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ABSTRACT

This study offers a response to the question facing the Australian Anglican Church about how the mission of Anglican schools is aligned with the mission of the whole Church. The study explores two Anglican school principals’ faith formation leadership, as they engage in this mission. Fundamental to understanding the context of this study is awareness of Anglicanism’s broad variety of expression balanced with unity through Scripture, Reason and Tradition. In spite of differences, the Anglican Church seeks the ‘Via Media’, the middle way, held together in a dynamic tension of debate. Anglican school principals lead faith formation in this context of diversity, which leads to the purpose of this study: to explore two Australian Anglican school principals’ perceptions of their role and capability as school leaders of faith formation within the Anglican Church’s mission. The three questions guiding this study relate to the ways in which the principals understand their role, their capability for the role, and the ways in which the Anglican Church has equipped them to be faith formation leaders in their schools.

Various Anglican sources note that these questions have been on the Anglican Church’s agenda for several decades. A recent report on the governance relationship between an Australian Anglican Diocese and its schools noted lack of Anglican identity and role definition of schools’ mission in the Church as significant issues (Nicholson, 2007), and this appears to be the case in faith formation leadership also.

Underpinning this study are assumptions that the nurturing of the Christian faith in the Anglican tradition is a core task of Anglican schools as agents of Anglican mission, and that the principal of an Anglican school plays a key role in leading faith formation by authentic personal Christian witness. In this study, Anglican school faith formation leadership has been explored in cultural and symbolic dimensions of leadership. Catholic and Lutheran schools’ faith formation leadership practices are reviewed to inform the study.
This exploratory, qualitative study has an orientation of social constructionism, seeking two purposively sampled Australian Anglican school principals’ perceptions from an open research stance. A theoretical framework of symbolic interactionsism has valued the participants’ context. A phenomenological research methodology has used data gathering methods of interview, survey questionnaire, observation and documentary analysis.

The study indicates that areas for further study include the shared faith formation leadership roles of principals and school chaplains; the fostering of a culture of research about Anglican school faith leadership; the provision of professional mentoring for principals; the relationship of principals to the Anglican Church; and provision by the Anglican Church of guiding statements and training to equip principals for their faith leadership roles.
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CHAPTER 1

THE RESEARCH ISSUE

1.1 Introduction

Many Australian Anglican Dioceses, as with other Anglican dioceses throughout the world, own or have close affiliation with Anglican schools. There are 153 Australian Anglican schools (Australian Anglican Schools Network, 2009), 4,690 Anglican schools in the United Kingdom (Church of England, 2009), over 1,200 Anglican Schools in the USA (National Association of Episcopal Schools, 2009) and more Anglican schools in other countries. Fostering a distinctive Anglican identity is a current concern for American Episcopal schools (National Association of Episcopal Schools, 2005) and also for United Kingdom Anglican schools:

The National Society has developed, through its involvement in the inspection process, an assessment sheet that explores the sources of evidence that can be used to assess a school’s Christian character (National Society, 2001, p. 19).

Driving these two largest national groupings of Anglican schools’ quest for identity are statements by the Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Wales, such as “the General Synod of the Church of England has resolved that Church schools stand at the centre of the Church’s mission to the nation” (National Society, 2001, p. v).

The Australian Anglican Church is also being challenged to define what an Anglican school is because of the philosophical differences among dioceses, “the fragmentedness of Australian Anglican identity” (Reid, 2006, p.250), and the reality of there being no unifying national Anglican school system. Cole observes of Australian Anglican schools:
At one end of the spectrum are relatively new schools, some of which have been founded with a desire to keep fees as low as possible. At the other end are extremely well-resourced high profile schools with long histories and much higher fees. Some are fiercely independent, while others nestle closely with a local Parish. The task of understanding what Anglican identity might mean in this context is further hampered by a lack of common expectations at many levels (2006, p. 335).

Principals of Anglican-sponsored schools within the mission of the Anglican Church are leaders of schools for formation in the Christian faith within the Anglican tradition. They do so in a context that lacks common expectations at many levels and unclear Anglican identity. This study focuses on the role of Anglican school principals as faith formation leaders, in the light of the following question posed by the Australian Anglican Primate, Archbishop Aspinall, “How can we ensure that the mission of Anglican schools is aligned with the mission of the whole Church?” (Aspinall, 2008, p. 8). Anglican Mission is expressed as the ‘Five Marks of Mission’, which is a touchstone for Anglicans throughout the world:

The mission of the Church is the Mission of Christ to proclaim the good news of the Kingdom;
To teach, baptise and nurture new believers;
To respond to human need by loving service;
To seek to transform the unjust structures of society, and
To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth (Aspinall, 2006b).

While Section 1.1 introduces the issue of Anglican schools seeking Anglican identity, the following sections of Chapter One provide an overview of this thesis. Section 1.2 presents aspects of Anglican theological and ecclesial diversity and unity that contribute to understanding the Anglican Church context of this study. In Section 1.3, the significance of Anglican schools within the broad Anglican mission is discussed. Section 1.4 explores the issue of Anglican school principals as faith formation leaders in their schools.
and the ensuing questions that guide this study. The researcher’s lens through which this study is presented is also introduced. The purpose and significance of this study are discussed in Section 1.5. Section 1.6 outlines the design of the study and Section 1.7 presents an overview of the chapters of the thesis.

1.2 The Australian Anglican Context

Anglicanism is a faith tradition of both diversity and unity, which poses a challenge for the Anglican Church. Thus it is necessary to understand the ecclesial context in which Anglican schools operate and are led. Complementing this lack of Anglican identity is an Anglican tradition of vigorous flexibility, allowing Anglicanism to hold together through its differences (Kaye, 1994; Rayner, 2006; Reid, 2006). Stephenson captures the fluidity of Anglican identity as follows:

There is not now, and there never has been a distinctive Anglican theology. We have no Thomas Aquinas (sic) or Luther, no Calvin or Zwingli. Nor is there any authority in Anglicanism which corresponds to the magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church or the theological themes which provided the touchstones of theological enquiry for the Protestant Reformation (Stevenson, 1988, pp. 174-175).

The Anglican Communion’s ability to journey together is found in the concept of Via Media, the middle way. The Via Media involves mutual respect, holding firmly to one’s position on any topic and at the same time disagreeing and discussing views because of the respect for alternative positions. The Via Media entails mutual acceptance of wide diversity of Biblical interpretations, cultural perspectives and Anglican expression, based on each Diocese’s cultural context (Pobee, 1988). Inherent in the Via Media are challenges encapsulated in Kaye’s comments about engaging with each other as Anglicans in an Australian context:
Because power and its first cousin property, are held at the Diocesan level, the Diocese can easily tend in the Australian environment to become a self-referencing totality and thus to constitute an empirical reality which is often overwhelming and seriously corrosive of open conversation both within its own arena and in relation to the wider church (Kaye, 2006, p.20).

A similar observation from a retired Australian Primate is that Australian Anglican challenges are resolved only with patience and time because the structure of authority is “not imposed by organs of governance from above” (Rayner, 2006, p.44).

Diverse expressions of Anglicanism are held in working cohesion by the three key teaching and practical marks of Scripture, Reason and Tradition (Adam, 2006; Aspinall, 2004; Kaye, 1994; Macquarrie, 1984), serving as ‘mutual qualifiers, checks and balances, to restrict and revitalize each other’ (Avis, 1988, p. 415). The salient points of Anglican tradition, contained in the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, are adherence to the Scriptures, the Creeds, Dominical Sacraments and Episcopal leadership, although their interpretation and application varies widely (Hankey, 1988).

These various guideposts offer some bonds of unity, however Holloway says of Anglicanism:

We are not a Church for everyone, which is why really ardent extremists of one sort or another find us exasperating. People who like a well-chiselled definition in doctrine and ethics will find us irritating, because we have a debilitating weakness for seeing the other side of the question (Holloway, 1984, p. 5).

While the moderate reasonableness of Anglicanism can end up as “the bland leading the bland” (Holloway, 1984, p. 4), or alternatively as ‘seriously corrosive of open conversation’ according to Kaye, another perception of the *Via Media* is that it takes the Church on robust and demanding paths. The
thirty-eight Primates of the Anglican Communion met in February 2007, with seven not receiving Holy Communion as a group, in part due to the presence of a female Primate. The consecration of women to the Episcopate and to the Primacy of a National Church is a point of great division (Reader, 2007), however the Primates met and continue to meet and discuss this and many other issues. This may be due to Anglicanism’s capacity to tolerate internal divisions because of respect for expressions of faith and order from widely differing views and practices: It is “a distinctive tradition, but it is a tradition not bound by traditionalism, and hence it is able to reinvent itself, as the women’s ordination issue has demonstrated” (Cowdell, 2006, p. 195).

The Via Media requires Anglicans to listen to the position of others and to enunciate one’s own position in debate. Anglicans are called to encounter reality and to work in constant creative tension in order to hold their Church together. Kaye, when General Secretary of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia, wrote of Anglicanism:

> It is a question not just of intellectual gymnastics, but of discovering God in the midst of realities in which we now live in society. In the broad scope of two thousand years of Christian history, this way of doing theology is the more characteristic way. Think of Augustine’s city of God, or Hooker’s Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, or Paul’s letter to the Romans. These were all written out of the realities of the situation of the writer (Kaye, 1995, p. 232).

Anglicanism’s ‘Via Media’ is grounded in the phenomena of lives lived in social contexts interplaying upon each other, shaped by the marks of Scripture, Reason and Tradition, and as such is given further substance by the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. Setting Anglican school leadership in the context of the Via Media, Aspinall at the commissioning of a new principal of an Anglican school stated:

> We can do no better than to keep in mind the reading we have heard today from the letter to the Church at Philippi. Would that it had gone on for one more verse, for that verse sums up the whole task of Christian
leadership. ‘Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus’ (Phil. 2.5) (Aspinall, 2006a, p. 1).

This raises questions about what is expected of Anglican school principals in living with the same mind as Jesus Christ in faith formation leadership. The question is asked as to how it might be exercised amidst lack of clear Anglican identity, set against a wider Anglican Via Media context of fluid debate. The next section moves discussion from the focus on the broad Anglican Church to the setting for this study of Anglican school leadership in an Australian context.

1.3 The Context of Australian Anglican schools

The Anglican Primate of Australia is “the chief archbishop or bishop of a province of the Anglican Episcopal family of churches” (Anglican Consultative Council, 2009). A detailed description of the opinions of each diocesan bishop and their diocesan settings as they relate to Anglican educational leadership would be beyond the scope of this study. As a consequence, the material for this study is mainly generated within one Anglican Diocese, and in so doing reflects the Primate’s immediate leadership and policies, which contribute significantly to understanding the context for this thesis.

Aspinall (2004) affirmed the Via Media as fundamental to an understanding of the Australian Anglican Church. Australian Anglican schools function in this context of variance and debate, reflecting the international diversity of the Anglican Church. In the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane as one of twenty-three Australian Anglican dioceses, twenty Anglican schools operate under five different governance models. Some schools have been founded by the Diocese, some by the Society of the Sacred Advent, some by individuals and subsequently owned by the Diocese, some are separately incorporated schools with Diocesan affiliation, and some [Ed-UC-Ang or Educang] schools are jointly owned by the Uniting Church and the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane. An overview of Anglican schools in the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane is
presented in Table 1: Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane. The final column shows five different governance models within the twenty schools.

### Table 1
**Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglican Diocese of Brisbane</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Governance Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocesan Controlled Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon Hill Anglican College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Church Grammar School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coomera Anglican College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Coast Anglican College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew's Anglican College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Hilda's School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke's Anglican School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Glennie School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Southport School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Toowoomba Preparatory School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Moreton Anglican College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocesan Affiliated Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints Anglican School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lake College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillbrook Anglican School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Flinders Anglican College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Aidan's Anglican Girls' School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret's Anglican Girls School</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Springfield College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diocese
- DI: Diocesan Owned
- SI: Separately Incorporated
- SI(1): SI owned by Diocese and Uniting Church
- SI(2): SI owned by Diocese
- SSA: Sisters of the Sacred Advent

Notes:
1. Any subschool (e.g., Middle School) has their own ‘Head of School’ under the authority of the School Head.
2. This table has been created by the Anglican Schools Commission for academic use by Craig Moody.
3. Full permission is given for its use (Peta Smith - Executive Director).

The Brisbane Diocesan Anglican Financial Services report for 2006 showed that of the total $40,563,000 in loans approved in that year, $33,509,000 was for the twenty schools (Anglican Diocese of Brisbane, 2007). Of the 381 pages of the 2009 Diocesan Year Book, 117 pages are reports by schools and the Schools’ Commission. Other Commissions’ reports also give further pages to school matters (Anglican Diocese of Brisbane, 2009). These figures demonstrate the significance of these schools in the life of the Anglican
Diocese of Brisbane, reflecting a similar importance of Anglican schools for other Australian Anglican Dioceses.

The role of Anglican schools, in common with other educational institutions is the provision of academic excellence, cultural and sporting development and the holistic nurture of the students. A particular feature of Anglican schools that is especially valued by their dioceses and the focus of this study is their evangelising mission of proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ and teaching, baptising and nurturing people (Aspinall, 2006b), a view shared by the Archbishop of Canterbury (National Society, 2001). At the 2000 National Anglican Schools Conference, the Bishop of Canberra asked whether there was any value in having Anglican schools without them working for Anglican mission (Browning, 2000). Aspinall encouraged schools to release the Church’s blessing for all seekers, by living and teaching the Anglican ethos (Aspinall, 2004). This cross-section of episcopal opinion demonstrates a consistently high value afforded Australian Anglican schools and a context within which research into leadership in faith formation is warranted.

1.4 The Research Phenomenon and the Research Questions

In light of the established worth of Anglican schools as places of Anglican mission, Aspinall notes that “the work of Christian and spiritual formation in our schools has struggled somewhat for a rationale and an effective methodology” (2004, p. 5). He further mentions that “there isn’t necessarily a strong sense in our schools of what it means to be an Anglican community” (2004, p. 6). In contrast to principals of Catholic and Lutheran schools who are provided with role statements for faith leadership (Lutheran Education Australia, 2001; Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2006), principals of Anglican schools have a lack of guidance in faith formation leadership.

Given Anglicanism’s deficiency of role definition for Anglican school principals and the diversity of theological definition inherent in the Via Media, an issue
emerges concerning the guidance and capability of Anglican school principals to lead faith formation in their schools. This problem has concerned the Anglican Church for several decades, as the following observation by a retired Anglican bishop demonstrates: “I always found the problem was to find good Anglicans who were at the same time good teachers and leaders. This has been on the Church’s agenda ever since I arrived in Australia – nearly fifty-two years ago” (A. Holland, personal communication, March 1, 2006). Nicholson, in reviewing governance relationships between the Brisbane Anglican Diocese and its schools, reports that one of three key issues impacting this relationship is “the articulation (or lack thereof) by the Diocese of the role of schools within the broader mission of the Diocese” (Nicholson, 2007, p. 5). Sly also observes, “there continues to be no formal policy for leadership in Anglican schools” (Sly, 2008, p. 7). This study will consider two Anglican school principals’ perspectives of their role and capability for faith formation leadership as they serve the mission of their schools and the Anglican Church.

Emerging from Aspinall’s challenging question posed to Anglican school communities in 2008, the following over-arching research question has guided the study: How do two Anglican school principals lead faith formation in their schools? This research question’s relevance is grounded in the Anglican Church’s frequently expressed desire that Anglican schools participate in the evangelising mission of the Church. Due to the dearth of research in this area, specific research questions seek to explore basic elements in the general question (Johnson, & Christensen, 2004).

A fundamental issue in any role is to understand the expectations for successful performance of that role. In light of the Anglican Church’s commitment to respecting diversity, and given the variety of school relationships to the Anglican Church (see Table 1), a basic question arises as to how Anglican school principals perceive expectations placed upon them to be leaders of faith formation. Research has previously been conducted which has sought similar understanding of Catholic school principals’ leadership roles in Catholic schools, by asking the principals for their perceptions and
opinions (Hansen, 1999; Slattery, 1998). Consequently, the first specific research question is: How do Australian Anglican school principals understand their role as faith formation leaders?

Extensive literature guides principals of Catholic schools, ranging from global Catholic statements by the Vatican (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977) to Queensland diocesan guidance (Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2006) and archdiocesan initiatives (Gowdie, 2006). These advocate development of dimensions of and capabilities for, religious leadership by the principal. The Lutheran Church of Australia has similarly prepared documents providing clarity of expectation for school principals’ capabilities in religious leadership (ACU National Leadership Flagship, 2005; Lutheran Education Australia, 2001). Anglican principals lead Christian faith schools, leading to the second specific research question: How do Australian Anglican principals feel capable and equipped to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

Both the Catholic and Lutheran Churches, in addition to offering precise directions for religious leadership by school principals, have also fostered a culture of scholarly research to inform school principals and others involved in the educative process (Albinger, 2005; Bartsch, 2006; Dorman & D’Arbon, 2003; Duignan, 2005; McLaughlin, 2006). The combination of these approaches offers enhanced clarity of understanding for principals exercising religious leadership. A third specific research question therefore is: How does the Anglican Church equip Australian Anglican school principals to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

In order to better appreciate the intention and motivation for engaging in this study, a brief explanation of the researcher’s involvement in the area of research is appropriate. The researcher’s experiences of Anglican schools include governance in three, honorary chaplaincy in two, attendance of three Anglican schools by his children and one for his own secondary education. These roles have contributed to experiences involving planning and leading worship, attending conferences, strategic planning including budgetary,
organisational and building matters, classroom teaching and parent interviews, both as a parent and as a member of staff. Teaching in three Queensland state high schools during 1976-1985, including two years as Head of Department, and being an Anglican parish priest since 1989 has also contributed to the researcher’s perspective. The symbolic interactionist stance of this study values this researcher empathetically standing in the place of the other (Bryman, 2001; Crotty, 1998). This enhances an interpretive investigation of participants’ perceptions of the meaning of their world views. The researcher has acknowledged these personal experiences in endeavouring to describe the complexity of participants’ understandings, to consciously avoid injecting personal bias or hypotheses into the study (Creswell, 1998).

1.5 The Purpose and Significance of the Research

The purpose of this research is to explore two Anglican school principals’ perceptions of their roles and capabilities as faith formation leaders, and their sense of feeling equipped or otherwise for this ministry in the Anglican Church. This study endeavours to move beyond the decades of addresses and conversations relating to the topic of faith leadership of Anglican schools, to gather empirical evidence on the topic. The Synod of the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane noted:

It is interesting that thirty years ago the School’s Report (1978) recommended the Diocese consider ways to make more funding available for the training of chaplains as well as acknowledging that schools and school staff were evangelists for the Anglican Church. It continues to be a strategic issue for our schools as these appointments are significant roles in supporting Heads in the leadership of faith communities (Diocese of Brisbane, 2008, p. 88).

The issue of religious leadership of Anglican schools has been on the Anglican Church’s agenda for over fifty years. The importance to Anglican
schools of Anglican identity and Diocesan mission is contained in the Nicholson Report (2007), recommending, *inter alia*, that:

There is a need for a clearer vision of what it means to be an Anglican school in the Diocese of Brisbane as defined within the Canon and what this requires of schools, the Commission and all other associated bodies (Nicholson, 2007, p. 1).

It further states:

Councils and Heads are charged with maintaining a direction and culture that respects the traditions and direction of each school while aligning with and furthering the Mission of the Diocese. If this is not possible, both the Diocese and school should review their relationship (Nicholson, 2007, p. 23).

This research is timely and may assist the Anglican Church and its school principals gain insight into the challenges inherent in Anglican school faith formation leadership roles. This research has further significance, evident in the following communication from the Executive Director of the Anglican School’s Commission: “There is a real absence of scholarly work on the characteristics, understanding or appreciation of what is required for leadership of school faith communities” (P. Smith, personal communication, April 4, 2006). This study seeks to redress the lacuna in the literature in this field of research and contributes to understanding the roles, responsibilities and capabilities for faith formation leadership by principals of Australian Anglican schools and will further contribute to research in this area.

1.6 Design of the Study

Due to there being a lacuna in the literature, this study is exploratory, examining the two participants’ lived experiences in a natural setting by discovering the meanings they attach to their faith leadership roles and capabilities. In reviewing the literature for this study, the researcher has
established the following four propositions as significant for shaping enquiry into the faith formation leadership role of Anglican school principals and for underpinning the design of this study:

- An Anglican school’s mission involves responsibility for formation of faith for school members;
- The school principal is the key faith formation leader of an Anglican school;
- Two dimensions of leading an Anglican school’s faith formation are cultural and symbolic leadership, and
- The Catholic and Lutheran Churches provide statements of dimensions of faith formation leadership and capabilities for leadership of their schools, which in conjunction with supporting documents, guide school principals in their role. There is a lacuna of similar documentation for Anglican school principals, who might or might not appreciate such guiding statements.

The contextual and perceptual sensitivity of a qualitative study provides opportunities for entering the inner world of the participants, exploring their perceptions of their leadership in faith formation as meaning-making for others (Creswell, 2005; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Neuman, 2006). Consequently, this study is exploratory, seeking participants’ perspectives from a completely open research stance. Considering these factors, a social constructionist epistemology with an interpretivist theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism is employed. A phenomenological research methodology shapes the use of data gathering and analysis, using interview, questionnaire, document analysis and observation methods.

Participants are referred to as ‘Principal’ in diocesan handbooks and on their school websites. During interviews participants referred to their colleagues and themselves as ‘Heads.’ The colloquial use of ‘Head’ has been retained in
reporting the data from the principals in Chapters Four and Five, but not throughout the thesis.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

The first chapter provides an overview of the Australian Anglican ecclesial context within which this study is conducted.

In Chapter Two a review of selected literature provides a contextual background for the study and insights to shape the design of the study. Literature pertaining to the meaning of faith, its formation in schools and contemporary education leadership theory and cultural and symbolic leadership frames, is presented. There follows a consideration of literature relating to Church school principalship from cultural and symbolic leadership perspectives to gain understanding of faith formation leadership as a process within a school context. Anglican culture and symbolism is presented in terms of its formative influence on the faith development of both the Anglican school principal, and also upon the Christian character of the school itself. Anglican school documentation is reviewed, followed by reviews of selected Catholic and Lutheran school leadership literature, for insights that inform an understanding of Anglican school faith formation leadership.

Chapter Three details the epistemology, theoretical framework and methodology employed in this study. The selection of data gathering methods and analysis are discussed, as are issues of verification, ethics and limitations and delimitations of the design and conduct of this research.

Chapter Four presents the data from the study. From the literature, three questions emerged, which shaped the enquiry and facilitated the gathering of data. From these three areas of enquiry, eight issues developed as organisational foci for the display of the data.
In Chapter Five analysis and discussion of the data is organised within a framework of five themes which represent the coming together of the eight issues and topics which emerged from the literature. The participants’ perceptions of themselves as Anglican school faith formation leaders, their sense of being equipped for the role and their views of their schools’ mission alignment with the mission of the Anglican Church are discussed.

The conclusions from the study and recommendations regarding Anglican school faith formation leadership are the subject matter of Chapter Six.
CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter selected literature regarding the nature of Christian faith is examined, contrasting faith as objectively held doctrine with faith as subjective experience. The review then seeks to gain understanding of faith formation as a process of meaning-making by reflective and active engagement of individuals within Church school contexts. Various sources cite that the core reason for a church school’s existence is the process of forming faith, thereby nurturing the individual and enriching the community. Church school communities can assist students make meaning of life by offering engaging experiences of tradition as a part of cultural faith formative processes; “in this way, faith schools can have a role in creating positive identities that express living religious and cultural traditions” (Johnson, 2003, p. 470). Tradition enables engaging community encounters with a living revelation, helping school members discover deeper meanings beyond mere self-interest.

A sample of educational leadership literature explores the need for principals to demonstrate authenticity of personal Christian faith practice in their leadership. Church school principalship is considered from cultural and symbolic leadership dimensions by surveying recent literature to gain understanding of leading faith formation as a process within a school context. Anglican school literature is reviewed, followed by reviews of selected Catholic and Lutheran school leadership literature, for insights that may inform understanding of Anglican faith formation leadership. The study seeks to explore how principals of Australian Anglican schools understand their roles of leadership in faith formation, and feel capable of undertaking that leadership.

An overview of the conceptual framework that shapes this literature review is diagrammatically represented in Figure 2.1. The forces shaping principals’
faith formation leadership capabilities are identified as personal qualities and formative factors that bear on the nature of the leadership offered.

Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework for the Literature Review

2.2 Faith Development

In this section a sample of the literature contributing to an understanding of faith and how it develops is presented. In the Anglican Baptism liturgy, the candidate is asked to affirm the faith of the Church, by saying the Creed, after which the congregation adds, “This is our faith: we believe in one God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit” (Anglican Church of Australia, 1995, p. 59). In this instance, ‘faith’ is a body of believed truth, an objective intellectually held
body of Christian revelation passed through the generations, focusing on the content of the revelation as prime importance (Astley & Crowder, 1996; Clements, 1983; Cross & Livingston, 1983). It can be a body of orthodox knowledge providing fundamental certainty circumscribed by doctrine (Cowdell, 2009), in which “faith means little more than trust in religion to arbitrate our beliefs, values and behaviour” (Erricker, 2007, p. 51). Astley (2002) criticizes faith limited to unambiguous doctrinal “resolution of intellectual doubt” (Cowdell, 2009, p. 209), arguing that faith involves a transforming subjective engagement in dynamic growth of understanding and valuing what is held as important.

An understanding of faith as subjective experience has emerged in educational and theological literature in the last three decades, increasingly viewed as a body of knowledge personally and critically experienced, leading to life lived in trusting relationship with God (Chapman, 1983; Kung, 1976). Objective certitude, without being balanced by subjective commitment is simply fanaticism (Dulles, 1971), whilst subjective trust without intellectually seeking to know more of God is also unbalanced, as Hansen and Hansen explain, “Our trust in God is not directed towards a vacuum, but to a God of a particular nature who has disclosed himself (sic) in particular ways” (1981, p. 38). They argue for faith and reason to inform one another, citing Anslem’s motto “faith seeking understanding” (1981, p. 38), an interrelationship of subjective experience and objective knowledge, which mutually nurture each other within the person of faith (Collins, 2006).

Subjective and objective faith interplay for individuals is particularly influenced by their cultural context. Hebert (1962) presents Jesus the historical man as unknowable in modern historical terms, but deeply knowable as Christ the risen Lord by people’s faith which is a personal response shaped by peoples’ specific contexts. Dulles criticises faith which lacks personal and contextual engagement: “one cannot impose a single pattern of faith on the Mississippi sharecropper, the London businessman, the Sicilian peasant, and the German university professor” (1971, p. 25). Groome (1991) similarly notes that the Second Vatican Council of the Catholic Church called for an interchange
between faith and culture, so that expression of faith can be shaped by the cultural context of the believer.

Faith expression is also influenced by an individual’s age and maturity: Faith development is presented as a six stage process by Fowler (1981). Fowler’s theory is one of respected scholarly worth for educators (Astley, 1996; Groome, 1980; Hansen, 1999; Seymour, 1996). Astley (1996) contends that the majority of teenagers are at Fowler’s Stage Three, with late teens making a transition to Stage Four. Groome asserts that for many people, Stage Four “emerges only in the mid-thirties and forties, and many adults never achieve it” (1980, p. 71). In this study, discussion is limited to literature regarding Fowler’s Stages Two and Three as they apply to Christian faith formation.

Fowler (1981) understands faith as a process of making meaning and finding coherence in life, there being seven aspects of engagement in each stage: reasoning, taking another’s perspective, making moral judgements, social awareness of relationships to others, relating to reliable authority, forming a coherent world-view, and finally understanding and relating to symbols. Astley suggests that:

Fowler’s theory is contentious, and many researchers prefer to think of different styles or patterns of faith rather than a developmental sequence of stages, an account that better fits the influence of a person’s life history and social context on her way of being in faith (2002, p. 68).

Whether styles, patterns or stages, or all combined, Fowler provides valuable insights for principals leading faith formation of school students.

People in Fowler’s Mythic/Literal Stage Two are generally primary school age children and are developing order in their world through increasing cognitive skills and interpersonal relationships. By joining groups, a growing sense of belonging assists self-image and the taking of literal meaning from stories and symbols of the group (Groome, 1980; Astley, 2002; Erricker, 2007). Fowler’s Stage Three, Synthetic/Conventional, often lasts the teenage years, and for
some is as far as their faith develops. In this stage people conform, develop understanding of others, experience wider circles of interactions and require prioritization of relationship. Perspectives about others and self-image are developed and shaped by membership of whatever group a person belongs to (Groome, 1980). This stage entails difficulty explaining personal belief, which Astley argues, “partly explains the notorious difficulty of reasoning with young people about the views they hold” (1996). It therefore requires patience and sensitivity by leaders of faith formation.

Faith as objective truth, passing stories from one generation to another, resonates with some aspects of the child in Fowler’s Stage Two. The exploring teenager in Stage Three will be attracted to the subjective and fluid understanding of faith. Individuals in both stages experience growth and meaning-making, calling for engagement of the whole person. Groome (1991) explains faith as a threefold dynamic of cognitive belief, a trusting relationship with God and the community of faith, and behavioural obedience to God’s will. Groome does not present these as components or consequences of faith. They are the substance of holistic lived faith, which is the understanding of faith that is assumed in this study. Educating people for this living faith “is an ontological enterprise that is to inform, form and transform people in heads, hearts and life-styles: it is to engage nothing less than the marrow bone” (Groome, 1991, p. 21). The challenge for Christian religious schools is how to form people in this living faith.

