you make all the decisions." C1-7. It is not clear to what extent the team approach involves all staff. It would appear that much of her sharing of decision making with staff, is sharing with a core group of staff that she calls "the big four...my people who look after curriculum, educational environment, management and resources" C1-7. With this group, the principal will brainstorm ideas and then take these to staff C1-7. By using the team to present ideas, it suggests that the principal is giving the impression of collaboration and sharing responsibility, whilst still exerting considerable control over the decisions made. Thus, whilst staff are involved in decision making, the staff involvement may be limited to a few staff, and the principal clearly exerts considerable control over decisions, especially those that are related to the future directions that she has for the school C1-4.

Delegation

The principal does not appear to rely on having close relationships with all staff. The AST3 teachers, her
"essential leaders" are used to implement and monitor programs such as the school charter C1-3. Also, there is a system of delegation that the principal has implemented which means that staff are given clear responsibilities and expectations of what they are to achieve, and then they are left to do their job C1-4, to be responsible for their own performance levels C1-3, albeit with a series of monitoring mechanisms in place that ensures that the principal links with people across the school and knows what is happening C1-3.

Initiating ideas

Related to decision making is the principal's involvement in initiating new ideas such as becoming involved in Schools of the Future C1-5,6, adopting an "international school" focus C1-7; shifting the emphasis away from curriculum to include student welfare C1-8.

Interaction with teachers

There seemed to be a distance from many of the staff. The principal described the job as being lonely C1-8, she noted that some of the staff did not understand the relevance of her actions C1-4, and there was a distance between her and the union branch which she described as strong but "occasionally feral" C1-5. There was support for the staff in terms of wanting to involve staff in decision making processes C1-7 and in terms of structuring the school to allow teachers to concentrate on their primary tasks to do with learning and teaching by, for example, restructuring the office to free the vice-principal of certain non-core tasks C1-9.

Characteristics

Qualities necessary for leading a school were identified and included: having vision C1-3,4,7 and remaining focussed on the vision even when it means that the decisions made may be unpopular and that there maybe feelings of loneliness C1-8; being able to make the hard decision when necessary C1-8; being an expert in many areas C1-3.

Values

There were several values that the principal held that came through in the interview. These included: supporting people in the school C1-5; constructing an ordered system where people can experience purpose and achievement C1-4; relying on the people in the school to achieve the school goals C1-7; schools are seen to reflect society C1-5 and there is a need to explicate this within the school through greater contacts with the external world C1-6; teaching and learning is the prime purpose of schools and her role is to ensure that this occurs C1-8, and this may involve her protecting the school from external forces such as decisions that the DSE or the unions may make C1-8; the school has to have a balanced whole school plan that includes curriculum, welfare and extra-curricular activities C1-8.

Changes

The principal noted a number of changes that are occurring in the principal role. These include: the need to have vision C1-3; being more executive in style, freed from daily school responsibilities so that more time can be given to the direction of the school C1-3; less hands-on and more time spent on linking with the wider community C1-6, increasing the strength of the school staff through local selection of staff C1-9. The principal also noted that the changes in the principal's role are not all due to Schools of the Future, but that Schools of the Future has allowed her to do things that she was already implementing or wanting to do C1-4,5.

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - TEACHERS C2,C3,C4,C5

Vision

The principal ensures that the school is heading in the direction she wants the school to go in C3-22; C4-32, however her actions are viewed by some staff as simply responding to an idea she had seen rather than being driven by a sense of vision C3-12. This may be because, as another teacher observed, the
The principal did not articulate to staff what her preferred direction was for the school C2-23; however, another teacher believed that she did tell people the direction she wanted for the school C4-35 and another believed that she wanted the school to be a language school C5-34,35.

Wider knowledge

The principal had wide experience outside the school, involvement in various external committees, understanding of the state and national educational trends, and she brought the knowledge that she gained into the school C3-10, C2-16, C4-25,28, C5-34.

Symbolic awareness

The principal needed to be more aware of the symbolism inherent in her actions; by focusing on outside the school, the principal gave the message that school and the students were not important and the principal did nothing to address this perception C2-18,23. However, the principal did display knowledge of the power of symbols through her commitment to improving the physical appearance of the school (especially the office, staff room areas), ensuring that open days were well organised and through rewarding high student achievement C4-29,31.

Decision making and communication

The principal is viewed as a person who is prepared to make difficult decisions C3-12 and to not compromise on some issues C2-22; she is the ultimate authority C5-34 and she is decisive C4-26. The principal has been responsible for reforming the meeting structure in the school, but in doing this she involved the staff so that there was ownership of the process C4-25. Despite the reform of the meeting structure, some teachers perceive that there is little opportunity for staff participation in decision making with decisions being made elsewhere and not in staff meetings which are considered to be reporting sessions and an opportunity for the principal to formulate and refine her ideas C3-10,12,13. The principal has overruled decisions made by school decision making bodies such as curriculum committee C3-14, C2-18; e.g. the introduction of Indonesian was not supported by the LOTE faculty, but it has been introduced with the LOTE faculty being given the task of introducing it C5-35. One of the principal’s methods of providing information to staff and influencing the decision making processes is to include people as confidants; the problem with this method is that she provides different people with contradictory information, so that the process is not trusted by staff C3-11, C5-33. The principal was viewed as needing to find a balance between getting what she wants and compromising; it was suggested that she needed to explain the reasons behind her decisions C2-17. Also, she was viewed as wanting ideas implemented too quickly, before they could be made manageable, and often she did not supply enough information about ideas that she wanted the decision making bodies to consider C2-18,19, C5-35; one teacher commented that it was difficult for staff to stay with the pace of change that she brought to the school C4-30.

Delegation

Teachers were delegated jobs C3-10, C4-25 and this was often used to allow people the chance to develop C4-25, C5-33. One teacher perceived little follow-up in that once the job was delegated it was considered as done C3-10. Another viewed the principal as a “watch dog” ensuring that what she had instituted was done; she was aware of what was happening in the school because she would ask questions of people C4-25,27. There was a lack of trust displayed by the principal overruling decisions that people had made in their delegated job C2-23; although, another teacher noted that she would let people run with their jobs and only attend meetings when invited C4-31. It was noted, however, that processes are still being set up to enable more systematic follow up C3-12.

Accountability

The principal has increased accountability by introducing extensive documentation of what is occurring; e.g. the introduction of program budgeting C3-14, and documenting of procedures C3-13 and faculty policies C5-36.
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Initiating Ideas

The principal has implemented new processes, structures and procedures at the school C3-14; C2-24; the change in processes was well thought out C2-21. The principal was responsible for the introduction of procedures, such as program budgeting, designed to increase accountability C3-13. The principal had a direct influence on the program initiatives of staff by providing staff with the opportunity to look at the trends in education C2-16 and by questioning and making suggestions to staff in charge of an area C4-31; she challenged staff to look at what they were doing C2-17. The principal stepped into a school that was closing and turned it around by C4-26, revamping the school council and getting parents involved C4-26; setting up new systems to run the school C4-25, 26, 27, 28; emphasising student welfare C4-27; physically improving the school C4-28, 29; getting the school involved in Schools of the Future C4-26, 28, 29; introducing music C4-31; introducing Indonesian C5-35. The principal was described as someone who likes to be at the forefront of developments, in that she would want the school to be involved in new initiatives; this was seen by some staff as superficially responding to trends, although it is clear that some of her initiatives, such as being involved in Schools of the Future, were important for the school C2-20, 21.

Curriculum Involvement

There is conflicting messages concerning the principal's involvement in curriculum. The principal was not directly involved in the curriculum committee, and this committee felt that she should be so they got approval from school council to institute a system that forced the principal to attend meetings C2-19. However, the principal would still have an agenda concerning curriculum matters; she would provide the school with information concerning educational trends and ask the curriculum committee to investigate ideas, and overrule the curriculum committee when necessary C2-18, 19; C4-31. Whilst the principal trusted pragmatic issues to the curriculum committee, she was less inclined to trust them with philosophical issues C2-20.

Interactions with Teachers

She did not get involved in personal issues and the principal is viewed as being isolated from staff; for example, she did not mix socially with staff C3-12, 13. It was suggested that she needed to be more sensitive to staff and to socialise with them more C2-17; this may have averted problems she had with staff with some of the ideas she pushed C2-21. Her handling of confrontation with people was good in that she did not personalise issues C2-22 and she would negotiate to ensure the school did not suffer C4-27, but there were problems in that there were times when she did not try to counter balance the antagonisms that she created C2-22. The principal has provided good support for individual teachers giving them time off to work for the Board of Studies C3-10, organising help for teachers with personal crises C3-14, securing employment for staff members C5-33, supporting the teaching areas of staff C5-33 or supporting them on documented problems with students C4-30. The principal used positive encouragement to encourage people to develop their potentials (especially the female staff) and she gave staff time to change and develop C2-17, 21, 22; C4-25, 26; C5-33. It was noted that the principal experienced problems in living up to staff expectations of her C2-22. Towards the end of her principalship, the relationships between the principal and some staff became very strained and this may reflect that dynamic people instituting large change programs have a "used by date" after which they become less effective C4-30.

Interactions with Students

The principal had little involvement with the students C3-13; C4-28; C5-33; the students were aware that she was away from school often, and that she did not know them C2-23; C4-28. Early in her principalship she did teach, but this did not work because of her commitments elsewhere C4-28. The principal did celebrate the good work of students C4-31.

Characteristics

1. The principal was described as a good manager C3-12, organiser and administrator C4-28, who was very good at keeping the school going C3-13; C4-28; C5-36.
2. The principal is considered as a dynamic person, concerned with pushing ahead C2-22 and outward looking C2-21. She was described as "inspirational in terms of the big picture stuff" C2-18 and as a "born leader" who knows what is happening in the school C4-27.
3. The principal would readily admit to mistakes C4-26.
4. She is ambitious and self-serving C5-34 and a high flier C4-28.

**Values**

1. The focus is on the kids, parents and the community C2-17; the principal sees the kids as the most important aspect of the school, yet she doesn't know them, which suggests that the rhetoric doesn't much the actual C5-33.
2. The principal believed in the school being at the forefront of education C2-17.

**Changes**

1. The principal is being asked to do too many extra activities C3-10; she is more separated from the school by being involved in more outside activities C2-20,23. One teacher believed that principals now have to get out of schools and promote the school and be informed on a wide range of educational related matters C4-25; they will become more like business people involved in marketing, sponsorship, promotion, establishing business and community contacts and have less involvement in the day to day running of the school C4-30.
2. There is an increased emphasis on schools being self-managing, controlling their finances and competing for students; this means that the administration side is being emphasised which requires good management skills C3-12. It was noted that with the increased importance of financial management, the principal was giving program leaders more responsibility C2-21
3. It was noted that staff were becoming more vocal due to feeling less threatened and due to anger at decisions the principal made, however, no implications for the principal’s leadership role were drawn out C3-12.
4. The principal’s role will not change drastically as the new powers support how the principal led before Schools of the Future C2-23.
5. Delegation will become more important to free the principal from the day to day running of the school; the deputy principal will take over the running of the school on a day to day basis C4-28,31
6. There is more emphasis on the principal having to impress people C5-34.
SCHOOL D

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

The school is a large inner suburban school with the principal at the school for over twenty years with ten years as principal. During this time, the school has undergone major changes by becoming co-educational and catering for a number of students from a nearby secondary school that was closed by the government. The school has a strong sense of its tradition which emphasised academic performance. It also has a relatively stable staff with many teachers remaining at the school for more than ten years, and about ten per cent of the staff having been students at the school. The school has a large site, but the school has grown too quickly for its accommodation resulting in the use or a number of relocatable rooms.

PRINCIPAL D1

Vision

Vision was identified as an important feature of the principal's leadership; the principal is the leader and does this by setting the directions and enthusing others to become involved and take on responsibilities, and to do as the principal does in terms of hard work, enthusiasm and concern to do one's best to pursue the set directions D1-3. The principal employs his vision to set the school direction, but does so in consultation with others D1-3; for example, with the charter the principal had a "firm vision of the items to make up the school charter priorities", and these were then presented to the various school forums for discussion D1-3.

Delegation

The principal views his leadership role as a shared one where there is a mutual dependence between himself and the "team of people who are working collaboratively to get the task done" D1-3,8. Thus, delegation is an 'essential element of leadership' for the principal D1-7. Once tasks are delegated, the principal then has made sure that the task are done, without "interfering too much" D1-7.

Decision making and communication

The principal believes in involvement of staff in decision making in that he will present ideas, be the link to outside if needed, and then get people to accept the notion through discussions at various forums: e.g. the principal's role in the school deciding to be involved in Schools of the Future D1-3,4. The school has a number of groups which provide advice to the principal with the weekly staff meeting and the LAC being the two key forums that he has to convince to gain support for a proposal D1-4. If the principal does not agree with advice he receives then he will send it back to be reconsidered D1-4. In terms of decision making there is a leadership hierarchy in the school consisting of the 2.5 vice-principals, followed by the AST3 and 2 teachers D1-5. Thus, whilst there is opportunity for input from staff, the decision making structure appears to be controlled and hierarchical in nature. The principal has considerable power and can overrule the main decision making forums D1-4, although he has never had to do this because of the emphasis he gives to convincing the majority of staff D1-5. Whilst he has the power of veto over staff recommendations, he feels bound by decisions of school council D1-5. He also noted that the principal is held to be more accountable then in the past D1-8 and that he is ultimately responsible to the Minister and to Parliament D1-9.

Initiating Ideas

The principal emphasised his central role in initiating programs. These included becoming a pilot school D1-3, increasing the period allocation for LOTE D1-5, establishing music D1-5, spending of school money on buildings and publicity D1-6, being involved in defining and refining the curriculum D1-6. The principal described how he operated in getting the school to be a pilot school D1-3. This involved becoming personally familiar with the program, informing staff, listening to and alleviating staff concerns, and then seeking staff support. He informed the school community through meetings and newsletters. Schools of the Future has allowed the school to run with ideas that may have been stopped by central or regional management and it has been his leadership role to convince people of the worth of the programs,
to explain them and to stand by them, "no matter what the flak might be." D1-8; thus, he is supportive of initiatives that fit with the school direction.

Curriculum involvement

On curriculum committee, the principal's role is "give advice, guide, encourage, support, warn"; the principal noted that he has the power to overrule a decision or ask for it to be reconsidered, although he has never had to do this D1-5. He emphasised that curriculum committee is democratically elected and that it implements the policies of school council. The principal appears to have an executive function on the curriculum committee. The previous section on "initiating ideas" gave examples of the curriculum initiatives that the principal has been involved personally involved in: Schools of the Future, LOTE, music, buildings, and development of the curriculum D1-3,5,6.

Wider knowledge

The principal displayed an awareness of wider issues such as the implications of the new student code of conduct D1-9, problems associated with having to advertise vacancies and having to select staff from the excess pool of teachers D1-9, and being aware of the need to support teachers through times of change and to allow them to see things in a broader light D1-10.

Interaction with teachers

He is supportive of staff. He will encourage staff to take on new roles D1-5, with the help of his senior staff he will target staff that he feels might be suited for a particular job D1-5; he cited as an example how will target people for SRP positions and how he supports these people if they do not get the job (he emphasised that whilst he targeted people, he did not interfere with the process of allocating responsibility positions to teachers) D1-6. He is aware that staff morale is fragile and he feels that he has to prop people up by "praising people at every opportunity" D1-10. He supports staff by attending informal meetings (eg. morning teas), listening to people, and addressing their complaints D1-10, although there is less time to be out of his office and mixing with staff D1-8,11.

