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ABSTRACT

The research enquiry for this thesis, from an insider/outsider position, is a deeply held reflection of personal values, convictions and professional experiences stemming from the researcher's life's work in school leadership both in the United States and abroad. The intent of this study is to engage with the sacred discourse of evangelical Christian school leaders and the discourse of the sacred and secular scholarly literature.

This is a qualitative study of a constructivist/interpretivist approach where semi-structured interviews, with 12 senior school leaders, four in each of three Anglophone countries, inform the data. A more in-depth case study of one school is utilised as a comprehensive illustration of thematic elements revealed through multiple data sources.

The preliminary literature for this research was based on the readings of various contemporary theories of leadership and literature around servant-leadership from which the initial research question was framed. As the data analysis advanced, a new framework emerged around attributes of leadership and community building through leadership, making it imperative to accommodate a new set of transformational/relational/ethical literature, taking the story on a completely different journey with a new research question and sub-questions; therefore, leaving behind the initial research question.

Two descriptors of leadership became the primary framework for the thesis: the 'sacred' and the 'secular' discourses relating to school leadership. Standing in the doorway, as it were, the researcher took on a role of interpreting and translating one discourse to the other rather than acting solely as observer and interpreter of the data.

The findings, the utilisation of two discourses, and the interpretive stance make a positive and original contribution to knowledge and are significant in two ways. First, the participants, speaking through the sacred discourse, express an extension to or linkage with the secular literature, revealing much more overlap between the two discourses than was expected. Second, the secular literature does not capture the sacred discourse; there is an appurtenance – an add-on – a more spiritual dimension, to consider.
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REFLECTIVE STATEMENT

Introduction
Reflection is a ‘learning journey’ (Carnell and Gold, 2009) and has been a significant part of my EdD International experience. This extraordinary journey has been filled with untold emotions, challenges and trials, successes and setbacks, ups and downs; nevertheless, it has been an intellectual metamorphosis and a process of personal transformation empowering me to redefine my personal and professional goals. I surmise that this act of reflection brought me to the Institute of Education as well. I was seeking to further my education, and desired a course of study that was unique and situated within an international context. This doctoral experience has met my expectations, adding breadth and depth to my professional knowledge.

Professional Development
Much of the writing for this doctorate was influenced by years of teaching and leading in secular and evangelical Christian schools. The last 28 years have been devoted to leadership, hence the selection of writing around leadership for nearly every phase of the doctoral programme. Each taught course has challenged my professional learning and leading, and I trust that those with whom I work can see a transformation in my leadership in sharing more of the decision-making. I do not think that I have ever been as acutely aware of the impact of my leadership; however, reading extensively in the scholarly Christian and relevant secular scholarly literature, and speaking with colleagues from Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States, has heightened my awareness of the various discourses shaping the discussion of leadership today.

I do not think a day goes by when I am not challenged to reflect upon my leadership and professional execution of duties — how I serve others, how I interact with colleagues and how I impart new knowledge with the intent of educating my staff. Most importantly, as a Christian, I am challenged to model Christ as I lead my staff, students and parents, and reflect upon how my own sacred discourse influences my leadership.
Putting Theory into Practice

The taught course modules opened up new worlds of professional learning for me. Having become quite stagnant following the completion of my MA many years previously, I found this new challenge fraught with excitement and fear. Although I did not pursue a specific line of enquiry throughout the programme, there was overlap in several areas. The Foundations of Professionalism (FoP) module of the taught courses challenged me to evaluate my own professionalism when conducting the affairs of my school. Defining concepts used in writing, developing critical pedagogy to define a leadership discourse and engaging with relevant theoretical constructs were components of the FoP that brought my writing forward. My introduction to scholarly literature began, and my use of it in writing was challenging. Reflecting back now, I recall feeling very alone during this course. That was to change as I advanced through the taught courses, finding success along the way and colleagues with whom to converse.

The four taught courses were the catalysts for engaging with the areas of interest that would guide the direction for my IFS and thesis. During the Methods of Enquiry 1 (MoE1) module, I was exposed to new concepts such as epistemology, ontology, positivism and constructivism. I began to define my own ontological assumptions and discovered a methodological framework in which to place my research. Philosophically, from my own personal and evangelical Christian background, I think I should be a positivist; when it came down to the sociological aspects of educational leadership, however, I found myself engaging in the fine art of hearing and constructing meaning from qualitative data. Therefore, I adopted a constructivist/interpretivist epistemological stance to underpin my research findings, realising that it was important not to ‘throw the constructivist baby out with the positivist bathwater’ (Kragh, 1998).