2.3 Church-Sponsored Schools as Sites for Formation in Faith Tradition and Community

This literature pertains to faith formation’s significance as a core dimension of church-sponsored schools. Forming people in Christian faith “is the essence of what the Church is called to be in this world, a people formed in Christ to be the witness to the Gospel in both their words and their deeds” (White, 1990, p. 109). The experience of faith ranges from members of a school staff who may be in Fowler’s literal second stage of faith development and beyond, to students who may be entering Fowler’s individuating fourth stage of growth in
personal responsibility, examining values, making choices about meaning, identity, and commitments, with the stress of establishing one's own faith meaning (Astley, 2002; Groome, 1980). The literature focuses on engaging people in faith, as in Groome's "ontological enterprise" (1991, p. 21). Groome hypothesises that parallel to Fowler's six stages of faith development, there are similarly six stages in faith formation. To help students reach mature faith in adulthood, religious educators need to engage students during the early stages of faith formation in "an approach that causes children to reflect on their lives as critically as they can in order to promote authentic Christian engagement in the world." (1980, p. 238). Groome describes this as 'morphosis,' shaping their 'being' in terms of "who they are and how they live" (Groome, 1998, p. 37).

Being formed in faith in this way involves dynamic praxis between,

constant movement back and forth between doing and reflecting on doing. It is not just a practice: nor is it the application of a theory. It is rather an ongoing exploration into living the Gospel life (Searle, 1992, p. 12).

This active process involves individuals being nurtured and transformed by participating in, and reasoning about experiences of God in Christian community (Cavalletti, 1992; Cowdell, 2009; Francis & Greer, 1993; Groome, 1980, 1991). Whilst acknowledging faith as a gracious gift predisposing the human heart to seek relationship with God (Dykstra, 1996; Groome, 1991), the gift needs to find human expression by being formed in the specifics of the community's faith expression (Astley & Crowder, 1996; Cavalletti, 1992; Duignan, 2003; Groome, 1991, 1998). Engaging in the community, students experience belonging, nurture and integration as they encounter the humanity of others (Cole, 2004; Dykstra, 1996; Richard, 1996).

Formative acts shaping individual development are found in what faith communities do: praying, reading and sharing Scripture, worship, pastoral care, participating in Eucharist and Baptism, confessing, forgiving, and
reflecting on the meaning of these acts. These experiences engage the developing student in a contextual community relationship as a living proclamation of faith that sustains and confirms the child (Cavalletti, 1992; Dykstra, 1996; Groome, 1991; Merriman, 1990). Christian formation calls people to participate in the formation of others (Groome, 1998; Slattery, 1998). Groome argues that students should simultaneously be formed and also be agents of God’s care for others, suggesting a “pedagogy that engages and forms people’s very selves to be historical agents of God’s reign” (1991, p. 17).

Understanding community tradition as a context for experiencing faith formation is an important matter for a school’s cultural leader, because tradition is often confused with antiquarian custom. It is however a living reality constantly finding contemporary expression, “consistent with Divine revelation” (Thornton, 1984, p. 69), an ongoing elucidation of the Christian faith. It is perhaps this misunderstanding of tradition as archaic custom that Erricker portrays as adherence to orthodox doctrine, confining and prescriptive, removing any opportunity for choice and investigation (2007). He argues that in the post-modern faith education classroom, “nothing is fixed or governed as an outcome, and that no particular authority holds sway” (2007, p. 59). While acknowledging the creative engagement of the individual in the process of faith formation, Erricker’s tradition-less individualism appears bereft of engagement with and in a community. Contrastingly, Groome’s perspective is that the post-modern view of tradition in faith, robs even the present of its ‘realness’, seeing nothing as stable and ‘present’ but everything as ad hoc and virtual. Whatever emerges is particular to each social age and context, and is soon superseded by another ‘virtual reality’ with nothing remaining to be called a tradition. There is a counter-voice to both modernism and post-modernism as it were, which appreciates their insights but refuses their bias against tradition, insisting it can be reclaimed in reflective and life-giving ways (1998, pp. 217-218).
Eaude (2007) argues that the post-modern world is characterised by uncertainty and confusion, in which people lack sustained affiliation to anything, let alone affiliation to a belief system. He joins Groome (1980) and Astley (2002) in contending that schools are places in which children make meaning of their lives. They can engage in formative school-based culture experiences enabling moral development and value decisions which are lacking in the broader individualistic consumer culture. Additionally, faith development in faith communities facilitates discovery of one’s place and meaning by belonging and participating in a social context (Cowdell, 2009).

Another contemporary issue impacting on faith formation is loss of deeper individual identity. Globalisation impedes meaning-making by individuals, who are impaired by shallow societal identity (Johnson, 2003), and disengaged through isolationist identity (Duignan, 2005). Hansen writes of a contemporary “collectivist mentality in which the claims of the individual are lost in the demands of the group” (1999, p. 50). Expression of individuality in contemporary societies is characterised by self-fulfilling individualism to the extent that it “constitutes an addiction at the individual, institutional and societal levels” (Duignan, 2005, p.3). Duignan argues that besides substance addictions, there are also societal approved addictions to processes such as working, money making, power, stress and shopping. Schools can become addicted to the process of students finding the answers that the teachers want, without any deeper meaning in their learning than being “focused on passing the tests that are used to determine how well they can pass these tests” (Duignan, 2005, p.4). This results in reinforced process addiction for individuals, and disengaged learning without making meaning. However, schools can also function as powerful formative institutions claims Duignan (2005), engaging students in justice and social responsibility in their school communities, thereby rising above modern selfish individualism.

In summary, faith can be understood as an objective body of knowledge, or a subjective ontological engagement in a process, with shades in between. The ways in which people are formed in faith are influenced by the understanding of faith by those in authority, as shown by Astley and Crowder (1996), who
write that there are two general types of Christian faith formation, the first being a content focused didactic approach of handing a body of knowledge from one generation to the next. The alternative is an experiential process approach, in which the Christian content is passed on as a vehicle for personal encounter and reflection, challenging the individual to discern God in personal life. Astley and Crowder (1996) argue that Groome defines a middle ground, understanding faith as an interpretive dialogue between the learner and faith, involving hearing, reflecting, criticising, being criticised and sharing, supporting Christian teaching which exhorts schools to give,

every generation the freedom to utilize the past for itself, both by allowing the Christian tradition to work its power on their lives and by testing it against their own experiences. This supports the general purpose for a Catholic school where staff should facilitate personal contacts and commitments which consider absolute values in a life-context and seek to insert them into a life framework. Indeed, culture is only educational when young people can relate their study to real-life situations with which they are familiar (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977, para. 27).

Faith formation of students in tradition, community and life meaning-making in Church-sponsored schools is the distinctive reason for those schools’ existence, as argued by Astley (2002), and by Groome who writes, “Religiously sponsored schools lose their warrant unless they are places of spiritual nurture” (1998, p. 354).

2.4 The Principal’s Role in Faith Formation in Church-Sponsored Schools

The proposition that the principal occupies the key leadership role in any school is widely supported (Bartsch, 2006; Davies, 2005; Dearing, 2001; Dorman & D’Arbon, 2003; Gowdie, 2006; Kleinschmidt, 2002; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Weaver, 2001). Of particular importance for principals leading Christian schools is Duignan’s criticism of leaders who are so concerned for tolerance, that they become morally ambivalent, then morally indifferent,
ultimately failing to stand for anything or to make “commitment based on principles that could be perceived as exclusive, for example, a set of core values” (2005, p.11). Because church-sponsored schools espouse distinct Christian core values, literature about faith formation leadership by principals of Church-sponsored schools will be examined in the following sections.

Church school principals are expected to live their faith in daily life (Albinger, 2005; Duignan, 2003; Johnson, 2003; Weaver, 2001), to demonstrate a strong Christian commitment (Childs, 1992; Cole, 2004; Dorman & D'Arbon, 2003; Gowdie, 2006; National Society, 2004), and to encourage others to grow in faith (Bartsch, 2006; D'Arbon, Neidhart & Carlin, 2002; Groome, 1998; Slattery, 1998). Gowdie encapsulates the value placed upon the faith formation leadership of the principal by daily life and example:

The literature consistently indicates that if leaders do not see spiritual formation as central to effective ministry in Catholic education, in overall staff development and in their own leadership, then it is highly unlikely that staff will develop this perspective (Gowdie, 2006, p. 25).

Bolman and Deal (2002) note that successful school leaders vigorously demonstrate what they value, authentically living what they believe and believing what they live. Behaviour of school principals is significantly driven by their personal values, which, if not personally explored and understood, overrides values that might be desired by employers, further affirming the need for authenticity in Christian school leadership (Branson, 2004; Donnelly, 2004). In reviewing resources available for the spiritual and personal formation of Christian leadership within Catholic Education, it is observed that there is “an absolute commitment to and conviction about the centrality of spiritual formation for true and strong Christian leadership” (Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2006, p. 19).

These observations drawn from the literature, demonstrate the importance of the role of principals in faith formation in church-sponsored schools. The contemporary style of faith nurture reported in the literature is subjective and
experiential. The principal’s leadership in faith formation is concomitantly experientially lived as authentic witness. Both those leading and those being formed are encountering an ‘ontological enterprise’ (Groome, 1991, p. 21). In order to better understand leadership by principals, a brief overview of recent education leadership literature follows in the next section.

2.5 Recent Developments in Educational Leadership

Recent leadership theory literature will be reviewed briefly, in order to select and build an understanding of leadership for the purposes of this study. For many years, the established perception of the principal had been as a solo heroic leader with full responsibility for the school (Hansen, 2000; Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2006; Spry, 2006), “an industrial paradigm of the leader as a power wielding figure” (Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd, 2002, p. 205). This model of educational leadership, which began to undergo change in the 1970s, was the product of “a mechanistic world view in which objectivity, control and linear causality are supreme” (Shriberg, Sbriberg & Lloyd, 2002, p. 212), involving centralised positional power (Spry, 2004, 2006).

D’Arbon, Neidhart & Carlin (2002), commenting on the impact on school leadership of economic, social and political developments and restructuring within society in the last quarter of the twentieth century, cite Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999):

The fundamental forms of education that were designed for an age of heavy manufacturing and mechanical industry are under challenge and fading fast as we move into a world of high technology, flexible workforces, more diverse populations, downsized administrations and declining resources (D'Arbon, Neidhart & Carlin, 2002, p. 3).

Responding to this changing global context, various models of educational leadership have emerged. A concept common to these models is the principal’s role of future planning and development (Shriberg, Shriberg &
Lloyd, 2002), supported by Davies’ notion that, “leadership is about direction-setting and inspiring others to make the journey to a new and improved state for the school” (2005, p. 2). Leadership is increasingly complex, operating in ambiguity and flux rather than in the industrial world’s predictability and more ordered structure. Spry (2004) observes that these features of post-industrial society place leaders in contexts which are characterised by conflicting values and ethical dilemmas and tensions.

The literature reveals a plethora of responses to these challenges with a variety of models (Spry, 2004), many of which are complementary to one another rather than competing for primacy. Davies presents eleven models of leadership (2005), while Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd (2002) present a further four models not included by Davies. In this short study, it is sufficient to observe that “the new paradigm moves away from the notion of the single, heroic leader and advocates a culture of shared leadership” (Spry, 2004, p. 9). This is echoed by Duignan and Bezzina (2006), Hansen (1999) and by Shriberg, Shriberg and Lloyd, who assert:

In every context, a flood of information makes it impossible for one person to go solo. We need each other’s eyes, ears and insights to better gauge the situation and the necessary actions for exerting leadership. In the new paradigms of leadership, leaders and collaborators (a term we prefer) together ‘practise leadership’ (2002, p.11).

These authors further observe that there has evolved a post-industrial understanding of leadership: “Several models of leadership served as precursors to the new paradigm, specifically servant leadership, transformational leadership and the critical model of leadership. These models broke with the industrial paradigm (Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd, 2002, p. 219). Contemporary leadership may be seen as a shared, collaborative and transforming experience in which the school principal sustains their own and others’ capacity to work in various areas of responsibility by inviting, distributing, sharing and enabling others to be part of a journey of growth within the school.
The church school principal’s role in faith formation takes place within the broad context of a Christian school, however the specific context of each school is different from all other schools (Kaye, 1994; Slattery, 1998). Differing contexts result in differing practices of leadership, involving, “a multidimensional integration of theory, process and practice. What is successful in one situation may not be useful in another” (Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd 2002, p. 10). Principals enable school members to make meaning in ways that are suitable to the context in which the school exists (Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd, 2002; Spry, 2004, 2006). Southworth citing Leithwood Jantzi & Steinbach (1999), notes that a school’s context affects what a leader does, “there is no one way to be successful in all situations because ‘outstanding leadership is exquisitely sensitive to the context in which it is exercised’” (2005, p. 77). Christian school contexts challenge principals to provide the school community with opportunities to encounter Gospel values such as compassion, forgiveness, repentance, justice, faithfulness and honesty as summed up in Jesus’ words in Matthew 22:37:

He said to him, ‘you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind’. This is the Greatest and first commandment. And a second is like it, ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself’ (New Revised Standard Version Bible, 1989).

With the passage of time, Christ’s teachings and life have been expressed in Scripture, Sacraments and traditions, maintained and developed in Christian community by shared values and beliefs expressed in Creeds, Baptismal promises, Eucharist and other liturgies. These practices and teachings have grounded people in networks of local, Diocesan and broader communities of Church. Within Church schools, principals facilitate contextually appropriate student engagement with these practices and teachings as experiences in the process of faith formation.

Davies & Davies (2005) describe this leadership capacity as ‘contextual wisdom’. They argue that the historical background and contemporary experiences of a school need to be sensitively understood by the leader,
placing the school in the “wider community and the educational world in which it belongs,” appreciating “the uniqueness of a particular school environment”. The salient features of contextual wisdom are:

- Understanding and developing culture;
- Sharing values;
- Sharing beliefs;
- Developing networks, and
- Understanding the external environment (2005, pp. 25-26),

which contribute to the faith dimension of Christian school culture. They find expression in as many different contexts as there are Christian schools, facilitated by the contextual sensitivity and wisdom of the principal. The following section of the literature review presents an understanding of culture and the significance of cultural leadership by Christian school principals leading faith formation.

2.6 School Principals’ Cultural Leadership

Knowing the school context assists the principal to understand the school’s culture, in turn developing leadership capacity for enabling the school community to make meaning of their experiences (Duignan & MacPherson, 1992; Slattery, 1998). Dorman & D’Arbon emphasize the importance of principals being aware of the connectivity between school context and school culture, noting that “schooling occurs within a cultural framework and educators ignore the contextual realities of their schools at their own peril” (2003, p. 36). They further observe that where principals’ lifestyle and Church practice are not consistent with, and sensitive to the school and broader culture, then tensions are created for these principals as effective leaders.

School culture is understood as the shared ideas, common beliefs, standards, values and attitudes that students, parents, teachers, and other members of a school community have inherited, hold, reinforce and pass on by social interaction and action. These intangible elements are developed and reinforced in the school and shared by the school community (Deal, 2005;
Duignan, & MacPherson, 1992; Eaude, 2007; Johnson, & Castelli, 2000; Scott, 1998; Sergiovanni, 2007). Slattery asserts that “culture in the daily life of the school provides stability, fosters certainty, encourages predictability and creates meaning” (1998, p. 34), producing an environment in which people know they are valued as school community members, participating in shared values, common activities and caring social relationships (Deal, 1998, 1999; Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy, & Wirt, 2004). Eaude presents culture as an expression of intellectual and emotional relationships within community that gives ultimate meaning to life in social engagements that take us beyond ourselves. Culture’s importance is “because the values we live, the qualities we deem worthwhile, the environment we create, the mood we encourage and the expectations we have matter more than the content of the curriculum” (Eaude, 2007, p. 3). School members gain deeper meaning and stronger participation in school life through the shaping and reinforcing of cultural patterns of leadership behaviour. A school’s cultural expression is set within “broader value packages evolved at regional, State and National levels” (Walker, 1992, p. 56), calling for insight and awareness by principals. Culture acts as an amplifier for the involvement and motivation of the whole school (Deal, 1999; Slattery, 1998), a vital resource for leadership.

The understanding of a school’s culture enhances the principal’s capacity to create meaning for those within the life of the school, by respecting and valuing what the community respects and values: the customs, traditions, values and shared meanings that hold the school together (Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy, & Wirt, 2004; Slattery, 1998). Johnson and Castelli claim that in order to creatively work with school culture:

Principals look for ways to reach into the organization to establish the importance of the culture and its chosen values. Importantly, they implicitly communicate key values and inculcate them via day-to-day actions. The parallels between successful managers and school leaders are compelling in terms of creating an overall school environment in which the spiritual development and transmission of a faith tradition can flourish (2000, p. 79).
The principal provides cultural leadership by “marinating” (Deal, 1999, p. 21) staff and students in the culture, reinforcing and encouraging other members of the school to strengthen the culture in their own lives and in the lives of others (Deal, 2005; Duignan, & MacPherson, 1992; Johnson, & Castelli, 2000; Scott., 1998; Sergiovanni, 2007). Schein’s evaluation of culture’s importance for school leadership is expressed powerfully: “the only thing of real importance that leaders do is create and manage culture and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to work with culture” (Deal, 2005, p. 115).

School culture can be merely the status quo, as Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy & Wirt express it, ‘the way things operate around here’ (2004, p.135). However, cultural leadership also looks to the future, changing and reshaping the existing culture “through their actions, conversations, decisions and public pronouncements” (Deal, 1999, p. 55). School leaders strengthen and support aspects of culture that fit with their ideas, and decide what new directions are needed and what cultural changes can be creatively made to achieve these ends (Deal, 1999; Duignan & MacPherson, 1992; Walker, 1992). Deal refers to this as the “paradox of change” in which “leaders must perpetuate what is thriving in the present while reaching for what may be even better in the future. They must both embrace change and remain the same” (1999, p. 138). Cultural leadership seeks to influence and build a culture that motivates and inspires others to grow and reach potential (Johnson, & McCreery 1999). Sergiovanni, writing of culture in school growth refers to culture as:

A compass to steer people in a common direction: provides a set of norms that defines what people should accomplish and how, and provides a source of meaning and significance for teachers, students, administrators, and others as they work (2007, p. 11).

Cultural leadership values all that is worthwhile in the present, as well as working with change and growth, in the same way that faith formation seeks to grow and form faith in the lives of individual school members. Deal (1998)
asserts that failure to ground change in school culture harms a school, so powerful is its force.

A strong cultural leader can engender change in directions suited to personal choice rather than in directions grounded in the school’s culture, by extending control over school staff and students by “little more than a further refinement in the art and science of manipulation” (Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy & Wirt, 2004, p. 137). Scott suggests the possibility that transmission and development of culture “are often artificially contrived by administrators who speak more of the beliefs they wish to impart rather than those generated by the mainstream of the school community” (1998, p. 11). A means of preventing this is by testing change against the school’s stated mission. In Anglican schools this is expressed by the Anglican five marks of mission, as well as within the schools’ local contexts by a school mission statement and the school’s constitution, overseen by the principal, school board and bishop. In addressing the 2003 Anglican School conference, Archbishop Aspinall stated that “the mission of the school should be seen as part of and contributing to the wider overall mission of the church” (2003, p. 17), and in 2000, Bishop Browning declared, “The school’s leadership must be committed to the school’s mission” (2000, p. 4). Cultural leadership has to be aligned with the school’s mission if changes are to be faithful to the culture of the school.

A school’s mission is more than a brake on a principal’s potential personal indulgence, it is also a creative force, “articulating the school’s mission and purposes” (Slattery, 1998, p. 36). It is a key cultural leadership activity of a school principal in successful schools. Deal supports the worth of the school’s mission as a necessary component of cultural leadership:

In study after study where the culture did not support and encourage reform, that improvement did not occur. In contrast, improvements were likely in schools where positive professional culture had norms, values and beliefs that reinforced a strong educational mission (1999, p. 5).
If cultural leadership is to successfully form growth, it must be shaped by the school’s vision, its mission expressed as policies and practices (Sultmann, Finucane & Power, 1990). To successfully lead meaning-making in faith formation, principals must know, sustain and develop school culture within the school's context and mission.

2.7 Symbolic Leadership

Culture and cultural leadership are expressed in intangible terms, such as values, norms and beliefs. There are also tangible elements of school culture, physically observable within the educational environment, including:

- the school's written documents such as mission statements, curriculum, school histories, yearbooks and magazines. They would include major physical representations of the school such as its buildings and grounds, its artefacts, crests, mottoes and the school uniform. The tangible elements would also include the behavioural manifestations of the school’s culture, expressed by such acts as teaching style, school ceremonies, school rules and established patterns of interactions (Scott, 1998, pp. 7-8).

Symbolic leadership emanates from cultural leadership, as leadership which values and expresses the tangible symbols of intangible community culture:

- Anthropologists speak of culture as webs of meaning organized in terms of symbols and other representations. Symbols are key in understanding cultural meaning. Culture does not exist separately from people in interaction. People hold culture in their heads, but we cannot really know what is in their heads. All we can see or know are representations or symbols (Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy & Wirt., 2004, p.134).

Principals as cultural leaders are required to give focused attention to their school’s symbolic aspects, thereby creating meaning for the school community by demonstrating what matters to them. They encourage and
promote values which provide “an orderliness in one’s school life derived from a sense of purpose and enriched meanings” (Sergiovanni, 2007, p. 13).

The dynamics of school leadership, according to Sergiovanni (2007, pp.7-16) are expressed as five forces, which are:

- Technical forces: derived from effective management skills;

- Human forces: derived from harnessing and developing available social and interpersonal resources;

- Educational forces: derived from capacity for diagnosing and developing curriculum, staff and programmes;

- Symbolic forces: focuses attention of others on what is valued by the school, presiding over ceremonies and important events. By integrating and enhancing meaning of everyday experiences, the symbolic leader elucidates deeper meaning and cultural significance of symbols in school life, engendering belonging and ownership of the school by fostering purpose and creating a sense of vision; and

- Cultural forces: “define, strengthen and articulate those enduring values, beliefs and cultural strands that give the school its unique identity” (2007, p. 11), encouraging reverence for the school and its purposes by being engaged in a strong and bonding culture, participation in which gives meaning to their lives. The cultural leader enunciates school mission, socializes new members, tells stories and explains and maintains traditions, develops, displays and communicates meaningful symbols and rewards those who reflect school culture.

Of these five forces, Sergiovanni presents the first two as basic school management forces, whereas the remaining three are contextual and unique to each school. Sergiovanni argues that the first three are fundamental for competent schooling, the last two are essential to excellence in schooling. Any Church school, by its mission, should treat faith formation as a focus of
excellence, as suggested by Sergiovanni’s elucidation of the ‘five forces of leadership’ which demonstrate the importance of cultural and symbolic leadership.

Deal (2005) presents similar connections between culture and symbolism in school leadership, presenting educational leadership in two metaphors, leader as ‘politician’ and leader as ‘poet’. He asserts that many organisations are over-managed, but under-led, which can be redressed by focussing leadership on political and poetic frames. Deal describes political principalship as recognising the processes of power and conflict, making pragmatic decisions such as “move when the time is right,” and “befriend opponents” and “create arenas to air and resolve conflict” (2005, pp.113-114), without which schools are left with unresolved conflicts. Political frame decisions are made within the value-laden context of the school, which is best understood by paying close attention to the rich meaning of symbols portraying the values and culture of the school, which Deal has titled the poetic frame:

Its rhythm, rhyme and expressive verse help us to apprehend and appreciate the deeper aspects of being human. The symbolic frame introduces us to the allurement of symbols. Symbols are important for what they express and represent. Throughout history, people puzzling over the mysteries and paradoxes of existence create symbols and symbolic activity to give life meaning. Woven together these create a unique culture that bonds individuals in a common quest and provides unified direction, faith and hope. All human groups and organizations assemble over time a culture built around key symbolic elements: history, values and beliefs, heroes and heroines, ritual, ceremony and stories (Deal, 2005, p. 115).

In schools where symbols have lost their meaning or are ignored, fracturing eventuates and individuals are disassociated from the whole. Deal claims that poetic leadership restores and maintains “symbolic buoyancy” (2005, p.116), when “symbolic leaders first find their own spiritual core and then share their
gifts with others” (2005, p.119). Seven guiding principles for symbolic leadership advocated by Deal are:

- “Revisit and renew historical roots.” Historical cultural stories enhance understanding of the present by learning what to perpetuate or avoid;

- “Convey cultural values and beliefs.” Use symbols that impart cultural values, encouraging members to identify with what the school stands for;

- “Recognise heroes and heroines.” Ground people in human symbols of common people doing heroic deeds representing school values;

- “Convene and encourage rituals.” Bonding people together and to key values by rituals, exposes deeper meaning more effectively than words;

- “Celebrate key events.” Gather to celebrate or remember triumphs or tragedies that capture core cultural values;

- “Speak in picture words.” Connect with school members by using exciting metaphors to communicate deeper culture issues; and

- “Tell stories.” Keep hero’s exploits alive and find and tell stories that maintain and foster the culture (Deal, 2005, pp. 116-118).

In these guiding principles, Deal exhorts leaders to passionately seek and develop “sacred symbols” (2005, p.120), in order to keep schools alive and growing, resonating with Duignan’s assertion:

Through symbolic leadership activities the leader helps create a purpose which is embodied in the vision of the school. Through living out the vision the leader breathes a sense of purpose and excitement into the routines of daily life in the school. People in the school, teachers, parents
and students, are challenged by this vision with the expectation that they will become committed to it (1988, p.211).

Deal’s poetic principles of symbolic leadership share many similarities with Sergiovanni’s symbolic and cultural leadership forces. This congruence of scholarship regarding cultural and symbolic leadership frames is the focus by which faith formation leadership in Church-sponsored schools will be explored.

2.8 Cultural and Symbolic Leadership of Church-Sponsored Schools

The literature pertaining to cultural and symbolic leadership suggests that Christian faith development is intrinsic to a church school's mission. This faith entails a subjective intangible experience of valuing, believing, belonging and being integrated into community, and perceiving the world ordered in a Godly way. Amongst the ways that faith is expressed are physical experiences of Scripture, liturgy, Sacraments and traditions, all of which contribute to the store of the faith culture’s tangible symbols. The setting for this study is two Anglican Church schools of the Anglican Church of Australia, which is contextually rich in the use of symbols expressing culture, as the ensuing literature will demonstrate.

In Christian liturgy, significant past events are made present for worshippers through symbols which “presuppose certain agreements, conventions or shared beliefs within the community and which govern the use and interpretation of signs and symbols” (Thiselton, 1986, p. 492). This in turn, contributes to forming beliefs and values. Symbols need to be understood if they are to convey the meaning they have. This is of special importance for the Christian school principal as a cultural and symbolic leader working with Christian symbols.

*A Prayer Book for Australia* (Anglican Church of Australia, 1995) contains many liturgical symbols which contribute significantly to Anglican culture. The
Catechism within the prayer book explains the Eucharist in tangible and intangible terms as “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace,” (1995, p. 817). Funeral preparation in a Church is titled, “Placing of Christian Symbols” (1995, p. 709), including a lighted Easter Candle near the coffin, use of holy water, and placing Scriptures and a cross on the coffin. Each action is accompanied by prayer which contributes to understanding the symbol. The Baptism liturgy instructs that emphasis be placed on the symbolism and use of water, oil and lighted candle. The prayer book commentary offers advice for highlighting the symbolism of the seasons of the Church year (Dowling, 1997). An interpretive booklet about the Eucharist provides a summary of the importance of symbols in Anglicanism:

These small signs and gestures are part of the sacramental nature of the Anglican Church. The life of faith involves our whole self: the material body and the spirit. We use visible, tangible things: candles, the cross, the altar, bodily gestures, to remind us of spiritual realities (Ministry Education Commission, 2006, p. 2).

Symbolism is important in the daily practice of Anglicanism, and the meaning of these symbols needs to be learned if they are to be meaningfully used in personal life.

If symbolic and cultural leadership is to successfully form faith, with reliance upon faith symbols in Anglican schools, then Anglican school principals must understand and work with the symbols and culture of the school and Church which sponsors the school. Nouwen, discussing spiritual leadership writes, “only he who is able to articulate his own experience can offer himself to others as a source of clarification” (1979, p. 38). Effective Christian school principals as cultural and symbolic leaders gather and unite schools shaped by mission. They share and strengthen culture, and make Christian meaning of the world by daily and authentically modelling Christian faith in all aspects of the life of the school.
2.9 Australian Anglican School Principals Forming Faith

There is a dearth of research about principals leading faith formation in Australian Anglican schools. Related literature from Archbishop Phillip Aspinall as Australian Primate and from his diocese, has been prioritised for review reflecting his Australian Anglican leadership role, however literature from other Anglican dioceses is also reviewed. Scholarly articles reporting research into principal leadership of faith formation in Anglican schools in the United Kingdom are reviewed as part of this study.

An *Ethos Statement for Anglican Schools in the Province of Queensland* (Anglican Schools Commission, 1996), asserts that “the starting point has been the nature of the mother church itself on the simple assumption that Anglican schools will be like the Anglican Church” (p.1), followed by seven characteristics thereof:

- “Anglican schools are firstly Christian schools” living out faith in God in daily school community;
- “Anglican schools should be characterised by tolerance and a respect for difference”;
- “Anglican schools should be characterised by a high respect for intellectual endeavour”;
- “Anglican schools celebrate the contribution of the mother church to the wider political, social, economic and artistic life of our culture”;
- “Anglican schools should be characterised by a commitment to tradition and dignity within school worship,” re-expressing ancient forms of worship in contemporary style;
- “Anglican schools should be characterised by a commitment to tradition and dignity within school life,” using “the richness of symbol, story and ceremony to promote their values”; and
“Anglican schools should be characterised by a sense of social responsibility.”