Personal characteristics

The principal: works hard, is enthusiastic and is wants to do his job well D1-3; can identify strengths in others D1-5; is fair D1-5; supportive D1-10.

Values

The principal expressed a number of values including: getting people involved and having a collaborative team D1-3; leading by example D1-3; getting staff on-side D1-3; being fair ad following procedures D1-5; supporting staff D1-10; the need to employ new teachers, to get new blood into the school D1-7.

Changes

Whilst the principal acknowledged that there was not a great deal of change in his role, he did state that there is more work and more responsibility, especially in the financial and personal areas D1-6,7 and the principal is more accountable D1-8. The principal believes that Schools of the Future simply confirmed what he had been doing for a number of years in terms of marketing, promotion and determining the school direction D1-6. However, within the interview a number of changes were noted: staffing at the moment is less in control of the principal who has previously been successful at recruiting his own staff D1-7,8; there are now more principal class personnel to help D1-7; the principal delegates more, but he considers that the leadership role is expanding as a result of the need to share leadership D1-7,8; there is less time to be out of the office and seeing what students and staff are doing and he believes that he will have to fight against becoming too much of an administrator who is isolated from the others D1-8,11; there is less external control from the DSE and more freedom for the school to pursue its own plans D1-8,9; it is more difficult to get help from the DSE as the lines of communication are "clogged" D1-9.
Vision

The principal sets the direction for the school and how the school might achieve it D4-22; his vision acknowledges the traditions of the school and emphasises caring for all students and ensuring they achieve their best D4-24. His vision reflects the vision of school council and of the community D4-25. He has been successful at leading the school through a period of sustained growth D5-30.

Wider knowledge

The principal is perceived as an experienced person who deals regularly with higher bodies and form whom teachers can learn D3-19,20.

Delegation

One teacher commented in relation to their job that the principal left the teacher to do their job within rigid boundaries set by the principal; thus, he delegates, but maintains control through setting the boundaries D2-14. The principal is viewed as delegating jobs well, particularly to the deputy principals D4-26 and AST teachers D5-33; however, it was also suggested that he leaves these people to do their jobs because he is intimidated by them, especially the women staff members D5-33.

Decision making and communication

There are different views of how the decisions are made in the school. One teacher believes that the principal doesn’t allow open discussion as he likes to keep control, he tends to work through his senior staff and uses them to influence others; the school is led from the top and it has a strong culture of not being highly committed to democratic decision making processes D2-13,15, although the staff forum recently was changed to include an open discussion at the beginning D4-23. This teacher was supported in that the principal was perceived as not working well in a consultative mode, and preferring to be removed from staff; he is more comfortable with the defined hierarchy D5-31. Another teacher believed that the principal was consultative D4-22 and that he consults various groups to influence his thoughts on the school direction; a major group that he consults weekly are the level coordinators D4-22. Thus, the principal appears consultative, but only with certain groups of staff involved. Whilst he is not a facilitator of discussion and is selectively consultative, he can be influenced by personal approaches and in committees, and he is now more open to differing views D2-13; after reviewing the benefits and effects he may change his mind D4-26. All the decision making groups in the school provide advice to the principal, which he may, or may not accept D4-23. It was suggested that whilst he would rather work through committees than overrule them, he needs to be more decisive D4-22,24. The principal has made decisions against popular opinion (eg. class grouping structure), and he will admit to mistakes and allow the school processes to fix the mistakes D4-24,26. The principal will make decisions as demonstrated by him deciding on staff excess without the help of formal staff support (the unions had banned staff involvement) D5-32.

Initiating ideas

He has been instrumental in the school going co-educational and in increasing enrolments, despite the poor facilities, by emphasising academic, conservative values D2-12; he has successfully led the school through a period of sustained growth D5-30. Other staff do not see him as an initiator, they believe that he reacts to what is happening more than he initiates D3-17,D5-30 and that his reactions are not always educationally based, but may be more to do with keeping up with what others are doing D5-30. When he is enthusiastic about an idea he may be too enthusiastic and not look at potential problems eg. introducing computers D5-30. The principal is not seen to be supportive of staff initiatives and reacts to them negatively in the first instance D5-28; this may be a strategy to give himself time to think about a proposal D5-28. It was also suggested that often initiatives are watered down through lack of decisive leadership by the principal D5-30.
Curriculum involvement

He is not seen as a curriculum thinker, but more someone who reacts to community expectations, to what the community wants and will value. He has been very successful at selling the school based on the traditional values of the school - conservative, uniform, strong discipline, high academic standards and wide range of subject choice - and he has employed a professional publicist to help with this. He has a good public image, especially with parents and he relates well to people external to the school.

Power

The principal is the ultimate authority and he was described as the “boss”, the “great man”, “dad at the top” and the “principal lacks contact with staff” 22, 23, 26. The principal does not socialise with staff and he doesn’t reveal his feelings to staff. His personal relations are strained as people do not feel immediately comfortable with him 22, 26, and he is not comfortable with staff, especially with women who, it was suggested, intimidate him. It was noted that he responds to staff better if they treat him well and his response to staff at times needs to be corrected if they treat him ill. His response to staff at times needs to take into account that many of the staff are experienced and have been at the school for a long time; it was described as being like a family, with the principal needing to play mum and dad in some cases.

Political awareness

There was evidence that the principal had a developed political awareness. The principal would work well with the LAC, but sometimes he would disagree and use this to his advantage; presumably allowing the LAC to have ownership of the decision rather than himself. Another example was given where the principal would make a decision, but would mask it so that it did not appear to be his decision (e.g. solving complaints against staff by moving them and claiming that the move was caused by timetable difficulties). It was suggested that one of the reasons that he is not more decisive is because he is afraid of possible political repercussions.

Public relations

The principal has been very successful at selling the school based on the traditional values of the school - conservative, uniform, strong discipline, high academic standards and wide range of subject choice - and he has employed a professional publicist to help with this. He has a good public image, especially with parents and he relates well to people external to the school.

Cultural awareness

He shows awareness of the school culture through his promotion of the school and through the way he leads in emphasising a conservative, stable school culture. This values are reflected in his vision for the school.

Interaction with students

He is hands-on with students, knows a lot of them and is involved in some of the harder discipline cases.

Interaction with staff

It was believed that the principal lacks contact with staff. The principal does not socialise with staff and he doesn’t reveal his feelings to staff. His personal relations are strained as people do not feel immediately comfortable with him, and he is not comfortable with staff, especially with women who, it was suggested, intimidate him. It was noted that he responds to staff better if they treat him well. His response to staff at times needs to take into account that many of the staff are highly experienced and have been at the school for a long time; it was described as being like a family, with the principal needing to play mum and dad in some cases.

Whilst he is prepared to correct mistakes that he believes teachers have made (such as chronic absenteeism), he is considered to be helpful and supportive as shown by his work in guiding staff and encouraging staff to do professional development programs. He gets frustrated with staff attitudes that adversely affect students, but he is also supportive of teachers in terms of the impact of government policy on teachers. Another teacher noted that he was not supportive of the union or staff during the end of last year when excess and cutbacks were affecting staff morale - it was suggested that the DSE may have told principals that they could not give staff help in terms of information about what was happening. In dealing with complaints against teachers, he is non-judgemental and tries to find solutions that are satisfactory to
all D4-25. He is seen to have a conservative approach to initiatives raised by staff, and treats new ideas from staff with suspicion; he is perceived as being non-supportive of non-academic subjects D5-28,29.

**Personal characteristics**

1. He is a fair D2-16; D3-18; D4-25 and good principal, with good organisational skills D2-15. He has respect from staff and is seen by staff as being human and sensitive D3-17,20 and as an honest, hard worker D3-17,18.
2. He follows rules (eg. in discipline matters) and is prepared to give everyone a fair go; he does not want to leave himself open by bending rules D3-17,18.
3. He is more reactive than proactive D3-17; D5-30.
4. He is accessible through having an open door policy D4-25.

**Values**

1. The principal has a conservative, academic focus; he wants the school to have good welfare and discipline, to present itself well and to be run effectively D2-12,15.
2. He is humane and concerned with welfare issues D4-22.
3. The overall good of the school and the students is his main focus D4-22,25, with an emphasis on good and caring teaching D4-24.
4. His values and philosophies can be modified by others, and he in turn, influences their views D4-25.
5. Fairness comes through in all the interviews D2-16; D3-18; D4-25.
6. Schools have to be responsive to the whole community D4-25.
7. His decisions are driven by his values; eg. he will not allow English or mathematics to suffer cuts in their period allocation D4-26,27.
8. The school has to compete with neighbouring schools D5-30.

**Changes**

It was noted that the school was very conservative and valued not changing and that it would likely not change now, so the principals role will not need to change D2-14.
1. Increased emphasis on financial management D2-12,14; which is described as being comfortable with and good at D5-33.
2. Increased need to ensure good publicity and increasing enrolments D2-12; D5-30.
3. There is greater control by the principal of industrial issues due to the diminished control of the unions D2-15; he can now review staff performance D3-20; D5-31 and staffing is easier D3-21; D5-31 with the ability to hire staff allowing the principal to more easily implement his vision D4-25.
4. There is more power; the principal is seen as the boss D3-20.
5. The job is more difficult as there are more complicated processes that have to be used, eg. in hiring staff selection panels have to be formed D3-21 and the stressors are greater due to role conflicts between what principals are being asked to do and their past training and experience D5-32.
6. He is more accountable for the decisions made as he can no longer use the LAC as an excuse for decisions he doesn't like as the LAC will not, due to political views, participate in all decision making processes D4-22; it should be noted that the principal is seen to be supportive of retaining a functioning LAC D4-22.
7. There was perceived to be more control over principals by the DSE D5-29 and there is a more defined hierarchy of the DSE, the principal and then teachers; this means that the principal is viewed as being more closely aligned to the DSE then the staff D5-29.
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SCHOOL E

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

The school is a large, growing school in a semi-rural location. It has a strong academic focus and it has good facilities. The principal appears confident and in control of a school that is well run. He also appears to be aware of the politics and its usefulness for school. The people working in the school appear to enjoy being there and school was most accommodating for the research with six staff being interviewed as well as the principal.

PRINCIPAL E1

Vision

The principal has direction gained through his broad understanding of political and educational trends $E1-3,4,5$. One of his roles on school council was to ensure that they were aware of educational trends $E1-8$ and this role was also evident with staff, where he would challenge staff to address educational issues $E1-9,10$. His vision for the school is strongly influenced by the expectations of the school community $E1-3$.

Wider knowledge

The principal has wider knowledge and uses this for the schools benefit. Reading, analysis and looking at the challenges that need to be addressed are fundamental to the principal's role $E1-3$. The principal discussed the introduction of standardised testing by referring to the educational experiences in England $E1-5$. He is aware of the political climate both past $E1-14$ and present and he ventured predictions about what it will look like in the future $E1-10$ and he also predicted that there will be further cuts to the education budget $E1-13$. The political dimension is emphasised in his discussion of external constraints placed on the school by the government in terms of the preferred school size to achieve maximum resources $E1-4,6$, and role descriptions for assistant principals $E1-6$. The principal emphasised the need for principals to be aware of educational and political trends in education and to respond to them pro-actively, ignoring some and "looking for the big one's" that will impact on the school $E1-3,4,5$. It is the principals wider perspective that allows him to operate "within a relatively coherent framework in terms of direction" $E1-3$.

Political awareness

The principal described himself as political $E1-11$, and a watcher of political trends $E1-4,10$. He is concerned to bring about realism in educational debate by recognising that most issues are not black and white; this acknowledges the political nature of decision making $E1-11$.

Symbolic and cultural awareness

The power of symbolic images is acknowledged. This includes images the school consciously fosters by actions like having a school uniform $E1-3$ and a strong welfare and discipline policy $E1-5$. Images that may be hidden like those that will be attributed to the type of curriculum the school offers and that emanate from the traditional culture of the school; "if you are successful with that, you feed of those symbols and you feed of the mythology $E1-4$. The principal believes that the school has a positive image and one in which the school is viewed as rich; the principal does not discourage these perceptions because "myths are important" $E1-16$. The principal is also aware of the damage that can be done by negative community images of the school, or if there is a clash between the directions of the school and those that the community want $E1-8$. He is aware of the community culture and the sort of education that it wants; the school community cares little about how the school is run as long as the students learn and are well disciplined, and as long as they like the images that the schools puts out (such as having a school uniform) $E1-3$.

Delegation

The principal acknowledges that he can not do everything $E1-6$ by his extensive use of delegation $E1-3,6,7,16$. He described the school as "leadership thick" with key people being used to take up the challenges identified by the principal $E1-3$. In delegating tasks he allows the people to run with it, with
little interference from him; he trusts people to do the allocated job, and allows them to make mistakes E1-7. He gets feedback through official and unofficial channels, although he did not elaborate on the details of how feedback was received E1-7.

Decision-making

The principal has the power to make decisions and he believes that there are times when it is imperative that the principal takes responsibility and makes a decision; "the critical things can not be subject to veto" E1-6. However, although he takes a strong position on the right of principals to make decisions, he has retained a powerful administration committee that works entirely on consensus: "there has never been a vote and there has never been a veto in seven years" E1-12. He noted that using a consensus process "spread the knives" so that the principal is not entirely responsible for decisions made and it also made for an open and honest process that is able to make definitive decisions and not vacillate E1-1B.

Accountability

Accountability is part of his role and he views this as a whole school focus E1-15. The school has to be accountable for how it allocates its budget and this accountability should reflect the good and the poor practices that occur in the school E1-14. By trusting people to do their job and allowing them to make mistakes he believes that he places himself at risk E1-16. However he also believes that it is better to take the risk and that he is the new breed of principal that will live by the sword and die by the sword E1-16.

Curriculum involvement

He believes that he has a significant involvement in curriculum through identifying deficiencies, selling ideas, challenging methodology and talking to staff; for example, he wants the years nine and ten curriculum reviewed and he is challenging the year ten mathematics teaching methodology E1-9. He challenges the staff by bringing into the school outside views (eg. from articles he has read) and by getting the school involved in initiatives such as the Hill, Rowe and Holmes-Smith (1994) longitudinal study of school effects E1-9,10. It was illustrative of his leadership that although he felt that the school and teachers would benefit from participation in the Hill et al. (1994) research, when they rejected it he was not prepared to override their decision, although he did want to explain his view of their rejection and challenge them to reflect on their decision E1-9,10. The principal believes challenging staff views is one of his leadership roles and he cited how he is educating the staff politically concerning the implications of the new assistant principal employment contracts E1-11.

Initiating ideas

From the previous section on "curriculum involvement" it can be seen that the principal is strongly involved in initiating ideas: e.g. reform of years nine and ten curriculum; participation in major research studies that will impact on the schools educational provision.

School council role

His school council role is that of an executive officer who keeps the Council aware of the directions, the "changing winds" that are occurring E1-8. He tries to ensure that the narrow, singular issue focus that can occur on school council is offset by painting the broader picture E1-8. Also, he believes that his reports to Council need to be proactive and "absolutely honest", giving the negatives as well as the positives E1-8.

Financial role

The financial aspect was not emphasised by the principal. The school is strong financially and the principal appears confident in managing the finances E1-16. With the budget process the principal has a monitoring role to ensure that the processes are running correctly E1-7.
**Personal characteristics**

The principal trusts people $E1-7$, is forgiving of mistakes $E1-7$, honest $E1-8$, political $E1-11$ and a risk taker $E1-16$.