I realised that I could acknowledge that knowledge is constructed by individuals through a process of interaction with objects and people in their environments, without having to accept that knowledge is only constructed (Newell, 2011). I believe that we apprehend reality from our personal situations and experiences, yet, as an evangelical Christian, I contend that knowledge is, most importantly, revealed. These revelations and reflections are what led me on my research journey for this thesis, discovering my engagement with the sacred and the secular as two discourses, as well as a research method. Perhaps this
represents the two parts (the sacred and the secular) of my life coming together; it is the realisation that I am standing in the doorway of two discourse communities. In a way, this is why I have written, how I have written, and why I have come to the conclusion that I can engage with the constructivist paradigm as it focuses attention on the affective domain of learning and leading. Constructivists suggest that education be rebuilt from the bottom up, based upon how people actually learn (Newell, 2011). Upon reflection, this is what I have always believed about education in general and evangelical Christian school education specifically.

The Methods of Enquiry 2 (MoE2) module was the practical application that helped me to begin my methodological research journey, as it exposed me to all facets of qualitative research, where I have found a home. Data analysis in the hybrid form of grounded theory and the constant comparative method, as forms of inductive theory building, were new concepts for me, offering unique ways of designing a research enquiry. Exposure to the specific ethical and political considerations of beneficence, respect and justice was not only informational, but critical to the interviewing process.

Several new thoughts regarding leadership emerged during the Specialist Course in International Education (SCIE) module. I began to look more closely at educational leadership, i.e. leadership styles and models, as the focus for both the IFS and the thesis. My exposure to new theories and frameworks of leadership fostered the kind of dialogue and honest enquiry that became essential to my professional learning. The SCIE had me examining movements in educational reform, past and present, both at home and internationally, where the dominant literature on transforming schools with a bottom-up, inside-out constructivist approach, focusing on the core of schooling and the professional autonomy of teachers and leaders, began to influence my writing. At this point in the doctoral programme, I had become more cognisant of my leadership style and wanted to lead more holistically and less hierarchically. This model of linearity has greatly impacted on my professional knowledge and practice, and has translated into a version of leadership development and transformation that is collaborative and horizontal. The SCIE and the IFS challenged me to move even further from the crude top-down bureaucratic management paradigm towards a calling into leadership that is transformational and
serving, reinforcing my intention to lead as an opportunity to serve and to steward stakeholders within my own educational environment.

The literature review for each taught course laid the foundation for researching educational leadership, challenging my academic thinking in terms of writing clearly, establishing and sustaining an interpretive argument, and finding my own voice when writing research. Once the appropriate rationale and research questions were explicit, making certain that my design was not lost in the research became paramount. The course work in these modules sparked my engagement with qualitative data analysis as an iterative process guided by emerging theory.

Learning to research as an insider within my own institution was an interesting endeavour in the Institution Focused Study (IFS). I had to guard against my own insider/researcher bias. Reviewing the literature on insider research for the IFS and applying what I had learned to the writing and researching of this thesis as an insider/outsider researcher was valuable. I referred to my methodology in the IFS as magic, where new worlds of qualitative research were being revealed to me through the pilot interview and the use of the vignette. It was this experience that further advanced my research, applying such skills as triangulation and case study research.

My thesis journey was an arduous intellectual task: complex and reflective, taking more time than I had imagined, stretching my capacity for scholarly work. Locating and contacting those who might participate in my research took an inordinate amount of effort, expense and time – no regrets and thoroughly enjoyable. Part of the professional learning experience was engaging with the international aspect required in the programme and incorporating this dynamic within my research framework. As I reflect on this aspect of my thesis, I am fondly reminded that this was an exciting exploratory phase, as I travelled to the 12 schools, meeting the senior leaders and getting to know, to some extent, their schools' cultures and missions.

The experience of the IFS methodologically increased my skill in making connections with my thesis participants, putting them at ease and creating a joint venture between us. The interviews became amiable conversations, although initially they were quite
unnerving. The interviewing process, I think, became the most enjoyable facet of my thesis research activity. I have never ventured into so much unknown territory. I was rewarded by the openness and friendliness of each of the participants, learning so much from listening to their stories and observing their interactions.

My thesis writing was a process that included multiple dimensions. Part of my thesis journey was dealing with the time factor. Working as a senior leader in a specialised school programme while writing the thesis, has been challenging. Having a family with unexpected needs took time away from my studies. Finally, I had two bouts of illness and a death in the family which interrupted my studies.