Anglican school communities are to nurture these seven characteristics, “not as some discrete component of their lives, but as an implicit dimension of their intellect, their social conscience, and their art” (Anglican Schools Commission, 1996, p. 9). While the principal is required to be Anglican, other staff only need “assent to a general Christian ethic, but this is poorly defined and is rarely a genuine condition for employment” (Anglican Schools Commission, 1996, p. 5). The dissonance created by seeking to live Anglican faith in daily school life, whilst not appointing Anglican staff can be seen in the following:

The central sacraments of Anglican worship are Baptism and the Eucharist. All schools have had to wrestle with the question of whether it is appropriate to celebrate Holy Communion for staff and students when a significant number of those present are not Anglicans or baptised and communicant members of other faiths. In this matter, the Eucharist becomes not the bringing together of God’s people, but the way of defining the difference between members of the school family (Anglican Schools Commission, 1996, p. 5).

This ethos statement expresses a distinct intention of promoting Anglican faith and practice, concomitantly demonstrating an awareness of the tensions and impediments that prevent these goals being realised.

School constitutions from the Anglican Diocese of Brisbane provide statements of school governance and the relationship between the school and the Diocese. Without exception, these constitutions commence the Aims section with:

The school is a school of education for the purposes of developing a community of faith based on a belief in God and a Christian way of life according to the principles and traditions of the Anglican Church of Australia (Glennie School, 1998, p. 2).
The Constitutions contain details of the principal’s terms of appointment and leadership duties, using similar wording to, “demonstrate personal behaviour consistent with the Christian faith and be a communicant member of the Anglican Church of Australia” (Glennie School, 1998, p. 12). These schools have undertaken to appoint principals capable of Anglican cultural and symbolic leadership. A vision statement prepared for the Diocese of Brisbane Synod (2009) (see Appendix I), offers a suggested list of actions that illustrate a vision for Anglican schools, providing “a framework for discussion and review” (Anglican Schools Commission, 2009, p. 1). It does not address roles, capabilities or means of implementation, but acknowledges this need. It shares with the Nicholson Report (Nicholson, 2007), a desire to answer Aspinall’s question, “How can we ensure that the mission of Anglican schools is aligned with the mission of the whole Church?” (Aspinall, 2008, p. 8).

Aspinall affirms Anglican ethos in Brisbane Archdiocesan schools, encouraging “the School’s Office to develop new initiatives in assisting staff in schools to understand and own and value the Anglican ethos” (Aspinall, 2004, p.13), as “there isn’t necessarily a strong sense in our schools of what it means to be an Anglican community” (2004, p. 6). A lack of strong Anglican culture in these schools potentially offers an education that fits people to live in society without “equipping them to work for its transformation towards the reign of God” (Aspinall, 2003, p. 6). Aspinall posits three sets of norms that exert influence on Anglican schools:

Those that come from the theological and faith tradition of the Church, those that are imposed by the pluralistic, multicultural, democratic context of civic society and the governments which structure it, and thirdly the forces of the corporate world and the paraphernalia of contemporary management (2003, p. 9).

He notes that civic and corporate pressures can result in a slow, quiet death of schools as agencies of Church mission. Among six practical suggestions for preserving Anglican ethos and guarding against “unintended values drift” (Aspinall, 2003, p. 9), the Primate suggested the possibility of Brisbane
Diocesan schools having a Mission Director, as is the practice in Brisbane Catholic hospitals, who would be a person who “nurtures a sense of identity, meaning and purpose throughout the organisation” (Aspinall, 2003, p. 13). The Mission Director’s task is:

To remind the community of its fundamental identity, its reason for being, and to ensure that identity and character are expressed in and through everything that happens. Perhaps school chaplains fulfil something of that function in schools. Clearly the role of the head or CEO also bears significant responsibility for shaping the identity and ethos of a school. But both those roles can be so busy and demanding that there remains the risk of losing sight of the school’s distinctive mission (Aspinall, 2003, p. 13).

Aspinall is adamant that it be normative that school staff be “explicitly drawing on the Christian faith, as it is received by the Anglican Church” (2003, p. 16). Anglican school principals have responsibility for what, in this study, is termed cultural and symbolic leadership, if Anglican values are to be presented to school communities and taken up by them to make meaning in their lives.

Nationally, there are statements of Anglican school identity, similar to Brisbane Diocesan literature. Anglican schools are flexible, vigorous and committed to service of God and community, employing a faith formative style that is “interactive, exploratory, persuasive, rather than coercive” (Kaye, 1994, p. 141). Cole (2004, 2006) notes that nationally among Dioceses and within Dioceses there is wide divergence of Anglican identity in Anglican schools as places of faith formation. This may range “from a whole-hearted embracing of them to an embarrassed peripheralisation of them” (2006, p. 337). The West Australian Anglican Schools Commission requires “staff modelling of the Christian ethos; this is to be achieved through the appointment of staff who are excellent teachers and committed Anglicans” (Cole, 2006, p. 340). Less rigorously, the Anglican Diocese of Melbourne states “that the Head be a member of a Church in Communion with the Anglican Church in Australia” (Cole, 2006, p. 343). Within the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, principals and
members of governing boards are to be practising Christians who have signed a statement of personal faith, and priority for employment is given to practising Christians (Anglican Education Commission Diocese of Sydney, 2008). The Anglican Diocese of Sydney encourages teachers to undertake research on any project that 'explores the interface between Christian faith and educational practice, and encourages the Anglican Education Commission to publish the findings of such research” (Anglican Education Commission Diocese of Sydney, 2008, p. 5). From recent literature, there is an awareness of the importance of leadership of Anglican schools in the formation of faith.

Across the variety of Anglican faith expression in Australia it is agreed that all aspects of leadership in an Anglican school reside with the principal (Cole, 2006). Bednell (2006) posits that Anglican school principals’ broad religious leadership of Australian Anglican schools is expressed by the principal’s personal faith, religious attitudes and ability to negotiate the relationship between their school and the Anglican Church. Spiritual leadership is usually shared with an ordained chaplain who is accountable both to the diocesan bishop and to the principal, in which case there needs to be an agreement as to:

- how that leadership will be incorporated in the overall leadership of the principal and other decision-makers in the school. This is not an easy task, given that there is no single model for the exercise of ordained ministry in Anglican schools (Cole, 2006, p.344).

The literature indicates the importance of Anglican school principals as faith formation leaders of their schools, a task undertaken in a context of diversity and unclear identity. The first guiding research question emerging from the literature explores how Australian Anglican school principals understand their role of faith formation leadership within the mission of the Anglican Church.

Although Kaye offers no comment about leadership by school principals, he presents five distinguishing “Marks of an Anglican School”, which are “Reason and Understanding; Tradition; Incarnation; Worship and Social Interaction...
(1994, pp. 138-141).” Of these, Tradition and Worship have already been demonstrated as significant elements with which cultural and symbolic leaders work. Similarly, regarding Jesus having been present in human form historically, and present now in the Church as a living symbol, Kaye observes about the incarnational mark of an Anglican school:

It reminds us constantly that our pilgrimage is a personal one, and that our allegiance is not to a system, nor to a philosophy but to the son of God Incarnate. So the Anglican school ought constantly be asking itself the question, ‘What is the shape of Christ in the professional world of education?’ (1994, p.140).

If an Anglican school is to be led effectively in an Australian context, demonstrating Anglican cultural and symbolic qualities as a worshipping and incarnational community, then it needs a cultural and symbolic leader who knows these qualities and can live and model them for the entire school. Considering that this leadership is situated within the diversity and fluidity of the Via Media, a second guiding research question emerges, enquiring: How do Australian Anglican principals feel capable and equipped to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

Beyond Australia, the United States Episcopal Church from 2006 has commenced the practice of conducting short courses of one to three days for ‘Aspiring Heads’ and ‘Newly Appointed Heads’. These courses address Anglican school leadership issues including the Anglican identity of Episcopal schools (National Association of Episcopal Schools, 2009). This reflects the Episcopal Church’s policy wherein “the head of school is the primary ambassador of, and advocate for Episcopal identity and, as spiritual leader of the school, shares this ministry” (National Association of Episcopal Schools, 2005, p. 3). However, no scholarly literature from research pertaining to faith formation leadership by Episcopal school principals which would inform this study has been published. The Anglican Church of New Zealand’s national website makes no mention of a specific faith formation leadership role for
Anglican school principals in their Church schools (Anglican Schools Office, Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, 2009).

In the United Kingdom research studies have assessed Anglican schools and the impact on them of recent Church of England statements in relation to education. The Church of England Bishops' framework for Anglican principals' roles and responsibilities includes Christian faith formation duties, emphasising that the principal has non-delegatable responsibility for the Anglican character of the school (Weaver, 2001):

Their personal example will set the tone for the whole school and will demonstrate to pupils and to other members of the staff that the character of the school is a matter to be taken seriously. More challenging than ensuring regular attendance at worship, is demonstrating, in practice, that the senior members of staff and particularly the Head have thought out their role as leaders in the school in the context and example of Jesus. Practical Christian leadership is shown in a thousand small decisions and examples everyday (Weaver, 2001, p. 13).

The Way Ahead, a report on Church of England schools in the United Kingdom, affirms the formative role of the principal, emphasising leadership by personal example (Dearing, 2001). Guidelines for selecting, appointing and developing staff in Anglican schools in England reinforce strong Christian commitment as a necessary prerequisite for successful Anglican school leadership (National Society, 2004).

Johnson (2003) examined transmission of culture by Church of England school principals and Catholic school principals and explored the potential impact of The Way Ahead's recommendations on Anglican school principals as nurturers of culture. An earlier paper focuses on Catholic principals as nurturers of faith (Johnson & Castelli, 2000), another reporting on Anglican principals as formers of faith (Johnson & McCreery, 1999) and another compared Anglican and Catholic principals in faith formation leadership (Johnson, 2002). Church of England schools prior to the 1970s were viewed
as a community service, in which there was “no expectation that the head-teacher and teaching staff should be practising Anglicans (or even practising Christians)” (Johnson, 2003, p. 474). By contrast, *The Way Ahead* presents schools as aiming at a seamless integration into the Church’s mission of bringing people to faith, with the principal playing a central role (Johnson, 2003). Johnson found that Church of England school principals were ambivalent about faith, with faith leadership and formation being “dependent on the personal and professional stance of the individual head-teacher” (2002, p. 217). Some principals preferred to avoid using the name ‘Jesus’ at school assemblies in acknowledgement of multicultural sensitivity, contrasting with:

There was no such neutrality expressed by the RC (Roman Catholic) headteachers. The (Catholic) school was to be regarded as much a part of the Roman Catholic church as the local parish. It was part of the partnership of staff, children, parents and the local parishes…all of the RC heads spoke openly of faith development in a taken-for-granted way through all the structures of the school. This was in contrast to some of the CE (Church of England) headteachers, who had been somewhat diffident about it (Johnson, 2002, p.214).

Throughout Johnson’s papers (2000, 2002, 2003) many Anglican school principals express a lack of Anglican identity and indifference about spiritual leadership. This contrasts with the clarity of understanding of the expectations for the same roles performed by Catholic school principals.

Street (2007) investigated ten principals’ reactions to the impact of the *The Way Ahead* on their professional lives, concluding that there has been minimal impact. Principals interviewed were unable to differentiate between Christian values and the values espoused by any good school, expressing Christian ethos “in general terms such as ‘respect’, ‘caring’, and ‘being nice and working hard’” (2007, p. 142). A cause of this problem, Street suggests is that *The Way Ahead* encourages employment of Christian teachers and strong school leadership for the development of Christian values and an Anglican ethos in schools. However “a fundamental aspect of the head-
teachers’ understanding of what constitutes distinctiveness in an Anglican school is not addressed in the report in a systematic and structured fashion” (2007, p.143). Similarly, the meaning of spirituality left principals confused because the Anglican Church does not provide “a clearly articulated and philosophical rationale” (2007, p. 145) for faith formation within the daily life of the school. Street concluded:

This lack contrasts with the contributions made by Roman Catholic scholars (McLaughlin, O’Keefe & O’Keefe, 1996; Grace, 2002; Sullivan, 2006). Research prompted by publication of [The Way Ahead] makes an interesting and stimulating contribution to the potential debate (Reed, Bazalgette, Hutton & Kehoe, 2002) but there appears to be no systematic planned programme addressing the nature of Anglican school leadership [which] means that the notion of church schools being at the centre of the Church’s mission to the nation remains in the realm of rhetoric rather than reality. In summary, the Church’s new-found enthusiasm for its schools appears not to be matched by a coherent and consistent consideration of the role and function of the Anglican Church school or the ministry of school leadership (Street, 2007, p. 147).

The Anglican experience in the United Kingdom therefore seems to lack the necessary Church support for Anglican school principals to provide the cultural and symbolic leadership which would equip them as faith formation leaders in their schools.

For the Church of England to require the principals of their schools to undertake training for their faith formation leadership role delineated in The Way Ahead is a fresh expectation by the Church. It could be seen as another set of professional standards and competencies for principals to achieve and sustain. Luckcock supports Street’s (2007) argument that faith formation leadership training for Church of England principals is warranted, stating that:

It could be regarded as a means by which church school leaders can articulate their philosophy of education confidently, in a way that
encourages reflection about their spiritual values and beliefs, appreciate and strengthen their identity as ministers of the church, and (re)awaken their calling to serve the education of the young as a sacred vocation (Luckcock, 2006, p. 272).

This gives rise to the third guiding research question for this study: How does the Anglican Church equip Australian Anglican school principals to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

In summary, cultural and symbolic leadership of Australian Anglican schools creates and sustains the Christian culture, it is ‘the normative glue’, that holds the school together (Street, 2007, p. 142). In light of the literature reviewed, this study will seek to determine whether the perceived gap between the rhetoric and the reality in United Kingdom Anglican schools, is also discernible in Australian Anglican schools. Street argues that Anglicanism’s openness and lack of systematic guidance has contributed to principals experiencing vagueness about their role and purpose in faith formation. In this research two Australian Anglican school principals will be interviewed about their perceptions of their role, in relation to their willingness, capacity, and sense of being adequately equipped as faith formation leaders. In exploring these questions, an examination of the literature on non-Anglican Church-sponsored school leadership practice and policy is of value for this study.

2.10 Catholic, Lutheran and Anglican School Leadership: some common ground.

Much of the literature reviewed on symbolic and cultural leadership of Anglican schools has contrasted Anglican school leadership with Catholic schools leadership (Anglican Schools Commission, 1996; Aspinall, 2003, 2004: Cole, 2004, 2006; Johnson, 2002, 2003: Johnson & Castelli, 2000; Johnson & McCreery, 1999). This study examines a sample of the Catholic and Lutheran school leadership literature. As Anglican culture values symbols, Sacraments, Scripture and traditions, understanding the relationship in these areas among Anglican, Catholic and Lutheran churches is valuable
for establishing comparability between these denominations’ school systems and Anglicanism in educational leadership policy and practice. Cultural and symbolic expressions of faith contribute to the context in which all three denominations operate faith-based schools.

The Anglican and Catholic ecumenical dialogue outcomes, found in the Australian Anglican Roman Catholic Conversations report to Anglican General Synod (Stewart, 2001), communicate many areas of agreement. The Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission over thirty years, has achieved “agreed statements on the Eucharist, ministry, ordination, the church, salvation, morals and authority” (Stewart, 2001, p. 4). Similarly, the relationship between the Anglican and Lutheran Churches in Australia has significant common ground in several areas:

They believe and practise a shared faith: the Bible, God’s will and commandment, the Gospel, the creeds, liturgical worship, the Church, Baptism, the Lord’s Supper [Eucharist], membership of the church, pastoral office and ordained ministry, orders of ministry and the Episcopal office, a common hope and mission (Anglican – Lutheran International Working Group, 2003, p. 8).

There is sufficient broad agreement on various symbolic expressions of mutual religious cultural matters, for schools operating within Anglican, Catholic and Lutheran ecclesial contexts to be compared in this study. Considering the frequent references to Catholic school policy and practice throughout the available Anglican literature, what follows is a review of a sample of Catholic and Lutheran literature in relation to school leadership.

2.11 Faith Formation Leadership in Catholic Schools

Selected Catholic education leadership literature is critiqued focusing on three areas of enquiry which have emerged from the review of Anglican school literature in Section 2.10:
• How principals understand their role of faith formation leadership in their schools;

• How principals feel capable and equipped to be faith formation leaders; and

• How church formation practices equip principals to be faith formation leaders.

The purpose of this section is to discern those Catholic education trends and approaches which may illuminate the Anglican context. Whilst acknowledging the significance of the Congregation for Catholic Education’s *The Catholic School* (1977), *Lay Catholics in Schools* (1982), *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School* (1988), *The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium* (1997), and many Australian Catholic archdiocesan and diocesan education publications, for example the eight manuals published by Brisbane Catholic Education from 1975-1995 guiding leadership of Catholic schools (Hansen, 1999), these will not be reviewed. Their very existence and wide dissemination is in sharp contrast to the paucity of Anglican school leadership policy documents for principals. The Queensland Catholic Education Commission (2006), Slattery (1998, pp. 14-63) and Hansen (1999, pp. 68-119) all review Catholic school literature, providing clarity of Catholic Church initiatives in relation to school leadership.

Johnson and Castelli noted the language used by English Catholic school principals was distinctive: “These Catholic head teachers used an educational language that was recognizably Catholic” (2000, p.82). In another English study Johnson observed:

In the six schools visited, the spiritual, moral, social and cultural education of their pupils was seen in almost exclusively RC terms. The interviews revealed a consistency in view, approach and language, and thus unsurprisingly, a commonality of discourse could be detected. The language and concepts used by the south London RC headteachers had
some similarity with the RC Church’s expectations of schools principals in the US (Johnson, 2002, p. 216).

A study of English Catholic principals reports cultural and symbolic consistency: “shared discourse was evident drawn from those centrally determined and declared values, instructions and advice. The schools were recognisably Catholic in terms of ritual, paintings and religious statues” (Johnson, 2003, p. 475). Johnson noted the extent to which Christian symbols were evident throughout Catholic school buildings in these three studies, reflecting shared cultural expressions. The widespread unity of expression describing Catholic school leadership is contributed to by *The Catholic School* (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977, para. 37-48), urging teachers in Catholic schools to integrate faith and culture and faith and life, by synthesising faith with both culture and life”. Slattery (1998) and Johnson (2003) both note the central role of the principal as leader of this endeavour. *The Catholic School* (1977) and subsequent Congregation for Catholic Education documents gave rise to additional local, national and archdiocesan reports and statements.

In addition to ecclesial directives, Catholic school faith formation leadership also gives rise to a culture of professional reflection published in scholarly journals. Catholic school principals in their role as faith formation leaders are described as spiritual models who live a vocation of faithful service and nurture, expressing faith throughout the total life of the school (Gusdane, 1999; Jacobs, 1998; Ryan, 1997; Wallace, 1998). This demonstrates a culture of reflective contribution to Catholic Education leadership.

A culture of research in Australian Catholic Education is also evident. Diocesan and archdiocesan initiatives foster insight into appropriate models of leadership and leadership succession issues and strategies (Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2006; Spry, 2004). Of particular interest to this study, is the 2006 Queensland Catholic Education Commission document, *Spiritual and Faith Formation Opportunities*. It lists ministries that foster faith development, particularly for school leaders, throughout the
Catholic Church in Australia and in other denominations, but the Anglican Church is not listed as providing one resource. This stands in sharp contrast to Catholic practice.

In the 1970s and 1980s the decline in numbers of Religious school principals led to a growth in lay Catholic school leadership:

This gave rise to a plethora of documentation, reports, policies and processes at archdiocesan level focusing specifically and in great detail on the appointment process, performance review criteria and role expectations of a principal in a Catholic school (Hansen, 1999, p. 9).

Faith leadership of Queensland Catholic schools by lay principals emerged as a focus in 1995, with Catholic School Personnel: The Role, Performance Review and other support documents, identifying faith and mission among the key components of leadership demonstrating “growing sophistication and a more professional approach to defining the role” (Hansen, 1999, p. 40). This, continues Hansen, was to ensure that lay Catholic principals were equipped with the capacity for theological and religious education leadership assumed to be possessed by a Religious principal. A concise presentation of the dimensions of and capabilities for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools is found in Appendix II, from A Framework for Leadership in QLD Catholic Schools: A Report (2004). This latter focused on naming and validating the dimensions and capabilities required for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools, which incorporated “an extensive review of the literature and our experience of similar developmental projects in Lutheran education” (Spry, 2004, pp. 17-18). D’Arbon, Neidhardt & Carlin refer to “research which confirms the central role of the principal as the educational, pastoral and community leader” (2002, p.1), citing the Policy Statement on Lay Principals under Contract in Catholic Secondary Schools. In this statement, “the role of the lay principal is an integral part of the church’s official educational ministry and involves the obligation to give witness both sacramental and general to that ministry” (2002, p. 4). Extensive Catholic education leadership literature has been produced by the Catholic Church to guide their school principals.
Gowdie affirms spiritual formation leadership as “core business of Catholic schooling” (2006, p. 11), declaring that Catholic Education offers,

a transforming vision for those who choose to stand in the Catholic Christian tradition. And while the individual path to this reality is acknowledged and respected, the vision itself is a non-negotiable touchstone for all those choosing to be involved in the educational mission of the Church (2006, p. 7).

This statement acknowledging ‘individual paths’ is a Catholic equivalent of Anglicanism’s non-prescriptive attitude in schools, the difference being that the Catholic position provides clear parameters within which the individual path may be taken. Catholic principals complain of being swamped by Catholic Education system paperwork (Slattery, 1998, p. 142). Hansen (2000), also writes of principals “sometimes feeling under-prepared spiritually, undervalued personally and under-remunerated financially” (2000, p. 32), functioning “within a tension of both faithful adherence to and loyal dissent from aspects of Church teachings and disciplines” (Hansen, 2000, p. 33). McLaughlin reports dissent in which teachers struggle with aspects of official Catholic teaching, such as the doctrine of the Assumption, yet still teach it and prepare liturgy for it in their classrooms, leading to a “tenuous relationship of Catholic teachers with their employer” (2006, p. 113). Whether this dissent is loyal or fearful or for whatever reason, these Catholic teachers at least have a clearly defined “non-negotiable touchstone” for their individual paths. They know, as a result of Catholic documents, research, training and publications in scholarly journals, what are the Catholic standards and parameters of mission in exercising their role of faith formation.

2.12 Faith Formation Leadership in Lutheran Schools

The Lutheran Church of Australia states that principals are theological and spiritual leaders of Lutheran schools. As ministers of the mission of the Church, they must know, accept and live the “distinctive Lutheran character”
and “only Lutherans can be expected to fulfil these expectations” (Lutheran Education Australia, 2001, p. 1). Detailed direction by Lutheran Education Australia supports Lutheran principals, specifically regarding conflict resolution between principals and the school governing body, relationship with the school pastor and developing a principal mentor support system (Lutheran Education Australia, 2000). Additionally, the Leadership Framework for Lutheran Schools (ACU National Leadership Flagship, 2005) states that the Lutheran educational mission is to “provide to Church members and others in the community, a formal education in which the gospel of Jesus Christ informs all teaching and learning, all human relationships, and all activities” (p.1). This is expressed within five dimensions of the leadership process: spiritual, authentic, educative, organizational, and community, which are enacted through individual leadership capabilities. These individual leadership capabilities are named as theological, personal, relational, professional, managerial, and strategic. Details of Lutheran school leadership dimensions and capabilities are presented in Appendix III.

A Catholic document observes that the development of Lutheran school faith formation leadership gives particular attention to formal study and mentoring for principals of schools. The document also notes that Lutheran schools have a “model of leadership centred around a theological understanding of the school’s mission. Lutheran Education Australia has continued to work at building strong faith formation as the core of school leadership,” (Queensland Catholic Education Commission, 2006, p. 19). This opinion emerges from the same document that failed to identify any similar Anglican endeavours in the field of Anglican school leadership formation.

Lutheran school leadership literature frequently mentions ethics as a cornerstone of Lutheranism. The subtitle to Childs’ (1992) text on faith formation is Ethics in the Community of Promise. The author presents life as being ethically modelled on God’s faithful behaviour to Israel in the Hebrew Scripture’s covenants. The leader is a model of keeping faith, displaying an ethic of “truth telling and promise keeping” (Childs, 1992, p.138). The introduction to Leadership Framework for Lutheran Schools, mentions ethical
life as a prerequisite for school leadership four times, asserting, “authenticity in leadership derives its legitimacy from personal integrity, credibility, and a commitment to ethical and moral conduct in leadership practice” (2005, p. 1). This is reinforced by Bartsch (2006), and by an exhortation to Lutheran principals to live with spiritual “integration and authenticity” (Kleinshmidt, 2002, p. 63), articulating a faith that is theologically informed and lived ethically for the school to see. Albinger calls for Lutheran principals to be equipped with education in ethics to face the difficult daily decisions of leadership. Because “every decision is laden with moral significance” (2004, p. 9), Lutheran principals need to “remain aligned with the expectations and the teachings of the Lutheran Church of Australia” (p. 11).

Albinger’s thesis investigates leadership facing ethical dilemmas by Lutheran school principals. Lutheran theology has a series of “concept pairings to show the dynamic tension of the Christian life suspended between the creation event and the end time” (2005, p. 33), a dialectic tension between two fields or ‘kingdoms’, spiritual and temporal. Christians journey through life using intellect and God’s grace to choose the ethical path using the theology of the ‘two kingdoms’ as a framework within which choices are made and life is lived.

For a principal, a common dilemma is choosing between the worldly kingdom’s attraction of functioning as a CEO and the spiritual kingdom’s attraction to function as a pastor to the school, taking on two conflicting roles and deciding the right path through grace and training (Bartsch, 2006; Childs, 1992). Working through the tension of the two kingdoms explains the Lutheran theological focus on ethics as a way of making meaning of life within a faith-shaped, decision-making process. A significant challenge facing Lutheran principals as nurturers of faith is that Lutheran schooling has well established schools and also a significant number of recently established schools, involving large school population growth and a decrease in committed Lutheran and Christian students. It also brings challenges to find Lutheran staff (Albinger, 2004; Kleinschmidt, 2002).

Similar to Catholic principals, Lutheran principals have a culture of leadership and guidance within clear parameters from an educational authority. Anglican
principals have stated Diocesan and constitutional expectations, but no central precise statements pertaining to their faith leadership role. This review has demonstrated that Catholic and Lutheran principals know what is expected of them as faith leaders, and that research and supportive documents exist to guide, support and develop their faith leadership role. Possibly, the Anglican Via Media and the Lutheran ‘two kingdoms’ both challenge principals with choices to find the correct path, but the expectation that Lutheran principals are involved in congregational life better equips them for appropriate Lutheran cultural and symbolic school leadership decisions, than for Anglican school principals for whom this expectation is not stated.

2.13 Summary and Implications of Reviewed Literature

The Anglican Via Media’s fluidity of debate and tension necessitates a pathless journey in which Australian Anglican school principals, functioning as cultural and symbolic leaders charged with forming faith in their school communities, need to know the terrain of theology, liturgy and history in order to understand Anglican culture and symbolism in leading others. The literature has shown that Anglican school principals work with less clear role definitions in the area of faith formation than do Catholic and Lutheran principals, who aided as they are with considerable direction from Church authority, are also expected to have theological training. If Anglican school principals are not suitably equipped to create their own path, in keeping with Anglican Via Media practice and culture, and are also left without clear definitions of role as faith formation leaders, then, like the English Church of England principals of Street’s study (2007), they may be unable to distinguish between general social norms and Anglican values. They risk losing their way, experiencing values drift and lack of Anglican identity with consequent impact on their school communities. This literature review supports the need for enquiry into Australian Anglican principals’ understanding the role, their capacity for their role, and Church equipping them for their role as faith formation leaders. The next chapter will present the methodological processes by means of which this study was conducted.
CHAPTER 3:

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explain and justify a research design that addresses how two Anglican school principals lead faith development in their schools. The following three specific research questions focus the conduct of this study:

1. How do Australian Anglican school principals understand their role as faith formation leaders?

2. How do Australian Anglican principals feel capable and equipped to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

3. How does the Anglican Church equip Australian Anglican school principals to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

This chapter presents a qualitative research methodology as being suitable for this study’s exploration of two Anglican school principals’ faith formation leadership roles in their schools. Social constructionism (Crotty, 1998) as the epistemological understanding for exploring the participants' perspectives of their roles is then discussed. The chapter endeavours to demonstrate the appropriateness of a theoretical perspective that incorporates interpretivism’s contextual understanding of everyday behaviour, and pragmatism’s and symbolic interactionism’s alignment with exploring and understanding participant’s perspectives as subjective realities. Congruent with symbolic interactionism’s empathetic relationship of researcher with participants’ world views, is the methodology of phenomenology which enables rich description and depth of understanding of participants’ perspectives. Chapter Three then provides reasons for the purposive sampling of participants and explains the
four data collection methods of survey, interview, documentary analysis and observation. The chapter closes with discussion of verification of data collection and analysis, the ethical conduct of the research, and finally the limitations and delimitations of this research.

The purpose of the study is to explore the role of school principals in faith formation within the educational mission of Anglican schools in the Anglican Church of Australia. In reviewing literature for this study, the researcher has established the following four propositions as significant for shaping questions into the faith formation leadership role of Anglican school principals:

- A core responsibility of an Anglican school is nurturing faith as a process of meaning making by reflective and active engagement of individuals within the community of an Anglican school;

- The school principal plays a key role in leading faith formation of school members, leading with personal authenticity of Christian witness;

- Two dominant dimensions of Anglican school principalship in faith formation are cultural and symbolic leadership, which require the principal to understand Anglican culture and symbolic meaning and to portray them in daily life, and

- The Catholic and Lutheran Churches have provided statements of dimensions of leadership and capabilities for leadership of their schools, which in conjunction with detailed supporting documents, guide school principals in the performance of their duties. There is a lacuna of similar documents for Anglican school principals, who might or might not appreciate such guiding statements.