**Values**

A number of values were noted including: as long as students learn and are well disciplined, the community and the government will not interfere with the running of the school $E1-3$; trusting people and allowing them to make mistakes $E1-7$; the school must aim for continuous improvement and not be satisfied with what it is doing $E1-10$; the principal is highly political, but not party political as their are usually shades of grey surrounding issues $E1-11$; whilst his job is different to a teacher he still considers himself as a teacher $E1-11$; he trusts people and he is prepared to accept the risk to his position that this entails $E1-16$; constructive myths are important $E1-16$. His criteria for an efficiently operating school are that it is leadership thick, that it has a coherent direction and a supportive school council $E1-3$.

**Changes**

The principal did not see great changes for how he leads the school $E1-12$. He believes that most principals of the pilot schools are like him and are prepared to take risks and have a go and, therefore, *Schools of the Future* will not be “overly challenging or overly confronting” $E1-12$. The problem for him is not that his role has changed, but that the DSE is placing constraints on what he can do (eg. having to use the current pool of excess teachers for new employment) $E1-12$. He does believe that principals from the old-guard will have to change and that the new system will favour teachers that “have come through kicking and screaming all the way through, who have been the stirrers, who have been the ones prepared to put their necks out and have a go” $E1-16$. Whilst his leadership role will not change significantly he did note areas that have changed including: office administration responsibilities are changed from actually doing the work to being the approver/disapprover $E1-7$; the revamping of the principal class structure will mean that the principal will “hold the reigns” in the personnel area, whilst the two assistant principals will look after curriculum and day to day management $E1-7$; the principal will not be involved in the budget process apart from overseeing that the processes are running correctly $E1-7$.

**TEACHER INTERVIEWS - TEACHERS E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7**

**Vision**

The principal has a vision for the school and objectives to fulfil that vision were formulated in the charter; his goals and objectives are coherent, make sense and are accepting of the past $E3-20$; although, at times he has to have his ambitions for the school checked by staff to make sure they are realistic and will have staff support $E5-26$. His vision includes making the school bigger, better and more academic $E5-26$ with the school having a high profile and involvement in new programs $E2-30$.

**Wider knowledge**

The principal has good contacts outside of the school which enables him to know what is going on and to inform the school $E3-21,22$ and to get the school involved in new programs $E2-30$. The principal was described as aware, knowledgeable and a good political person, one who is out and about talking to colleagues and others in high places with his finger on the pulse $E3-22; E4-23; E2-30$. He has both theoretical knowledge gained from reading and street knowledge about what makes a good school $E5-26$. The principal uses his knowledge of change in education to look ahead $E2-30$. He has a strong union background $E5-26$.

**Delegation**

The principal delegates tasks as shown by the development of the charter were he was involved, but a lot of the work was delegated to staff, with the principal there to ensure that the process did not drag $E3-18,19$. Recently, the administrative committee (with his input) appointed a 0.5 assistant principal to monitor charter implementation $E3-20$; thus, he is the leader, but other people are doing the charter
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implementation \textit{E4-24, E2-30.} Due to the high workload, he has had to delegate tasks in areas such as policy development and implementation and to do this he has recruited people that he knows can do the delegated jobs \textit{E2-30.} The principal puts faith in people, encourages them, facilitates their involvement \textit{E4-23, E5-27,} supports them and allows them to make mistakes \textit{E7-38.} In delegating, the principal provides clear role definitions \textit{E4-23.} The principal receives feedback through formal meetings (staff, curriculum, administrative committee, school council) and through talking informally \textit{E3-21,} although one teacher believes that he does not gather enough feedback \textit{E4-23.} Although he delegates he is still considered hands-on and involved \textit{E4-23.} Whilst the principal spends time outside of the school, he has developed structures which enables the school to continue functioning without him, although he will want to be brief when he returns \textit{E9-19.} Initially he did not delegate; he has had to learn to trust people \textit{E5-27.}

Decision making and communication

The principal will make decisions himself, and he will overrule decisions made by committees, but usually he seeks staff consensus \textit{E3-21,} and facilitates collaborative decision making \textit{E4-24;} if he does overrule a decision he will give an explanation \textit{E3-21.} He has initiated and retained structures that ensure there is consultation and collaboration such as retaining the LAC \textit{E5-26.} He does not see himself as an autocratic leader and he shares his views, although he is considered a little secretive and he is seen as someone who gets what he wants \textit{E4-24; E5-26;} indeed, whilst he supports the school decision making structures, his impatience can mean that he will bend the processes to suit his ideas and this may cause friction with the staff \textit{E2-30.} He shares power and thus shares accountability \textit{E5-26.} He will sometimes get the school involved in a program that he thinks will be good for the school, and then he will try to sell it to the staff \textit{E4-23; e.g.} the principal sold the idea of becoming a pilot school by informing the staff and seeding the idea, gaining staff support then delegating tasks and doing the PR work for the initiative \textit{E4-24.} The principal has a reasonably large group of people that he will defer to for advice; this includes formal and informal groups, such as the 'smokers group' \textit{E5-26.} A young, inexperienced member of staff perceived the school as having a hierarchical organisational structure with those in higher positions having more to do with the principal \textit{E6-33.} This same teacher also saw the principal as good at keeping the staff informed and she gave examples where he was directive and his decisions were non-negotiable (not employing new staff or instituting new subjects for 1994) \textit{E6-33.} Another teacher described the process the principal uses to make decisions he is responsible for as: providing information, giving a limited amount of time for people to mull it around and then deciding \textit{E7-41.} So, in making decisions, the principal is consultative in that he will have open discussions, listen to the opinions of staff, and make a decision that is up-front, honest and that can be trusted \textit{E7-39,40.}

Curriculum involvement

The principal works closely with the curriculum coordinator on some projects, such as the charter \textit{E3-18.} He has demonstrated a strong leadership role in the welfare and discipline structures of the school \textit{E5-26.} One teacher perceived the principal as influential in curriculum committee and able to have his views adopted, but the teacher also felt that the principal was responding to ideas, rather than initiating his own \textit{E6-34.}

Initiating ideas

To initiate ideas he will discuss them informally and formally with trusted staff, work out the barriers and then go to staff for support \textit{E4-24.} He is good at finding funding and encouraging staff to apply for the funding \textit{E5-27.} He is attributed with having turned the school around from a school with declining enrolments \textit{E2-30.} He is an "ideas man" who knows what he wants and knows how to work the system to achieve this \textit{E2-30;} although one teacher believed that the principal responds to ideas, rather than initiates his own \textit{E6-34.} He is criticised because he is perceived as embracing new ideas uncritically and not paying due care to the concerns that staff may express \textit{E2-30.} He is involved with the hands-on implementation of his ideas, but he does rely on staff to help, such as the writing of the school charter \textit{E2-30.}

Cultural awareness

In turning the school around he was true to the school culture of a fairly conservative, semi-rural
community that values good discipline, academic results, uniform, etc.; he was effective in bringing about changes that matched community perceptions of schooling \[E2-30\]. He has also embraced the formal organisational structure of the school by supporting democratic decision making \[E2-30\]. He has developed good relationships with the local community and he knows what they want from a school \[E7-39\].

**Interaction with teachers**

He is supportive of staff, trusts them, and encourages and facilitates teachers' greater involvement in the school \[E4-23;E5-27\]; he is especially encouraging of women \[E5-27\]. In getting the school involved in initiatives, he is sympathetic to the demands on teacher time \[E4-23\]. He maintains a lot of personal contact with staff, and he is supportive of staff both within the classroom and in personal matters \[E5-26,27; E7-37\]. His leadership matches the conservative and pragmatic staff culture \[E5-26\]. He pushes staff to learn and actively encourages the professional development of staff \[E7-37,42\]. In appointing staff to positions, he is consultative, seeking staff views on what they like and dislike, and making appointments that accommodate the individual and the school \[E7-41\].

**Interaction with students**

He does not see kids as much as he would like, although he is visible and active around the school and aware of what is happening \[E5-27\]. He takes a strong interest in welfare and discipline to the extent of being closely involved in supporting students at risk \[E5-27\].

**School promotion and public relations**

He is well liked and respected by the school community \[E7-39\] and he maintains a high public profile by, for example, actively promoting the school in competition to nearby schools \[E5-28\].

**Personal characteristics**

1. He is a good salesman \[E4-23,24\] and a good communicator \[E7-41\] who keeps the school informed \[E6-33; E7-40\].
2. He is pragmatic \[E5-26\].
3. He trusts staff, recognises potential and encourages staff \[E4-23; E5-27,28; E7-38\]. He allows people and himself to make mistakes; he is non-judgemental and doesn't hold grudges \[E7-41\].
4. He is adaptable \[E5-28\].
5. He is fair and reasonable \[E5-26; E6-34,35\] honest and trustworthy \[E7-39,40\], and approachable \[E6-33,35\].
6. He is a motivator and an ideas person \[E2-30\] who has engendered high morale \[E7-38\].
7. He is liked by staff \[E7-42\].

**Values**

1. Excited by the intrigue and possibilities associated with *Schools of the Future* \[E5-26\]. Associated with this is the belief that it is beneficial to be involved in something and to find out through first-hand experience whether it is appropriate or not \[E7-40\].
2. Welfare and discipline is important \[E5-27\].
3. It is all right to make mistakes \[E7-41\].

**Changes noted in the principal's leadership style**

1. There is extra pressure, the job is more complex and there is more time out of the school attending meetings, which all means that the principal has got to be very versatile \[E3-19,21\]; there is also more responsibility including the increased need to be the public face of the school \[E5-26\].
2. Because the school is growing and running well, the principal may not experience large changes in his role \[E4-24\]; *Schools of the Future* is allowing the school to develop what was already in place and he is formalising a role he already had \[E5-28; E2-32; E7-39\].
3. He has had to make tougher decisions and to accept more criticism \[E4-24\]. He has more power \[E2-32; E6-35\], which he is aware of, but he has chosen to retain the collaborative processes eg. in the appointment of assistant principals he could have appointed them, but chose to work through the formal
processes E2-32. Whilst there is increased power, there are remain limitations on what the principal can do E6-35. Finance was an area where the principal was seen to have increased power E2-32; E7-39.
4. The staff welfare aspect has increased E4-24 and there is now the power to control personnel hiring and firing E5-28.
5. He has to develop more skills in a wide range of areas including finance and building programs E5-28; E2-32.
SCHOOL F

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

Although the principal has been at the school for four years as the vice principal, he only recently took over as principal. In the interview it is evident that he is still defining his role and still in the process of separating his previous position from what he is now doing. Whilst the school is larger than average it is in an area where there may be pressures on enrolments due to a soon to be open private school catering for an ethnic/religious group from which the school has many students.

PRINCIPAL F1

Defining the principal’s role

As this principal was recently appointed he described his role as still consisting of administrative tasks that he did as vice principal and acting principal at the school F1-3. The principal is having difficulties defining his role, both for himself and staff. Partly, this is because he is recently appointed and staff are still treating him as though he was the vice-principal. However, it is also to do with the principal not wanting to let go of jobs that he did in the past such as being around the school doing gardening, helping staff do day-to-day things, etc.; he acknowledges the need to review what he does F1-12.

Wider knowledge

His discussion of wider knowledge only extended to attending professional development training related to leading a self-managing school F1-3.

Cultural awareness

There is awareness of the school culture. Whilst the school is moving towards self-management, the principal noted that the school is not at a stage of non-reliance on the principal has evidenced by the school recalling him from a professional development activity to attend to a matter at school F1-3. The awareness of the school culture is also reflected in how the principal works with the communication and decision making processes in the school (see below). He demonstrated awareness of the family cultures in his description of the need to support parents on school council so they can overcome cultural barriers to genuine involvement F1-11.

Decision making and communication

The school has a history of open, democratic decision making which the principal supports F1-3, but which is also preventing teams from making decisions without having to consult the staff or school council F1-3,4. Thus, the process is under review so that there will be teams that will have the authority to make decisions and not have to refer to the principal all the time F1-4. The principal has retained the LAC and whilst that group sees it’s function as making recommendations to the principal, he usually accepts their advice with the LAC working as a team, making collaborative decisions F1-4. The school hasn’t endorsed autocratic leadership in the past, and the principal is not comfortable to be an autocratic leader, so he is prepared to work with the open democratic decision making process that exists F1-8. Whilst the principal is supportive and comfortable with democratic decision making, he will make unilateral decisions when necessary as in the case of staff excess where the staff refused to be involved despite his requests for help F1-9. He acknowledges that he has the ultimate authority, but he prefers strongly to involve others and to secure agreement from the majority of staff before proceeding F1-10; this was demonstrated in his shelving of plans to alter the meeting schedules after he met with staff opposition to the plan F1-7,8. The principal rarely referred to himself as making decisions, rather, he referred to the various decision making groups, of which he is part; again this emphasis his sense of being part of a democratic process F1-4. In his description of the school structure there is a strong emphasis on involving the whole school community in decision making F1-5; the principal consults widely and he believes that it was his abilities in listening and working with people that gained his appointment F1-6. He would like to streamline the communication process to reduce the number of meetings staff attend, but he can not at present due to the strong school culture which supports the continuation of the system they have had for a number of years F1-7; he will use the culture of the school to introduce the change by continuing to seed the idea and
waiting until the climate will change to where it is proposed by the staff rather than him $F_1-8$. To get feedback the principal employs an open door policy $F_1-6$, informal meetings and formal meetings such as the weekly LAC meeting, curriculum committee, all the sub-committees of school council and the weekly staff meeting $F_1-6,7$.

**Delegation**

Delegation is an important part of the principal’s role, although it is still being developed $F_1-3$. The school and the principal are still defining the structure and roles of the principal class at the school and looking to devolve responsibilities that have traditionally been the principals (such as personnel and curriculum) and then trusting the people to run with the delegated jobs $F_1-3$. The principal is emphasising devolved leadership as evidenced by the work of level coordinators who are entrusted with responsibilities that do not need the principals continual input $F_1-6$.

**Curriculum involvement**

The principal does not see himself as being involved in curriculum initiatives. He is a member of the education committee, but he rarely attends due to time pressures and relies on feedback from his assistant principal $F_1-5$. The education committee is responsible for implementing the policies of school council, fostering new initiatives and monitoring charter implementation $F_1-4$.

**Initiating ideas**

The principal is involved in proposing initiatives as demonstrated by his idea to restructure the meeting schedules $F_1-7$. He described the process he would use to initiate an idea; he would attempt to get people on side by seeding the idea through discussion papers and presenting alternative models, letting the idea germinate, presenting his position (which may be an ambit claim to generate discussion), allowing discussion and modification of the proposal, and then waiting until there are enough staff in agreement for the idea to work $F_1-8$. Through this process he seeks to give people ownership of the idea and it can be seen that he is striving for unity and collaboration rather than autocratic decision making.

**Interaction with staff**

The principal is concerned for staff and this is shown by his proposal to reduce the demands on teachers by decreasing the number of staff meetings $F_1-7$. His concern is further demonstrated in his description of the impact on teachers of being named in excess, an impact that was increased because of the staff’s refusal to participate in the process $F_1-9$. He is concerned that the excess procedure is fair and does not single out specific groups of teachers (such as non-union members) $F_1-10$.

**Public relations**

He did not emphasise the public relations role except in his involvement in the enrolling of students $F_1-6$.

**Characteristics**

The principal identified a number of characteristics of his role including: listens and works well with others $F_1-6$; being seen around the school $F_1-12$; encouraging open contact with the school community $F_1-6$; supporting people $F_1-7,9,10$; putting a lot of time and energy into the job $F_1-12$; wanting to be successful in the job $F_1-12$; finding the job frustrating in that it is difficult to organise the day due to the time pressures $F_1-12$.

**Values**

Values evident included: use of collaboration and team work $F_1-8$; fairness $F_1-10$.