Supervision and Support
For years as a school administrator, the supervision of staff has been central to my leadership and professional development. At one point in my educational career, I supervised student teachers at a university where I was an adjunct professor. My overall supervision experience with the EdD International programme has been extraordinary, contributing to my overall success in the programme, adding value to my professional learning as well.

The MoE1 was a most challenging course, leaving me, on completion of the draft, in some despair. However, with constructive feedback from the course tutor, I completed the course quite successfully. My tutor for the SCIE was instrumental in guiding me forward with a summative report that was instructional, witty and encouraging. I finally felt somewhat scholarly. I learned from my SCIE tutor that everything is metaphorical—it will just take another ‘metaphorical’ week! I have yet to interpret just how long that is.

My supervisor has been there from week one: patient beyond requirement, encouraging despite my emotional ups and downs, generous with time and insightful and constructive in her comments. I consider her a dear and valued friend. Reflecting on the quality supervision that I have received throughout this journey has made me a better supervisor of those with whom I work and with the students that I teach.
Conclusion and Future

This EdD International programme has created a new passion within me, igniting a fresh boldness to effect real change in terms of transforming school leadership into leadership that is more caring and collegial, to the building of relationships and an increased sense of community. Engaging with the sacred discourse of my evangelical Christian school leader participants has stimulated reflection as to the importance of evangelical Christian school leaders having a strong, influential discourse expressed through their Christian values.

I have discovered that the reflective process serves a purpose other than the examination and interpretation of data. Reflection has enabled me to examine myself, aligning newly acquired professional knowledge with future dreams and aspirations – perhaps instructing others in qualitative research, as I have become familiar with nearly every aspect of it through this thesis-writing experience. Because of my past teaching and leading experiences abroad, I strongly anticipate that my future in the area of school leadership will involve international opportunities and travel.
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GLOSSARY

ACSI:  The ‘Association of Christian Schools International’ provides professional services for Christian educators and is an organisation accrediting Christian schools worldwide.

ASB:  The ‘Associated Student Body’ is the governing body of students in the school run by students and founded to promote the interests and welfare of the school, its students, and the community.

ISLLC:  ‘Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’ is a set of standards with the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (NPBEA) in the United States to help strengthen preparation programmes in school leadership.

Microsoft Excel:  ‘Microsoft Excel’ is a software product that makes it possible to analyse, manage, track and highlight information and important data trends.

NGCSU:  ‘North Georgia College and State University’ provides a quality education with practical experiences and leadership opportunities specialising in leadership training and developing civilian and military leaders.

Nursery-6th Form:  Ages 3-18 for students in the United Kingdom.

Nvivo:  Nvivo is a form of NUD*IST which stands for ‘Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing’. It is a qualitative data analysis (QDA) computer software package produced by QSR International designed for qualitative researchers working with rich, text-based data.

PreK-12:  Ages 4-18 for students in United States and Canada

SCSBC:  The ‘Society of Christian Schools of British Columbia’ is an organisation of Christian school communities in British Columbia, Canada sharing a biblical vision for Christian education through programmes, leadership, curriculum, financial stewardship and resources.

TISCA:  ‘The Independent Schools Christian Alliance’ is an association of educators upholding Christian truth and promoting Christian values in education in the independent schools in the United Kingdom working with staffing, curriculum, management and discipline.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

1.1 Introduction
This thesis is based upon the underlying perception that leadership is emphasised increasingly as a factor, if not 'the factor, that makes the difference' in the managing and organisation of institutions where leadership is described as 'being concerned with change, influence, relationships, people, strategy, inspiring, motivating and the creation of meaning' (James and Connolly, 2000: 36). Currie, Locket and Suhomlinova (2009), researching within a sociological paradigm of leadership and institutional change in secondary schools in England, propose a broad view of the effects and characteristics of leadership, stressing that leadership cannot be divorced from the system-wide social structure and processes of schooling which would certainly include the evangelical Christian aspect of education embraced in this research. I spoke with the senior leaders of 12 evangelical Christian schools in three countries who perceive that they enact leadership with an emphasis on three key attributes of leadership; calling, stewardship and serving, with the intention that a strong sense of community in their schools is achieved.

In his *Critical Leadership Studies* project, Grace (2000) suggests a framework for leadership that would move attention away from the specifics of educational management to the principles of educational leadership, therefore, making a difference between schools that are performing effectively and those that are performing adequately. As I discovered during the participant interviews, some overlap is understandable, with the possibility of leading and managing simultaneously (Yukl, 1994), yet with leadership in the forefront.