This study of two principals’ perspectives of their role as leaders of faith formation in Australian Anglican schools is foundational as no previous research studies on this topic in an Australian context exist. The study seeks to examine the participants’ lived experiences in their school settings by discovering meanings they attach to their faith leadership roles and
capabilities. An appropriate research design needs to provide opportunities for entering the world of the participants and exploring their perceptions of their leadership in faith formation as they serve and lead others.

The contextual and perceptual sensitivity of a qualitative study (Creswell, 2005; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Neuman, 2006) suits this research design requirement of an exploratory study, seeking participants’ perspectives from a completely open research stance. Considering these factors, an interpretivist theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism is appropriate. A phenomenological research methodology shapes data gathering and analysis using survey questionnaire, interview, document analysis and observation methods, as represented in Figure 3.1.

**Figure 3.1 The Research Structure**
3.2 Qualitative Research

This section establishes why a qualitative rather than a quantitative research orientation is best suited to this study. Positivist, empirical, quantitative research enables measurement of objective facts, studying many cases to obtain reliable statistical analysis by a detached researcher (Creswell, 2005; Neuman, 2006). By contrast to quantitative studies, the nature of this research study is suited more to a qualitative approach which accepts researcher involvement with a small number of participants, valuing their context in order to interpretively understand themes which emerge in the course of the study by seeing the participants' worlds through their eyes (Bryman, 2001; Denscombe, 2003; Neuman, 2006).

Berg argues that qualitative methods are particularly helpful because, “certain elements of symbolism, meaning, or understanding usually require consideration of the individual’s own perceptions and subjective apprehensions” (2004, p. 11). This is especially suited when addressing a lacuna in the research literature, where existing instruments, theories and measures do not exist, for exploring a phenomenon and identifying and understanding themes that emerge (Creswell, 2005; Frechtling & Sharp, 1997). Seeking to understand two Anglican school principals’ subjective perceptions of their roles and capabilities as faith formation leaders in this exploratory study is well served by qualitative research methods.

3.3 Epistemology and Theoretical Perspective

3.3.1. Social Constructionism

In this section, social constructionism is posited as the appropriate epistemology for exploring meaning-making by participants of their role as faith formation leaders. This study explores two school principals’ subjective perceptions of their roles and capabilities regarding their schools’
contributions to the objectively defined Five Marks of Mission of the Anglican Church, which are:

- The mission of the Church is the Mission of Christ to proclaim the good news of the Kingdom;
- To teach, baptise and nurture new believers;
- To respond to human need by loving service;
- To seek to transform the unjust structures of society; and
- To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth (Aspinall, 2006b, p. 7).

Principals make meaning of Anglican mission by constructing meaning as individual subjective reality. In the constructionist view of knowing, “subject and object emerge as partners in the generation of meaning,” (Crotty, 1998, p. 9), with meaning’s “objectivity and subjectivity being indissolubly bound up with each other. Constructionism teaches us that meaning is always that” (Crotty, 1998, p. 48). More specifically, ‘the ‘social’ in social constructionism is about the mode of meaning generation” (Crotty, 1998, p.55). The individual actively makes meaning of phenomena encountered in the cultural, social context of life by social interactions, rather than meaning being inherently contained in objects. Meaning is not objectively inert, instead it is,

built up during interaction. Meaning is likely to be highly ephemeral, in that it will vary in both time and place. This kind of stance frequently displays a concern with the language that is employed to present categories in particular ways. It suggests that the social world and its categories are not external to us, but are built up and constituted in and through interaction (Bryman, 2001, p. 19).

Our culture teaches us how to construct understanding of what is experienced, thus “the basic generation of meaning is always social, for the meanings with which we are endowed arise in and out of interactive human community” (Crotty, 1998, p.55). This study seeks to discover the principals’
subjective and social constructions of their understanding of their role in leading the mission of the Anglican Church in their schools.

Two frames of reference within which the principals’ leadership is understood, are cultural leadership and symbolic leadership. Crotty notes that culture is the source of “human thought and behaviour; it is a set of control mechanisms – plans, recipes, rules instructions” (1998, p. 53). Citing Geertz (1973), Crotty views thinking as being more than happenings in the head, but also as:

traffic in what have been called by G.H. Mead and others, significant symbols – words for most part, but also gestures, drawings, musical sounds, mechanical devices like clocks or natural objects like jewels – anything, in fact, that is disengaged from its mere actuality and used to impose meaning upon experience (1998, p.53).

Social constructionism’s attention to conveying meaning through symbols and culture, which are also the source of human action (Crotty, 1998), places value on the researcher’s interaction with the reality of the participants’ world, allowing researcher insight into the world of the participants (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006). Social constructionism therefore is the epistemological understanding through which the perceptions of the social actions of the principals in this study will be explored.

3.3.2 Interpretivism

In this Section, interpretivism’s suitability as the philosophical stance providing a context for the methodology employed in this study is explained. An interpretivist theoretical perspective is appropriate for interpreting and understanding participants’ perceptions and actions, located as they are in the social world (O’Donoghue, 2007) of two Anglican schools. Interpretivism is a way of exploring and understanding complexity, ambiguity, and the messiness of social interactions by inductively interpreting data while remaining sensitive to context (Creswell, 2005; Mason, 2002; Neuman, 2006). Crotty argues that positivist researchers’ claims of “certitude and objectivity cannot be sustained
and that the findings of natural science themselves are social constructions and human interpretations” (1998, p.71). Emerging in contrast to positivism’s claimed empirical objectivity, interpretivism is a complexity of assumptions whereby a researcher’s philosophical perspective “looks for culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world” (Crotty, 1998, p.67), eminently suitable for research into the complex social world of school principals. Interpretivism’s perspective assumes that the real world of participants “does not exist independently, but that it can only be known and understood interpretively” (Mason, 2002, p. 179). As a consequence, interpretivist research is concerned with interpretations, understanding and perceptions of people as social actors constructing meaning within their social contexts (Mason, 2002; Neuman, 2006), as, “for the interpretivist, the individual and society are inseparable units” (O’Donoghue, 2007, p.16).

Understanding and describing context in interpretivist studies deepens the understanding of participants’ contextual setting. It also assists the researcher to explore participants’ beliefs and behaviour in their context because, “we cannot understand the behaviour of members of a social group other than in terms of the specific environment in which they operate” (Bryman, 2004, p.281). O’Donoghue emphasises the importance of social settings for interpreting human action. He presents four key assumptions underpinning interpretivist research:

- ‘Everyday activity’ is the fundamental basis of human action. In order to understand education, everyday actions of participants must be studied;
- ‘Freedom’ to choose actions and produce roles is always present to some extent in everyday activity. Within social constraints participants have sufficient autonomy and freedom to create their own activity in their context;
- ‘Interaction’ is a frequently occurring feature of everyday activity. Participants rarely act in isolation; interaction with others gives meaning
to the actions of self and of others. Interpretation of activity is set in the particular social context; and

- ‘Negotiation’ of meaning takes place in everyday activity, modifying participants' views. Shared perceptions and interpretation, through continuous negotiation of meaning by participants lead to shared assumptions about what is happening in their social setting (2007, p.17).

O’Donoghue concludes: “each of these four assumptions of interpretivism … apply specifically in the case of symbolic interactionism” (2007, p.18), reflecting a close theoretical connection between these positions. This also harmonises with this study’s social constructionist emphasis on valuing context as essential for exploring meaning-making as being “contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings” (Crotty, 1998, p. 42). In assuming a social constructivist epistemological stance for understanding two principals' perceptions of themselves as faith formation leaders, this study’s interpretivist perspective is given expression through symbolic interactionism, which is examined in the next section of this chapter.

### 3.3.3 Pragmatism and Symbolic Interactionism

The study’s theoretical perspective is further explored through demonstrating how pragmatism’s and symbolic interactionism’s assumptions provide a context for the study’s methodology. Symbolic interactionism’s genesis stems from the work of George Mead, from whom Blumer (1969, p.2) formulates three basic assumptions of symbolic interactionism:

- that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meaning that these things have for them;

- that the meaning of such things is derived from, and arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one’s fellows; and
• that these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things encountered.

Crotty emphasises that Mead’s and Blumer’s development of symbolic interactionism is informed by pragmatist philosophy, which “remains a significant dimension of symbolic interactionism today” (1998, p. 72).

Pragmatism’s contextual concern for understanding human activity and for making ideas clearer to help improve the functioning of human activity in particular situations (Crotty, 1998; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006), meets the aim of this study. Australian Anglican schools’ lack of both dogmatic theology and tight organisational definition, lend themselves to being studied within a research epistemology which respects pragmatism’s attention to practical realities rather than theoretical underpinning definitions (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). The practical realities of participants’ experiences are the myriad social interactions of participants in their environment, meaning-making being shaped by their ontological interests and values, and not by abstract theory (Bryman, 2001; Crotty, 1998; Greenwood & Levin, 2005).

Coser (1971), cited in Crotty, credits pragmatists with, “having been instrumental in stressing the need for always considering situations from the point of view of the actor” (1998, p. 75). Pragmatism’s valuing of both context and of participant’s subjective meanings match this study’s theoretical perspective, which is aligned with Blumer’s three symbolic interactionist assumptions. O’Donoghue includes these theoretical characteristics in his own three assumptions underpinning symbolic interactionist research, particularly concentrating on discovering participants’ perceptions in their life context:

• A participant’s concrete experience is never abstract. The individual is inextricably inseparable from the society in which life is experienced;
A participant’s life and sense of reality is defined and understood through individual subjective experience as an “ever-emerging relativistic perspective”; and

Understanding of a participant’s perspective as subjective reality is ambiguous.

For O’Donoghue, this leads to research that eschews abstractions, instead embracing “the particular, the detailed and the experiential, thus allowing one to grasp the ambiguities and inevitability of different perspectives” (2007, pp.143-144).

Blumer and O’Donoghue’s assumptions both assert symbolic interactionism’s emphasis on understanding the participant through subjective concrete experience and the indissoluble connectivity of individual with social context. These imperatives are inherent in defining a participant’s perspective. A perspective is a point of view,

an angle on reality, a place where the individual stands as he or she looks at it and tries to understand reality. A perspective is an absolute basic part of everyone’s existence and it acts as a filter through which everything around us is perceived and interpreted (Charon, 2001, p.3).

Through their filtering perspectives, participants find order for their world, create meaning and also limit their view of how they see their world (Crotty, 1998: O’Donoghue, 2007). Not only the making of meaning, but also the basic formation of perceptions, are subjective and embedded in social context. This study seeks to delve beneath the participants’ meaning-making to the perceptions that have shaped them, and it employs symbolic interactionism to do so.

O’Donoghue affirms the suitability of symbolic interactionism for exploring participant’s perceptions:
A researcher adopting a symbolic interactionist theoretical approach when conducting research within the interpretivist paradigm is concerned with revealing the perspectives behind empirical observations, the actions people take in the light of their perspectives and the patterns which develop through the interaction of perspectives and actions (O'Donoghue, 2007, p.20).

Differing situations shape the ensuing perceptions and interactions of participants (Berg, 2004; Charon, 2001). Within these interactions, people make decisions about the meaning they ascribe to experiences, objects and events. Their construction of meaning is not accidental; it is negotiated proactively through a process of interaction of the individual within context, interpreting the symbolic meaning of forces impacting on them, the actions of others and the environment (Berg, 2004; Bryman, 2001; Crotty, 1998). People construct and attach meaning by self interaction between the individual and their developed ‘self’ image as they experience daily life (O'Donoghue, 2007). Assigned meaning then shapes their actions, observed in this study as the faith formation leadership by two Anglican school principals.

Additional to interest in the interactions of participants with the variety of social forces experienced in their life-world, and represented by the symbols of words and other tools, the symbolic interactionist researcher seeks to enter into the place of the participant. Through dialogue, the researcher shares and communicates through language and other symbolic means, “an awareness of the perceptions, feelings and attitudes of others and interprets their meanings and intent. Hence the term symbolic interactionism” (Crotty, 1998, pp.75-76). Symbolic interactionism requires an empathetic relationship of researcher with participant (Bryman, 2001), entering the participant’s world with sufficient understanding to see the participant’s world from the participant’s perspective, exploring the development of interpretation and the construction of meaning (Berg, 2004; Crotty 1998).
The theoretical position of symbolic interactionism is suited to the researcher’s exploration of the study’s two participants’ perceptions of symbols and culture. The researcher seeks understanding of the participants as the principals make choices about their actions and make meaning through self-interaction in their context. Bryman observes that “seeing through the eyes of the people studied in the course of qualitative research is often accompanied by the closely related goal of seeking to probe below surface appearances” (2001, p. 277). This is a useful means of revealing the origins of the principals’ perspectives that shape their faith formation leadership actions.

Accepting Crotty’s assertion that a “central notion of symbolic interactionism is the putting of oneself in the place of the other” (1998, p.75), this study’s intention to reveal and explore participants’ perceptions, suggests a close link to phenomenology, as argued by Bryman:

The empathetic stance of seeking to see through the eyes of one’s research participants is very much in tune with interpretivism and demonstrates well the epistemological links with phenomenology and symbolic interactionism (2001, p.278).

This study employs a strategy of phenomenology which will be discussed next, accompanied by a rationale for the choice of the methods used.

3.4 Phenomenological Research Methodology

Research employing phenomenological methodology must avoid the error of exploring the fictional, non-existent world constructed by the researcher. In order to explore the subjective life world of the participant, researchers need to ‘bracket’ their own views and suspend judgement on their view of the world, instead seeking understanding of how the participant sees the world (Creswell, 1998; Crotty, 1998; Denscombe, 2003; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). Gubrium and Holstein explain this as enabling the researcher to “view the constitutive process, the ‘hows’ by which a separate and distinct empirical world becomes an objective reality for its members” (2008, p.176), exploring
the process of their subjective construction of their world. Subjective encounters of social experience are constructed as meaningful and familiar, using language to express them as ‘essence’, a “commonality of experience” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 365). They are similarly, but not identically understood, as ‘typifications’ which “organise the flux of life into apprehensible form, making it meaningful,” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2008, p. 176). The intersubjectivity of people sharing the same environment allows the researcher to tentatively explore the meaning the participant creates in that world by exploring the process of typification, the construction of the language building blocks of the participants’ social worlds.

Study of the formation of perceptions underpinning participants’ understandings lack positivist empirical measurement or certitude, calling for great care in dealing with opinions, ambiguity and interpretation. The phenomenological researcher is guided in this endeavour of understanding and describing participants’ subjective experiences, by uncritically “putting oneself into the place of the other” (Crotty, 1998, p. 82). This view is supported widely (Bryman, 2001; Denscombe, 2003; Johnson & Christensen 2004; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006), always with the caution that researchers be aware of their own subjective experiences, bracketing them as a first step. Furthermore, “phenomenology focuses on how processes of interpretation are shared and ‘socially constructed’” (Denscombe, 2003, p.100), suiting the epistemological position and theoretical framework of research into principals sharing and leading faith development.

Phenomenological methodology, emphasising “description more than analysis, interpretation more than measurement” and dealing with “perceptions or meanings and attitudes” (Denscombe, 2003, p.96), is appropriate for this study. The researcher seeks understanding of how participants perceive their worlds, with rich description from the participant’s perspective (Bryman, 2001; Creswell, 1998; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005) aimed not at describing “what is happening, so much as how the events get interpreted by those involved” (Denscombe, 2003, p. 101). By these means, the researcher is faithful to an approach that emphasises that the meaning of
reality is, in essence, in the “eyes and minds of the beholders” (Weirsma & Jurs, 2005, p.243), revealing the way participants perceive their experiences.

Coming to participants as ‘stranger’ is an important concept for phenomenological researchers seeking to see reflectively how the participants understand and experience actions (Denscombe, 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 2006). As previously mentioned, bracketing preconceptions, “so as not to inject hypotheses, questions or personal experiences into the study” (Creswell, 1998, p. 33), enables the researcher to bring naivety to the study. This allows vision of “things for what they are, uncluttered by assumptions that form part of everyday thinking about these things” (Denscombe, 2003, p.102), not-withstanding Creswell’s observation that ‘bracketing personal experiences of the researcher may be difficult,” (1998, p. 55). In spite of this difficulty, phenomenological methodology is helpful as it has an emphasis that typically remains on common understandings and the meanings of common practices, so that phenomenological research of this kind emerges as an exploration, via personal experiences, of prevailing cultural understandings (Crotty, 1998, p. 83).

This study explores the perceptions through which two principals construct meaning about their faith formation leadership roles. The researcher’s experience as teacher, school council member, chaplain, parent and past student across a number of Anglican schools provides the empathy through which the world of the principal may be tentatively viewed. Many extensive conversations with beginning principals about the tasks before them augments this capacity for empathy. Conscious awareness by the researcher of the researcher’s personal opinions, coupled with an open stance, facilitates this pragmatic, symbolic interactionist approach to the study conducted within a methodology of phenomenology. The next section of this chapter addresses the selection of participants for the study.
3.5 Participants: purposively sampled for exploratory study

The participants for this study are drawn from principals of Australian Anglican schools. The researcher has avoided selecting principals of schools which his children, wife and self have attended, as well as schools in which he has served in any way. Also avoided will be any principals whom the researcher has ever met, so that “personal interest, increasingly referred to as the researcher’s positionality, will not bias the study” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 30). Whilst seeking empathetic insight into the participants’ worldviews, the challenge of ‘bracketing’ may be simplified by data gathering as a genuine ‘stranger’.

Purposive sampling, the intentional selection of information-rich participants for depth study (Creswell, 1998, 2005; Flick, 1998) is appropriate for exploratory research because of the value of seeking participants who will, in the researcher’s experience, provide the most useful information for the purposes of the study (Creswell, 1998; Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Mason, 2002). This study is well suited to exploratory study, which Babbie observes, is conducted for three main purposes;

- To gain better understanding of an area of study;
- To test the feasibility of conducting a more extensive study; and
- To develop methods for a subsequent study (2007, p. 88).

These general principles of exploratory study are well supported (Bryman, 1988; Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Marshall & Rossman, 2006) and are endorsed by Creswell (2005), who additionally notes the suitability of qualitative methodologies for exploring a phenomenon to identify themes for further research.

For phenomenological methodology, participants “need to be carefully chosen to be individuals who have experienced the phenomenon,” being explored (Creswell, 1998, p. 55). Referring to purposeful sampling, Yin (2006) argues
that the intention for selection is to avoid the possibility whereby after having commenced a study, the selected participants turn out to not be what one wanted to study. Yin also suggests screening by personal knowledge or by peer reference. This researcher is doing both, as the opinions of trusted retired principals are being sought. For small studies such as this one, honing in on participants from whom there are good grounds for believing critical data will be gained, is economical and informative in a way that conventional sampling can never be (Denscombe, 2003; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006). The sampling strategy is to select samples from the extremities incorporating maximal variation in order to provide balance of factors (Denscombe, 2003; Flick, 1998; Yin, 2006) while ensuring that both participants have had sufficient length of service in the schools to capably provide answers. A description of the two participants follows:

**Principal A**: Female, long established single gender school, Anglican religious order founded. School not owned by an Australian Anglican Diocese, but very closely affiliated with the Anglican Church. For this study the principal’s pseudonym is Meg Kempe, the school being referred to as St Julian’s Anglican School.

**Principal B**: Male, recently established school, co-educational, community founded. School owned by an Australian Anglican Diocese. For this study the principal’s pseudonym is Walter Newman, the school being referred to as St Richard’s Anglican School.

### 3.6 Data Collecting Strategies

The data collection strategies useful for this study are presented in this section. As this study is exploratory, one intention of the researcher is to generate ideas, by inductively looking for tentative hypotheses that can lead to subsequent studies (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). Rich description, close to the natural setting is important in exploration (Krathwohl, 2004), leading to the use of four data collection methods to enhance description and validity.
3.6.1. Semi-structured Interview

The main method chosen for this study is a semi-structured interview, which is considered by some to be the most effective qualitative data gathering method, assuming participants are co-operative (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 2006) and articulate (Creswell, 2005; Johnson & Christensen, 2004), which is true in this study. Interviews allow the participants to express their perspectives of their experience in their own words (Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Marshall & Rossman, 2006), again suitable for phenomenological research. In using semi-structured interviews, “it is important to have a protocol that will guide the collection of data in a systematic and focused manner” (Creswell, 1998; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006, p. 124), so that there is some standardization of data collection (Interview Questions are provided in Appendix IV). The conduct of the interviews allows deeper questions to develop from topics of interest that arise in the participants’ experiences and opinions. The interview becomes conversational after the introductory questions, because in qualitative studies, “rambling or going off at tangents is often encouraged, it gives insight into what the interviewee sees as relevant and important” (Bryman, 2001, p.313). Babbie extends the understanding of conversational interviewing, observing that the qualitative interviewer is like a miner digging, or a traveller exploring a new land, adopting the role of the “socially acceptable incompetent” (2007, p.306) drawing fresh comments from the participant.

Symbolic interactionist studies, seeking to grasp participants’ perceptions of the phenomena under investigation and “how participants act in the light of their perspectives” (O’Donoghue, 2007, p. 33), benefit from interview questions that are “purposive conversations” (Ludico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006, p. 121). Such questions have “the potential to engage the participants in conversations across as wide a range of areas as possible” (O’ Donoghue, 2007, pp. 37-38). Conducting interviews in this manner necessitates intense researcher listening, remaining attuned to the participants’ words, actions and body language (Bryman, 2001). In order to assist the capture of nuances and details of the interview, each interview was audio-taped, with the participant’s
consent, and transcribed to facilitate depth of reflection during analysis (Bryman, 2001; Creswell, 1998; Denscombe, 2003). The researcher-interpreted data was discussed in a further interview with the participants to ensure accuracy as they recalled from the time of the interview (Denscombe, 2003).

This is assisted by a phenomenological interview style of ‘researcher naivety’ or ‘stranger’, encouraging the opening up of participant conversation to reflect on meaning and perceptions (Creswell, 1998; Crotty, 1998; Denscombe, 2003). Some benefits of interview method are the depth of information obtainable for the astute listener, the participants’ priorities can be discovered and explored, and there is flexibility not available in written answers. These factors serve the exploratory purpose of discovering participants’ perceptions (Creswell, 1998, 2005; Denscombe, 2003; Neuman, 2006). Additionally, this researcher is practised in listening, note-taking and reporting, and frequently conducts interviews, from which have developed skills for reducing participants’ statements to the common essence of their experience (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).

In addition to gathering data from interviews, other methods used to obtain data for this study, contribute to better results:

This multi-method approach is referred to as *triangulation* and allows researchers to use different combinations. For instance group interviewing has long been used to complement survey research and is now being used to complement participant observation. Human beings are complex, and their lives are ever changing. The more methods we use to study them, the better our chances will be to gain some understanding of how they construct their lives and the stories they tell us about them (Fontana & Frey, 2005, p. 722).

Other methods employed in this study will now be discussed.
3.6.2 Survey Questionnaire, Observation and Documentary Analysis

A survey questionnaire (Appendix V), was mailed to the participants, collected by the researcher prior to the interview and used to supplement the generation of probing questions in the interview. It was intended that engagement in this self-reporting written task would stimulate participants’ focus and reflection on the themes raised as preparation for the interviews. A questionnaire was used because it has been shown that the writing process garners “information about the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, values, perceptions, personality and behavioural intentions of research participants” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 164). Questions in the instrument are not of a detailed nature, as the research is exploratory and seeking preliminary information only (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).

Observation as a data-gathering technique was also employed. The researcher has drawn on a decade of being present in many Anglican schools and observing in an unobtrusive way, and this has been augmented by recent observation. Whilst observation is flawed by its subjectivity, it can offer depth of description of context (Stake, 1995), of importance in symbolic interactionism. As well it can enhance validity when used in conjunction with other data collection methods (Creswell, 2005; Denscombe, 2003; Fontana & Frey, 2005; Yin, 2006).

Documentary analysis of the participants’ speeches and addresses, school year books and school newsletters, the school website, school constitutions and relevant Diocesan archives (Creswell, 1998) provided a fourth source of data collection, to assist the verification of analysis.

3.7 Analysis of Data

This section outlines the research design, demonstrating the sequence of data gathering and analysis processes, an overview of which is presented in figure
3.2 in this section. Data are thematically organised around the three specific research questions relating to:

- The principals’ perceptions of their role in faith formation leadership;
- The principals’ perceptions of their capabilities for faith formation leadership; and
- The principals’ perceptions of whether or not they have been properly equipped by the Australian Anglican Church for their role of faith formation leadership.

The use of logic, discernment and an inductive approach seeks fresh discoveries from this exploratory study, requiring the researcher to be alert for themes emerging from the data (Creswell, 2005; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Yin, 2006). At the commencement of data analysis, the researcher’s self is bracketed (Creswell, 1998), noting significant personal experiences and perceptions that bear on the participants, as “it is always good research practice to acknowledge the impact of the researcher’s own identity and values in the analysis of interview data” (Denscombe, 2003, p.188). In acknowledging the researcher’s self, it is argued that this researcher has a privileged insight into the world of the participants, a lens through which data from the participants can be empathetically understood and interpreted (Denscombe, 2003).

As recommended by Johnson and Christensen (2004), following a careful reading of field notes, interview transcripts and survey responses, lists of significant statements were compiled. Clusters of similar significant statements were then interpreted to elucidate the participants’ meaning. Lists of statements and of meanings were examined to discern issues in the data. The next stage entailed description of the fundamental experience of the participants discerned in the issues, seeking the essence of their experience, and the underpinning perceptions. A report then assists the reader to understand the participants’ experience as faith formation leaders (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). A fundamental stage of data analysis is seeking
frequency of expressions and patterns in the data (Babbie, 2007; Bryman 2001; Denscombe, 2003). Creswell advises when representing data in a phenomenological study, that in each issue data is arranged into “a list of non repetitive, non-overlapping statements,” (1998, p.147). Whilst seeking patterns, the researcher must also remember that because a qualitative approach can convey messiness and ambiguity, “being overly categorical can constitute a sanitization of the argument, and risks missing the point entirely” (Mason, 2002, p.177). Oversimplification fails to do justice to the complexity of the phenomenon being studied (Denscombe, 2003).

Documentary analysis is approached using qualitative content analysis. Bryman notes that this combines hermeneutical attention to the text’s social and historical context in order to exegete meaning from the author’s perspective, with content analysis seeking issues within the text (Bryman, 2001). Hermeneutical discernment of meaning and perspective from the context is aligned with the interpretive, symbolic interactionist framework of this study, especially when analysing text written by the participants.
3.8 Verification

In this section, the validity and trustworthiness of outcomes are discussed. Triangulation of measure (Denscombe, 2003; Johnson & Christensen, 2004;
Neuman, 2006) occurs in this study by measuring principals’ perceptions using four different methods of data gathering. At stages Seven and Ten in Figure 3.2, the participants’ views were solicited, ensuring that their meanings were accurately presented by the researcher to verify credibility of findings (Babbie, 2007; Denscombe, 2003; Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Mason, 2002). While reliability is a greater concern for quantitative research (Creswell, 2005; Neuman, 2006), care is taken in this study to accurately present all aspects of the process, from asking questions, through the description of context and methods, and the audio-tape recording of interviews.

Researcher interpretation seeks verification from others, study supervisors and readers, to provide reader verification of patterns and conclusions (Creswell, 1998; Denscombe, 2003). Additionally, while acknowledging that interviews involve social interaction between participants and researcher, the use of a semi-structured interview protocol seeks to minimise bias and assist validity (Mason, 2002). Qualitative studies, by the researcher being present in the field, have validity from detailed observation that quantitative studies do not offer, however the reliability of these observations is very subjective, requiring consciousness of the researcher’s self (Babbie, 2007). The sense of validity offered by phenomenological methodology can be found in the authenticity of the subjective experience of the researcher (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) in the field with the participant, interpretively engaged in their perspectives (Creswell, 1998) of their constructed world.

3.9 Ethical Issues and Informed Consent

The participants need to trust the researcher, especially as the data collection seeks an open and honest relating of perceptions in both the questionnaire and the interview. A tension exists in the qualitative process between the researcher’s subjective interest and previous involvement in schools, and the value of understanding the participants’ contexts and roles. It was important that the researcher in no way appeared to be an official representative of the
Anglican Church. Participants were invited to choose their place of interview, so as to be as comfortable as possible, each choosing their office, which also proved valuable as a site for observation by the researcher.

The researcher informed the participants of the care being taken to preserve their anonymity. Participants and their schools received pseudonyms for use in the report and any subsequent documents, so that neither their names nor demographic details of their schools could be identified. Informed consent in writing from participants and the relevant Anglican Schools Office was obtained agreeing to participation in the study. The purpose of the research and the requirements asked of participants was fully explained in writing. All procedures required by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Australian Catholic University were met, ensuring that ethical standards were applied in the data-collection, use and storage.

3.10 Limitations and Delimitations

This study is limited by the risk of social desirability bias, in which a socially acceptable answer may be given to a question (Neuman, 2006). It is also possible that the corollary of this may be the case, that is, that a particularly negative answer may be given, in order ‘to send a message’ to the Anglican Church. Single researcher studies are prone to bias (Denscombe, 2003), but some standardization of questions and attention to details of interview structure and technique contribute to minimising bias.

As previously reported, the study is conducted within the boundaries of the Australian Anglican Church, involving choice from one hundred and fifty-three possible school sites, resulting in awareness by the two participant principals that they are, to an extent vulnerable. Neither questions nor reporting identify the participants or their schools’ identities. This seeks to overcome Merriam’s concern that questions which threaten participants’ personal or workplace wellbeing are unethical (Merriam, 1998). It would be unfortunate if a study
seeking to offer benefit to the Anglican Church, its schools and the mission of the Church caused fragmentation or harm.