**Change noted in principal’s leadership style**

A number of changes were noted including: the need to specify the roles of staff more tightly $F_1-10$; employment of staff, the ability to manage a global budget and to balance the staff and categories of work.
to fit the budget will be important F1-10; there is an increased role for the finance sub-committee of school council F1-11; school council will be asked to make more decisions, which means that it will be more important for the principal to ensure that school council members have the appropriate training and support to be genuinely involved F1-11.

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - TEACHERS F2, F3, F4, F5

Cultural awareness

He is aware of and values the consultative, democratic decision making culture of the school F4-16 and he has accommodated himself to this structure and he will not be willing to change it as it has a long history in the school F4-17.

Wider knowledge

He attends professional development activities and uses regional networks and the information he gains is used in the school; he has a lot of experience and is able to share it F3-24,26.

Decision making and communication

The principal is viewed as too conciliatory, too accommodating and not decisive enough; he needs to be more authoritative and show more direct leadership F5-13; the principal is too consultative F2-19. The principal tries to involve himself in the decision making processes and to know what is happening in the school which results in indecisiveness because he tries to please too many people F5-14; F2-19. He knows what is happening around the school through his participation on the education committee and the LAC, and through his close working relationships with a variety of staff F5-14; he consults staff informally and uses them as sounding boards F4-18. To help staff make decisions he keeps staff well informed F5-14; F3-24. He supports the consultative, democratic decision making processes of the school and is not distinguished from the staff in terms of getting ideas of his accepted F4-16; F3-24. For example, ideas emanating from the LAC are presented to staff as the LAC's decision and not the principal's, thus emphasising the collectiveness of decision making in the school F4-18; he values and respects the LAC and does not override its decisions F2-19. The main decision making processes are staff meetings, the LAC and the informal consultations of the principal F4-18.

Initiating ideas

One teacher believed that he did not initiate ideas enough, and that he is too influenced by extreme elements in the school F5-15. He does initiate ideas, but the strong committee structure means that he doesn't need to as he knows that appropriate initiatives will be raised by others; it appears that the traditional arrangements of the school offer the principal little scope for much input from him F4-17. It was noted that if he has a proposal that is not accepted by staff, he will not push it F2-20.

Curriculum involvement

He is not involved much in the education committee due to work demands and it was noted that there is nothing that the principals has pushed that the school has to do F2-20. However, he has demonstrated involvement in curriculum through his work on the school charter in setting priorities and getting people involved, and through his work on developing a literacy policy and planning for the renovation of the library F2-20.

Interaction with teachers

He keeps staff informed F2-19; F5-14; F3-24 and immediately reacts to staff concerns F2-19. He tries to assess staff feelings and tries to work with staff F2-19, although he sometimes seems to unaware of the staff climate and he has difficulty managing conflict situations F2-21.
Interaction with students

He has good relations with students and has regular contact with them through self-referral, the SRC or teacher referral F3-26.

Power

The principal is seen as someone who does not enjoy power and is reluctant to make decisions unilaterally F2-19,22; F5-15. The principal is viewed as someone who would find it difficult to be autocratic F2-22. The contradictions found in supporting staff and fulfilling DSE regulations is creating anxiety for the principal F2-19.

Financial management

He lacks confidence in financial management, but uses expert help when necessary F3-25,26.

Characteristics

1. He is approachable, personable and a good listener F5-14; F3-25; he has an open door policy, is friendly and socialises with staff F2-19; F3-24. He is well respected for his ability to relate to people F3-24; he has the capacity to make people feel respected and listened to F3-25
2. He is supportive of staff F2-19
3. The principal is not as highly regarded by staff as the last principal who was consultative, but also decisive F2-22.
4. He has an open door policy, is not absent from school often, and he is visible around the school F3-26.
5. He takes a keen interest in all aspects of school life F3-26.

Values

1. Consultation and democratic decision making F4-16.
2. Fairness F2-21.
3. He has high regard for the opinions of others F3-25.

Changes noted in principal's leadership style

1. There is little change yet, although it should mean greater ease in making decisions and more power, which he will not be comfortable with F5-15. Another teacher believed that the principal will not change as he has accommodated himself to the traditional organisation of the school, and that organisation will not change F4-17.
2. There will be increasing need for the principal to keep staff informed as schools are becoming isolated from the outside due to the funding cuts F2-23.
3. His role will change because he is new to the job; he will not become autocratic, but it is hoped that he will become less consultative F2-22.
4. Increasing emphasis on business management role; he will have to have to be able to operate as a middle level manager in private industry and this will include being responsible for planning, staffing and finances F3-25.
5. There is an increased need for the principal to promote the school and to increase linkages with others schools and the community F3-25.
SCHOOL H

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

Throughout the interview there was a sense of excitement and opportunity; there is a positive feel to how he sees his role. It was also evident that the principal relies on staff and doesn't talk about himself; throughout the interview it was always 'us' and not 'I'. The school has growing enrolments and good community relations as the State secondary education provider in a semi-rural setting. The interview was a long interview (75 minutes) with the principal seeming very sure about being able to describe his leadership role.

PRINCIPAL H1

Leadership role

The principal has developed ideas concerning his leadership. He has prepared a chart of his leadership role that covers educational leadership, policy development, human relations, industrial relations, communication and organisational management style H1-4. The principal summarised his leadership role as "the leadership for me then is really focussed into this team approach, collaborative decision making, communication, I guess that it is these things (referring to a leadership chart he developed) policy development, human relations, industrial relations scene, and, if you like, the overseeing of the implementation of the charter ethos of the school; that is absolutely critical." H1-6. He also distinguishes between leadership and administration with the adoption of the administrative computer package CASES as an example of administration H1-3.

Vision

The principal's vision for the school is contained in the school charter H1-4,6 and is expressed through goals such as implementing charter visions; supporting staff to implement charter vision; improving the leadership process through TQM; improving quality provision through TQM. H1-5.

Wider knowledge

The principal has experiences and knowledge outside of the school which are used to help the school. Examples include: his involvement in helping other schools to understand Schools of the Future H1-2; visiting schools that are using a Total Quality Management system H1-4; developing links with the business community by seeking their help on school council H1-7; and, awareness of the ramifications of new initiatives such as the possible introduction of performance pay for teachers H1-10.

Symbolic awareness

He uses symbolic acts to reinforce school values. Thus, he maintains contact with students and encourages pursuit of excellence through the issuing of "principal awards" H1-12,13. The measuring of school performance mentioned previously is also symbolic in stating the areas that the school values; more up-front is the employment of a public relations person to promote the school ethos H1-11.

Decision making

Throughout the interview the principal emphasised the his team approach to leading the school H1-2,3,7,9,12. He believes that having a team approach is critical in a self-managing school H1-2 and that the best way to implement the school charter is through a team/collaborative approach to decision making H1-9. The team approach extends to personnel matters where he uses the principal class team to assist him when needed H1-3. He is also trying a team approach with non-teaching staff H1-3. The decision making in the school is organised on a collaborative model H1-3 although the principal will make unilateral decisions H1-3 and he acknowledges that whilst there are times when this is necessary "I know that as soon as I start making unilateral decisions that I will have other problems which will be worse." H1-9. Thus, in terms of power, he acknowledges that he has the ultimate authority, but rarely exercises his power of veto H1-9 preferring to work with teams of people. An example is that he has retained a decision making body called the support committee that makes decisions on a range of issues such as teacher
work loads. In this committee he has only had "to veto one decision in the last twelve months and we work as a team and, as far as possible, work in a consensus mode." H1-9. On school council the principal has an executive role, and he also feels it is his role to gather expert help when needed H1-6.

**Delegation**

The team approach relies on successful delegation "where everyone has a clear focus and goal-setting and goal implementation is all delegated through the teams; there is a clear focus for the whole school community." H1-7. He is currently exploring Total Quality Management as a process that will allow his emphasis on delegation through teams to work more effectively H1-7. Whilst the principal believes that he delegates heavily he sees the need for further delegation so that he can concentrate more on being involved with the teaching and learning process H1-12.

**Initiating ideas**

A number initiatives of the principal were described. The school, at the instigation of the principal, is investigating the possibilities of employing a public relations person and a business manager H1-11. The principal has been instrumental in the development and implementation of a locally based staff appraisal scheme and he chairs the charter implementation team responsible for this H1-10. To improve quality provision and his leadership, the principal is investigating the merits of a Total Quality Management system for the school H1-4. He used this to illustrate how he would seek to collaboratively institute a new idea. To implement a new idea such as TQM he will:
1. Write a paper.
2. Seed idea with senior staff.
3. Get feedback.
4. Raised the revised plan with various school groups.
5. Take it to staff.
6. Take it to school council.
7. Implement plan.
This will result in a concept that is progressively shaped as it goes through the process H1-8.

**Curriculum involvement**

The principal wants to become more involved as an educational leader, supporting staff in the teaching and learning process, and becoming more visible as a leader than current time pressures allow H1-12. He believes that once the management/leadership teams and systems are working well, he will be freer to become "embroiled in the teaching and learning process, working with teachers and kids and parents, on curriculum programs, working with teachers, working in the classroom with teachers and providing support." H1-13. Examples were given including: the process the school used in deciding to become involved in *Schools of the Future* which used consultation, feedback, discussion and debate amongst the staff and the community H1-2; the use of volunteer sub-groups of staff to write the charter with the principal providing the overview H1-2 with the help of a 0.5 assistant principal H1-6;

**Accountability**

Accountability was a concern for the principal, although he preferred to view it more as a learning process of measuring how well the school performs so that the school can continue to improve. He wants to be able to measure school performance by focussing on student outcomes, community support, customer satisfaction and supporting teachers through a staff appraisal process H1-5,6. Staff appraisal is viewed as a way to improve student outcomes and to support teachers professionally to become better teachers H1-10. The principal believes that adopting a Total Quality Management system may help in the process of measuring school performance H1-5.

**Interaction with teachers**

He is protective of his staff; indeed, whilst he agreed to be interviewed for this research, he felt that his staff had already taken on too much and so shouldn't be involved. He is aware of the increased workloads of teachers H1-5 and he is concerned that they are not asked to do more. For example, although the principal is enthusiastic about Total Quality Management, if it requires too much additional
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work from staff which in turn effects classroom performance, he will delay or not implement it H1-8. He is concerned about staff development, staff morale and showing support for staff and this is shown in his desire to review the amount of work the school has taken on with the current version of the school charter H1-13.

Interaction with students

Despite time pressures he attempts to remain a "hands-on" principal through contact with students via his "principal awards" and through receiving feedback via attending meetings, leading meetings and calling people into his office for talks H1-14.

Personal characteristics

The principal: enjoys working in teams H1-2,3,9; is a workaholic H1-7; works up front and has an open door policy H1-10,12; is positive H1-4; seeks self-improvement H1-10.

Values

Values expressed by the principal included: involving and empowering people H1-2, that self-management will empower staff H1-2; working closely with teachers and union branches H1-9 and having an open door policy H1-12; maintaining a positive school focus as shown in his belief that the school is an excellent school H1-4; seeking and being able to demonstrate continuous improvement H1-6; having as the primary focus the improvement of teaching and learning for students H1-5,6,10,14 - "we can't lose sight of the fact that the fundamental reason we are here is to provide quality education for our kids and that is critical to us and I think that the important thing is that everything else has to be supportive of that fact." H1-6. He also emphasised that despite his interest in TQM and his active courting of local businesses, that he did not see the school as a business H1-7.

Changes

A number of changes in his leadership role were mentioned. As a general statement he viewed the changes positively as providing him with challenges H1-7. Schools of the Future has allowed him to extend the leadership style that he already had by gaining focus H1-9. Other changes mentioned included:

* Improved flexibility and increased responsibility in the personnel management area H1-3.
* Through the charter, there has been development of a focussed school vision which has allowed the principal to take on board the values of the school community and the direction it wants to go in H1-3,4.
* Increased onus to be more accountable H1-5.
* Greater demands on the principal's time, which he said is fine because most principals are workaholics (along with most of his staff). H1-7
* Allowed him to gain the confidence of the staff and community to implement the charter and a self-managing approach to administration. H1-9
* Industrial relations may cause future concerns, but he believes that his leadership style is well suited (working closely with the staff and unions in terms of issues related to working conditions) and will not need to change H1-9; he works "up front" and tries to allay teachers' fears. H1-10
* Communication and feedback procedures "within the college and to the school community" will have greater importance to the extent that the school is considering employing a public relations person to ensure "that people understand what is happening with this change and that they understand what the ethos of the college is for the next three years." H1-11
* The principal is looking at the employment of a business manager who will take over some of the functions that the principal currently does (such as "financial management, generating sponsorship, liaison with department heads, liaison with the community, public relations") H1-11 and allow him to become more of an educational leader H1-12,13.
* The principal is not able to teach this year as it was considered unfair to keep doing this with the increased time demands of Schools of the Future. H1-12
* Management of change is more important. H1-14
SCHOOL I

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

The principal was recently appointed to the school by the DSE. He showed strong views of how he was going to lead the school and what he expected of teachers. Whilst the principal is a person with strong views on education which have been developed over a number of years working with difficult students, his views are difficult to follow due to the disjointed way they were presented in the interview; it is hoped that this analysis does justice to the principal's ideas. Due to the recent nature of his appointment, the principal thought that it would be inappropriate for staff to be interviewed.

PRINCIPAL 11

Vision

The principal expressed a number of visions for the school and he believed that *Schools of the Future* gave him the opportunity to establish a school that he sees as appropriate; there was no indication in the interview that his vision was formed in consultation with other school members 11-2,10. He wants to make the school technology centred 11-5, and it should be responsive to a modern student by being an "adult type school" 11-8. The principal wants the school to address parent needs. Thus, the school will offer a conservative education, focused on the business of education "which is teaching and learning, LOTE, literacy and numeracy, developing the emotional needs of people and developing the body" 11-8. As part of his vision for the school, the principal is adopting long term planning by collecting demographic data and insisting that teachers plan in six year cycles; the principal himself claims to have a 100 year view of the school 11-6,7.

Wider knowledge

He demonstrated wider knowledge and experience involving: reading educational literature 11-2,6,12; knowledge of private industry 11-3,6,7; use of statistical information from DEET and census data 11-7; past work experience as a principal in a number of settings and as a bureaucrat in the DSE 11-2,3,9,10; using a three stage theory of change involving inactivity, resistance, flux 11-11.

Decision making

His style of decision making seems to be autocratic; he questions the usefulness of democratic structures believing that schools and businesses are little hierarchies in which democratic processes do not work 11-3. Related to this is his belief that principals have the power to make decisions and that they have to exercise the power "to confront them and take them on." 11-3; indeed he believes that principals can not avoid exercising their power and that the system and parents want principals who will exercise power 11-8. He emphasises the control aspect by wanting to know everything that goes on in the school by getting teachers to write action plans which will allow him to allocate labour time, resources and funding appropriately and tell staff what the school will be doing at a particular time 11-7. He views *Schools of the Future* as an opportunity for him to "implement my conceptual framework...it is like a once in a lifetime opportunity, it is a wonderful opportunity to put on a large scale things that I know work from an educational point of view 11-11; there is no sense of consultation in this statement.

Initiating ideas

Whilst the principal is very new to this school he did discuss his involvement in introducing initiatives at other schools where he has been principal. In his last school he introduced sport, syllabuses, uniform and general assemblies and he generated publicity and public relations for the school 11-10. He views *Schools of the Future* as an opportunity to bring about changes and establish a school that he envisions as appropriate 11-2 and it will allow him to do it more easily as it is the catalyst for introducing change 11-10; it is as if *Schools of the Future* is giving him permission to implement ideas of schooling that he has been developing over a number of years. An example he gave of implementing an idea of his concerns the use of technology. The principal wants to make it a technology centred school and to do this he will force teachers to use computer technology by making office staff unavailable for teaching staff use and requiring teaching staff to document what they do, which means they will of necessity have to use...
computer technology; thus, he believes that teachers will become computer literate and then this will flow to students 11-5. In the one term he has been at the school he has introduced or is in the process of introducing sports education, and restructuring student responsibility by having houses, house captains, school captains and a Student Representative Council 11-B.