'Essentially leaders do two things: think and act; and to be successful, they must do both well' (Weber, 2006: 121). A good deal of the thinking and acting done in the participants' schools was revealed to revolve around specific 'attributes of leadership' and one important result of the manifestation of those attributes: 'community building'. Three key leadership attributes (see definition, page 89) and the resultant outcome
community building emerged as themes from the analysis of the participant data and are expressed, if you will, through the 'sacred' discourse.

It appears that I had a pre-conceived view of the 'sacred', expecting that its discourse would somehow be very different to that of the 'secular' discourse; however, while I was immersed in the secular, scholarly literature relating to educational leadership, I found that the participant data, surprisingly, more often than not, overlapped with the secular literature and, in those instances, showed that there was no appreciable difference between the two in terms of how the participants viewed school leadership. This notion generated an interesting foundational framework for the research: the 'sacred' and the 'secular' discourses. Perhaps this overlap of discourses should not have surprised me as I have been immersed in both discourses myself for the past four decades. I also expected to find a greater difference between the discourses in the three Anglophone countries, yet I did not, due perhaps to the fact that all three countries have underlying societal values that are mainly of the Christian tradition and because the schools' senior leaders that I interviewed are all evangelical Christians.

Three key frameworks inform this thesis. The first and primary framework is the sacred and the secular discourses revealed through the data analysed from the interviews with 12 evangelical Christian school leaders and from the relevant secular, scholarly literature where I assumed the role of interpreter/translator between these two discourses. The second key framework pertains to attributes of leadership and community building through leadership, which were the key themes to emerge from the data analysis and became the context in which to examine the two discourses. I conducted a pilot interview for the purpose of gathering initial data, creating a preliminary interview schedule, and from there formulated the initial research question, Might the evangelical Christian school leaders in three countries (Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States) be servant leaders? and the sub-question, Can major stakeholders in an evangelical Christian school perceive the values of their schools' leaders? This original research question was quickly abandoned as more leadership evidence emerged from the participant data to include a broader view of leadership attributes. Thus, a new research question and sub-questions were established as follows:
How is the sacred discourse of the participants in the 12 evangelical Christian schools in three countries (Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States) expressed in terms of their leadership enactment, and is there an overlap or linkage with the relevant secular literature regarding attributes of leadership and community building?

This study also attempts to answer the following sub-questions:

- What attributes of leadership most often appear to direct the leadership of the evangelical Christian school leaders to whom I spoke?
- Is it possible that the sacred and secular discourses are complementary, with no perceived dissimilarities between the two; or are these discourses an oppositional binary with certain fundamental distinctions?
- Is there an appurtenance (an add-on) to the sacred discourse expressed by the participants that adds a richness and distinctiveness to their discourse?

The thesis will no longer focus on the initial research question except in Chapter Four where 'servant-leadership' is briefly discussed, with reference to values where appropriate. This discussion of servant-leadership was retained for three reasons: first, because of my personal interest in this theory and model of leadership; second, because it was an important leadership component for the pilot study participant; and third, because it was part of my initial reading. As the data analysis continued, servant-leadership was referred to directly by three other participants, which led to critical discussions by 11 of the 12 participants regarding the 'serving' attribute of evangelical Christian school leaders.

The final and third framework (the foundation of the literature review) is the conventional or general scholarly leadership literature that undergirds the initial research question. These principal frameworks of the research are depicted in Figure 1.1 (page 20). The innermost circle of Figure 1.1 represents the conventional and general leadership literature, which contributed in a minor way to the research; the middle circle represents the two broad themes that emerged from the data analysis and became the second framework for the research; while the outer circle represents the primary framework for
the thesis illustrating the 'sacred' and the 'secular' discourse aspect of the study as integral to the whole thesis.

Figure 1.1: Emerging Frameworks

The basis for this thesis topic stems from more than 45 years of involvement in education and 30 years of leadership within evangelical Christian schools; some of the time I was teacher-department head, at times I led in deputy roles, and for the past several years I have led as principal and/or senior leader of evangelical Christian schools. Therefore, it is my intent, in this research, to look at an evangelical Christian school leadership model with its attributes of leadership constructs and community building objectives, as well as the relevant secular literature, revealing both through the dual lens of discourse (the 'sacred' and the 'secular') as I interpret one discourse to the other.