Due to this being a small study addressing an area in which there is a lacuna in the literature, the themes of enquiry in the survey and interview instruments were narrowly focused on the perceptions of their leadership practices by the two participating principals. For this reason questions about others who play roles in faith formation leadership, such as Diocesan bishops and Education Commissions, Chairs of school councils and council members, school chaplains, members of school staff and Religious education teachers and others, were not included.

As an exploratory design, the study is not testing hypotheses, therefore little can be concluded with objective force behind it. It is a small qualitative study, offering no generalizability of results (Babbie, 2007; Denscombe, 2003; Johnson & Christensen, 2004), as the two participants chosen are unable to be representative (Bell, 2005) of the other schools, which are a diverse group within a bounded system. The study is limited to seeking themes for further exploration in later studies, and making some limited recommendations.

3.11 Design of the Study Summation

This chapter has presented the study’s qualitative nature, detailing the reasoning behind its epistemological understanding within social constructionism. Interpretively, symbolic interactionism is employed to explore the participants’ perspectives, assuming a methodology of phenomenology. From the two participants and their contexts, data is gathered using four methods; survey questionnaire, audio-taped interview, document analysis and observation. An explanation of inductive thematic data analysis is provided, concluding with a presentation of ethical considerations and the limitations and delimitations of this study. The following chapter presents the data from the study.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the data from the study. The data has been gathered from each participant in a written survey, a transcribed audio-taped interview, analysis of selected documents written by the participants, and researcher observation. It is organised and presented according to eight issues that emerged from the data. The next section describes the organising issues for presentation of the data and their relationship to the research questions.

4.2 Organising Issues in the Data: description and rationale

As stated in Chapter Three, data collection was organised around three research questions which emerged from Aspinall’s (2008) seminal question, congruent with the literature and which determined the instruments used for the data gathering process. The semi-structured interview instrument (Appendix IV) provided a means of data collection, from which have emerged eight issues. The alignment of research questions and the eight issues is presented in Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1
Research questions and organising issues for presenting the data.

**Research Question One:**
How do Australian Anglican school principals understand their role as faith formation leaders?

- **Issue A:** Responsibility for faith formation leadership in Anglican schools: solely the principal or shared with others?
- **Issue B:** Faith formation leadership as a lived, core quality of Anglican school life.

**Research Question Two:**
How do Australian Anglican principals feel capable and equipped to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

- **Issue C:** Faith formation leadership and Anglican Church culture.
- **Issue D:** Faith formation leadership and living the Anglican Christian tradition.
- **Issue E:** Anglican Church leadership capability expectations in relation to principals’ faith formation roles.

**Research Question Three:**
How does the Anglican Church equip Australian Anglican school principals to be faith formation leaders in their schools?

- **Issue F:** Mentorship of Anglican school principals in faith formation roles.
- **Issue G:** Specific Anglican Church formation of Anglican school principals for faith formation leadership of schools.
- **Issue H:** Anglican school principals’ faith formation through personal spirituality and life experience.
In this Section each organising issue is briefly described. As well, a rationale is presented clarifying their use for organising data into manageable segments for analysis (Creswell, 1998; Johnson & Christensen, 2004), in Chapter Five. Each issue’s alignment with one of the research questions is set out below:

**Research Question One** explores the principals’ perceptions of their role in faith formation leadership, generating the following two issues:

**Issue A: Responsibility for faith formation leadership in Anglican schools: solely the principal or shared with others?**

Educational leadership scholarship refers to shared and collaborative leadership styles. The principal sustains and enables others to take part in a journey of school growth. This issue is evident in the participants’ comments about their faith formation leadership experiences in their schools.

**Issue B: Faith formation leadership as a lived, core quality of Anglican school life.**

The role of faith formation leadership emerges as an issue in this study. The literature reviewed reveals the importance for principals of Church-sponsored schools to publicly express the cultural and symbolic life of their Christian faith. Participants frequently reflect on their contribution to faith formation leadership in their schools.

**Research Question Two** explores the principals’ perceptions of their capabilities for faith formation leadership, from which emerged the following three issues:

**Issue C: Faith formation leadership and Anglican Church culture.**

The third issue emerging in this study identifies the principals’ awareness of the cultural and symbolic life of their school. This awareness enables the principal to work cooperatively with the school community especially for faith
development. The participants’ perceptions of their awareness of Anglican culture are explored in the data.

**Issue D: Faith formation leadership and living the Anglican Christian tradition.**

Cultural and symbolic leadership of Anglican schools require principals to be more than intellectually aware and supportive of their school’s Anglican culture. Issue D is guided by literature arguing that principals are called to demonstrate their school’s culture’s importance in their own lives and to facilitate meaning-making as faith formation within the particular cultural and symbolic context of their Anglican school. This expression of faith formation leadership is one of the guiding propositions of this study. Both participants indicated that this is significant in their understanding of their faith formation leadership roles in their schools.

**Issue E: Anglican Church leadership capability expectations in relation to principals’ faith formation roles**

There is no detailed Anglican statement of leadership dimensions and capabilities providing direction and meaning for principals as cultural and symbolic faith formation leaders of their schools. Issue E explores the participants’ perceptions of the value of such a statement being formulated by the Anglican Church for principals’ direction as faith formation leaders in their schools.

**Research Question Three** explores the principals’ perceptions of how they have been equipped by the Australian Anglican Church for their role of faith formation leadership, from which emerged the following three issues. Whereas Issues A – E explored the participants’ faith formation leadership roles, Issues F – H explored the participants’ perceptions of the extent to which they are equipped for their roles. Each of the following issues focuses on one aspect of the participants’ sense of feeling equipped for faith formation leadership roles.
Issue F: Mentorship of Anglican school principals in faith formation roles.

The participants in this study identify the issue of mentoring as a developmental tool for school principals.

Issue G: Specific Anglican Church formation of Anglican school principals for faith formation leadership of schools.

The literature review suggests a contrast between the Catholic and Lutheran Churches’ established practice of providing guiding statements for principals’ faith formation leadership and facilitating research into school leadership, and the absence of the same in Anglican education. The literature indicates that this might reflect the ecclesial difference between the systematic theology and more centralist ecclesial structures of the Catholic and Lutheran Churches vis-a-vis the Anglican Via Media’s diversity. The participants’ interview responses in this area indicate the importance of this issue to them within the context of the study.

Issue H: Anglican school principals’ faith formation through personal spirituality and life experience.

The life worlds of both participants are rich in interactions with people who have contributed to their growth as Anglicans. Participants’ life experience stories contribute to understanding their development as persons equipped to lead Anglican schools. The participants’ personal interactions in significant faith formation relationships are amalgamated into the term ‘Spirituality.’

4.3 Displaying the Data

This section provides details of data presentation using codes with explanations of their use throughout Chapter Four. Where text segments apply to more than one issue, the researcher’s subjective
judgement has been used to assign data to the appropriate issue. In order to eliminate repetitive text and for clarity of presentation, the following codes are displayed in Figure 4.2

**Figure 4.2**

**Codes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Participant pseudonym</th>
<th>MK = Meg Kempe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WN = Walter Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.I.A –H</td>
<td>Organising Issues</td>
<td>As presented in Chapter 4 section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. + initials</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>e.g. S.MK Survey from Meg Kempe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bracketed initials and numbers throughout this chapter refer to the participant pseudonym and their interview transcript page number from which the statement was taken.

E.g. (MK12) refers to page twelve of the transcript of Meg Kempe’s interview.

4.4 The Participants and their Schools

A brief biography of each participant follows, situating them in their school context. Any descriptions and references that might identify principals or schools have been altered, so that school publications, websites, newsletters and speeches have been adjusted by the use of pseudonyms.

**Meg Kempe** is 50 years old and completed her primary and secondary education in south-east Queensland. Meg is from an Anglican family and is raising teenage children. She holds Bachelors degrees in Arts and Education, as well as two Masters degrees. Meg is active on various education committees outside her school and her teaching career has been in Anglican schools in one Australian Diocese where she feels ‘at home’. One of Meg’s previous schools is frequently mentioned, for which the pseudonym St
Bridgets is used. Meg is well accepted as principal in her present school, known by the pseudonym of St Julian’s Anglican Girls School, which is an urban, single gender, girls’ Anglican school with distinctive school culture and traditions.

**Walter Newman** is 48 years old. He had his primary education in Sydney and Brisbane, and his secondary education was completed in south-east Queensland. Walter has undertaken Diploma, Bachelor and Master’s degree studies and been involved in national conference leadership. He has published in various journals. By personal preference, all of Walter’s teaching appointments have been in Anglican schools in various Australian Anglican dioceses. Walter and his wife are members of their local Anglican parish. He is settled in his present school, known by the pseudonym of St Richard’s Anglican School, an Anglican school less than two decades old, co-educational and located on an urban fringe. Walter frequently mentions two Anglican school principals with the pseudonyms Frank and Tom, the latter an Anglican priest, both of whom Walter regards as mentors. Walter was a junior teacher in Frank’s school and Dean of Students, then deputy principal in Tom’s school.

The chapter now proceeds to present the data for this study, organised according to the eight Issues A – H.

**4.5 Issue A: Responsibility for faith formation in Anglican schools: solely the principal or shared?**

Data for this issue is displayed in two phases. Phase One presents data pertaining to the participant as the sole responsible figure for faith formation leadership. The second phase contains data which demonstrates the shared nature of the participants’ faith formation leadership roles.
4.5.1 Phase One: The principal having sole responsibility for faith formation leadership

Both participants volunteered that the Christian faith holds the central point of meaning in their schools’ cultural life and that they are responsible for espousing and maintaining this. Walter describes faith formation at St Richard’s as being, “not one of the veggies on the plate. It is the plate and then everything else sits under that. … It can’t just sit alongside of everything else; it’s got to be the big thing” (WN4). Similarly Meg explains that at St Julian’s a variety of symbolic religious expressions take precedence in the school’s cultural life, offering as examples, whole school Eucharists, religious festivals, Chapel attendance and regular pauses for community prayer. Meg’s understanding of her leadership role is that she “has to be seen by the students and the staff to be leading and respecting the faith traditions at St Julian’s” (MK7).

Meg and Walter indicate that they indisputably hold prime responsibility for faith formation leadership in their schools. Meg frequently robes in her alb at school Eucharists, serving the chaplain as a licensed liturgical assistant, demonstrating by her actions that she values St Julian’s Anglican culture. She asserts, “I clearly see myself as the ultimate spiritual leader of the school. … That’s absolutely vital” (MK7-8). Meg sees her liturgical ministry as her practical answer to staff and parents who question the use of school time for worship and prayer. She demonstrates as principal at St Julian’s that servant leadership is a visible symbol of her commitment to faith formation in her school. Servant leadership is particularly understood in this liturgical aspect of school life to be, “visibly seen there by parents, students and staff alike as supporting the chaplain. That’s leading the faith of the school” (MK8).

Walter also expresses his acceptance of prime responsibility for the faith formation aspect of St Richard’s school life, stating, “unless you really announce these things from the top as the leader, they’re just not going to be seen as important” (WN21). Walter recounted an anecdote about swapping the Wednesday and Thursday timetables to allow the Ash Wednesday rites to
be celebrated as a whole school liturgy on the correct day. He related the many complaints that the Deputy Principal and he received from staff about the disruption to the timetable. Walter expressed amazement that the same members of staff regularly expect timetable adjustments for sports and excursions. Walter saw this as an opportunity to show his commitment to Anglican faith culture, by confronting complainants in the following manner, “I just kept saying ‘What is the third word in the name of the school? Remember that! That comes first’” (WN5). In practical fashion, both participants conveyed that they hold and practise sole responsibility for faith formation leadership of their schools.

4.5.2 Phase Two: The principal sharing responsibility for faith formation leadership.

Two categories of shared faith formation leadership emerged from the data. A general category is evident as a shared responsibility with the whole school staff. In her annual Awards Night speech, Meg addresses the school community saying that in order to assist students at St Julian’s make informed decisions about faith, the school staff provide, “good solid role models and values from which (our girls) make informed decisions” (Kempe, 2006, p.5). Walter similarly observes, “All staff share responsibility for advancing the Christian mission of the College through their words and deeds” (Newman, 2007, p.1).

The participants also express responsibility for supporting those with whom the role is shared. Meg notes that faith formation is “assisting students, staff and members of the broader community to understand God and then to prepare a place for Him in their hearts and minds” (S.MK). In similar supportive vein Walter said, “You have to be seen to be offering and providing support to everyone who wants to express their faith and bring the faith of the school alive, and it can’t just be lip service”(WN5).
A second, more specific category of shared leadership emerges between participants and their chaplains. A week before Walter’s interview for this study his chaplain had resigned and returned to parish ministry. Meg however having a well-established relationship with her chaplain, includes St Julian’s chaplain in the school’s leadership team, so that the chaplain’s role is seen as significant by the school, “having the chaplain on the leadership team, I have the opportunity as the principal of saying this is a very important part of our life” (MK8). Walter echoes this philosophy of supporting the chaplain in shared leadership as he reflects on a principal and chaplain relationship which he observed in his early years of teaching:

Sometimes in schools, chaplains can be on their own if they don’t have the tangible backing of the administration. Oh! People say they back them, but how much do they actually back them? I saw Tom, not only model the right thing himself, but he actually gave tangible support to the others in the school who needed that to be able to advance the mission of the school (WN3-4).

Both participants communicate a shared faith formation leadership with their whole school staff, and a more specific relationship with their chaplains, evident in the data.

4.6 Issue B: Faith formation leadership is a lived, core quality of Anglican school life.

In this section, data is arranged in two biographical sequences. The data indicates each participant’s sense of being formed as faith formation leaders and then presents participants’ faith formation leadership as a lived core quality of life.

4.6.1 Meg: A personal story of faith exemplars.

Meg’s data conveys an interest in leadership that has developed since her childhood, noting parental support, influence and encouragement, “through
my life’s journey, I’ve had opportunities to take on leadership and I’ve liked leadership, helping others, supporting others, organizing things” (MK6). When choosing teaching as a career, Meg remembers, “I was very keen to move down the pathway, as it turned out, to become a leader” (MK6). Reflecting on her formative teaching years, Meg recalled having the desire and predisposition to lead, and being enabled for leadership by possessing the right skills and qualities and having God’s blessings. Serendipity emerged as a sense of Godly circumstance that saw Meg teach in three Anglican schools where she was encouraged to develop as a leader by three principals, “who contributed and fed my desire to be a leader and supported me to learn more and take on the role” (MK6).

In response to the question, “How do you think that further diocesan assistance could be given to you for exercising your faith formation leadership role?”, Meg recounted some of her formative experience offered by the Anglican Church. She reported that following her appointment as principal of St Julian’s, she joined with some other newly appointed Anglican principals and, “we did a bit of a travelling workshop” (MK6). This entailed visiting experienced Anglican school principals, “to talk about various issues that we’d identified; it wasn’t so much faith, it was the important things that we really needed to know about in staff management, industrial relations, and those sorts of things” (MK12). For the group of new principals it provided, a sense of collegiality because we shared ideas and thoughts. I guess I’m saying that whilst that process was about the tin-tacks of being a principal rather than faith, it actually provided a faith-based collegial network, and I think that sort of thing is incredibly valuable (MK12).

Meg, reflecting on faith formation leadership as a lived, core quality of life, expressed her intention of being seen by the entire school community as consistently living with integrity, honesty, and “being a good symbol of Anglican Christian leadership” (MK17). Declaring her commitment to having Anglican values inform her leadership, Meg ensures that parents of prospective students understand that these values are important to her and
that they pervade the school’s community life, commenting, “It’s integral to what we do here. We want to make sure that parents know that, because if they don’t want that, they should go somewhere else, because it’s compulsory here” (MK18). Responding to the question, “How would people in your school perceive your faith formation leadership?”, Meg states, “It’s your values, your way of operating, working with people that is reflective of Christ’s leadership, servant leadership, that’s what I would hope others would say about my leadership” (MK17).

In public forums, Meg expresses her core commitment to faith formation in her school, using an Awards Night address to encourage St Julian’s community members, “to strive to fulfill their inherent potential as children of God,” and to “develop and nurture healthy relationships with God, oneself, others and the world we live in” (Kempe, 2006, p.4). Similarly, Meg writes, “This edition of the Magazine highlights what sits at the heart of our school, and always has, service to others, to prepare a place for God in our own hearts and minds and in the world in which we live” (Kempe, 2008, p.2).

4.6.2 Walter: A personal story of faith exemplars

Walter’s narrative of his development as a faith formation leader reveals the influence of two principals, Frank and Tom who both inspired him by being, “very committed Anglican Christians, prepared to model … Anglican ethos in the Anglican tradition of the school, and to actually live their faith in the school...It’s certainly rubbed off on me” (WN2). The formative guidance Walter gained from Tom and Frank is also evident in Issues F & H.

Walter’s data relating to his authentic faith formation leadership of St Richard’s, displays his intention of living with core Christian values, able to bear scrutiny by the school community. Walter declares a desire to earn the respect of the staff, students and parents in his daily running of the school, because this respect will be extended to his faith leadership: “people are more likely to accept and respect what I regard as the number one thing and that’s
what I’m working on, the Christian faith” (WN5). The consequence for Walter of earning the respect of the school community is contained in, “I need to be using my credibility to say to people, ‘Hey, God is real. This is something that we all need to be a part of … . Come with me and explore with me’” (WN11). Walter notes that his personal expression of faith can “communicate with people such that they are encouraged to follow me … (but) if I turn them off in some way, then they won’t even follow, then I’ve got no chance” (WN10).

Walter is involved in, or attends, all services of worship at St Richard’s. He states this intention to ensure that the school sees him leading by example, because if he does not do this, “the lead is not there; the captain’s not on the bridge. It sends a message that you’re not interested. … The human side is me going to all the possible expressions of faith” (WN21-22). The question, “How would people in your school perceive your faith formation leadership?” reveals Walter’s view of St Richard’s impression of the authenticity of his faith formation leadership:

Any staff member would tell you that I have a strong faith commitment and that I’m prepared to talk about it, write about it, hopefully they’d say that I live it. …. I occasionally would speak at chapel … and offer some words of encouragement during the service to the kids and to the staff. I think people would say that I do live what I say (WN11-12).

An example of Walter’s willingness to publicly express his core beliefs is found in:

I encourage everyone in the College Community to take the time to attend some of the services being offered at St Simon’s (parish) in (town), over Easter. Fr Ted is an excellent preacher and a great supporter of our College. Easter service details are on the school website (Newman, 2008, p.2).
4.7 Issue C: Faith formation leadership and Anglican Church culture

The issue organising data presentation in this section is the participants’ awareness of the Anglican cultural context’s relationship to their faith formation leadership. Interview questions explored whether Meg and Walter have a preference for leading a school which is Anglican, and in what ways their past has equipped them for their present faith formation leadership roles. Both participants refer to an awareness of Anglican culture as an aspect of their personal development. Walter observes, “at least coming in here as an Anglican with a faith commitment, I have some credibility” (WN7). Both participants refer to their background in Anglican schools as nurturing their awareness, illustrated by, “it became clear that my core strengths are in Anglican schools and my experience is there too” (MK5). Personal spirituality experiences reported in Issue H also display the participants’ awareness of Anglicanism. Additionally, Walter speaking of leadership and awareness of Anglican culture says, “If I espouse that the Anglican ethos of the school is paramount, then I think that carries a lot of weight” (WN10). Observations about Walter’s awareness of Anglicanism are exemplified by, “It is very informal and it’s hard to put your finger on what it is. Anglicans are very accepting of many things and that translates through into your school” (WN7). Meg addressing the same issue, states, “I think I’m very clear on the (religious foundations) guiding this school” (MK13).

Personal experience, Anglican awareness and leadership are expressed in Walter’s following comment, “it’s easier to live your faith and to make headway in that way in an Anglican school. I wouldn’t have gone into a non-Anglican Christian school. I would have found that a little more difficult” (WN6-7). Walter states that his Anglican faith development and personal experience has shaped his awareness of,

the mission or the ethos of an Anglican school. Therefore, in preparing for leadership of an Anglican school, I believe that I understand what the bigger picture should be because I try to live it myself (WN7).
Meg also indicates awareness of Anglican culture in the life of St Julian’s mentioning a variety of symbolic and traditional expressions, “the ringing of the (chapel) bell, the central location of the chapel, the prayers to commence our meetings, the Lenten box on my table there when we have meetings” (MK15).

Both participants express views about practical implications of awareness of Anglicanism for their faith formation leadership, such as the integration of Anglican values into daily school life. Meg states that at the broad level of school life, “Anglican culture shapes how we treat each other. It’s about using teachings and wisdoms from the Bible in day to day life when we’re talking to students and we’re talking to staff” (MK15). Similarly, Walter notes that values at St Richard’s seek to be overtly Anglican:

Religious Education classes and the chapel services need to be about more than honesty or trust. There’s got to be a deliberate focus, have God and Christianity as the centre of it, and then you use these other things as examples. You don’t use the examples and then have God as the add-on. That’s the difference (WN17-18).

Walter, in commenting about awareness of Anglicanism’s impact on his leadership proposes that, “it is integral to the Church that I actually lead properly. I don’t want to be running an Anglican school that’s heading off in a direction that’s different from all the others….. It needs to be all connected” (WN17).

4.8 Issue D: Faith formation leadership and living the Anglican Christian tradition

In this section the data demonstrates the participants making meaning of their Anglican cultural engagement with their schools. Both participants were asked whether they felt comfortable in their role of faith formation leadership. This was the sole use by the researcher of the term ‘comfortable’.
Participants had used the term ‘comfort’ in their responses in the context of feelings about Anglican culture prior to its introduction by the researcher.

The participants report that as beginning teachers, personal religious experience provided a setting in which a sense of comfort developed with Anglican schools. Meg explained that ‘serendipity’ led her to an Anglican school for her first teaching appointment, and having a very good experience, “I applied for another Anglican school position. I just made my life in Anglican schools, so it was a natural fit” (MK2), and,

it wasn’t as if I was in a religious culture that was uncomfortable. It was like being at home. Also as you move down the pathway, you realize that this is where you’re making your career and it would be sensible for me to stay in the Anglican school suite (MK2).

Walter reports that he would not have felt comfortable in a Christian school other than Anglican, “in terms of a Christian school, it was going to be an Anglican school or a non-denominational school where I could have espoused the faith and made some headway in that regard” (WN6). Walter’s opening interview comment expresses a conscious career decision based on comfort with Anglican schools:

All my schools have been Anglican schools, and I guess that’s been deliberate because there is a way of doing things that I feel comfortable with. … I look at the four schools I’ve taught at and I feel some degree of comfort that as an Anglican, I have given those years of service in an Anglican school (WN1).

Meg similarly indicates a conscious choice for her professional life to be in Anglican schools rather than in other denominational Church schools:

I think there was definitely an intention of being in, and remaining in, an Anglican school. I am at home with the traditions of the church and I feel very comfortable within a very formal, traditional institution such as St Julian’s……. I’m not sure I would feel as comfortable in a Uniting Church
school for example. And that’s OK, but this is where I’ve chosen to make my career path (MK4-5).

The researcher interviewed both participants in their school studies, entering the school through the main office foyer. Both foyers contain clearly displayed religious symbols, one of which dominated the entire entry. Participants’ studies contained such items as stained glass crosses which had sunlight shining through them, religious artworks in paint and Christian sculptures. Meg’s and Walter’s personal school environments reflected comfort with public display of religious symbols. Dialogue exploring their comfort with symbolic expression of Anglican culture in their schools revealed:

As a symbol of commitment to faith formation in the school, I created a new position: Head of Religious and Values Education, (RAVE). Swapping the timetable for Ash Wednesday is another. Another one is having chapel early in the day in the timetable as a symbol of its importance, and we want the kids to be switched on when they go to it. … So I think there were a lot of symbols that are demonstrations to people that faith is important and we value it, and I value it as the leader because I see it as an important part of the school (WN18-19).

Meg indicated that at St Julian’s she is comfortable with Anglican faith traditions and that she leads

in a manner that demonstrates and upholds Anglican traditions. I feel very comfortable that I have an excellent chaplain who is a great adviser on the particulars if it is such that I don’t have the language that someone who is a priest and a leader in that particular area has. I feel very comfortable (MK9-10).

In response to being questioned about their comfort with faith formation leadership of Anglican schools, both participants answered forthrightly, “Yes, it’s part of the job. Why would you head up an Anglican school if you weren’t comfortable doing it? (MK9) and, “I’m very comfortable really with what I’m
doing. I don’t feel awkward or anything like that” (WN12). Meg and Walter provide data indicating the challenges they face to manage tension in order to sustain and further their school’s Anglican culture. Already mentioned is Walter’s narrative of adjusting the time-table to accommodate Ash Wednesday liturgies, which is amplified by the following comment about what would happen at St Richard’s if Walter implemented a Sunday evening family service, “It’d be World War III if I suggested we have a family service on a Sunday evening” (WN20). Meg also expresses an assertive stand for St Julian’s Anglican culture, saying, “through our publications we badge ourselves so people know that we’re a distinctive Anglican school and we are informed by our values and heritage, and that informs what we do and how we conduct ourselves” (MK16-17).

4.9 Issue E: Anglican Church leadership capability expectations in relation to principals’ faith formation roles

Issue E reflects enquiry into participants’ current capability for their faith formation leadership role and whether these capabilities might be developed. The data gathered also connects with Themes F, G and H which emanate from Research Question Three. This section opens with the participant’s written data about desirable capabilities for their leadership roles in Anglican faith schools.

Responses to the question asking Meg and Walter about desirable personal qualities for leading an Anglican faith school were, “humility, concern for others and a desire for high standards” (S.MK), and the need to, “live by Gospel values in word and deed, both professionally and personally” (S.WN). Comments offered about necessary training for Anglican faith school leadership were, “be an excellent teacher, know and understand HR, IR and finance as well as governance, and have a Masters degree in Leadership” (S.MK), and “clear articulation of our faith journey, the possibility of peer mentoring nationally, and a need to better articulate what the Church wants from Anglican schools” (S.WN). A question concerning the sense of mission required for leadership of an Anglican faith school was answered by Meg who
wrote of the need to be “committed to leading an Anglican school” (S.MK). Walter wrote of the need for a “strong faith commitment articulation to stakeholders and a mission to nurture, knowing that most do not believe” (S.WN).

A question asking the extent to which participants felt equipped for their faith formation leadership role has Meg stating that she felt comfortable in her role, and with the “faith traditions of our church. I feel very comfortable that I lead in a manner that demonstrates and upholds those. I feel very comfortable that I have an excellent chaplain who is a great adviser” (MK9-10). Responding to a question about whether she felt a need for being further equipped for her faith formation leadership role, Meg indicated that in her experience, parents contact St Julian’s chaplain when enquiring about the Christian faith:

We know so few students in our schools are actually card carrying Anglicans. This is the church for them and this is their experience of the church, as is also evidenced by the number of times the chaplain is called upon to do weddings, funerals, Baptisms and so on (MK14).

Walter’s response to the same question conveys a reliance on personal faith experience with the comment that, “I don’t feel as equipped as I might like to be” (WN13). After some reflection, he adds,

I would not feel equipped for that, not at all. I’m equipped as a lay person with a strong faith commitment to talk about my faith journey to encourage others to embark upon their faith journey, but … I have had no formal training in faith at all. … I don’t have anything formal from the whole organization that I represent, which is the Anglican Church in Australia. It’s simply me living out and talking about my faith (WN13-14).

When asked about the importance of being equipped for the role of faith formation leader of their schools within the mission of the Anglican Church, both participants pondered before replying. Walter reported encountering expectations that schools will contribute to growing Anglican parish congregations, often hearing the comment, “We’re not getting increased
congregations on Sundays! What’s going wrong in the schools? I think, what do you want us to do here?” (WN13). Walter expresses concern that this expectation is unreasonable, noting his perception of his readiness to lead in this area:

We have a wonderful opportunity here to nurture Christian formation in young people, but there needs to be a connection between what we do here and what they get outside in the church, and that’s too big a jump (WN13).

Meg expresses a sense of her preparedness for leading St Julian’s Anglican mission, adding,

I’m not aware of any directions or over-arching instructions about how to be a faith leader in an Anglican school, aside from the Marks of Anglicanism ….. or the information that (a bishop) has put out for all of our schools and parishes, so I’m aware of all that literature and over-arching stuff there….The statements for Anglican schools provides that broad motherhood sort of stuff (MK13).

4.10 Issue F: Mentorship of Anglican school principals in faith formation roles

This issue expresses the participants’ experiences of being formally or informally mentored in their professional development. Meg described various relationships with Anglican Church leaders which provided her with strength and direction, reflectively noting, “I think maybe talking this through (pause) what this assistance has done, it’s provided me a personal touch” (MK10). Similarly, Walter, remembering his early days as a teacher, noted that the personal examples of Frank and Tom, “gave me the courage to move upwards, not only in the technical side of the job, but that you could actually lead a faith community” (WN4).
Meg states that the mentoring she has received has been important to her, because,

I think all people, perhaps particularly women, need relationships and encouragement to go forward and it certainly works for my personality style. … I certainly felt very well mentored and supported by (two previous principals) and learning about school culture and different ways of leading people (MK4).

In addition, Meg indicated that she felt very fortunate to have gained experiences from teachers, other leaders and,

you learn the things that you would like to emulate that feel comfortable with you and the things that you don’t want to do. I had some interesting experiences when I was first at St Bridgets and then I went on to (another Anglican school). … It was the leadership style that they had that really felt very comfortable for me and when I came here to St Julian’s and was deputy to Emma, then again, very, very good mentoring from a very able female leader (MK2-3).