**Business orientation**

He has a business orientation to school, believing that schools are a type of business needing principals that have a business view and professional development that addresses areas covered in courses such as Masters of Business Administration 11-5,11. He has a plan that includes structural development, marketing, policy development, data and current action 11-12 and he discusses marketing the school and having a marketing plan 11-3 that will ensure the school attracts enrolments and is successful 11-4,7,11. The competition to attract students is mentioned often and the connection between enrolments and school success is explicit, as is the principal’s role in ensuring that teachers understand that what they do will be reflected in enrolments; thus there is a need for the principal to ensure that the school has plans that respond to parent expectations and ensure continuing enrolments 11-4,7,11.

**Accountability**

Accountability is important and is achieved by directing teachers to produce syllabus statements which he believes are empowering for teachers and contributes to a more efficient and effective school producing better student outcomes 11-5. He is also concerned to document what he and the school does; for example, he has documented the management structures used at the school 11-7. By improving documentation he is also reducing concerns about legal liability and litigation 11-7.

**Interaction with teachers**

The principal has a focus on staff professional development. He wants to shift the way teachers see their work and create a new paradigm where they see what they do as a social construction; he wants to empower teachers to meet their social responsibility. For example, he wants to shift the emphasis of discipline problems away from a teacher/student problem to a school problem 11-6. The professional development of staff is broadly conceived. Thus he is concerned with establishing an appropriate teaching culture, to engender a sense of collective work, to focus on teaching and learning and generate consistency of approach and loyalty and solidarity which will result in a degree of stability in the teaching staff that will promote calm amongst student 11-9. He describes the school at the moment as a like a troubled family which is ridden with conflicts and power struggles; he wants to change that 11-9. He also believes that in the future schools may have very different work structures with a core of on-going staff supported by a team of short-term contract staff 11-4,5

**Personal characteristics**

The principal: enjoys rapid and dynamic changes 11-2,12; is conscious of the image he portrays 11-3; views business management skills as necessary 11-5; wants to know everything 11-7; is comfortable with having and using power 11-8; views himself as distinct from the teaching staff 11-8.

**Values**

The primary value expressed by the principal was to get all students through year twelve 11-2,9 and he believed that it was his responsibility to have goals and performance indicators that satisfied this 11-2. He also believed that change is necessary and that it needs to happen quickly, within eighteen months before the “window of opportunity closes” 11-2,12, but that it is also illusionary in that it is not real change, but more a different part of a repeating cycle ; he is committed to the idea of State education and believes that schools are powerful institutions capable of changing people 11-2,11; he is a socialist and has trouble with democratic approaches in education 11-3; the curriculum of the school is all important 11-3 and teachers are central to it 11-9; power and control is needed to bring about change and improvement 11-8; the principal is excited and stimulated by the change that is occurring 11-12; he believes that principals should be in the classroom so they know the kids and so they can act as a role model, however, the teachers at his school do not want him to teach 11-12.
Changes

Changes identified included: the school is now operating as an enterprise and the principal is in business mode \( f1-11 \); the "speed of work has tripled" \( f1-11 \) and there is now rapid and dynamic change which the principal enjoys \( f1-2 \); there is a new capacity for the principal to alter the personnel work situation via incentive payments and regular individual staff reviews, and the future may allow the principal to have a mix of permanent and part-time staff \( f1-4,5 \); principals will be running schools that will have to respond to parents or face losing enrolments \( f1-11 \); principals are not now expected to teach \( f1-12 \); whilst he does not believe that principals have more power now, he does believe that they are now expected to exercise it and that this may be a cost for principals in that there will be a clear distinction between the principal as manager and the teachers as workers \( f1-8 \); the perspective for school planning is changing from the short-term to the long-term and he is getting six year plans from teachers and he has a ten year plan for the school \( f1-7 \).
SCHOOL J

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

The principal is a man of substantial experience in running schools and involvement in senior central office functions such as state-wide curriculum development. In the interview he described how his leadership role in his current school; he noted that he has adopted other leadership roles where he has been principal in other schools. The school has declining enrolments, but this will stabilise and then grow with the opening of a new housing estate.

PRINCIPAL J1

Wider knowledge

The principal is concerned that staff are kept well informed of what is happening in education. Last year he wrote a weekly “Teacher’s Bulletin” and subscribed to relevant journals. This year he uses regular staff briefings and meetings, but laments that he can not get staff to discuss ideas; they tend to want to receive information and not to discuss issues J1-5. The principal also brings wider experience and perspectives to the school citing his work in curriculum development as helping him to identify that he has good teachers on staff J1-9, and his knowledge of demographic trends indicating that the school will have a secure future despite enrolments falling over the next couple of years J1-8. The principal is involved in external work for the DSE, and he noted that the demands for his time out of the school were increasing J1-6.

Cultural Awareness

The principal is aware of the school culture and he has modified his leadership to suit the culture. Thus, he is less up-front and directive than he has been at other schools and he relies more on working with people and encouraging their leadership J1-4,5. Also, when he attempted to encourage staff input and open discussions at staff meetings, the existing staff culture resisted this and so he has not pushed it further J1-5. The principal would like to be more up front, but believes that would be impossible now without being seen as taking over peoples’ established roles J1-5.

Symbolic awareness

The principal is aware of the symbolisms inherent in what he does. As was mentioned, the principal is concerned that his inability to be spending time in classrooms is indicating that the classroom is not important J1-7,8. He is also concerned about being available to people and the messages that sends; too available and he sends the message that the job is not important, not available and he sends the message that they are not important J1-7. He “would probably lean towards giving…time to other people” J1-7.

One of the reasons for not appointing a someone to the vacant 0.5 vice principal position was that he did not want to the AST3’s to think that there work wasn’t valued if they didn’t get the position J1-8. He is concerned about failing enrolments and the effect it will have on the school; if he increases teacher allotments to maintain the subject range this will devalue teachers, yet if he reduces the subject choices, this will further decrease enrolments J1-8. The principal is concerned that he doesn’t become too involved in external activities because if he is not at school it suggests to staff that school is not important; yet he sees the job as requiring more time away from school J1-7.

Delegation

Delegation is important to the principal; he recognises the abilities of others and makes use of that by encouraging people throughout the school to assume leadership roles J1-3. He believes in using a team approach with leadership shared amongst a number of people J1-3.

Decision making and communication

The principal believes in using a consultative approach to decision making; “I don’t believe that any person should be judge, jury and whatever.” J1-9 To facilitate involvement of staff the school has a number of committees; although the school has more committees than the principal feels is warranted J1-
3. Whilst the principal encourages people to take on leadership roles and make decisions, he acknowledges that at times he has to be directive, although he still tries to ensure that the majority of staff support the direction J1-3. To convince staff the process he uses involves the assistant principal writing an initial paper which will be discussed at appropriate meetings (curriculum committee, LAC, department, staff), and then a decision will be made J1-4. Teacher appraisal was used to illustrate his style: the charter has directed him to adopt a particular strategy which he believes is unworkable, so he is now in the process of convincing staff that an alternative procedure is better J1-3. The introduction of sport education and a restructuring of pastoral care were two areas where he believes that he will have to give directions and convince people as well: "I see leadership as not direction, but bringing people with you in the, if you like, the directions that the school has to move." J1-4. Staff excess was an area where he was forced to be directive because the staff chose not to be involved, but he lamented this because it meant that he did have the best possible information on which to base his decisions J1-9. Thus, whilst the principal is willing to be directive, he does not view this in an autocratic way as he seeks to involve others J1-4. "While it says that the principal can decide, I believe that you have to get wider involvement than that." J1-8. Again there is the emphasis on involving others, but still being prepared to be decisive.

Initiating ideas

To get staff agreement on an idea of his, the principal works closely with the vice principal and has him write an initial discussion paper which will then be raised at appropriate meetings. This means that there is opportunity for the principal to convince the majority of staff and if he can't convince them, then at least they will understand the principal's reasons behind the decision J1-4. The principal is concerned that staff are kept informed J1-5. He brings into the school information and ideas that he thinks are important. Last year he did this via weekly "Teacher's Bulletin" and subscriptions to relevant journals (e.g. Directions in Education). This year he uses the regular staff briefings and meetings. He points out that he would rather have staff meetings as times where "people sit and discuss things", but the staff tend not to accept that and so do not put items up for discussion J1-5.

Curriculum involvement

The principal has a strong background in system wide curriculum development J1-5 and the principal would like to be more involved in school educational matters, but his time is increasingly used on administrative matters, especially financial J1-5,8.

Interaction with staff

He is protective of his staff because he acknowledges that they are "good teachers" J1-9. Two examples were given of protecting staff from increased allotments. The first, meant that the Student Welfare Coordinator position was abolished when staffing cuts hit last year J1-3, and the second, meant that the school has not appointed a 0.5 vice principal that it is entitled to J1-8, both were partly done to ensure teacher allotments didn't have to increase. Also, the principal seeks to involve his staff in the decision making processes (see previous theme).

Business and financial role

The principal noted that his role has changed due to the increased administrative pressures which have resulted in: less involvement in educational matters and less time spent in the classrooms J1-5,6,7; more time spent on financial management to generate and maintain funds J1-6; more time spent on personnel functions such as employing staff J1-6. The principal described the school as being like a business now J1-6.

Personal characteristics

The principal described a number of characteristics of his leadership including: not being out in front J1-3; encouraging of people J1-3; concern for fairness in processes such as staff excess J1-9; not being in control of his time which he described as being filled with a series of two-minute tasks J1-7; acknowledging that he does not have the time to do all that he should J1-7,8.
Values

A number of values were evident including: being at school and spending time with teachers in the classroom J1-6,7; consulting and involving people in a team approach J1-3,8; the most important aspect of school is what occurs in the classroom J1-8. The principal demonstrated a focus on learning by emphasising the importance of the maintaining the breadth of educational programs (and thereby not appointing a 0.5 vice principal that the school is entitled to have) J1-6 and ensuring that classes are covered even if that means spending a considerable amount of his time in finding replacement teachers for someone that has left J1-6. He is aware that the time pressures on himself and the vice principal mean that they can not get out to visit classes which is giving the message that the classroom is not important; the principal emphasised that the classroom is the most important aspect of school, and it troubled him that he can't be more involved J1-7,8.

Changes noted in the principal's leadership style

A number of changes to his role were noted including: less involvement in educational matters J1-5; more time spent on generating and maintaining funds J1-6; more time spent on personnel functions such as employing staff J1-6; the increase in administrative work means less time is available to be spent in classrooms J1-6,7; increased demands, from the DSE and others, for principals to be involved in work outside of the school J1-6.

TEACHER INTERVIEWS - TEACHERS J2, J3, J4, J5

Vision

There were different perceptions concerning the principal's sense of vision. One teacher believed that he lacks breadth of vision J3-17, and he never leads from the front by offering a vision J3-22; eg. not spending money on the appearance of the school which may lead to increased enrolments J3-18. There is no sense of common purpose coming form him and staff blame this for the declining enrolments J3-21. However, two teachers believe that he has vision J5-31 and that he provides overall direction for the school as shown by his work in developing the school charter J4-27 and in his belief that the school should be involved in Schools of the Future J5-33. The vice principal controls the normal running of the school, freeing the principal to gain an overview of what goes on in the school J5-35; this may help the principal to provide direction for the school.

Cultural awareness

One teacher believes that he does not understand the where the school sits in the community and what the contribution of the people in it could be or should be J3-17; it was suggested that he is not aware of the values the school is projecting, nor does he have a sense of the values it should be projecting J3-17, or the need to publicise values J3-20. However, another teacher argues that he works for the common interests of the school, and if this is true, then he must have an understanding of the school values held by the community J5-33. Also, it was noted that the principal has good working relationships with the school community members J4-29; this also suggests understanding of the school community. A possible explanation for a lack of understanding could be the principal’s increasing isolation from students through increased administrative tasks, the inherent school culture (in which the vice principal is very public) and a lack of facilities for large student assemblies J4-27.

Wider knowledge

He uses knowledge gained from external meetings he attends J4-27 in informing the general staff, feeding information to appropriate staff, instituting appropriate mechanisms to utilise the knowledge J4-28 and by using outside experts J5-33. Also he has knowledge of DSE policy; whilst this would seem a requirement and may not constitute wider knowledge, it is worth noting that teachers view the principal as understanding the DSE policies, which would indicate extensive reading and discussion with others by the principal J5-31.
Curriculum involvement

There was ambiguity here in the teacher perceptions. There was evidence that the principal is involved in curriculum:

He led staff through the charter development process by assigning tasks J2-11.
He has introduced an Asian language and supported the introduction of media J2-12,13.
One teacher believed that he has to be involved in curriculum matters and initiating ideas, because in the current climate, many staff are negative to any of the DSE initiatives; he has done a good job at introducing DSE initiatives J5-34.

However, another teacher believed that his role on curriculum committee did not involve initiating or encouraging new programs; indeed, he was viewed as saying no to everything J3-22. Also he was described as having a poor grasp on curriculum with no real commitment to curriculum matters J3-1.
The principal is seen as the school figure head, although this may be lost as the educational role of the principal is de-emphasised J4-29.

Initiating ideas

Again there were different perceptions. One teacher believed that he showed initiative by convincing staff to be part of Schools of the Future by putting a case for the affirmative J2-12. Also, it was noted that he will persist with a view until it is adopted by the democratic processes J2-14. Another teacher gave specific examples of programs that the principal has helped to initiate include staff professional development, introducing LOTE, sport and reviewing the pastoral care system J4-28. However, one teacher believed that he does not initiate programs J3-22.

Decision making and communication

He is viewed as tending to not be directive and leaving decisions for committees to decide on J2-11, preferring democratic decision making J2-12. However, he was viewed as being more directive in the recent development of the school charter J4-25, and staff are wanting him to be more directive J2-11,15,16.

Whilst the staff want him to be directive it is felt that staff believe that they can not influence the direction that the school is going in; because the principal is so complacent he can not be influenced, which meant that there was a sense of rudderless leadership J3-23,24. Whilst some staff see his leadership as rudderless, others believe that a lot of his work is behind the scenes and that he likes to know and is aware of what is going on in the school J4-28,29,30; J5-32 Even though he does not work up front, he has strong input in decision making committees such as the LAC and curriculum committee J4-28 and he works well in those committee J5-32. Whilst there is a very good committee structure at the school, the communication channels often get clouded, resulting in poor decisions J5-31.

Delegation

He delegates roles to staff; for example charter implementation, review and evaluation is the responsibility of a small group of senior staff including himself as convener, and this group then farms the jobs out to others J4-27, J5-31. He is selective about who he delegates to so that he can be confident that the job will be done J4-29 and he monitors the outcomes of the delegations J5-31. Whilst he delegates and collects feedback, he is not viewed as wanting to control everything J4-29.

Interaction with staff

Once decisions have been made he is supportive of staff by providing resources and promoting the program J2-13, and he is supportive in giving teachers assistance in dealing with students J5-32. Also, he is trying to create a more positive staff climate by the introduction of the “teacher of the week” award J2-15. However, some staff view this as a gimmick idea and they would rather that he recognize and ego stroke teachers when they have contributed significantly and not in artificial situations like the award J3-19,20,21. Others view this as a positive and sincere effort which compliments his acknowledgement of staff through the personal notes he sends J5-33. He is viewed as sending messages to staff that lead to low morale such as: there is no point fighting the current educational system J3-17; staff are to blame for the poor state of the school J3-18; classroom oriented teachers are not lauded, but sport orientated teachers are J3-20; his dealings with female staff members can be inappropriate in a sexist, belittling
manner J3-20. One teacher believed that the principal has created a distance from the staff by projecting and "us and them" attitude J3-17. Another teacher believes that he knows what is going with staff J4-30, whilst another teacher attributes some of the difficulties with staff to having to run a school where the staff do not always work together (eg. implementing uniform policy) J5-31. There was agreement from three teachers that the principal has poor personal skills, such as speaking before he thinks, which can lead to upset J5-34 and misinterpretation of his intentions J2-14; it is suggested that he is aware of the lack of personal skills J2-14. An example of his poor personal skills was that his farewell of a female staff member was interpreted as being inappropriate J3-20. He has no feeling for the atmosphere he creates J3-20, and lacks the level of empathy needed to have a feel for what is going on J3-21; eg. by not supporting the idea of a stand alone school in recent amalgamation discussions, the staff saw this as lack of commitment to the school J3-23. He believes that he is doing OK, but staff don't and he is not aware of this J3-22; indeed it is suggested that staff have a negative view of him with many wishing he would retire J3-21, and they believe that he is not competent enough to do the job J3-22. Other staff believe that he establishes good working relationships J4-29.

Interaction with students
He is increasingly having less to do with students J4-25,27, although he is still involved with them J4-29.

Public relations
In terms of public relations one teacher viewed the principal as a poor public speaker with no presence J3-21, while another teacher believed that he was good in the public relations role J5-33.

Business and financial role
The principal sees himself as the overall manager, business manager come administrator, of his the school J4-25. There is an increased administrative work load associated with aspects such as the new personnel and financial responsibilities, which means that he has less time with students J4-25,26,27,29; J5-36 and there is the potential for him to become only an administrator, leaving other roles, such as the educational role, to people like the assistant principals J4-26,28. The principal appears to have good financial management skills J2-14, J4-28. However, his control of the finances is sending mixed messages with some staff seeing him as controlling the money rather than being supportive J3-18, whilst other staff simply acknowledge his expertise in this area J4-27.

Personal characteristics
The principal has been described as: a decent human J3-17,21; complacent J3-24; easy to get on with and to have a joke with J4-29; a good team leader (as shown by his leadership of half the staff in writing the school charter) J5-34; up front and accessible J5-32; a practical person rather than an abstract thinker J3-18.

Values
Values held by the principal were not noted by most teachers. One teacher noted that he is conservative; he values the status quo and sees no need to change the school or fight the government J3-17,23.

Changes noted in the principal's leadership style
1. Teachers want more direction from the principal - this is due to work overload and increased stress experienced by teachers J2-11,15,16; he is less pragmatic and more directive and he now has to make the decisions because of the reduction in alternative support structures (eg. regional and central services are diminished) J5-35,36. One teacher saw little change in what the principal is doing, although they did note that during the development of the charter he was more directive J4-25.
2. He is trying to be more positive, as the charter requires, through promotion of positive aspects of the school J2-15, although his efforts here, especially those concerned with staff, are seen as gimmick and insensitive by some staff J3-19.
3. There is a slightly greater air of confidence as shown in increased threats to use his powers. J3-22.
4. There is an increased administrative work load associated with aspects such as the new personnel and financial responsibilities, which means that he has less time with students J4-25,26,27,29; J5-36 and there is the potential for him to become only an administrator, leaving other roles, such as the educational role, to people like the assistant principals J4-26,28. If he is not interacting with students and staff then there is the potential for him to make ill-informed decisions J4-26.

5. There is more time spent away from school attending meetings J4-27, although he is perceived as spending a lot of time at the school J5-33.
SCHOOL K

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTERVIEW AND SCHOOL

The school is large, well kept and has a stable student population. The interview was preceded by a long conversation about a variety of areas, some of which arose again in the interview. Whilst the principal was happy to be interviewed and allocated considerable time to the interview, he felt that his staff were over committed and he declined to have them participate in the research.

PRINCIPAL K1

Vision

Although this was not a strong feature of the interview the principal discussed the need for leadership to focus on the everyday and the long term K1-3. The principal also discussed the need in the current climate of dramatic change to ensure that the staff and the school survive; his current emphasis is not so much the future as ensuring that the school's programs are not adversely effected by the turbulent educational program K1-4. This principal may have a long term vision for the school, but the immediate problems are the current focus.

Wider knowledge

The principal brings into the school, wider educational knowledge. Thus, in deciding to become involved in the pilot program, the principal invited in outside experts K1-2 and also used knowledge of the experiences of self-management in New Zealand and England K1-2. The mentioned leadership studies that have influenced his views of leading the staff through a period of change; pushing the staff too hard to achieve effectiveness, may lead to reduced cooperation and lower efficiency K1-4. Also, he used a theory of motivation to explain his current handling of his leadership role K1-3.

Decision making

The principal uses a decision making model that uses negotiation K1-4 and consensus K1-5 as much as possible. However, he acknowledges that increasingly he is happy to be more authoritarian and make decisions, even though he would prefer to work via consensus (this view was expressed concerning recent staffing decisions that had to be made by him after reaching an impasse with the LAC) K1-5.

Curriculum involvement

The principal has involvement in curriculum planning and his discussion of how he got the school to decide to become part of Schools of the Future, and how the school wrote the charter and the implementation process illustrate this; of the tape other examples of his direct involvement in curriculum were given. He sold being a pilot school to the staff by arguing that it was better to be involved than not and by providing the staff with information from experts and overseas experiences; he also, unsuccessfully, attempted to sway the union branch K1-2. In writing the charter, he was the person that set the processes that ensured that all the various relevant groups would be involved K1-3. In the implementation and monitoring of the charter the school has teams of people working on priority areas, with the education sub-committee conducting a cyclic evaluation by evaluating the progress of a couple of priority areas each meeting K1-3. The principal gave an example where two of the priority areas (Increasing parent participation and strengthening LOTE) have already had success in meeting their goals K1-3.

Power and political awareness

There is criticism of the power being given to principals and this criticism reflects an awareness by the principal of the political nature of his role. It was noted in the changes section that the principal's power in relation to staffing has increased in theory, but is being hobbled by DSE requirements K1-6 and that schools are being made more accountable, but given fewer resources K1-5. The principal believes that the curriculum role is the key role for the principal K1-4, but he is not sure that principals will be allowed to exercise leadership in this area; the Board of Studies may prescribe what is to occur in curriculum leaving little for the principal to do in terms of curriculum leadership K1-4.
Interaction with teachers

The principal was concerned to protect the staff and the school. He described leadership as involving long term planning and what is done on an everyday basis. On an everyday basis he is trying to ensure that the school and the staff survive the period of dramatic change they are experiencing; he described his leadership as addressing the survival and shelter levels of Maslow's hierarchies of need. He believes that "we are certainly in a period of time where we have just got to let things flow, keep up the core business of the school, the good teaching and good learning". An example of his approach concerns the implementation of the school charter which he is content to just having ticking over because he is not prepared to push the staff hard for fear of damaging staff morale.

Personal characteristics

The principal noted qualities that principals will need in Schools of the Future including being introspective, reflective, tough, flexible and fairly pragmatic. People skills in relating to staff, continue to be of importance. Principals will have to be able to manage the school finances and bring schools in on budget.

Values

In terms of values, the principal believes that the key role for principals is in curriculum development. The principal believed that Schools of the Future is a progressive step and that it is better to be involved in the forefront of initiatives than to sit back. He also expressed respect for teachers, saw them as professionals and wants to have good relations with the staff and not be seen as "that little bastard who sits up in the office and tells them what to do". Another expressed value was the challenge involved in his current leadership role, a challenge to keep the school "running on an even keel through this period of turmoil", a challenge that he is looking forward to.

Changes

A number of changes were noted including; he is having to make more decisions concerning industrial issues because there is no agreement now, the school gets a grant and has to work staffing out itself and often the consensus process in the LAC breaks down; public relations will be more important because the government has handed responsibility to the schools, so schools will have to explain to parents what they are doing with the money they get and ensure that parents continue to support the school even though the school does not provide all that they wanted; whilst the accountability to the community has increased, the resources available to schools has diminished so principals will have to be politically astute in understanding what the community wants, in allocating resources and explaining to the community the school's actions; the power of the principal has increased with respect to the controlling the staffing mix of the school, but it has decreased in that the principal is more accountable but doesn't have the power to be in control of the criteria he will be judged upon (eg at the time of the interview schools had to recruit staff from the excess pool, which may not result in the best appointment); cutbacks and staffing changes in regional and central office support have meant that the principal has to anticipate and plan earlier for what may be coming over the horizon; there is a distance between him and staff in formal situations (not in social situations) where the staff now see him as the Ministry person that they have to deal with; principals have increased financial responsibilities in terms of managing a larger, more complex budget. The principal expressed concern at the training and inservicing offered to principals involved in the pilot program. He also expressed concern that the leadership role description gathered in this research may be a distorted view because of the chaotic period of change that is occurring.
APPENDIX TWO: SIMILARITY BETWEEN PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

For each of the seven schools where principal and teacher interviews were conducted, the themes arising from the principal and teacher interviews are compared to ascertain the degree of similarity between principal and teacher perceptions of the principal leadership role. References are given for teacher derived themes, but not for principal derived themes as these can be unambiguously got from reading of the principal thematic analysis. The referencing system is the same as that used for the thematic analysis described under table 3 in the result section of the main report. Thus, a reference such as A1-5 refers to person A1, and page 5 of the interviews from school A.

COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL A

There appears to be substantial agreement between the two perspectives on the broad thematic areas. Both the principal and the teachers included themes on vision, wider knowledge, cultural awareness, school promotion, decision making and communication, delegation, initiating ideas, interaction with teachers, characteristics, and values. The principal interview included extra themes to do with symbolic awareness and pessimism, whilst the teacher interviews included extra themes to do with curriculum involvement and interaction with students.

COMMON THEMES

Vision

There was agreement with the principal that the principal has vision and that this is an important feature of his leadership (only one teacher A2 did not mention vision). The principal's desire to reflect the needs of the local population was also found in the teacher comments A4-25. There was concern from the teachers that the principal's vision was not always articulated strongly A4-24 and that it was often expressed in the hidden agendas that he uses A3-21.

Wider knowledge

The principal's use of external networks was supported by two teachers A2-31; A3-21 and his knowledge of other industries supported by one teacher A3-22, as was his broad educational experience A3-16. Reading of research, awareness of historical patterns and visiting other schools was not mentioned by any of the teachers.

Cultural awareness

The principal emphasised the importance of the local community culture; the need to understand it, to reflect it in the school and to be aware of the influence it has within the school. One teacher mentioned the principal's awareness of local culture A2-31 and also noted the difficulty that the principal expressed concerning the need to encourage academic excellence, yet still remain supportive of the non-educationally centred community culture A2-31,34.

School promotion

The principal acknowledged his role in promoting the school to present the positive face of the school and to counter negative images, and this view was supported by one teacher A2-30,31 with another teacher acknowledging the importance of the principal in school promotion, but not sure that the principal has the abilities to do it A3-21.

Decision making and communication

The principal did not emphasise decision making or communication; from other statements he made it appears that he runs the school with little consultation and relied on delegation of tasks. Teachers
emphasised this area and explored its complexities, with all teachers making comments. From the teacher perceptions it seems that: the school has an extensive communication network with there being many forums where staff can participate in decision making A4-25; the principal strives to achieve consensus A2-30 and this may be related to perceived indecisiveness of the principal A5-37; or to wanting to leave decisions for staff to make A2-30; the principal will overrule decisions made through the formal channels A2-30; the principals concern to include others in decision making may reflect a desire of the principal to spread accountability A2-32; A3-17,20; the principal collects and uses people's opinions and he can be influenced by people A2-33,34; the principal often has hidden agendas A2-32; A3-16,21; A5-37. Thus, the principal's lack of emphasis in this area is not reflected in the teacher perceptions; indeed, for teachers the decision making process is complex, reflecting open, democratic processes, combined with informal and secretive processes.

**Delegation**

Delegation was emphasised by the principal; he uses delegation extensively and expects people to do the job without supervision, although he finds that this is not possible as either the people will want feedback from him, or they will not do the job unless he prompts them. Only one teacher mentioned delegation A3-17,18,22 and their view supported the principal's view.

**Initiating ideas**

Both the principal and all the teachers emphasised the principal's role in initiating new programs and ideas. The principal is viewed as a major driving force behind many of the more important school initiatives such as acquiring good facilities A3-16, being involved in important educational initiatives A4-25 and responding to school issues such as the falling enrolments A3-17,21,22; A4-24. It is worth noting that the principal and teachers did not view these involvements of the principal as curriculum involvement, although they could clearly be considered as such if a broad conception of what constitutes curriculum is used.

**Interaction with teachers**

The principal believed that he was supportive of teachers as shown by the principal motivating, encouraging, trusting, listening and empathising with teachers. The teachers were split on the principal's support for staff; two teachers believed that the principal was supportive A4-26,27; A5-39,40 whilst the other two teachers did not A2-35; A3-22. The principal and two teachers A2-34; A4-28 agreed that the principal was somewhat isolated from staff.

**Personal characteristics**

The principal saw himself as energetic, self-directing, wanting to discuss educational issues and coping with the time demands of the job; he also seemed isolated from staff and pessimistic. The teachers believed that he was energetic A3-18,22 and added that he was a "wheeler and dealer" A3-16,18,21,22, pragmatic A2-30, had a weak personality A5-37 and that he was tight with money A2-34.

**Values**

The principal has strong values of social justice, relating the school closely to local community values, and the importance of his role to the survival of the school. One teacher mentioned values and these were supportive of the principals, and included an additional value of having an informed staff A4-27.

**ADDITIONAL THEMES**

**Symbolic awareness**

The principal, but not the teachers, emphasised the positive symbolic power of actions such as celebrating student success, giving staff access to the principal, having his children attend the school; he seemed unaware of the symbolism inherent in his negative views of the schools image and its future.
Pessimism

The principal, but not the teachers, expressed much pessimism about the future of the school and the principal's capacity to lead effectively. This theme is perhaps more a characteristic of the principal than a theme about leadership. However, it was so strongly evident in the interview, that it is worth mentioning it by itself.

Curriculum involvement

Only one person, a teacher, discussed the principal's direct involvement in curriculum matters. This teacher indicated that in some curriculum areas the principal knew low and was happy to delegate that area to a teacher.

Interaction with students

Two teachers A2-30; A5-37 mentioned the principal's interaction with students; one believed that he didn't know the students well and the other believed that he was not a strong leader when dealing with students.

CONCLUSION

Table A presents a summary of the findings showing the ten themes identified by the principal and at least one teacher, the two themes identified by the principal only, and the two themes identified by teachers only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>Low agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>Two agreed, two disagreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal char.</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>Low agreement, 7 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School promotion</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement, 4 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic aware.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with students</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the common themes there is high agreement on seven, moderate agreement on one and low agreement on two. There were four additional themes identified. Given the level of agreement on the common themes, it can be concluded that the principal and teacher perceptions have produced substantially similar descriptions of the principal's leadership role; there are some differences due to differences in the personal characteristics described, the low agreement concerning decision making and communication and the few additional themes described.
COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL B

There is some agreement between the principal and teacher perspectives with common themes including vision, symbolic awareness, wider knowledge; decision making and communication, initiating ideas and values. The principal interviewed included the one additional theme of accountability. The teacher interviews included six additional themes: school promotion, delegation, curriculum involvement, interaction with students, interaction with staff, and personal characteristics.