Commenting on his experience of being mentored, Walter stated that he had not had a formal mentoring relationship with a colleague, adding

As a formal mentoring system, I know of no such thing in the Anglican schools. … I have a couple of good friends who are Anglican principals and also friends who are not Anglican principals who are principals of other schools, and there’s the informal mentoring that happens. But there is no formal structure (WN16).

4.11 Issue G: Specific Anglican Church formation of Anglican school principals for faith formation leadership of schools

The presentation of data in this section is divided into two sub-sections, the first of which presents participants’ views of how the Anglican Church has equipped them for their faith formation leadership role. The second sub-
section expresses the participants’ views about whether further equipping for their leadership role is needed.

4.11.1 Participants’ perceptions of their existing faith formation experiences provided by the Anglican Church

Here are presented responses to the question, “In what way do you believe that the Anglican Church in Australia has contributed to your development as a principal in an Anglican school as part of the mission of the Anglican Church?” An annual retreat for principals of diocesan schools was mentioned by Walter, providing, “an opportunity for spiritual nourishment and it’s also an opportunity for Heads to get together and have a chat and catch up” (WN8). Walter indicated that this serves a valuable purpose, but “it’s not training you for the position” (WN8). After reflecting on this question, Walter recounted experiences from the four Anglican dioceses in which he has taught in Anglican schools. He said that in his teaching positions, he has worshipped in the local parish near each school, and has had involvement, “as a boarding house master in the boarding chapel services; but, in four dioceses, not any formal training, no” (WN9-10).

Elaborating on this answer, Walter added,

It may be just peculiar to me and maybe I’ve missed something along the way, but certainly as a Deputy principal I didn’t have any formal training other than on the job observing the principal, thinking through in my own mind how I’d deal with certain situations. I then became a founding Head in (a Diocese) where again there was no training for heads (WN8-9).

Having served as principal in two Anglican schools in two dioceses for seven years, in addition to previous positions in two other dioceses, Walter has never had an invitation to attend Church run courses to prepare him for Anglican school faith formation leadership. Walter indicates that his sense of feeling equipped for his faith leadership role is limited to him, “trying to live the faith and understanding the breadth of Anglicanism and the fact that an
Anglican school is probably going to be something that shares that same ethos and that same tradition, I guess” (WN7), and

there’s been an assumption that you are an Anglican, you are a person of strong faith, conviction, regularly practising, and that you will, by reputation, and through referees, lead the faith community well, but at no point has anyone really told me how to do that (WN9).

Meg’s teaching experience has been in one diocese, in which she is grateful to “people who have assisted intentionally and also subconsciously just through me being motivated by being around them” (MK7). Meg decisively responded to the question regarding the Anglican Church’s contribution to her leadership role, “I think the Church has been … (a pause) such a big question, isn’t it? Look I don’t think the Church proper has done anything intentional. I don’t think there’s been any formative guidance, no” (MK6-7).

4.11.2 Participants’ opinions about faith formation experiences that could be provided by the Anglican Church

The data in this section presents responses to the question, “Do you think that further Anglican Church assistance could be given to you for exercising your faith formation leadership role?” A need to have good leaders rather than good Anglicans as principals of Anglican schools, is cautioned by Meg, saying, “get the right people, but also making sure that the right people are the faith leaders that we may want them to be” (MK11). Expressing her view on the Anglican Church’s preparation of the ‘right people’ for faith formation leadership roles in schools, Meg states, “It’s hit and miss. It’s part of the broader Anglican view of doing things too, but I think there is certainly room for people to have greater opportunities to find faith formation” (MK11). The interview reveals that in speaking of her faith formation leadership role, Meg values the role and calibre of the school chaplain. “In many cases the relationship between the Head and the chaplain may not be so strong. There could be many reasons why that might occur. I think there is an opportunity for the Diocese to look at that” (MK11-12). When asked if she would find it
helpful to have more guidance provided by the Anglican Church for her as the faith formation leader at St Julian’s, Meg answers,

I don’t think so. I mean the statements for Anglican schools provide that broad motherhood sort of stuff, but I think quite frankly principals have got so many other things on their minds that that is probably not going to be the most important thing for them (MK13).

Drawing on his background of Anglican schools in four Anglican Dioceses, Walter compares his experience of Anglican practice of faith formation leadership with “colleagues in Catholic schools where there is a greater regimentation of how things are done. Maybe the Anglican system can learn from the Catholic system in the way that they do actually do things” (WN9). Walter mentioned his desire to lead in a manner that reflects mainstream Anglican ethos, “I do the best I can, articulating the mission and living the mission, but where’s the Church heading into the future? Therefore, where should I be leading the school into the future?” (WN15).

Walter’s response to his own question commenced with the general statement, “I’d like a bigger picture from the Church” adding, “I think that if there was more dialogue between the Church and its schools, we would be better equipped to know in what direction the Church wants us to go” (WN15). Offering his experience of discovering that there is a shortage of ordained priests willing to be school chaplains, Walter suggests that his ignorance of this and of other matters, could have been remedied by some formal preparatory training for beginning principals of Anglican schools, “I would like to see some form of formal training before you go into this, because I’m operating on a personal level, assuming I’m doing the right thing, but I don’t know” (WN16). Two suggestions are offered by Walter, the first being a short course to be offered by the Anglican Church,

It may not need to be a long course, but I just think that if I was at the point of leading an Anglican school, why not a few weeks’ intensive course of some description to talk to me in more detail about the Church and its
history and its issues at the moment and where it may be heading into the future to give me some examples, perhaps, of good and bad practice that had happened in Anglican schools in terms of faith leadership. I think there is a place for some sort of formal training which gives you an overview, even, of what you are going to (WN15-16).

Developing his idea that there be more dialogue between the Anglican Church and Anglican schools, Walter’s second suggestion follows,

It would be good to have something that was like a handbook that would come to life through dialogue and sitting down (WN16).

4.12 Issue H: Anglican school principals’ faith formation through personal spirituality and life experience

This issue presents participants’ recollections of life experiences that have contributed to their faith formation as a dimension of school leadership. Whilst similar to the personal and professional development focus of Issues B, F & G, this issue provides more personal insights offered by participants. The data portrays personal growth in faith as distinct from mentoring in the role of school principal. Watching school principals who blended personal faith with their involvement in the broad life of their school inspired Walter. Frank in particular had an ability to live his faith in the school community, noting:

That certainly rubbed off on me. Frank was somebody who would be a football coach or a cricket coach or whatever. He was a very strong academic in the school, but he had this important side (faith) to him as well, that wasn’t sort of hidden in the background; it was at the front … it was the number one thing (WN2).

Meg also recalls that her early years of teaching at (St Bridgets) was a formative time of observing school leaders with a strong faith. The expression of Christian faith in the life of the school, such as staff retreats (MK3), provided a sense of comfort with expressing faith in her own life and leadership. Meg stated that growing faith and comfort with Anglicanism
simply emerged in her life in a subtle way, so that “when I came here to St Julians it was something that I very much picked up and felt I knew where I was, even though St Julians and St Bridgets are very different schools” (MK3). Commenting on her faith journey in her present school, Meg stated, “it wasn’t until I came to St Julians that I actually encountered (strong faith leaders) in a much more personal manner. …the thought of that personalized the Church for me, if that makes sense” (MK10).

A final comment from Walter again indicates the influence of Christian leaders in the formation of his own practice of Anglicanism:

One of the things I’ve always thought was when a decision has to be made, what would the Archbishop think? … I say that because he is the head of the Anglican Church and I think, well, if I make a call about a disciplinary matter or involving a staff member or a student or whatever, that’s my touchstone back to the reality so that I make sure that I reflect upon what the Anglican mission is and what would be expected in an Anglican school. I sometimes use that touchstone and then, you know, to drill down further, I use some of these other guys (Tom and Frank) that we talked about in the first question to more practically live out how I would deal with situations” (WN7-8).

4.13 Conclusion

This chapter has presented the data gathered from the two participants in this study, organised according to eight issues which emerged from the data. Discussion of the participants’ perspectives of topics of enquiry generated by the research questions will be presented in the next chapter. Themes that were established in the review of scholarly literature in Chapter Two of this study have also informed the examination of the data, contributing to the presentation of findings in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the data which has been presented in Chapter Four will be analysed and discussed, after which the findings and recommendations of this study will be offered in Chapter Six. This chapter begins with profiles of the participants’ life-world as Anglican school principals in Australian Anglican schools, as revealed in the data and as interpreted by the researcher. The framework shaping the discussion of data is then explained (5.3), followed by discussion within that framework.

5.2 The Participants’ Worlds

The participants subjectively construct meaning that is shared inter-subjectively with other individuals experiencing similar understanding, and organisation of life worlds. Words and the categories that they express, give meaning to these similar understandings of objects, events and other phenomena of daily life which are the blocks by which the social world is constructed. This process of typification, described in Chapter 3.4, is the giving and inter-subjective acceptance of meaning, organising the complexity of life experience. Typification serves to sustain inter-subjective understanding, underpinning a phenomenological methodology for seeking understanding of how participants view their world (Gubrium & Holstein, 2008). In their constructed life-worlds the participants of this study have commonality of shared experiences as faith formation leaders of Anglican schools.

As much as can be understood, in this limited study, of Meg’s and Walter’s common and individual life worlds is presented to assist analysis of how they experience their reality (Gubrium & Holstein, 2008). Understanding the
experiences contributing to the construction of the participants’ perceptions assists the analysis of the data. This in turn contributes to understanding the meanings participants give to words with which they describe their roles as Anglican school faith formation leaders.

Meg and Walter share common experiences as Anglican school faith formation leaders:

- Both are members of a bounded system of one hundred and fifty-three principals of Australian Anglican schools;
- Both are responsible to a diocesan bishop and the Five Marks of Mission of the Anglican Church, within the diversity of the *Via Media*;
- Both have responsibility to a Governing Board or Council, and a school constitution;
- Both exercise leadership expressed by Sergiovanni (2007), as five forces; technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural, detailed in Chapter 2.7;
- Both have responsibility to stakeholders common to all non-government schools;
- Both share faith formation leadership with a school chaplain; and
- Both function without the benefit of guidance of a Church definition of expected capabilities for faith formation leadership of schools.

Each of these common experiences is understood subjectively by each participant and therefore is consonant with the social constructionist approach of this study.

The data also reveals that Meg and Walter demonstrate differing personal formative experiences. These features are presented in Figure 5.1
Figure 5.1
Participants’ individual life-world experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walter</th>
<th>Meg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of Anglican schools in four dioceses</td>
<td>Experience of Anglican schools in one diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions his sense of connectivity with Church expectations</td>
<td>Sense of connectivity with Church expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal faith lived within local Parish and school</td>
<td>Personal faith lived within school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent reference to relationship with school chaplain</td>
<td>Strong positive reference to relationship with school chaplain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These common and differing experiences contribute to the researcher’s interpretation and understanding of the data provided by each participant.

5.3 Framework for Analysis and Discussion of Data

This section outlines the organisational framework for analysis and discussion of the data. The review of the literature in Chapter Two saw the generation of three guiding research questions for this study. The data collected was organised under eight issues in Chapter Four. From these issues and the literature review have emerged five themes which shape the discussion in this chapter. Each theme discusses an aspect of Anglican school principals leading faith formation in Anglican schools:

1. The lived authentic faith of the Anglican Church school principal.
II  Faith formation leadership in Anglican school’s cultural and symbolic contexts:
   - Awareness of Anglican culture in faith formation leadership of Anglican schools;
   - Comfort with Anglican culture in faith formation leadership of Anglican schools; and
   - Tensions arising from leading within an Anglican culture.

III  Anglican school principals sharing responsibility for faith formation leadership in their schools.

IV  Adequacy for faith formation leadership of Anglican schools amidst the diversity of the *Via Media*:
   - School faith formation leadership in Anglicanism’s *Via Media* culture;
   - Participants’ perceptions of being equipped for Anglican school faith formation leadership; and
   - Participants’ desire to be more equipped for Anglican school faith formation leadership.

V  Anglican school principals: Leaders of Anglican mission.

Some data issues are directly aligned with a particular discussion theme, however the connection between data issues and discussion themes encompasses many connecting relationships. Blending of issues and themes has generated the ensuing discussion and is represented in Figure 5.2 ‘Development of framework for data discussion’, which is an expansion of Figure 4.1.
5.4 The Lived Authentic Faith of the Anglican Church School Principal

In this section the participants’ reflections on their leadership contribution to faith formation in their schools are discussed. A brief synopsis of the literature is presented, providing a context in which to analyse and discuss the data. From the literature review an understanding of faith emerges that encompasses experiential meaning-making of life founded on the teaching of Jesus Christ (Astley, 2002; Duignan, 2005; Groome, 1998). Dialogue between individual and community develops Christian values in community, integrating faith with culture and personal life experience (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977). Principals in living their personal values, authentically animate their schools with these values. In Church-sponsored
schools, it is essential for school principals leading faith formation to live their personal Christian values in daily professional and personal lives, as expected by the Catholic and Lutheran Churches and the Church of England.

Both participants in this study report their commitment to authentically living the Christian faith in their daily lives. Meg notes the importance of “being a good symbol of Anglican Christian leadership ... with staff, students and families in a broader Christian context ... your values, your way of operating with people that is reflective of Christ’s leadership” (MK17). Similarly, Walter says, “(School staff) would tell you that I (have) a strong faith commitment and that I’m prepared to talk about it, write about it, hopefully they’d say that I live it in the context of what I do here” (WN11). Conversations explaining their understanding of authentically living faith in schools reveal that Meg and Walter report differing experiences, as shown by the ensuing contrasting data.

In terms of necessary training for the role of leading an Anglican faith school, Meg values excellence in teaching, a range of leadership administrative expertise and academic qualifications (S.MK). Data from Meg’s interview reflects a similar understanding of Anglican faith leadership qualities, (MK6, MK12), in which a personal disposition for leadership roles and the skills required for leading schools are discussed. These are contained within Sergiovanni’s (2007) first and second fundamental management forces for leadership which are technical forces and human forces. It might be that Meg perceives these basic forces being shaped, in the “broad Christian context of St Julians”, by Christian faith leadership which is, “integral to what we do here” (MK18).

By contrast, Walter’s response to the same issue includes a desire for clear articulation both of faith journey and also Anglican Church expectations of Anglican schools, as well as for a national system of peer mentoring (S.WN). These are contained within Sergiovanni’s (2007) fourth and fifth forces for leadership, symbolic forces and cultural forces. Walter’s response reflects a perspective more overtly connected with the cultural and symbolic faith formation leadership frames in the literature (Deal, 1999, 2005; Sergiovanni
2007). Walter vigorously engages in conversation about this topic, providing personal insight into the influence on his development of two Anglican principals, Tom and Frank. Insights into Walter’s understanding of why people follow authentically lived faith leadership, and his awareness of the formative or destructive power of personal example, are exemplified by:

If by living the faith and by the way I communicate with people ... they are encouraged to follow me, they may then be more informed to make their own decisions as they find out more. If I turn them off in some way, then they won’t even follow, then I’ve got no chance (WN10),

and:

The Christian side of the school is not tangible ... for people who don’t have a faith. They can’t go and see God (or) Jesus, whereas they can go and see (various school activities), so I need to be using my credibility to say to people, “Hey this is real ... we all need to be a part of it ... come with me and explore with me” (WN11).

The data presents contrast in the participant’s expressions of how they authentically live their faith as faith formation leaders. Possible understanding of these differences is developed in the discussions of shared leadership, especially with chaplains. Also evident is that in their own leadership styles, both participants’ daily faith leadership reflects Weaver’s guidance to Church for England schools:

More challenging than ensuring regular attendance at worship, is demonstrating, in practice, that the senior members of staff and particularly the Head, have thought out their role as leaders of the school in the context and example of Jesus (2001, p.13).

What follows focuses on Meg and Walter leading faith formation in their Anglican expression of ‘the context and example of Jesus’.
5.5 Faith Formation Leadership in Anglican Schools’ Cultural and Symbolic Contexts

The importance of contextual wisdom for faith formation leadership by Anglican school principals is discussed in this section. Discussion is organised into three subsections which sequentially consider the importance of Meg and Walter being firstly aware of, and then comfortable with, St Julians and St Richards faith formation leadership context, located in the Australian Anglican Church. The third sub-section explores the significance of faith formation leadership when encountering tensions generated by Anglican culture in the school.

The literature records the importance of contextual wisdom in all dimensions of successful school leadership. This wisdom enables the principal to place and lead the school in its multi-levelled, various relationships, understanding culture, working with its values, beliefs, networks and external environment (Davies & Davies, 2005). Each school’s specific context requires contextual wisdom of the principal to enable school members to make meaning in the context in which that school exists. The frames within which the contextual discussion is conducted are cultural and symbolic. These theoretical understandings of leadership are eminently suited to this study’s purpose of describing the rich liturgical, ecclesial and theological contextually diverse expressions of the Anglican Church.

5.5.1 Awareness of Anglican culture in faith formation leadership of Anglican schools

The literature reveals a lack of defined expectation for Anglican principals as faith formation leaders. This is coupled with a view of Anglican schools encompassing a wide divergence of Anglican identity as places of faith formation, “from a whole-hearted embracing of them to an embarrassed peripheralisation of them” (Cole, 2006, p.337). The two participants allude to
a sense of the importance given to their awareness of Anglican culture as a basic contextual feature of their faith formation leadership, as demonstrated in the following paragraphs.

Both participants’ affirm the importance of their being aware of Anglican culture expressed in school symbols. Meg believes St Julians does have an Anglican culture and her awareness of its importance is expressed by significant symbols being central to the school, “the ringing of the chapel bell, the location of the chapel, prayers to commence our meetings ... (other) symbolic external expressions” (MK15). Walter similarly is aware of the St Richards chapel as a cultural Anglican symbol, “it’s right there, it’s huge, it’s pride of place ... everything leads to that building” (WN 22). Both participants take supportive roles in school liturgies, “I always participate in the services, because if I don’t, then the lead is not there, the captain’s not on the bridge,” (WN21) and, “I’m a liturgical assistant. I wear my alb ... at various school liturgies” (MK7), showing awareness of the symbolic significance of their actions in the liturgical and spiritual context of their faith formation leadership.

In addition to their awareness of these visible symbolic acts, spaces and artefacts valuing Anglican culture, both Meg and Walter are aware of Anglican culture being distinct from the cultural values of secular independent schools, as indicated by the comments: “It’s about using various teachings and wisdoms from the Bible in day to day life when we’re talking to the students and staff” (MK15), and “You can’t just have a set of values that could apply to any school. There needs to be some direct focus on the worship and the nurturing, the Christian formation side of the school” (WN 17).

A contrast is apparent between Meg’s and Walter’s awareness of how Anglican culture is expressed in their schools. Their differing life-world experiences, enable Meg to answer with conviction, “I’m very clear on the (Religious foundations guiding) this school” (MK13), and, “Yes (our values) are definitely Anglican” (MK15). Walter however, observes, “(Anglican culture) is very informal and it’s hard to put your finger on what it is. You know, Anglicans are very accepting of many things and that translates through into
your school” (WN21). A consequence for Walter of this awareness is found in his desire to lead his school in a manner that is aligned with the mission of the Anglican Church: “We’ve all got to be singing off the one song-sheet ... it is integral to the full picture of the Church that I do it properly” (WN 17).

Walter’s perception of his awareness of Anglican culture being less defined than Meg’s, might be due to her experience of Anglicanism within the stability of one Diocese. Walter has broader experience across four Diocesan schools and from the local parishes that he has attended in each of those four Dioceses. Because of Anglicanism’s variety of expression, Walter would have been exposed to less liturgical and theological unity than Meg which might underpin his perception of lack of clarity about Anglican cultural expression. There is agreement that both participants value an awareness of Anglican culture as a salient feature of their school leadership.

5.5.2 Comfort with Anglican culture in faith formation leadership of Anglican schools

Having examined the awareness of the importance of Anglican culture for Meg’s and Walter's faith formation leadership as an intellectual understanding, investigation moves to their sense of lived, experiential engagement with Anglican culture. Discussion clarifying the participants’ awareness of the necessity of engaging with Anglican culture in order to authentically live the Anglican faith as school principals follows.

Comfort with Anglican culture for principals as faith formation leaders does not emerge as a topic in the literature, yet data relating to the participants’ comfort is the richest data theme for this study. The participants’ frequently describe their perception of their experience as principals of Anglican schools as being ‘comfortable’. ‘Comfort’ does not appear as a term when describing principals of any Church-sponsored schools in the literature, although it resonates with Bednall’s understanding of the process by which principals of Anglican
schools negotiate the relationship between their schools and the Anglican Church in the domain of religious culture (Bednall, 2006).

This researcher suggests that ‘comfort’ in this context describes an undefined ‘right feeling’ or ‘fit’ of Meg’s and Walter’s perception of their relationship with their schools’ Anglican cultural context. Meg observes, “It was like being at home ... sensible for me to stay in the Anglican school suite” (MK2). “(I have) a cultural fit ... at home with the traditions of the Church and I feel very comfortable. I’m not sure I would feel as comfortable in a Uniting Church school for example” (MK4-5&9). Walter similarly expresses a sense of fitting into the culture: “All my schools have been Anglican schools. Although it’s not clearly defined, there is, anecdotally, a culture ... I feel some degree of comfort that as an Anglican I have (stayed in Anglican schools)” (WN1), and

There are some systems I would not have wanted to work in ... wouldn’t have a choice in the Catholic system because I’m not a Catholic ... wouldn’t have seen myself in a Lutheran school ... some of the other Christian schools you hear about, probably not. In terms of a Christian school, it was going to be an Anglican school or a non-denominational school ... I could still have a faith and espouse the faith (WN6).

Meg and Walter indicate more than simply passive acceptance of Anglican school culture, expressing clear preferences for this ‘anecdotal culture’ in which they play leading roles. Their sense of comfort is something that they welcome, choosing the Anglican culture from other options, as Meg observes, “(Faith formation leadership) is part of the job. Why would you head up an Anglican school if you weren’t comfortable doing it?” (MK9).

The understanding of the meaning of ‘comfort’ for both participants could be simply a choice gladly and willingly made for an easy and unchallenging path in terms of faith expression. Meg or Walter might feel comfortable in school cultures which are undemanding of faith, but happy to include the word Anglican in their school name. The data suggests that this is not a reasonable interpretation however, Meg stating:
At some schools, (parents) get more than they might have thought in terms of doses of Anglicanism. What we want to make sure, and through our publications, we badge ourselves so people know that we are a religious Anglican school (MK16), and

(Faith development) is integral to what we do here and absolutely that’s part of what you buy when you come here. We want to make sure that parents know that, because if they don’t want that, they should go somewhere else because it’s compulsory here (MK18).

At St Richards, Walter demonstrates a similar commitment to engaging and developing the school community in Anglican faith culture, reporting:

(Faith) symbols are demonstrations to people that, hey, this is important and we value it, and I value it as the leader. I’m prepared to pay for a Head of Department to run Religious and Values Education because I see it as an equally important part of the school (WN19).

For Meg and Walter comfort is perceived as an experience deeper than intellectual awareness. Comfort with Anglican culture has been presented as an engaging feeling of a “right fit”. The participants have also revealed an understanding of comfort as faith formation leaders in their Anglican cultural context. They have purposively chosen Anglican culture and they pro-actively strive to develop it as an important part of their school communities.

If this interpretation of the data is reflective of the participants’ understanding of comfort, then it offers a valuable insight into their contextual relationship with Anglican culture as faith formation leaders. Catholic and Lutheran school principals have documents detailing the dimensions of leadership which include faith formation, with listed capacities for fulfilling these dimensions. The Anglican Church in Australia offers no similar detailed guiding documents with indicators against which principals can check their compliance with expected Church standards. In the absence of compliance, Meg and Walter have a sense of comfort. This comfort enables them to engage with the
diocesan bishop and the bishop’s representative(s), the school council, and all groups which express their Anglican school’s culture.

5.5.3 Tensions arising within Anglican culture from faith formation leadership

In this section, the participants’ understanding of engaging with tension generated by their faith formation leadership in their school’s Anglican context, is discussed. The literature review for this thesis describes school ethical tensions experienced from the Lutheran principal’s perspective as being possible to deal with if Lutheran principals ‘remain aligned with the expectations and the teachings of the Lutheran Church of Australia” (Albinger, 2004, p.11). In Catholic school culture, Hansen (2000) and McLaughlin (2006) report tension for teachers who struggle with aspects of Catholic teaching. This ‘loyal dissent’ is resolved, sometimes tenuously, by adherence to clearly defined standards and parameters of mission established in official Catholic documents. Anglican literature similarly reveals awareness of tension fostered by the cultural experience of a school Eucharist being a means of defining the differences between community members, rather than being a means of unity for them (Anglican Schools Commission, 1996). Anglican school literature, although defining the tension, offers no path to resolution, by contrast with Lutheran and Catholic guiding documents.

This sense of struggle to resolve tension is reflected in the data. Walter, who has stated his commitment to leading faith formation at St Richards reveals his disquiet at attempting to work with Anglican culture in his school, saying, “We have to fight to be able to have a lot of these symbolic things ... I don’t know so much about the wider Church ... It’d be World War Three if I suggested we have a family service on a Sunday Evening” (WN 20). Walter offers a recent example of his willingness to nurture Anglican culture at St Richards, in the face of sustained tension from members of the school staff, in a story about swapping the school’s Thursday and Wednesday timetables to accommodate the Ash Wednesday liturgy:
Now to me that seemed fairly normal and to the chaplain that seemed fairly normal. ... but the number of complaints that I got and the Deputy got! ... The number of people who came up with all the reasons in the world why we couldn’t swap Wednesday and Thursday! I just kept saying, ‘What is the third word in the name of the school? Remember that! That comes first’ (WN5).

Walter encounters and resolves the tension, fostering Anglican culture at St Richardss Anglican School in the process. The process by which he does so is grounded in broader Anglican liturgical tradition of which he demonstrates both awareness and comfort as understood in this study.

Catholic and Lutheran principals might face the same conflict over similar issues in their schools, however, the decision-making process for Catholic and Lutheran principals is guided and reinforced by Church statements of expectation to support them if they elect to proceed with actions that further the mission of their Churches. As evident in the data, Meg has a school culture that would support her in having special liturgies out of school hours. The determining factor for Walter and Meg’s decisions lies with their individual school cultural contexts, not with central Diocesan or Church guidance and culture. The resolution of Walter’s ‘World War Three’ tension would rest with him, whereas Catholic and Lutheran principals lead in contexts that have Church statements that they can draw on for authority.

These three subsections have presented discussion of the implications of the Australian Anglican cultural context for Meg and Walter as two Anglican principals serving as faith formation leaders. The meaning and importance of being aware of their cultural context, of being comfortable in their leadership within it and facing cultural tension, have been explored. The next section of this Chapter discusses data relating to the participants exercising shared leadership in faith formation.
5.6 Anglican school principals sharing responsibility with others in faith formation leadership in their Anglican schools

In this section Meg's and Walter's perspectives of their practice of sharing faith formation leadership is presented, with reference to relevant aspects of the literature, particularly the cultural and symbolic leadership frames. An insight into these frames is provided by Deal's (2005, p.116), concept of "symbolic buoyancy" which requires that principals know and demonstrate the cultural and symbolic life of their schools in a manner that gives buoyancy to these values in the wider life of the school community: “symbolic leaders first find their own spiritual core and then share their gifts with others” (2005, p.119). The ‘spiritual core’ for Meg and Walter as faith formation leaders of Anglican schools, is an awareness of, and comfort with, Anglican culture, expressed as a lived, core quality of life. The ‘sharing of their gifts with others’ aspect of the symbolic buoyancy of faith formation leadership by Meg and Walter reveals some commonality between them, as well as an area of contrast between the participants.

Contemporary leadership paradigms advocate the practice of shared leadership by school principals (Davies, 2005; Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd, 2002; Spry, 2004). Sharing of leadership is collaborative, the principals sustaining their own and other’s capacities by inviting and enabling others in the promotion of the school. In this study, one aspect of the school’s overall promotion is specifically the process of faith formation, shared in ‘symbolic buoyancy’ particularly with the school staff (Gowdie, 2006; Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977; Weaver, 2001). Regarding this issue, Walter writes, “All staff share responsibility for advancing the Christian mission of the college through their words and deeds” (Newman, 2007, p. 1). Walter also affirms, “You have to be seen to be offering support, not just to the chaplain but everyone who wants to … bring the faith of the school alive, and it can’t just be lip service” (WN5). Meg describes this aspect of her leadership is these terms:

If you have a good team around you, people whom you trust and work closely and well with, then there’s a really great opportunity for … equal
sharing or co-sharing and those sorts of significant responsibilities, particularly in the sense of the chaplain (MK8).

What is indicated is that both participants value the sharing of faith formation leadership.

All of Meg’s data pertaining to sharing faith formation leadership includes comments about her close working relationship with her chaplain. The significance of Meg’s sustained shared leadership with her chaplain is a point of similarity to but also contrast with Walter’s data. It is significant that both participants incorporate school chaplaincy as a valued role with which faith formation leadership is shared, as evidenced by the following discussion.

School chaplaincy is a common appointment in Australian Anglican schools. Cole (2006) notes that spiritual leadership is usually shared with an ordained chaplain who is accountable to both the Diocesan bishop and the school principal, but there needs to be an agreement as to:

how the leadership will be incorporated in the overall leadership of the principal and other decision-makers in the school. This is not an easy task, given that there is no single model for the exercise of ordained ministry in Australian schools (Cole, 2006, p.244).

Supporting Cole’s observation, the data presents diversity of principal/chaplain relationships for Meg and Walter. Meg, as with other points of contrast with Walter, answers with certainty, whereas Walter answers with a sense of pensive self-enquiry.