COMMON THEMES

Vision

The principal and all the teachers acknowledged that the principal had vision. The vision that the principal articulated of a large, successful and visible school was supported by the teachers, and it was the principal's vision that was viewed as driving the school B3-11, B4-26.

Symbolic awareness

There was agreement between the principal and three of the teachers concerning the principal's promotion of school values through his actions B3-9,12; B2-33; B5-18.

Wider knowledge

The principal mentioned, although it was not emphasised, that he uses external networks and incorporates external ideas into the school. Two teachers commented that the principal has established external networks: they emphasised that he knows how to use the system to get what he wants B2-30; B5-19,20.

Decision making and communication

The teachers confirmed that the principal has considerable power B3-10; B4-25 and that he uses the principal class and AST3 teachers to help B5-22. However, whilst the principal's description centred on his power and control, the teacher descriptions acknowledged this but also emphasised that there are many opportunities for staff to have input and challenge the principal's view B2-30; B3-9,10; B5-16 and that the principal is not authoritarian B3-10. Thus, there is open communication and decision making, but the principal has, and exercises considerable influence.

Delegation

The principal delegates via the hierarchical staff structure he has implemented and receives feedback through the critical questions he asks of staff. Three teachers supported the principal's use of delegation: staff are given clear roles B3-11; B5-13 and the principal trusts staff to do their job B2-30,32.

Initiating ideas

The principal believed that he did initiate ideas and he gave examples. However, this view was supported by only one staff member, in an indirect comment concerning the employing of a person to help promote the school B2-30.

Curriculum involvement

The principal did not define any direct involvement in the curriculum. He did, however, describe how the curriculum policy committee operates; his role is to ask the critical questions that will ensure that the things that need to be done are completed. The principal's view was supported by one teacher who commented that the principal has delegated his curriculum role to the curriculum coordinator B2-32.
School promotion

The principal was concerned that the school had a customer focus and that it involved parents; this was supported by the teacher interviews B2-30. Indeed, the principal's ability to promote the school was one of the reasons for the school's success B2-30; B4-26,27 and also a problem for the school because the emphasis on promotion has meant less of an emphasis on the actual school programs B2-30,31,32; B4-25.

Interaction with teachers

The principal was concerned to ensure that teachers had a customer orientation and that they realised that the school is only there as long as parents want it to be. Whilst the teachers did not mention this aspect the four teachers did comment on this area. There were some differing opinions on the principal's relationship to staff. The principal was viewed as being supportive B5-19,20,21, approachable B4-24, encouraging B3-9; B4-26, and aware B2-33. Yet, these positive views were counterbalanced by negative views in which the principal was viewed as being non-supportive B3-11, negative about staff B4-26, a poor manager of staff B2-30; B4-26, and unaware B2-31; B4-24,25; B5-14,16,19.

Values

The principal's values included: client/customer orientation; focus on teaching and learning; autonomy from external constraints; importance of accountability. Teachers supported the principal's client/customer orientation B2-30; B4-24 and focus on teaching and learning B3-9,11; B5-13,17,18,22. They did not support autonomy and accountability and they added: fostering good working relations with staff B3-10; favouring large schools B5-15; and, having a strong work ethic B2-30; B5-18,20.

ADDITIONAL THEMES

Accountability

This area was not mentioned by the teachers. This may reflect the principal's view of accountability as an internal function of personal expectations and personal view of community expectations; thus, the principal may not be conveying his view of accountability to the staff. Also, to achieve accountability in others, the principal does this surreptitiously by asking teachers questions; thus, staff may not be aware that the principal regards accountability as important. Certainly, the importance that the principal placed on accountability is not reflected in the teacher perceptions.

Interaction with students

One teacher believed that the students see him as approachable, but not a strong leader B4-24.

Personal characteristics

The principal did not talk in terms of his personal characteristics. However, four teachers identified personal characteristics of the principal including: good leadership B5-13,17,18; B4-25; hands-on and involved B2-33; B5-19,20; non-intimidating B5-19,20; good at resolving conflicts B2-31; poor at collaboration and lacking in team work skills B2-31; ambitious for the school B5-18.
CONCLUSION

Table B presents a summary of the findings showing the ten themes identified by the principal and at least one other teacher, the one theme identified by the principal only, and the two themes identified by teachers only.

Table B: Summary of Principal and Teacher Perceptions for School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement, 7 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>Low agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic aware.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School promotion</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>Low agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>Moderate agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal chara.</td>
<td>4 teachers</td>
<td>6 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with students</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is high agreement on six common themes, moderate agreement on two themes and low agreement on two more themes. As there is substantial agreement over a large number of common themes, and only three additional themes, the principal and teacher perceptions have produced similar descriptions.
COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL C

There is substantial agreement between the two perspectives on the broad thematic areas. Both the principal and the teachers included themes on vision, wider knowledge, decision making and communication, delegation, initiating ideas, interaction with teachers and personal characteristics. There were no additional themes from the principal interview, but the teacher interviews produced four additional themes: symbolic awareness, accountability, curriculum involvement and interaction with students.

COMMON THEMES

Vision

The principal believed that vision was critical for a principal, and she articulated a clear vision and its consequences in terms of what she had already achieved and what was planned for the school. All four teachers believed that the principal had a vision for the school and that the principal attempted to ensure that her vision was implemented C2-23; C3-22; C4-32; C5-34,35. The principal articulated her vision C4-35; C5-34,35, although one teacher believed that she did not do this C2-23.

Wider knowledge

The principal had wide experience outside the school, involvement in various external committees, understanding of the state and national educational trends, and she brought the knowledge that she gained into the school; these aspects were confirmed by the four teachers C3-10; C2-16; C4-25,28; C5-34.

Decision making and communication

This theme was emphasised by both the principal and the four teachers. The principal's sense of power and control (ability to make unilateral decisions, ultimate authority, and delegation of tasks) was supported by the teachers C2-22; C3-12; C4-26; C5-34. The principal's emphasis on a team approach was supported C4-25, although one teacher believed that this emphasis was superficial C3-10,12,13. The principal's reliance on a small group of senior staff for advice was not a feature of the teacher interviews, although it was noted that the principal attempted to influence decisions by including people as apparent confidants C3-10,11,12,13; C5-33. The principal's manipulation of decision making processes was supported by teacher perceptions C2-18,19; C3-11; C5-35.

Delegation

The principal's use of delegation was supported by the four teachers C2-33; C3-10; C4-25; C5-33. The principal expected staff to do their delegated jobs; one teacher believed that she trusted staff to do this C4-31, whilst another believed that she did not always trust staff C2-33. The principal used non-intrusive monitoring which was either acknowledged in the teacher interviews C4-25,27, or interpreted as showing a lack of follow-up C3-10.

Initiating ideas

The principal described a number of initiatives that she instituted and the teachers supported this; the teachers supported the initiatives that the principal described and they commented on a number of additional initiatives C2-24; C3-14; C4-25,26,27,28; C5-35. The staff also described how the principal encouraged staff to be innovative C2-16,17; C4-31.

Interaction with teachers

The principal described her relationships with teachers as being distant and this was supported by the teachers C2-17; C3-12,13; C4-30. By wanting to involve staff in decision making and by emphasising teaching and learning the principal believed that she supported teachers; teachers acknowledged her support in personal matters C3-14 and educational matters C2-17,21,22; C3-10; C4-25,30; C5-33.
Personal characteristics

The principal identified the following characteristics: having vision, staying focused, capacity to make difficult decisions, and being an expert in many areas. Teachers believed that she demonstrated vision and stayed focused C2-16,21,22; C4-27. The teachers added that the principal was good at running the school C3-12,13; C4-26,28; C5-36, that she would acknowledge mistakes C4-26, and that she was ambitious C4-28; C5-34.

Values

Two teachers commented that the principal was focused on the students C2-17; C5-33, whilst one believed that the principal was also focused on the parents and the community C2-17. The principal was viewed as believing that the school should be at the forefront of education C2-17. The principal's statements reflected the first two values through her concern for teaching and learning and the importance placed on connections with the community. Being at the forefront was not an explicit value of the principal, although it could be interpreted as such from her actions in ensuring that the school was involved in innovation. The principal mentioned a collection of values that could be described as ensuring that the school provided a supportive and balanced educational and social program C1-4,5,8. Also, the principal emphasised the importance of the people in the school in achieving the school goals C1-7.

ADDITIONAL THEMES

Symbolic awareness

This theme was mentioned by two teachers. One believed that the principal needed to be more aware of the symbolism of her actions C2-16,23, whilst the other described actions of the principal's that showed that she understood and used symbolic messages C4-29,31.

Accountability

Two teachers described accountability procedures that the principal has introduced; i.e. the introduction of program budgeting C3-14, and documenting of procedures C3-13 and faculty policies C5-36.

Curriculum involvement

Two teachers commented on this area. Whilst the principal did not want direct involvement on the curriculum committee, she would influence the committee decisions, particularly in regard to philosophical issues C2-18,19,20; C4-31. Thus, the principal has a strong, but disguised influence on curriculum. The principal's lack of emphasis on this area may reflect her belief that she has effectively delegated this function.

Interaction with students

The four teachers commented that the principal had low to do with students C2-23; C3-13; C4-28; C5-33. One teacher noted that the principal would celebrate the good work of students and that she has taught classes, but time pressures meant that she could not continue to teach C4-28,31.
CONCLUSION

Table C presents a summary of the findings showing the eight themes identified by the principal and at least one teacher, and the four themes identified by teachers only.

Table C: Summary of Principal and Teacher Perceptions for School C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal char.</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement, 7 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement, 5 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with students</td>
<td>4 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic aware.</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>2 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the eight common themes were identified by all of the teachers, and six of these themes showed high agreement between the principal and the teacher perceptions. In addition to the common themes there were four additional themes described by the teachers. Given the strength of concurrence in the common themes, it can be concluded that the principal and teacher perceptions have produced substantially similar descriptions of the principal's leadership role, with the teacher descriptions providing some extra detail.
COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL D

There is agreement between the two perspectives on the broad thematic areas with seven areas identified by both the principal and the teachers: vision, wider knowledge, decision making and communication, delegation, initiating ideas, interaction with teachers, and values. The principal interview included no additional themes, and the teacher interviews included six additional themes: curriculum involvement, power, political awareness, school promotions, cultural awareness and interaction with students.

COMMON THEMES

Vision

For the principal, having vision and using this to direct the efforts of the school (in consultation with others), are important leadership features. Two teachers acknowledged that the principal had vision D4-22; D5-30 and one articulated the vision as centring on student achievement and care, and as reflecting community values D4-24,25.

Wider knowledge

The principal displayed knowledge of the implications of changes to the education system; this was supported by one teacher D3-19,20.

Decision making and communication

Many of the aspects raised in the principal interview were confirmed by the teacher interviews including: staff involvement in decision making through the various committees D4-22, the capacity to alter the principal's view D2-13; D4-26, the presence of a leadership and decision making hierarchy with the principal at the top D2-13,15; D5-31, the power of veto including the power to make decisions without consultation and/or against the majority view D4-22,23,24; D5-32. The teachers did not comment on the principal's discussion concerning his accountability to School Council and the Government.

Delegation

The principal's use of delegation was supported by three teachers D2-14; D4-26; D5-33. The principal discussed the need to check, without too much interference, that the delegated tasks are finished; one teacher believed that he did not interfere with delegated tasks because of poor personal skills D5-33, whilst another believed that he retained considerable control by setting rigid boundaries D2-14.

Initiating ideas

The principal described a number of initiatives he has been involved in and this was supported by three teachers D2-12; D3-17; D5-30. The principal was viewed as being too enthusiastic concerning new ideas and not aware of potential problems D5-30. It was believed that he was being reactive and wanting to implement new ideas because other schools have them and not because they are necessarily good educationally D3-17; D5-30.

Curriculum involvement

Whilst the principal's role on curriculum committee was more advisory than dynamic, the principal did cite a number of major curriculum reforms that he has been involved in and two teachers acknowledged this D2-12; D5-30. Three teachers believed that, although the principal has been involved in curriculum reform his decisions are driven by his perception of community expectations rather than by curriculum knowledge D2-14; D3-17; D5-30.

Interaction with teachers

The principal's support for staff was noted by teachers D3-19,20; D
staff professionally \textit{D3-18,20} and his non-judgemental support in dealing with complaints against staff \textit{D4-25}. The principals lack of time spent with teachers was noted by the teachers \textit{D2-16; D5-33}. The teachers also noted that: the principal's relationship with staff is uncomfortable \textit{D2-16; D5-28}; he is not aware of staff reactions \textit{D3-17,18; D4-26}; he is non-supportive of staff in non-academic areas \textit{D5-29}; he is initially non-supportive of initiatives raised by teachers \textit{D5-28,29}.

**Personal characteristics**

The principal saw himself as a hard worker, enthusiastic, wanting to do well, fair, supportive, and able to identify strengths in others. Staff also believed that he was a hard worker \textit{D3-17,18; fair D2-16; D3-16; D4-25} and supportive \textit{D3-17,20}. As well, staff believed that the principal: has good organisational skills \textit{D2-15}; is reactive more than proactive \textit{D3-17; D5-30}; and, accessible \textit{D4-25}.

**Values**

The principal stressed values of: staff involvement, support and collaboration; leading by example; fairness; and, support for staff. Fairness \textit{D2-16; D3-18; D4-25} and staff involvement \textit{D4-25} were supported by the teacher interviews. Teachers added values concerned with: a conservative, academic education \textit{D2-12,15}; welfare \textit{D4-22}; student centred schooling \textit{D4-22,24,25}; community orientation \textit{D4-25}; value driven decisions \textit{D4-26,27}; and, competition with other schools \textit{D5-30}.

**ADDITIONAL THEMES**

**Power and Political awareness**

Two teachers mentioned that the principal has the ultimate authority \textit{D3-17; D4-23} and one teacher described the principal in ways that emphasised the principal's status as the head of the school \textit{D3-17}. One teacher gave examples that suggested that the principal has political awareness in terms of manipulating situations to his advantage \textit{D4-22,23,26}.

**School promotion**

The principal is viewed as being successful at selling the school \textit{D2-12} and as having a good public image \textit{D5-30,31}.

**Cultural awareness**

The principal was viewed by teachers as being aware of the traditional school culture, and using this in his vision for the school and in the promotion of the school \textit{D2-15; D4-24,25}.

**Interaction with students**

One teacher believed that the principal was involved with students at the school; e.g. he is actively involved in the difficult discipline cases \textit{D4-25}.
CONCLUSION

Table D presents a summary of the findings showing the nine themes identified by the principal and at least one teacher, and the four themes identified by teachers only.

Table D: Summary of Principal and Teacher Perceptions for School D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>Low agreement, 10 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal chara.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement, 9 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power &amp; pol. awar.</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School promotion</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural aware.</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with students</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight of the nine common themes showed high agreement between the principal and the teacher perceptions. In addition to the common themes there were four additional themes described by the teachers. Given the strength of concurrence in the common themes, it can be concluded that the principal and teacher perceptions have produced substantially similar descriptions of the principal’s leadership role; the teacher descriptions provide some extra detail.
COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL E

The principal and teacher perspectives identified five common themes. The principal interview generated a further five themes, whilst the teacher interviews generated an additional nine themes.

COMMON THEMES

Vision

Teachers confirmed that the principal had a clear vision for the school that was accepting of the school culture E2-30; E3-20; E5-26, and aware of educational trends E2-30; E5-26.