Meg says of chaplains, “a good chaplain of course, is imperative, and you know how hard they are to find” (MK8), and,

Then there’s the opportunity as a leader to make sure that the chaplain’s role is seen as a significant one in the school …. By choosing to have (the chaplain) on the leadership team, I have the opportunity as the principal of saying this is a very important part of our life. (MK8)
When asked about her sense of being equipped as the faith formation leader of the school, Meg replies:

There is certainly room for people to have greater opportunities to find faith formation. At the moment, it’s hit and miss, depending on, in many cases, the calibre of the chaplain. In many cases the relationship between the head and the chaplain may not be so strong, and there could be many reasons why that might occur. I think there is an opportunity for the Diocese to look at that (MK11-12),

and

I feel very comfortable that I lead in a manner that demonstrates and upholds those (Anglican values). I feel very comfortable that I have an excellent chaplain who is a great adviser on the particulars if it is that I don’t have the language that someone —— who is priested (sic) and who is a leader in that particular area, so yes, I feel very comfortable (MK9-10).

Questioned about the sense of feeling equipped by the Church for faith formation leadership, Walter replies, “I don’t have anything formal from the whole organization that I represent, which is the Anglican Church in Australia. It’s simply me living out and talking about my faith” (WN13-14). To the same question, Meg’s response is:

Our chaplain is so visible, she’s got forefront in the newsletter, she teaches religious and values education ... I think parents would clearly seek (the chaplain) as the church contact, but because we know so few students in our schools are actually ‘card carrying Anglicans’, this is the church for them and this is their experience of the church, and is also evidenced by the number of times (the chaplain) is called upon to do weddings, funerals, Baptisms and so on” (MK14).

Meg’s perspective of her shared faith formation leadership exhibits a substantial trusted role for the chaplain, perhaps reflecting a long-established working relationship. By contrast, Walter perceives himself as retaining a
differing level of personal responsibility for this leadership, perhaps influenced
by the recent resignation of his chaplain, causing Walter to search for a priest
to fill the position.

It is possible that Walter’s informal mentoring by Tom and Frank as a
developing Anglican principal in four dioceses has resulted in a practice of
shared leadership with the chaplain that differs from the informal mentoring
and single Diocese experience of Meg, as indicated by:

Tom as a priest, you would expect he was going to be the spiritual leader
of the school and he was, and he afforded a lot of support to the chaplain,
and they worked very well together. Sometimes in schools, and I’ve seen
this, the chaplain can just be on their own and they don’t necessarily have
the real tangible backing of the administration. Oh people say they back
them, but how much do they actually back them? I saw Tom, not only
model the right thing himself, but he actually gave tangible support to the
others around in the school who needed that to be able to advance the
mission of the school (WN3-4).

Both participants value a shared leadership role with a school chaplain, with
differing practice and perceptions of what this means for their own exercise of
faith formation leadership.

5.7 Adequacy for faith formation leadership of Anglican schools
amidst the diversity of the Via Media

This section discusses the participants’ perceptions of the diversity and
definition of faith formation leadership in their Anglican school cultural context.
In the light of the literature reviewed, together with perspectives from Meg and
Walter, this section contains discussion of their perception of the Anglican Via
Media’s diversity. There follows an exploration of their views about how
equipped they feel for leadership in this context. A third section discusses
their understanding of whether they desire to be further equipped for their role,
and this reveals another contrast between the views of Meg and Walter.
This study has noted the provision of documented dimensions of, and capabilities for, leadership of Catholic and Lutheran schools. The statements affirm Church school principals being equipped as cultural and symbolic leaders, with theological training in the case of Lutheran principals, to lead meaning-making as faith experience within their Church’s mission. Education for Anglican school leadership requires Anglican principals to understand and work with the rich variety of Christian symbols in liturgy, pastoral care and the school community’s traditions. Anglican Primate, Phillip Aspinall, hopes that Anglican school staff will be “explicitly drawing on the Christian faith, as it is received by the Anglican Church” (Aspinall, 2003, p.16). To do so requires principals to be equipped for faith leadership of school staff. The literature notes the absence of faith formation leadership expectations for Anglican school principals. Street, finding that British Church of England principals express concern that they are not equipped for their role of faith formation leadership, writes, “the Church’s new-found enthusiasm for its schools appears not to be matched by a coherent and consistent consideration of the role and function of the Anglican Church school or the ministry of school leadership” (Street, 2007, p.147). Discussion illuminating the participant principals’ Australian Anglican experience of role definition in a specifically Australian context follows.

5.7.1 School faith formation leadership in Anglicanism’s ‘Via Media’ culture

Although not using the term Via Media, Meg and Walter both express a perception of Anglican school culture as lacking in definition, “an Anglican school, although it’s not very clearly defined, there is anecdotally a culture, I suppose,” (WN1) and, “it is hit and miss at the moment. It’s part of the broader Anglican view of doing things too, in many ways” (MK11). Walter’s perception of this diversity’s impact in his school is expressed in his comment that Anglican culture, “is very informal and it’s hard to put your finger on what it is. You know, the Anglicans are very accepting of many things and this
translates through into your school” (WN7). Placing St Julians in its traditional place within the Anglican spectrum, Meg observes:

This is one of the great strengths of our Church, I believe, that there are different ways of expression. Some Anglican schools …. are more overtly Anglican than others and others that aren’t, and the church has to work out how it wants to manage that (MK16).

One of the areas that the Church might need to ‘work out’ is how to equip principals as faith formation leaders amidst Meg’s “different ways of expression”. Street’s (2007) study bears testimony to the impact on school principals by the Anglican Church in England’s failure to provide clear guidance for them in this vital mission role. It appears for Meg and Walter that lack of clarity pervades their understanding of Anglican culture of the Via Media, reinforcing the researcher’s view that training is needed for principals to contextually lead and form others in faith through the diversity of the Via Media.

5.7.2 Participant’s perception of being equipped for Anglican school faith formation leadership

Both participants believe that the Anglican Church has not adequately, if at all, equipped them for the role of faith formation leadership in their schools. Already noted is Walter’s survey response, “Anglican – minimal formal preparation” (S.WN), reinforced by, “I don’t have anything formal from the whole organisation that I represent, which is the Anglican Church in Australia” (WN14). Meg comments:

I’m not aware of any directions or over-arching instructions about how to be a faith leader in an Anglican school, aside from the marks of Anglicanism … or the information that (a Diocesan bishop) has put out for all of our schools and parishes, so I mean I’m aware of all that literature and over-arching stuff there….The statements for Anglican schools provides that broad motherhood sort of stuff (MK13).
Two discussions with Meg and Walter emphasise their perception of the absence of being equipped by the Church for their faith formation role: “(The preparation I’ve had is) virtually none. … To be honest, virtually none” (WN8), and, “I don’t think the Church has done anything intentional. I think the Church has been…. such a big question, isn’t it? Look I don’t think the Church proper has done anything intentional” (MK 6).

Two comments by Walter presented in their entirety, accentuate this deficit of formal preparation and equipping for faith formation leadership:

There has not been, for someone who’s been a principal for seven years which I’ve been in Anglican schools, there has been no occasion where somebody has said, ‘Come along to this course or this session and we’ll talk to you about the sorts of things you need to be taking on board as you take on this challenge of leadership of an Anglican school’. That’s never happened. There’s been an assumption that you are an Anglican, you are a person of strong faith, conviction, regularly practising, and that you will, by reputation, and through referees, lead the faith community well, but at no point has anyone really told me how to do that (WN9), and

Certainly in (Diocese X) I had virtually nothing to do with the diocese at all. We worshipped at the Cathedral. I was also involved obviously as a boarding house master in the boarding chapel services or whatever. In (four dioceses), not any formal training, no” (WN9-10).

The data is almost stark in its presentation of Meg’s and Walter’s views of the dearth of formation of them by the Anglican Church, for their faith formation leadership of their Anglican schools.

Notwithstanding this paucity of formal preparation, both participants believe that they have received valuable insights from senior colleagues acting as informal mentors. The literature affirms the worth of Church school principals being mentored (ACU National leadership Flagship, 2005; Lutheran Education Australia, 2000). There is evidence in the data of the participants’
appreciation for mentoring they have received, summarised by, “with Frank and ... Tom, those two people gave me the courage to move upwards, not only in the technical side of the job, but that you could actually lead a faith community” (WN4). Meg also states:

I think all people, perhaps particularly women, need relationships and encouragement to go forward and it certainly works for my personality style. ... I certainly felt very well mentored and supported by (two previous principals) and learning about school culture and different ways of leading people (MK4).

Again, perhaps due to Meg’s professional experience being entirely in one diocese, with possible longer term local relationships, her perceptions of her relationships are decisively understood as mentoring. Walter equally values his informal experience of being mentored, but reflectively adds the following comment:

I’ve never had a mentor in terms of, you know, a colleague. As a formal mentoring system, I know of no such thing in the Anglican schools. ... I have a couple of good friends who are Anglican principals and also friends who are not Anglican principals who are principals of other schools, and there’s the informal mentoring that happens. But there is no formal structure (WN16).

Perhaps Walter’s movement throughout four Dioceses has provided him with helpful, but not sustained working relationships that he might view as mentoring. Although there are differences between participants on this point, they are united in their support of the worth of mentoring.

Additionally, the participants observe, “I think it has been people who have assisted intentionally but also subconsciously just through me being motivated by being around them” (MK6), and, “I didn’t have any formal training other than on the job observing the principal, thinking through in my own mind how I’d deal with certain situations ... there was no training for Heads” (WN8-9). Walter personalises his experience, reflecting that, “I will sometimes think to
myself now what would Frank have done in that situation and try to model what I do on what he may have done” (WN3). When confronted with difficult decisions, I often ask myself:

What would the Archbishop think? … I say that because he is the head of the Anglican Church … I sometimes use that touchstone and then, to drill down further, I use some of these other guys (Tom and Frank) to more practically live out how I would deal with situations (WN7-8).

Clearly, a major formative factor in preparing Meg and Walter for faith formation leadership in Anglican schools is their social construction of meaning as leaders through the influence of colleagues and other religious leaders.

The data does not suggest that Meg is unreflective on the formative guidance she has received as a faith formation leader, she has simply stated her strong belief that she is comfortable in her role and has been enabled by her religious experience through the schools in which she has taught. Meg also has a shared faith formation leadership role with St Julians chaplain whereby she is confident that the chaplain will answer Anglican faith questions. Walter has revealed that his multi-diocesan personal engagement with Church life both inside the school and beyond it in parish life, has shaped his understanding and construction of faith formation leadership. His personal belief is discussed in the context of his formation for leadership, observing, “In preparing for leadership of an Anglican school, I believe that I understand what the bigger picture should be because I try to live it myself” (WN7). Walter continues,

I’m equipped as a lay person with a strong faith commitment to talk about my faith journey to encourage others to embark upon their faith journey, but as a lay person … I have had no formal training in faith at all (WN13), and, “I’m operating on a personal level, assuming I’m doing the right thing, but I don’t know” (WN16).
The ‘personal level’ in Walter’s comment concludes with the following statement:

There’s been no formal training other than me as an Anglican trying to live the faith and understanding the breadth of Anglicanism and the fact that an Anglican school is probably going to be something that shares that same ethos and that same tradition, I guess (WN7).

Meg feels equipped and comfortable for her faith formation leadership of St Julians in part because of her relationship with her chaplain who is a trained and ordained Anglican priest. Walter feels less equipped, perhaps because without the same depth of relationship with a chaplain, he perceives himself to be more alone in his leadership, hence his personal reflections on his own faith stories. Meg and Walter agree that mentoring is a valuable preparative tool for faith formation leadership. Both principals also agree that they, personally, have not been equipped by the Anglican Church for faith formation leadership of their schools. The next section discusses the contrast between Meg’s and Walter’s opinions about their need for being equipped by the Anglican Church for faith formation leadership of schools.

5.7.3 Participants’ desire to be more equipped for Anglican school faith formation leadership

This section portrays a distinct contrast between the views of the two participants. Walter would like to be further equipped by the Anglican Church for his faith leadership role, having a keen desire for further personal formation in this role, as evidenced in comments such as, “in the Catholic system, there is a greater regimentation … maybe the Anglican system can learn from the Catholic system in the way that they do actually do things” (WN9), and, “I’d like a bigger picture from the Church. … more dialogue between the Church and its schools, we would be better equipped to know in what direction the Church wants us to go” (WN15). Walter continues:
I think it would be good if there was some form of formal training. … why not a few weeks’ intensive course … some sort of formal training which gives you an overview, even, of what you are going to (WN15-16), and

It would be good to have something that was like a handbook, I suppose, but a handbook that would come to life through dialogue and sitting down. … I would like to see some form of formal training before you go into this (WN16).

Meg however, confident in the nature her chaplain’s shared leadership of faith formation, observes:

I think there’s a real danger in becoming so focused on making sure you’ve got good Anglican leaders that you actually forget that you want good leaders or good educators … I think we have to be so careful that we don’t allow a tag of being a good Anglican Head to take over good sense in terms of getting right people to head our schools. Get the right people, but also making sure that the right people are the faith leaders that we may want them to be…..

(The Anglican school being part of the mission of the Church) is hit and miss at the moment. It’s part of the broader Anglican view of doing things too, in many ways, but I think there is certainly room for people to have greater opportunities to find faith formation. At the moment, it’s hit and miss, depending on, in many cases, the calibre of the chaplain. In many cases the relationship between the Head and the chaplain may not be so strong, and there could be many reasons why that might occur. I think there is an opportunity for the Diocese to look at that (MK11-12), and

The statements for Anglican schools provide that broad motherhood sort of stuff, but I think quite frankly principals have got so many other things on their minds that that is probably not going to be the most important thing for them (MK13).

Perhaps the data is indicative of differing shared leadership with chaplains, clearly however Meg and Walter hold contrasting views on the need for them
to be personally further equipped by the Diocese as faith formation leaders in their schools.

5.8 Anglican School Principals: Leaders of Anglican Mission

This section discusses the participants’ understanding of their faith formation leadership in terms of maintaining Anglican values and fostering Anglican mission. Scholarly assertions that a defining purpose for the existence of Church-sponsored schools is spiritual nurture in the Christian faith (Astley & Crowder, 1996; Gowdie, 2006; Groome, 1998, Weaver 2001), is affirmed in the context of Australian Anglican schools (Anglican Education Commission Diocese of Sydney, 2008; Aspinall, 2003; Anglican Diocese of Brisbane, 2009). It is therefore incumbent on Anglican school principals to be so well-grounded in Anglicanism, that they are capable of “marinating” (Deal, 1999, p.21) their school in Anglican culture. Firmly grounded in Anglican cultural and symbolic leadership qualities, the principal is equipped for maintaining values and enabling mission for future growth which remains contextually Anglican. Because of Anglicanism’s diversity in Via Media, a principal needs adequate equipping in Anglicanism to be ‘comfortably’ capable of steering a path that is not defined by systematic theology and central guiding statements as in Catholicism or Lutheranism, but instead shaped by contextual accommodation of diversity and situation.

Maintaining Anglican values is a prerequisite for leading mission that is authentically aligned with the Anglican Church. Duignan (2005) warns of tolerance for social diversity degenerating into moral ambivalence in principals’ stances on Christian values. Johnson (2002) cites a British Church of England principal who avoided using the word ‘Jesus’ out of multi-cultural sensitivity. Aspinall in the Australian Anglican context notes the need to guard against values drift influenced by civic society (2003), especially challenging because “there isn’t necessarily a strong sense in our schools of what it means to be an Anglican community,” (Aspinall, 2004, p.6). The Primate consequently asks this key question, “How can we ensure that the mission of
Anglican schools is aligned with the mission of the whole Church?” (Aspinall, 2008, p.8). This question is especially significant considering Street’s (2007) research that noted the Church of England Church school principals in his study could not differentiate between Christian values and values of secular schools. Furthermore, if school and Church mission are not aligned, then a principal’s only compass by which to guide the school might be personal values, whereas a distinct school/Church aligned mission grounds school development in contextual cultural reality (Scott, 1998; Sergiovanni, Kelleher, McCarthy & Wirt, 2004). This section of Chapter Five has provided a context for discussion of the data provided by Meg and Walter, illuminating their perception of their faith formation leadership as it is aligned with the mission of the Anglican Church.

This study contributes to the process of understanding and seeking to find an answer to Archbishop Aspinall’s seminal question about alignment of the mission of Anglican schools with the mission of the Anglican Church. The following offer insight into the participants’ priority given to Church and school mission alignment:

The God thing is the whole umbrella under which the whole thing operates … I often hear people say we’re a holistic school – we offer the arts, sports, academia, activities programs, outdoor ed and a Christian ethos. Now to me, the Christian ethos isn’t one of the veggies on the plate. It is the plate and then everything else sits under that and to run an Anglican school … you cannot do it any other way, I believe that you have to have the Christian ethos or the mission of the school overlaying everything else. It can’t just sit alongside everything else, it’s got to be the big thing” (WN4).

Meg clearly states a similar view, “It’s (faith development) integral to what we do here … we want to make sure that parents know that, because if they don’t want that, they should go somewhere else because it’s compulsory” (MK18). Various other comments such as, “This (Christian faith) is something we all need to be a part of … Come with me and explore with me” (WN11), and, “I
have the opportunity of enshrining (faith) stuff that occurs in the school calendar ... I'm again demonstrating the importance of this particular faith tradition to our school" (MK8), and, “You have to be seen to be offering support (to) everyone who wants to express their faith and ... bring the faith of the school alive, and it can't just be lip service" (WN5), reinforce the weight both participants perceive that they give to aligning their school with Anglican mission.

Meg affirms the importance of these values being visible and lived in St Julians: “the way one conducts oneself as a leader ... in a broader Christian context ... It’s your values, your way of operating, working with people that is reflective of Christ’s leadership" (MK17), as does Walter:

You can’t just have a set of values which could apply to any school. There needs to be some direct focus on the worship and the nurturing, the Christian formation side of the school ... you’ve got to cut to the chase, you can’t just talk about the warm and fuzzy things and then throw God in as a word at the end. You have to actually have God and Christianity as the centre of it (WN17-18).

These assertions show that both participants express commitment to the Anglican values and mission in their schools.

The final strand of discussion in this chapter offers a point of contrast between the views held by Meg and Walter, concerning the effective reality of school and Church alignment of values and mission. Illuminating this, Johnson’s United Kingdom study reveals:

In the six (Catholic) schools visited, the spiritual, moral, social and cultural education of their pupils was seen in almost exclusively RC terms. The interviews revealed a consistency in view, approach and language, and thus unsurprisingly, a commonality of discourse could be detected. The language and concepts used by the south London RC headteachers had some similarity with the RC Church’s expectations of school principals in

This contrasts with Johnson’s (2002) observation about Anglican values that have drifted where British Church of England principals avoided using the name ‘Jesus’ in their schools.

What is demonstrated is the practical effect on ‘consistency in view, approach and language’ of authoritative Catholic statements of expectation for their school principals. Meg, leading St Julians in a far less centralised Anglican system, has expressed confidence in her alignment with Anglican values and mission leadership, without any compliance criteria, “apart from statements for Anglican schools that (provide) that broad motherhood sort of stuff” (MK13), or central auditing. Because of a successful relationship with her school chaplain, consciously fostered as a part of her shared leadership style at St Julians, Meg stands in marked contrast to Walter. Walter similarly has no compliance criteria, yet he perceives the alignment of St Richards and the Anglican Church’s values and mission very differently from Meg, as evident in:

We’re one school and we’ve got to be all singing off the same song-sheet ... it is integral to the full picture of Church, that I actually do it and do it properly. I don’t want to be running an Anglican school that’s heading off in a direction that’s different from all the others..... It needs to be all connected (WN17), and

We have a wonderful opportunity here to nurture Christian formation in young people, but there needs to be a connection between what we do here and what they get outside in the Church, and that’s too big a jump (WN13).

Walter strives to link the mission of St Richards with the wider Church:

This week is Holy Week, and I encourage everyone in the College Community to take the time to attend some of the services being offered at St Simon’s (parish) in (town), over Easter. (Fr Ted) is an excellent
preacher and a great supporter of our College. Easter service details are on the school website (Newman, 2008, p.2),

but he feels unsure of his success, in spite of having attended four parishes adjacent to his four schools. When asked whether his school’s cultural and symbolic expressions are consonant with those of the wider Anglican Church, his response is, “It’s hard to say….. I’m just thinking we have to fight to be able to have a lot of these symbolic things ... I don’t know so much about the wider church” (WN20).

5.9 Conclusion

Chapter Five has explored Meg’s and Walter’s perceptions of themselves authentically living as faith formation leaders aligned with Anglican values and mission. This was followed by discussion of their perceptions of their personal comfort with the cultural and symbolic leadership of their school and their sharing of this leadership. Also investigated was their sense of being equipped as Anglican school faith formation leaders. Chapter Five concluded with discussion of Meg’s and Walter’s views of their schools’ mission alignment with the mission of the Anglican Church of Australia. Particularly significant in this chapter are Meg’s and Walter’s differing Anglican diocesan experiences and relationships with their school chaplains. The next chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, Section 6.2 summarises the study’s purpose, methodology and limitations. The following section identifies conclusions arising from the study. These conclusions focus on three areas:

- Principals of Australian Anglican schools leading faith formation and living the Anglican faith in their schools;
- Principals of Australian Anglican schools sharing faith formation leadership in their schools; and
- Principals of Australian Anglican schools being enabled by the Anglican Church to be faith formation leaders of Anglican mission in their schools.

Section 6.4 presents the recommendations of the study. The conclusion of the study is provided in the final section of this chapter.

6.2 Summary of the Study

The genesis of this study lies in the question: “How can we ensure that the mission of Anglican schools is aligned with the mission of the whole Church?” (Aspinall, 2008, p.8). From this enquiry has developed a guiding question for this research: How do two Anglican school principals lead faith formation in their schools? The two participant principals were questioned about their perception of their roles, their capabilities, and their sense of feeling equipped by the Anglican Church as leaders of faith formation in Anglican schools.
The following four factors emerged from a review of the literature as being significant for understanding the context of faith formation leadership roles of Anglican school principals in this study:

- A basic responsibility of an Anglican school is nurturing faith as a process of meaning making by engaging individuals in the Anglican school community;

- The school principal plays a key role in leading faith formation of school members, leading with personal authenticity of Christian witness;

- Important faith formation dimensions of Anglican school principalship are cultural and symbolic leadership, requiring understanding of Anglican cultural and symbolic meaning and portrayal of them in daily life, and

- The Catholic and Lutheran Churches provide statements of dimensions of leadership and capabilities for leadership of their schools, which in conjunction with detailed supporting documents, guide school principals. There is a lacuna of similar documents for Anglican school principals, who might or might not appreciate such guiding statements.

This study is exploratory, seeking understanding of the two purposively sampled participants’ perceptions of their roles as faith formation leaders of their Anglican schools. Employing a qualitative phenomenological research methodology within an interpretivist theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism, data has been gathered using four methods. A survey questionnaire and an audio-taped and transcribed interview were used in conjunction with observation and documentary analysis to assist verification of the data. The symbolic interactionist perspective of social constructionism has explored participants’ individual perceptions of their roles set in the context of Anglican’s ‘Via Media’ diversity and the Anglican Church’s mission. The interpretive nature of this study limits any claim of generalisation from the conclusions to Australian Anglican schools as a category. The depth of personal detail provided by the two participants offers insights that may be
transferable to other Australian Anglican principals as faith formation leaders in their schools. Sensitivity to the diversity of Australian Anglican schools is exercised in the study’s recommendations. Some schools have developed without defining documents in faith formation leadership and other areas, for several decades. Guiding documents may be perceived as unwelcome if diversity and context are not considered in any implementation of the recommendations that follow.

The next section of this chapter presents the conclusions arising from the study.

6.3 Conclusions from the Research

The inter-relationship between several of the data issues noted in Chapter Four and also between the analysis and discussion themes mentioned in Chapter Five is also evident between the three conclusion focus areas in Chapter Six. This study’s focus on one dimension of Anglican school leadership has resulted in a narrow range of matters explored. As a result, the conclusions contain common topics such as Anglican culture, contextual awareness, Anglican identity issues and the mission of the Anglican Church as presented in the next section.

6.3.1 Principals of Australian Anglican schools leading faith formation and living the Anglican faith in their schools

The diversity of expression between Australian Anglican dioceses is amplified in Anglican schools by various forms of governance, ownership, religious expression and understanding of, and commitment to the mission of the Anglican Church. This has been exemplified quite overtly in the contrasting attitudes, perceptions and modus operandii of the two participant principals in the study. The varied expressions of Anglicanism in schools, held together by the ‘Via Media’, might possibly exhibit some groupings of shared characteristics, clusters of alignment such as: being founded recently, or having long histories; having a strong allegiance to their diocese or having a
stronger sense of allegiance to independent private schools or some other structure; geographical clustering; being closely affiliated with a local parish; a strong or absent Eucharistic life in the school, or some other identifying feature(s). In order for a principal to lead a school in a manner that reflects its Anglican identity, personal authentic acceptance of the school's Anglican identity, and capability to engage in it as leader, is of paramount importance. It is necessary in the Anglican context that the principal of a school feel a 'comfortable fit' with their school's expression of Anglicanism. This conclusion gives rise to Recommendation One.

In order for Anglican principals to lead faith formation by authentically living the Anglican faith, they require sufficient awareness of Anglican diversity to be cognisant of their position in the Anglican spectrum of schools. Valuing an awareness of Anglican culture was an important issue for principals as faith formation leaders in this study. The diversity of Anglicanism may be an issue that aspiring principals of Anglican schools are not sufficiently aware of, particularly if their experience of Anglicanism has been limited. Taking up a principal's role of faith formation leader of an Anglican school without adequate awareness of the nature of Anglicanism, potentially impairs the sense of 'comfort' involved with leadership of an Anglican school. The Anglican Church has an opportunity to provide aspiring school principals with prerequisite training in awareness of Anglican issues necessary for comfortable mission leadership while simultaneously furthering a sense of Anglican school unity as principal aspirants undertake professional training together. This conclusion leads to Recommendation Two.

The participants frequently use the term 'comfort' as a descriptor of their experience of being the principal and faith formation leader of an Anglican school. Participants reveal a sense of comfort that includes 'feeling at home', and 'fitting into the Anglican culture', intellectually and spiritually. Additionally, they demonstrate a willingness to endure criticism in pro-actively affirming the Anglican culture in their schools. The study suggests that in the absence of Anglican Church documents defining faith formation leadership dimensions
and expectations, Anglican principals need to have some sense of comfort. However, comfort can potentially have negative connotations, for example, a principal may influence the school to suit his/her personal spirituality, belief (Johnson, 2002), and personal comfort that may be non-aligned with Anglican mission. The importance of comfort in this context is that it appears to be an informal means by which Anglican principals engage in ways that they negotiate with their school, the diocesan bishop and other representations of the Anglican Church beyond the school (Bednall, 2006). To more fully understand Anglican school faith formation leadership by principals, the meaning given by them to comfort in this context and any importance that it may have, offers a valuable field of study. From this conclusion Recommendation Three is derived.

6.3.2 Principals of Australian Anglican schools sharing faith formation leadership in their schools

The sharing of faith formation leadership by Anglican school principals with the school chaplain has been a significant issue in this study. Anglican school principals share leadership in the whole life of the school whilst retaining responsibility across the range of academic, administrative and extra-curricular dimensions in their schools. In faith formation leadership there is a need for authentic living of the Anglican faith that cannot be given as a responsibility to the chaplain or another person. Shared leadership in this area is not given to another person who functions as an expert such as an academic Head of Department or a specialist sports coach. If the principal is to avoid being a dependent partner to an ordained chaplain in sharing faith formation leadership, then the principal should have a theological foundation in Anglicanism that enables an informed partnership as a shared leader of this key mission expression of Anglicanism. This requires more than awareness of Anglican diversity, as in the second recommendation. There needs to be grounding for principals in Anglican theology, liturgy, ethics and general matters so that they are conversant with contemporary contextual Anglican practice. This conclusion leads to Recommendation Four.
The diversity that is a feature of Australian Anglicanism also applies to the relationship between an Anglican school’s principal and chaplain. Cole (2006) observes that an Australian Anglican school chaplain is answerable to both the school principal and the diocesan bishop and needs to be incorporated into the leadership of the principal and the structure of the school in a manner that suits the school. There are no models or guidelines for how this is implemented. It is possible that this relationship is an aspect of the ‘comfort’ that the principal experiences in faith formation leadership of an Anglican school, developing uniquely in each school and dependent on the principal and chaplain without any guiding criteria. Considering the importance of Anglican principals’ faith formation leadership as an expression of the mission of the Anglican Church, it is an area in which study could be undertaken to assist the furtherance of the mission of Anglican schools and the Church. Recommendation Five flows from this conclusion.

There are many persons other than chaplains in Anglican schools, not mentioned in this study, whose impact on the life of an Anglican school may contribute to faith formation and its leadership. Chairs and members of school boards, school staff and senior staff in leadership roles, bishops, diocesan schools officers, local clergy, past students and others might share leadership roles with the school principal. It is possible that some of these or other persons have the potential to share faith leadership roles with principals. As an unexplored area, there exist questions of current practice and potential opportunities for sharing of faith formation leadership by Anglican school principals. From this conclusion follows Recommendation Six.