Wider knowledge

The principal emphasised gaining and using a wider perspective, which he obtained through reading, analysis, and looking for political and external trends and challenges. The principal was supported by teachers who believed that the principal gained a wide educational perspective through reading E5-26, external contacts E2-30; E3-21,22; E4-23, and his educational background (e.g. strong union experience) E5-26. The principal believed that his wider perspective gave him direction and this was supported in the teacher interviews E2-30.

Symbolic and cultural awareness

The principal was aware of and used symbols to promote the school and the school values. He was also aware of the community culture and the need for the school to reflect community values. In the thematic unit labelled "cultural awareness", teachers underscored the principal's understanding of the community culture and the symbolic importance of things that the school did E2-30; E7-39 and included awareness of organisational culture of the school E2-30.

Delegation

The principal used delegation extensively, trusted people to do their jobs (and allow them to make mistakes) and got feedback through official and unofficial channels. His view was supported by staff who believed that he delegated E2-30; E3-18,19,20; E4-23,24, trusted people E4-23; E5-27, allowed people to make mistakes E7-38, and received feedback E3-21; E4-23.

Decision making and communication

The principal would exercise his power to make decisions or to overrule decisions, but he usually relied on a consensus approach which allowed for the involvement and ownership of others, and which spread accountability. Staff supported this view. Whilst the principal was viewed as being decisive and willing to overrule decisions E3-2; E6-33, he was also viewed as supportive of consensus E3-21 and collaborative decision making E4-24; E5-26 and sharing accountability E5-29. Whilst the principal did not describe communication processes the teacher interviews indicated that the principal kept staff informed E6-33, allowed open discussion of ideas E7-39,40, and used both informal and formal communication groups E5-26.

Curriculum involvement

The principal described how he had significant involvement in the curriculum. Some staff agreed with this citing work with the curriculum coordinator E3-18, formulating the discipline and welfare structures E5-26, and influence on the curriculum committee E6-34.

Initiating ideas

The principal described ideas that he wants to do and ideas that he has tried to have implemented. Staff believed that he was involved in initiating ideas E2-30; E4-24, although some believed that he responds to ideas of others more than he initiates his own E6-34, and he was criticised for embracing ideas uncritically
Personal characteristics

From the principal interview it was noted that the principal displayed trust, a forgiving nature, honesty, political nous, and risk-taking. The staff supported the principal on trust E4-23; E5-27,28; E7-36, forgiving nature E7-41 and honesty E7-39,40. The teachers added; good salesman and communicator E4-23,24; E7-41; pragmatic E5-26; encouraging E4-23; E5-27,28; adaptable E5-28; approachable E6-33,35; motivator E2-30; E7-38; well-liked E7-42.

Values

For the principal values that were noted included: a belief that by concentrating on learning and discipline, the school will not experience interference from the community or government; the need for continuous improvement; trusting and supporting staff, including accepting accountability for staff actions; having dispersed leadership; having direction; considering himself as a teacher; being political; and, the desirability of using constructive myths. The teacher interviews supported the principals concern for supporting staff E7-41, ensuring discipline is good E5-27, being political E5-26, and seeking Improvement E5-26; E7-40.

ADDITIONAL THEMES

Accountability

The principal emphasised the need for whole school accountability reflecting both the good and bad practices. He also noted that by trusting people to do their delegated jobs, he placed himself at risk because he was ultimately accountable; he also noted that this was a worthwhile risk.

Political awareness

The principal emphasised the need to be political and watch for political trends and to make educational debates more realistic be balancing political arguments.

School Council role

The principal described his role on School Council as being the executive officer who keeps the Council informed of educational issues, and to give proactive and honest advice.

Financial role

This was mentioned by the principal, but not emphasised; the principal was confident in this area and not concerned by it.

Interaction with teachers

This theme was explored in three teacher interviews. The principal is considered to be supportive, trusting and encouraging of staff, facilitating their involvement in school matters and in professional development E4-23; E5-26,27; E7-37, 41,42.

Interaction with students

One teacher mentioned that the principal was not as involved with students as he would like, yet there were examples where he became closely involved; e.g. in supporting students at risk E5-27.

School promotion and public relations

One teacher commented that the principal was liked and respected by the school community and involved in actively promoting the school E7-38.
CONCLUSION

Table E presents a summary of the findings showing the nine themes identified by the principal and at least one teacher, and the four themes identified by the principal only, and the three themes identified by teachers only.

Table E: Summary of Principal and Teacher Perceptions for School E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. mak. &amp; comm.</td>
<td>Principal + 6 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Principal + 5 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per. char.</td>
<td>Principal + 5 teachers</td>
<td>Low agree, 12 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. &amp; cult. aware.</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement, 8 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political awar.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Council</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial role</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>3 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Pro. &amp; Pub.</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with students</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the nine common themes showed high agreement between the principal and the teacher perceptions. Given the strength of concurrence in the common themes, it can be concluded that the principal and teacher perceptions have produced substantially similar descriptions of the principal’s leadership role; there are differences due to differences in the personal characteristics and values described, and because both the principal and teacher descriptions include a few additional themes.
COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL F

Both the principal and teacher interviews included themes on wider knowledge, cultural awareness, decision making and communication, curriculum involvement, initiating ideas, interaction with staff, characteristics and values. The principal interview included additional themes associated with defining the principal's role, delegation, and public relations. The teacher interviews included additional themes associated with interaction with students, power, and financial management.

COMMON THEMES

Wider knowledge

This was not a strong theme, with the principal only referring to attending professional development activities associated with Schools of the Future. This was supported by one teacher, who also added that the principal uses regional networks and has substantial experience, both of which he uses to benefit the school F3-24,26.

Cultural awareness

The principal was aware of the school culture (not able to function as yet without the principal, and a strong commitment to democratic decision making) and the community culture (supporting parents of all cultural backgrounds to be effective members of School Council). One teacher supported his understanding of the decision making processes F4-18,17.

Decision making and communication

The principal strongly supports the open, democratic decision making that the school has; this was verified by staff F2-9; F3-24; F4-16; F5-14. However, he wants to give the various teams more authority to make their own decisions; this was confirmed with respect to how the principal works with the LAC F4-18. The principal acknowledged that he will have to make unilateral decisions occasionally, but prefers to consult and involve others; staff perceive him as too consultative F2-19; F5-13,14. The principal gathers feedback through formal and informal processes; this was verified by staff F4-18; F5-14. The only area not supported by the teacher interviews was that the principal would like to see the communication process streamlined, despite the strong cultural resistance to this.

Curriculum involvement

The principal does not see himself as having a strong involvement in curriculum initiatives, and he rarely attends the education committee meetings, relying on his assistant principal; this was confirmed by one of the teachers F2-20. However, there were examples given by staff of the principal's curriculum involvement; e.g. charter development, developing a literacy policy, refurbishing the library F2-20.

Initiating ideas

The principal does attempt to initiate ideas, but he is respectful of the decision making process and uses the same processes that a teacher would use to raise an idea; he seeks collaboration rather than using his powers to force an initiative through. Teachers have confirmed this view; they believe that he will not push ideas he has F2-20, that he doesn't initiate enough ideas and he is prone to influence by extreme elements on staff F5-15; and that the traditional decision making structure gives him Low need to push ideas as he knows appropriate ideas will be raised by others F4-17.

Interaction with teachers

The principal is concerned about the stressors on teachers (e.g. too many meetings, staff excess procedure) and his is concerned that teachers are treated fairly; this was supported by one teacher F2-19,21. The teachers also noted that the principal kept staff informed F2-19; F3-24; F5-14 and react immediately to staff concerns F2-19.
Personal characteristics

In the principal's interview a number of characteristics were noted, including: listening and working well with others; supportive of staff; encouraging open contact with the community; working hard; wanting to be successful; frustrated due to time pressures; and, being seen around the school. Teachers supported the principal's ability to listen and to work with people F3-24,25, be visible around the school F3-26; F5-14, having an open door policy F2-19; F3-24,26 and being supportive of staff F2-19, and added: friendly F2-19; F3-24; interested in all aspects of the school F3-26.

Values

From the principal's interview collaboration, team work, and fairness were evident. Both of these were supported by teachers F2-21; F4-16, and having a high regard for people was also evident F3-25.

ADDITIONAL THEMES

Defining the principal's role

This theme arose as a direct result of the principal being recently appointed and struggling to define his role for himself and for staff. It is also due to the principal not being able to relinquish some of the activities he did in his previous role as the vice principal.

Delegation

Delegation is important for the principal who is concerned to increase both the amount of delegation and the responsibilities entrusted to staff.

Public relations

This was only mentioned by the principal in relation to the being involved in enrolling students.

Interaction with students

One teacher described the principal as having good student relations and regular contact with students F3-26.

Power

The principal was viewed by teachers as not enjoying the exercising of power, and as finding it stressful to try and support staff, but still fulfil DSE regulations F2-19,22; F5-15.

Financial role

One teacher believed that the principal was not confident with financial management, but used expert help when necessary F3-25,26.
CONCLUSION

Table F presents a summary of the findings showing the eight themes identified by the principal and at least one teacher, the two themes identified by the principal only, and the three themes identified by teachers only.

Table F: Summary of Principal and Teacher Perceptions for School F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal char.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement, 9 identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement, 3 identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>Moderate agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>Principal + 1 teacher</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Def. prin. role | Principal | N/A |
| Delegation      | Principal | N/A |
| Public relations | Principal | N/A |
| Inter. with students | 1 teacher | N/A |
| Power           | 2 teachers | N/A |
| Financial role  | 1 teacher  | N/A |

Of the common themes there is high agreement on six, and moderate agreement on the remaining two. Given the strong concurrence in perception for the common themes, it appears that the principal and teacher perspectives have generated similar descriptions of the principal's leadership role, albeit with some difference in the descriptions due to the additional themes.
COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS FOR SCHOOL J

Both the principal and teacher interviews included themes on wider knowledge, cultural awareness, decision making and communication, initiating ideas, curriculum involvement, delegation, interaction with staff, administrative role, personal characteristics, and values. The principal interview included an additional theme labelled as symbolic awareness, whilst the teacher interviews included three additional themes: vision, interaction with students and public relations.

COMMON THEMES

Wider knowledge

The principal displays wider knowledge through keeping staffed informed about educational issues by writing newsletters, subscribing to journals and speaking at staff meetings. Also, his experience in system wide curriculum development was mentioned. The principal noted that there were increasing demands on his time to be involved in external work for the DSE. Teachers acknowledged his utilisation of knowledge gained outside the school setting, his contribution to keeping staffed informed, and that he is now more often away from school attending meetings.

Cultural awareness

The principal displayed awareness of the staff culture when he described how he has modified his preferred leadership style to suit the staff culture. Two staff supported the principals cultural awareness, although they referred to the overall school culture, and not the staff culture specifically. One teacher believed that the principal did not understand the culture of the school community.

Decision making and communication

The principal emphasised the use of a consultative approach to decision making in which he prefers not to be directive unless it is unavoidable, and even then, he will try to ensure that the majority of staff will be supportive. To facilitate staff involvement there are a number of decision making committees, and the principal tries to ensure that the staff are fully informed on educational issues and ideas. The teachers largely supported the principal's description. Teachers acknowledged that the principal is usually non-directive and prefers decisions to be made democratically, although it was noted that with the charter development he was more directive. Some staff believe that the principal should be more directive and that his leadership lacks direction, while others believe that much of the principal's work is unseen and that he works well within the various committees.

Delegation

The principal endorsed the notion of delegation and shared leadership; the principal was supported by two teachers who noted that he does delegate, that he is selective whom he chooses for tasks, and that he monitors the work of the committees.

Initiating ideas

The principal did not mention ideas that he had implemented, but he did discuss the process that he uses to get an idea accepted; this entails trying to convince people, and being decisive if necessary. There was confirmation in the teacher interviews of the principal's description of the process he uses to push an idea, and examples were given of principal initiated ideas. One teacher believed that the principal did not initiate programs, nor encourage staff initiatives.

Curriculum involvement

The principal described his background in system wide curriculum development and how he would like to
be more involved in the school’s educational matters, but time pressures make this difficult. Teachers confirmed that he has been involved in curriculum initiatives J2-11,12,13; J5-34. However, one teacher believed that he had a poor understanding and lacked interest in curriculum matters, and that his work on the curriculum committee was negative J3-19,22. These views may be interpreted as supporting the principal by showing that he has been involved in curriculum initiatives, but that his involvement is limited by time constraints (hence, the negative interpretation of teacher J5).

Interaction with teachers

From the principal interview it was apparent that the principal respected his staff, was protective of them, and that he sought to involve them in decision making. The majority of the teacher interviews were supportive of the principal’s description; one teacher presented a dissenting view. Teachers acknowledge that the principal supports staff J2-13; J5-32, that he is aware of what staff do J4-30, and that he is trying to create a positive climate for staff J2-15; J5-33. Some staff believe that he does not acknowledge the work of staff J3-19,20,21 and that the way he deals with staff suggests that he does not value them J3-17,18,20.

Business and financial role

The principal described the school as being like a business now with more time spent on financial management and personnel functions, and less time spent on educational matters. Teachers confirmed that he has a business view J4-25, that he is concerned with financial and personnel management J2-14; J3-18; J4-25,26,27,29; J5-36, and that he may have to spend less time on educational matters J4-26,28.

Personal characteristics

The principal described himself as: not being out in front; encouraging; fair; not being in control of his time and not having enough time. The staff supported some of the principal’s positive qualities describing him as: a decent human J3-17,21; easy to get on with and to have a joke with J4-29; and, a good team leader J5-34. In contradiction to the principal he was described as up front and accessible J5-32. They also described him as a practical person rather than an abstract thinker J3-18 and complacent J3-24.

Values

The principal described values including: being at school and in the classroom; using a team work approach; having a teaching and learning focus. Only one teacher commented on values and they mentioned that the principal has a conservative approach to change J3-17,23. However, elsewhere, teachers described behaviour by the principal that confirms some of the values mentioned by the principal: the principal is visible in the school J4-29, J5-32; and, he uses a team work approach J2-12; J4-27, J5-31.

ADDITIONAL THEMES

Symbolic awareness

The principal was aware of the messages that were inherent in what he did; e.g. not being in classrooms, and being out of the school may indicate that the school is not important.

Vision

Three teachers discussed the principal’s sense of vision. One teacher believed that the principal lacked vision J3-17,18,21,22, whilst two teachers believed that he has demonstrated vision and has set a direction for the school J4-27; J5-31.

Interaction with students

One teacher noted that the principal is increasingly having less to do with students J4-25,27.
Public relations

One teacher believed that the principal was good in a public relations role J5-33, whilst another teacher believed that he wasn't J3-21.

CONCLUSION

Table J presents a summary of the findings showing the ten themes identified by the principal and at least one teacher, the one theme identified by the principal only, and the three themes identified by teachers only.

Table J: Summary of Principal and Teacher Perceptions for School J.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>People identifying</th>
<th>Extent agree with principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with teachers</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. &amp; fin. role</td>
<td>Principal + 4 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum involve.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement, 4 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating ideas</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>Moderate agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal char.</td>
<td>Principal + 3 teachers</td>
<td>Low agreement, 10 identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider knowledge</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Principal + 2 teachers</td>
<td>High agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic aware.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>3 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School promotion</td>
<td>2 teachers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. with students</td>
<td>1 teacher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the ten common themes half showed high agreement, four showed moderate agreement and one showed low agreement. There were four additional themes identified. The number of common themes suggests that the principal and teacher descriptions are similar, and this is supported by nearly all the themes showing substantial agreement. There are some differences, due to differences within the common themes and to the five additional themes; these differences add extra details to the substantially similar common themes.
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