6.3.3 Principals of Australian Anglican schools being enabled by the Anglican Church to be faith formation leaders of Anglican mission in their schools

This study has noted the value that principals place upon having a peer mentor. Both participants affirm the worth of informal and incidental experiences of being mentored in their professional development, with particular reference to being formed as faith formation leaders. This study
demonstrates that peer mentors have provided encouragement, personal example and role modelling for Anglican principals in their formative years. Lutheran Education Australia has had experience of implementing principal mentoring programmes since 2000 and might offer valuable insights for the establishment of mentoring for Australian Anglican principals as faith formation leaders. This conclusion leads to Recommendation Seven

The review of the literature revealed an abundance of research studies and scholarly publications pertaining to leadership of Catholic schools, both nationally and internationally. The insights gained and the debates fostered have enriched Catholic education practice, leadership and teacher preparation by providing academically qualified expertise to support and foster Catholic education culture. This is evidenced by the observation that Catholic principals in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America engaged in common discourse that is recognizably Catholic (Johnson & Castelli, 2000). Through research studies and the dissemination of literature in scholarly journals, Catholic school principals, academics and others give voice to their experiences, pose questions and share insights. There is also a culture of research and scholarly writing in Australian Lutheran education. Considering the lack of clarity and familiarity about aspects of Anglicanism expressed by the participants in this study, the development of a supportive climate for Australian Anglican educational research and scholarly publication may be of benefit to faith formation leadership and Anglican education generally. The Anglican Diocese of Sydney has begun to encourage research and publication for this purpose (Anglican Education Commission Diocese of Sydney, 2008). From this conclusion follow Recommendations Eight and Nine.

This conclusion addresses the challenge of leading an Anglican school in a culture of diversity, while striving to maintain unity through the dynamic process of the ‘Via Media’. Whereas the more centralist Australian Catholic and Lutheran Churches provide documents detailing the capabilities required for faith formation leadership by principals of their schools, the Anglican
Church has not done so. The study reveals that both participants acknowledge this lack of defined expectation and direction, but are divided as to whether they wish such direction to be provided by the Anglican Church for their guidance. This conclusion leads to Recommendation Ten.

The study indicates that the diversity of Anglican ‘Via Media’ can result in ambivalent blandness, corrosive division or robust debate and respect for differing positions. As an expression of Christianity that eschews definition and centralist governance, Anglicanism and Anglican schools are unable to work with overly precise definition. To ensure that Anglican principals lead faith formation within the Anglican mission, values espoused by principals should be aligned with Anglican culture. This ensures that the comfort experienced, in the absence of clear directives, facilitates creative school mission in partnership with diocesan mission. This avoids localised mission that reflects values that may have drifted from Anglican origins, perhaps representing general independent school values. Anglicanism is a faith expression in which the compliance documents for school principals developed by the Catholic and Lutheran Churches would probably not be welcomed. The problem is that principals of Anglican schools are ministers of the Gospel and leading agents of Anglican Mission in their community and have expectations upon them to function as such. Leading in the defined parameters of Catholic and Lutheran faith is possible for principals working within guidance provided by documents and central authority that has been in place for generations. To lead an Anglican school requires navigation through a path that is not defined by systematic theology, but is shaped by context and diversity. This offers less certainty and greater challenge to retain identity and negotiate relationships, achievable only if leadership is aware of and equipped to understand Anglican culture.

Anglicanism has character and distinctive qualities, expressed within the diversity of the Lamberth Quadrilateral, and the checks and balances of Scripture, Reason and Tradition. Anglican principals leading faith formation in their schools may benefit from training in order to negotiate the options
inherent in Anglican diversity. This training cannot be so precise that it offends whoever takes a differing stance somewhere else in the Anglican spectrum. Neither can it be so broad in seeking to accommodate diversity that it lacks identity. Anglican principals may benefit from being equipped to understand Anglican contextual diversity and the processes of choice, debate and respect, without which Anglicanism would not hold together. Recommendation Eleven follows from this conclusion.

6.4 Recommendations of the Study

As a consequence of the conclusions drawn from this study, the following recommendations are made in the interests of supporting Anglican school principals in their role of faith formation leadership of their schools. Recommendations follow from the conclusions in the previous section.

Recommendation One: That study be undertaken to establish if identity specific groupings of Australian Anglican schools might be discerned, thereby assisting prospective principals to assess whether a school’s Anglican culture and her/his personal Anglican culture fit comfortably together so as to ensure authentic faith formation leadership in daily life.

Recommendation Two: That Anglican Church-funded pre-service training be provided for aspiring principals of Anglican schools to support authentic living of the Anglican faith, by developing awareness of and comfort with Anglican school culture and the unity and mission of the Anglican Church.

Recommendation Three: That further research be undertaken to explore the meaning of ‘comfort’ as it is understood by Anglican school principals in the role of faith formation leaders, when used to describe their relationship with their school and the Anglican Church context in which their school is situated.

Recommendation Four: That principals of Anglican schools receive adequate training in contemporary Anglican theology, Scripture, ethics and general
matters to enable them to share faith formation leadership as an informed partner with the teaching role of the bishop.

*Recommendation Five*: That an exploratory study be undertaken to understand the shared faith formation leadership of Anglican school principals with their school chaplains as it contributes to the mission of the Anglican Church, with a view to developing guidelines for strengthening these roles and this relationship.

*Recommendation Six*: That the practice of and potential opportunities for principals to share their role of faith formation leadership of Anglican schools be further investigated.

*Recommendation Seven*: That the Australian Anglican Church select and train suitable people to be peer mentors for aspiring and early career principals to support them in their development as faith formation leaders and in other dimensions of school leadership; and that a formal peer mentoring programme for principals of Anglican schools be established and maintained by the Australian Anglican Church.

*Recommendation Eight*: That the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia foster and support research which benefits Anglican schools in furthering Anglican mission.

*Recommendation Nine*: That the Anglican Church regularly publish a journal of peer-reviewed scholarly literature concerning Australian Anglican education.

*Recommendation Ten*: That exploratory research be undertaken to determine whether principals of Australian Anglican schools would welcome an Anglican Church statement of capabilities required of Anglican school principals in the role of faith formation leader of an Anglican school, and the nature of such guidance if requested.
Recommendation Eleven: That the Anglican Church develop a core statement of Anglican belief and practice for the guidance of Anglican school principals leading faith formation in their schools. This statement could be presented in conjunction with a Diploma in Anglican School Leadership (incorporating Recommendations Two and Four), and aspiring principals be supported to undertake this to equip them as leaders in Anglican mission.

6.5 Conclusion of the Study

This study was conducted to explore the role and practice of faith formation leadership of Australian Anglican schools by Anglican school principals. Aligning the mission of a school with a Church that lacks defined identity is a challenge of heart and intellect. The personalities of growing students, parents, staff and other stakeholders and the character of an Anglican school, require leaders with vision and strength. These qualities have been evident in this study. Other areas in which research has been lacking have been addressed, offering some suggestions for progress in this debate and also some suggested areas of enquiry for further research.
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APPENDIX I

Vision Statement for Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane

Preamble

This vision statement has been developed in order to clarify the vision of the Diocese for Anglican Schools in the Diocese. The statement has been developed after significant consultation with schools and has been approved by both the Anglican Schools Commission and the Diocesan Council.

The vision document is in two parts. First the vision statement itself and then an 'expression statement' which seeks to offer practical indications of what activity might happen in a school to reflect the vision. This is not a prescriptive or limited list, but rather an indication of actions which will illustrate the vision being implemented. Additionally it will provide both guidance and a framework for discussion and review.

The vision places schools firmly within the mission of the Church - to proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God, and sees this mission lived out in the special context of a school. The vision statement is meant to be sufficiently broad so as to cover the whole life of the school and takes, as its starting point, that Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane will strive to be communities of learning excellence.

Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane share the mission of the Church and are an integral and valued part of the life of the Diocese and therefore deserve effective support and encouragement from the wider Diocese. This support will certainly come via the Anglican Schools Commission, however individuals, parishes and agencies are encouraged also to pray for our schools and join with them in their life.
Vision for Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane

As learning communities of excellence, Anglican Schools in the Diocese of Brisbane are called to share the mission of the church to proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God through:

**Faith**
Promoting faith in Jesus Christ among students, staff and families. Offering opportunity for students, staff and family to worship God and experience Christian community in the Anglican way.

**Vocation**
Educating students to value themselves and each other as gifted parts of God’s creation with a vocation to explore, understand, nurture and serve that creation. Helping students to develop their God given gifts, talents and opportunities to live out that vocation.

**Service**
Enabling students to develop skills and values to live in peace and harmony, seeking justice for all with a priority for the poor, powerless and persecuted and marginalized.
Putting the Vision into Practice

The following are examples of actions which will contribute to the vision becoming reality in Anglican Schools. The list is not exhaustive and schools are encouraged to reflect on the Vision Statement to determine what more can be done to live out the vision in their context.

1. **Promoting faith in Jesus Christ and the experience of Christian community:**

   A. **The provision for participation in core Anglican worship as central and available to the whole school community by such means as:**
      - The appointment of a chaplain/s licensed by the Archbishop;
      - The appointment of a youth minister/s by the Archbishop;
      - Worship opportunities in a form and style which is appropriate and accessible;
      - The offer of the Eucharist on a regular basis to the whole school;
      - Celebration of Christian festivals and seasons;
      - The offer of the other sacraments and rites of the Anglican Church such as baptism, confirmation, admission to communion, reception, and reaffirmation on a regular basis;
      - Regular prayer through the normal school program.

   B. **The provision of opportunities for exploration of the Christian faith expressed through:**
      - The offer of voluntary groups where staff and students can grow in knowledge and faith in Jesus Christ;
      - The development of a consecrated chapel;
      - Building close links with local parishes;
      - Opportunity and encouragement for faith formation of staff;
      - Opportunity for faith formation offered to families;
      - Opportunity for faith formation and exploration for members of School Councils.

2. **The provision of a Religious Education Program which:**
   - Is compulsory for all students;
   - Is grounded in the Christian faith;
   - Makes clear the beliefs and practice of the Anglican way of Christianity;
   - Is integral to the school and seen to be valued by the school;
   - While grounded in the Christian foundations recognizes diversity and is affirming and inclusive in form and content;
   - Encourages the development of moral values and reasoning and nurtures the notions and practices of the gospel values of compassion and forgiveness;
   - Encourages and develops the notion of vocation as living in response to God’s call;
   - Is relevant to the students’ beliefs and experiences;
• Is taught by committed Christian (preferably Anglican) teachers trained in Religious Education who are encouraged and facilitated to continue professional development;
• Encourages students to think reflectively and critically about faith and the ‘big’ questions of human life;
• Is well resourced.

3. The provision of School Staff who:
   • Participate in an induction process which makes clear the values and mission of the Anglican church;
   • Are encouraged and facilitated to undertake basic studies in theology;
   • Model the Christian life and ethos of the School;
   • Are cared for and supported as the most valuable resource of the school;
   • Have access to professional development;
   • Are offered and facilitated in Christian faith formation;
   • Are encouraged to participate in activities which link the school and Diocese and the wider church.

4. Governance:
   • That bases its decision making, processes, policies, structures, strategic planning on Christian beliefs, attitudes and values;
   • Whose participants are mainly practising Anglicans. For those who are not practising Anglicans, practising Christians who are supportive of the school’s Anglican identity and mission;
   • That develops a healthy, mutually respectful relationship with the Diocese including mutual accountability and regular review of that relationship.

5. The provision of outreach opportunities and learning activities reflecting the values of the kingdom of God which:
   • Address issues of injustice and inequality in society;
   • Engage in responses of care for human need;
   • Support Anglican organizations involved in mission and welfare;
   • Engage in action to care for and renew the environment.

6. The encouragement of a school culture where:
   • The gospel values of love, forgiveness, tolerance, honesty, safety and generosity are encouraged;
   • Students are encouraged to develop their God given gifts and use them to the full;
   • Those who might otherwise be marginalized are accepted as valued members;
   • The pastoral care of students and staff and families is encouraged, facilitated and resourced.

   (Anglican Schools Commission, 2009).
APPENDIX II

Dimensions of leadership and capabilities for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools

Table 1: Dimensions of Leadership in Queensland Catholic schools.

Inner Leadership

Inner leadership leads to personal development. Here the leader seeks to achieve an authentic self-realisation, thus enhancing their ability to serve the school community and the wider society. This requires balanced development in a number of dimensions including physical, cognitive, emotional, aesthetic, social, moral and spiritual development. Inner leadership involves personal reflection, freeing ourselves of habitual reminders and behaviours to make conscious choices and becoming integrated and autonomous people acting in accordance with values and purpose.

Interpersonal Leadership

Interpersonal leadership focuses on building working relationships with the various members of the school community as well with as the wider community. Here there is a strong commitment to integral human development for all, based on one’s personal values and a respect for the whole person within community. Interpersonal leadership involves moving from being aware of another’s presence or existence to sharing one’s personal self and being open to growth induced by the reactions of the other.

Organisational Leadership

Organisational leadership focuses on various aspects of management at school level with a view to ensuring efficiency and effectiveness. Organisational leadership is associated with the Christian ethic of stewardship and requires a commitment to the Common Good. This form of leadership involves strategic thinking, developing cultural meaning through policy and practice, managing physical and financial resources, facilitating performance management and being accountable to the school community and external authorities.

Educative Leadership

Educative leadership plays a critical role in the teaching and learning process by helping teachers and other members of the school community to discover meaning in what they do, while investing in them the capacity to bring about curriculum change. Educative leadership involves futuristic thinking and links curriculum development with an inspiring vision of a preferred future. It also involves placing teaching and learning at the centre of decision-making, heightening the level of professional dialogue about educational practices and encouraging individual innovation within a learning community.
Community Leadership

Community leadership focuses on achieving solidarity or patterns of cooperation, expresses human interdependence and is the means to achieve the Common Good. Community leadership is about nurturing positive interpersonal relations, as well as facilitating social and moral development. Subsidiarity is fundamental with leaders distributing responsibility, accountability and decision-making among those directly concerned with specific tasks. It is also important to establish and support a community of ethical inquiry.

Faith Leadership

Faith leadership focuses on sharing the Catholic faith with the intention of influencing and enriching the lives of students, staff and other members of the school community. This dimension of leadership provides educational opportunities for members of the school community to encounter the Catholic faith, to experience its gifts and to enhance life decisions in response to it. Guided by faith, hope and love, faith leaders support a community of life and worship through which to recognize, to accept and to cooperate with the mysterious action of God in our lives.

Table 2: Capabilities for leadership in Queensland Catholic schools.

PERSONAL CAPABILITIES

- Developing self-knowledge
- Displaying imagination and vision
- Showing confidence, optimism and resilience
- Exemplifying honesty and integrity
- Integrating work and personal life
- Seeking spirituality

RELATIONAL CAPABILITIES

- Demonstrating emotional maturity
- Projecting empathy
- Displaying a trusting disposition
- Cultivating productive working relationships
- Communicating with influence
- Engaging positive politics
PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITIES

- Being contextually aware and responsive
- Displaying curriculum and pedagogical know-how
- Inspiring a communal purpose and vision
- Engaging strategic thinking and planning
- Demonstrating sound organisational and fiscal management
- Focusing on outcomes and accountability

MISSION CAPABILITIES

- Committing to a personal journey of faith
- Giving witness to Gospel values, particularly social justice
- Developing Scriptural and theological understanding
- Acting as an agent of evangelisation
- Cultivating the school’s Catholic identity
- Engaging Catholic school renewal

(Spry, 2004, pp. 23 -26)
APPENDIX III

Capabilities for leadership and dimensions of leadership for Lutheran schools in Australia

Leadership Capabilities

Theological Capability

Theology expresses itself in a life of worship and service. Theological capability involves witnessing to Christian faith in the Lutheran tradition. It requires an understanding of Scripture and Lutheran theology to underpin leadership action.

Indicators:

- Is committed to a personal faith journey
- Serves as a witness to the gospel
- Engages in ongoing spiritual and theological development
- Clarifies and applies the school’s mission
- Integrates faith and life

Personal Capability

Personal capability integrates faith commitment, honesty, integrity, ethical reflection and self-critique, which result in a sense of self-efficacy and personal identity.

Indicators:

- Displays imagination, vision and hope
- Practises personal reflection and critique
- Models honesty and integrity
- Integrates word and personal life
- Exhibits good judgment and wisdom
- Demonstrates a belief in self
- Displays confidence, optimism and resilience
Relational Capability

Relational capability cultivates trusting working relationships. The relational leader collaborates with others with belief and purpose, and encourages others to be the best they can be.

Indicators:

- Demonstrates emotional maturity
- Cultivates trusting and collaborative relationships
- Communicates with influence
- Listens with openness and attention
- Is genuinely present for others
- Appreciates others’ feelings and perspectives and responds with empathy to their concerns

Professional Capability

Professional capability demonstrates curriculum and pedagogical ‘know-how’ as part of a relevant knowledge base. The professional leader encourages the development of educational expertise and responsibilities, and builds leadership capability in others, s/he engages in purposeful review, development and reporting, and is contextually aware and responsive.

Indicators:

- Is committed to the care, learning and growth of students
- Engages others in the development of a learning community
- Is aware of and engages in the development of teaching and learning
- Engages in personal and professional development
- Uses review and reflection to improve learning
Managerial Capability

Managerial capability requires management of all school resources, human, fiscal, physical and technical to achieve agreed goals and sustain priority outcomes.

Indicators:

- Sets appropriate goals and completes tasks
- Is organized and decisive
- Manages resources efficiently and effectively
- Monitors, evaluates and reports results
- Coordinates and manages human resources effectively

Strategic Capability

Strategic capability requires visionary and strategic thinking and builds a research based, mission-driven culture. The capable organisational leader builds organisational capacity, responsiveness and engages in positive politics.

Indicators:

- Shapes and encourages visionary and future-oriented thinking and practice
- Develops policies, procedures and action plans
- Responds effectively to a changing environment
- Is open to new and innovative ideas
- Builds alliances and networks

Spiritual Leadership

Spiritual leadership focuses on living a Lutheran understanding of God’s mission for the world with the intention of influencing and enriching the lives of students, staff and other members of the school community. This dimension of leadership provides educational opportunities for members of the school community to encounter a Lutheran worldview, to experience its gifts and to enhance life decisions in response to it. Guided by such a mission, leaders develop a community of life and worship.
**Authentic Leadership**
The authentic leader is committed to the development of self and others. Such individuals seek to achieve an integration of their personal and professional lives, so as to serve their community and the wider society. An authentic leader has a strong commitment to human development for all, based on values and a respect for the integrity of the person in community. Authentic leadership involves being aware of another’s presence through sharing one’s self and being open to growth through relationships with others. Such individuals challenge mindsets and behaviours so as to enhance autonomous and ethical choices. The outcome of such leadership is an integration of espoused values and lived behaviour in the leader and in the group.

**Educative Leadership**
Educative leaders play a critical role in the teaching and learning process by helping teachers and other members of the school community to discover meaning in what they do, while investing in them the capacity to bring about curriculum and pedagogical change. Educative leadership involves futuristic thinking and links curriculum development with an inspiring vision of a preferred future. It also involves placing teaching and learning at the centre of decision-making, heightening the level of professional dialogue about educational practices and encouraging individual innovation within a learning community. Such leadership is educative in its intentions, processes and outcomes.

**Organisational Leadership**
Organisational leadership focuses on various aspects of management at school level with a view to ensuring a balance of efficiency and effectiveness. Stewardship and a commitment to Lutheran beliefs and values of the organisation underpin a responsible approach to leadership. This form of leadership involves strategic thinking; expresses cultural meaning through policy and practice; manages physical and financial resources; facilitates performance management, and emphasises accountability to the school community and external authorities.

**Community Leadership**
Community leadership focuses on achieving a culture of solidarity and patterns of cooperation that encourages human interdependence as a means to achieve the mission of the school community. Community leadership is about nurturing positive interpersonal relations, as well as facilitating social and moral development. Such leaders distribute responsibility, accountability and decision-making among those directly concerned with specific tasks. They establish and support a community of ethical inquiry.

(ACU National Leadership Flagship, 2005, pp. 2-5)
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Interview Questions

1. Either from among the three factors that you have listed on the survey, or others, can you specify one or two main factors in particular that led you to becoming an Anglican school principal?

Why did you prioritise these factors as you did?

Why are those factors important to you?

2. Did you aspire to Principalship in any school/school system, or were you intent upon becoming a Principal in an Anglican school?

Would you mind explaining the reasons behind your aspirations?

3. In what ways has your past contributed to your preparation for leadership of an Anglican school?

In what way do you believe that the Diocese of Brisbane has contributed to your development as the Principal of an Anglican school?
4. In what ways would you perceive yourself to be the leader of faith formation in your school?

How would people in your school perceive your faith formation leadership?

Do you feel comfortable in this role of faith formation leadership? Why or why not?

5. To what extent do you feel equipped for a faith formation leadership role in your school?

How do you think further Diocesan assistance could be given to you for exercising this faith formation leadership role?
6. In what sense do you perceive your faith formation leadership of your school as a ministry within the wider teaching mission of the Anglican Church?

In what ways do you understand your faith formation leadership to be expressed as cultural leadership, ie working within and to promote the Anglican Christian culture of the school?

In what ways do you understand your faith formation leadership to be expressed as symbolic leadership, ie working with the tangible, symbolic expressions of your school’s culture that reflect its Anglican Christian identity?

7. In what ways do you understand the cultural and symbolic character of your school to be consonant with the cultural and symbolic expressions of the wider Anglican Church?

What do you perceive to be the most important cultural and symbolic aspects of your school leadership?

What do you perceive to be the most important cultural and symbolic aspects of your faith formation leadership in your school?
APPENDIX V

Survey Questionnaire

1. Pseudonym chosen

2. Year of birth

3. Highest academic qualification

4. Education

   primary school(s) attended

   Secondary school(s) attended

5. Post-secondary qualification(s) and institution(s) attended

6. Marital status

   Married   y / n   Number of years

   Single    y / n

   Widow     Divorced

7. Children

   No. of    Gender and ages (eg. F-14)
8. Professional life

**Number of years teaching**

Teaching placements (in chronological order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of years Principal**

Placements as Principal (in chronological order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please list, in order of priority, three factors (i.e. events, people) that contributed to your becoming an Anglican school Principal

   •

   •

   •

10. In what way(s), if any, did your family contribute to your decision to become a school Principal?

11. What formal preparation have you had for becoming an Anglican school Principal?
12. What do you feel are the most satisfying aspects of your work as an Anglican school Principal?

13. What do you feel are the least satisfying aspects of your work as an Anglican school Principal?

14. In relation to your current lifestyle and role as Principal of an Anglican school and lifestyle, and the time available to you for **prayer and spiritual growth**, could you indicate on the continuum, from **no time at all** to **more than 7 hours per week**, an estimate of the time in a week that you would give to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Time</th>
<th>2 hours</th>
<th>4 hours</th>
<th>6 hours</th>
<th>7 or more hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public worship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. What is your understanding of the term, Ministry?

16. What is your understanding of the term, Vocation?

17. Please list the personal qualities, necessary training and sense of mission that you feel are desirable for those serving in the role of leading an Anglican faith school:

   **Personal qualities**

   **Necessary training**

   **Sense of mission**

18. Defining school culture as the intangible shared ideas, beliefs, standards, values and attitudes that members of a school community have inherited, hold, reinforce and pass on by action and interaction, please list what you perceive to be the important elements of your school’s culture
19. Defining **school symbols** as the tangible, physically observable expressions of school culture, please list what you perceive to be the **important symbols in your school** that define its Anglican Christian identity.

20. What do you understand by the term **Faith**, in the expression ‘faith formation’?

21. What do you understand by the term **Faith formation** in the expression ‘faith formation leadership of schools’?

Thankyou for your co-operation in completing this survey and for the time you have given to this task, from your busy schedule. Please return the completed survey in the self-addressed envelope. Information from it will remain confidential and will be used in the interview.
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Information letters to participants

INFORMATION LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

TITLE OF PROJECT: An exploration of the role of school principals in faith formation leadership within the educational mission of two Australian Anglican schools.

SUPERVISOR: Dr Paul J. Hansen

STUDENT RESEARCHER: The Reverend Craig W. Moody

PROGRAMME IN WHICH ENROLLED: Master of Education (Research)

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in a study which explores two Australian Anglican school principals’ perceptions of their role and capabilities as faith formation leaders, and their sense of feeling equipped or otherwise for this ministry. This study seeks to assist Anglican school principals and the Anglican Church to develop understanding of Anglican principals’ roles in faith formation leadership and of the capabilities needed. The study also seeks to provide insights into ways to assist principals to feel equipped for the task as well as discovering additional areas of research to further describe this leadership. Data will be gathered through a short survey, an interview and analysis of publicly available documents such as speeches, websites or yearbooks.

The study offers negligible risk or inconvenience to you. The purpose of the study is to assist you and other Anglican school principals in faith formation leadership. As this is a new area of research in Australia, your participation will significantly contribute to the development of understanding and fruitful endeavour in this area. You will be asked to complete a short written survey of no more than an hour and to participate in an interview (again of about one hour), which will be tape-recorded to ensure accuracy. The interview will be transcribed, and any interpretation of these two sets of data will be discussed with you to ensure your agreement and comfort.

Anglican Church identity covers a broad spectrum, as I am sure that you know. Within this breadth of identity, Anglican school principals are “charged with maintaining a direction and culture that respects the traditions and direction of each school while aligning with and furthering the Mission of the Diocese”, as noted in Gavin Nicholson’s Report of 2007. Your participation in this study will offer insight into the nature of challenges of Anglican identity and faith formation leadership that are being faced. The study will culminate in a Master of Education thesis, a report to the Anglican Church with some suggested findings and possibly publication in a journal.
You are free to refuse consent for participation in this study without having to justify your decision. You are also free to withdraw consent and discontinue participation in the study at any time, without giving a reason. This study is not undertaken on behalf of the Diocese of Brisbane, the Anglican Schools Commission, or any other body. The sole genesis for this research lies in the researcher’s experience of Anglican schools as a student, parent, chaplain and member of three school boards, from which has developed sensitivity to the many demands placed upon school principals, especially in this area of faith formation leadership. Your participation or non-participation will remain confidential.

In the writing of any report or journal article from this study, or any subsequent documents, neither your name nor any identifying details of yourself or your school will be used. The researcher will take all care to protect your identity, asking you to select your own pseudonym for use in the study and any subsequent document(s).

Any questions regarding this study should be directed to the Supervisor and the Student Researcher.

Dr Paul J. Hansen          The Reverend Craig W. Moody
07 3623 7226              07 3359 2062
Senior Lecturer          Parish Priest
School of Education   All Saints Anglican Church
ACU McAuley at Banyo  501 Hamilton Road
PO Box 456            CHERMSIDE 4014.

During the study and at its completion, feedback will be provided to you to ensure that you are not misrepresented in any way and that reporting is accurate. A further safeguard for the ethical probity of the study is that it has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Australian Catholic University.

In the event that you have any complaint or concern about the way that you have been treated during the study, or if you have any query that the Supervisor or researcher have not been able to satisfy, you may write to the Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee, care of this address

Qld Chair, HREC
C/o Research Services
Australian Catholic University
Brisbane Campus
PO Box 456
VIRGINIA QLD 4014
Tel: 07 3623 7429
Fax: 07 3623 7328

Any complaint or concern will be treated in confidence and fully investigated. You would be informed of the outcome.

If you agree to participate in this study, please sign both copies of the Consent Form, retain one copy for your records and return the other copy to the Student researcher.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Dr Paul J. Hansen          The Reverend Craig W. Moody
Supervisor                  Student Researcher
APPENDIX VII
Consent Form

CONSENT FORM
Copy for Researcher/Copy for Participant

TITLE OF PROJECT: An exploration of the role of school principals in faith formation leadership within the educational mission of two Australian Anglican schools.

SUPERVISOR: Dr Paul J. Hansen

STUDENT RESEARCHER: The Reverend Craig W. Moody

I (participant) have read and understood the information provided in the Letter to Participants. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research study, involving a written survey of one hour’s duration, an interview, which will be audio-taped, of about one hour’s duration. I realize that I can withdraw my consent at any time. I agree that research data collected for the study may be published or may be provided to other researchers in a form that does not identify me in any way.

NAME OF PARTICIPANT………………………………………………………………

SIGNATURE………………………………………………

DATE……………………………

SIGNATURE OF SUPERVISOR………………………………………………………

DATE……………………………

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT RESEARCHER…………………………………………

DATE……………………………
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Ethics Approval from the Human Research Ethics Committee

---

Human Research Ethics Committee

Committee Approval Form

**Principal Investigator/Supervisor:** Dr Paul Hansen  Brisbane Campus

**Co-Investigators:** Dr Joy Kennedy  Brisbane Campus

**Student Researcher:** Revd Craig W Moody  Brisbane Campus

---

**Ethics approval has been granted for the following project:**
An exploration of the role of school principals in faith formation leadership within the educational mission of two Anglican schools within the Archdiocese of Brisbane. (Faith formation leadership by Brisbane Anglican school principals.)

**for the period:** 1 December 2008 to 30 June 2009

**Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) Register Number:** Q200708 51

---

The following **standard** conditions as stipulated in the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (2007) apply:

(i) that Principal Investigators / Supervisors provide, on the form supplied by the Human Research Ethics Committee, annual reports on matters such as:
+ security of records
+ compliance with approved consent procedures and documentation
+ compliance with special conditions, and

(ii) that researchers report to the HREC immediately any matter that might affect the ethical acceptability of the protocol, such as:
+ proposed changes to the protocol
+ unforeseen circumstances or events
+ adverse effects on participants

---

The HREC will conduct an audit each year of all projects deemed to be of more than low risk. There will also be random audits of a sample of projects considered to be of negligible risk and low risk on all campuses each year.

Within one month of the conclusion of the project, researchers are required to complete a Final Report Form and submit it to the local Research Services Officer.

If the project continues for more than one year, researchers are required to complete an Annual Progress Report Form and submit it to the local Research Services Officer within one month of the anniversary date of the ethics approval.

---

**Signed:**

K. [Signature]

**Date:** 1 December 2008

(Research Services Officer, McAuley Campus)

---

(Committee Approval.dot @21/11/2007)