Interpreting through this dual lens of discourse is an important aspect of the research for two reasons: first, when only one insight frames an entire discourse, other discourses are left impotent of their potential to positively affect the field (Dantley and Rogers, 2001) and second, I am in a unique and privileged position, for I am not trying to get into each world, but I am in each world, living and inhabiting each of the discourses. Even though I work in an evangelical Christian school, I also work in the field of school leadership, so the scholarly secular literature on school leadership is as important to me as is the scholarly, Christian leadership literature and the voices of the participants. I appreciate
that I can simultaneously inhabit the literature of the secular world and work in the sacred world. I have become deeply embedded in the reading of the literature from both discourses, and since I am interpreting each discourse to the other, I must inhabit them both. Exploring these two discourses has broadened my perspective and added richness to the research, which is evidenced throughout the thematic data chapters.

When Grace (2000) examined the changing discussions in education from the scientific discourse of management to the philosophical and sociological critical discourse of leadership, he referred to the notions of 'sacred' and 'secular.' Grace's application of sacred and secular to his research consequently inspired me to probe into and explore these two discourses from the voices of the participants and from the secular literature that not only seemed relevant, but are also under-explored in the literature in general, and particularly in the literature around evangelical Christian school leadership. For this research I chose the nomenclature of Bernstein (1996: 80) for the two discourses: the 'sacred' and the 'secular' as identifying specific discourses.

The educational model mentioned by Watson (2000) in her research into models of spirituality is relevant to one dimension of the discourse of this research – the 'secular' – referred to as secular/humanist because God is rarely mentioned and the supernatural barely at all; humanist, because it values and celebrates humanity in and for itself. The second dimension of the primary framework explores the sacred discourse of the participants, which includes the relevance of God, of Jesus Christ and of the biblical supernatural. The secular discourse comes from the relevant secular scholarly literature and the sacred discourse comes from what is regarded as the scholarly Christian literature, but primarily from the voices of the participants, who spoke with ontological certainty regarding their evangelical Christian worldview. Holding to the belief that the sacred represents the biblical worldview, Malphurs (2004), professor of ministry at Dallas Theological Seminary, contends that all the content of the Bible is true, yet not all truth is found in the Bible. Malphurs (2004) goes on to say, however, that to be considered sacred, values espoused must not contradict Scripture. The operational application of discourse as it applies specifically to the research is further explored in the methodology chapter (see section 3.3, page 63).
The second framework to emerge from the data analysis was attributes of leadership (see definition of attribute, page 89), which resulted in community building (see definition of community, page 58). While leadership can be many things, it is a process which requires interactions and relationships implicating leadership attributes, functions and purpose in moving schools and school ‘stakeholders’ (see definition, pages 78-79) toward desired goals (Murphy et al., 2006). The data analysis in the research concluded that the integration of the first three leadership attributes identified by the participants was vitally important in the facilitation of community building. The distinctions regarding each attribute and the various dimensions of community building were critical to examine within the context of the two discourses.

To initially peruse the dual lens of discourse I explored the use of both the sacred, Christian, scholarly literature and the relevant secular, scholarly literature. To introduce discourse through the literature, I propose Bush and Glover’s (2003) working definition of leadership highlighting the ‘secular’ discourse:

Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools grounded in firm personal and professional values.

(Bush and Glover, 2003: 8)

Conveying the sacred discourse through the scholarly Christian literature, John Stott, former rector of All Souls Church in London and considered by many to be the most influential theologian in the Church of England during the twentieth century (Dudley-Smith, 2001), proclaimed that evangelical Christian leadership

must be of a servant nature marked by meekness, humility and service, displaying acts of love and gentleness... for the shepherding of God’s people, being an example to the flock.

(Stott, 2002: 37)
The latter definition describes a model of leadership that is compatible with the servant imagery taught and exhibited by Christ (Stott, 2002). Evangelical Christian school leadership is a commitment to the ‘equipping of the saints’ (preparation of believers for life and ministry) and to looking beyond the immediate surroundings for God’s call to service – in serving, supporting and training (Gangle, 2002) stakeholders within the context of the evangelical Christian school.

In this thesis I do not intend to engage in a leadership-versus-management (see Appendix J) discussion; rather, I will present leadership as the dominant discourse that is helping to shape the focus of the evangelical Christian school leaders who participated in the research, in moving their leadership from theory into practice and away from the traditional hierarchical forms of school organisation (Earley and Weindling, 2004) and management. Earley and Weindling (2004: xvii) contend, however, that we must not lose the ‘management baby’ with the ‘leadership bathwater’. Research into educational leadership suggests that the pivotal factor needed to enhance human resources in evangelical Christian education is leadership (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). Demonstrating my engagement with the iterative and reflective process of this research, I am including some initial findings from the data collected and analysed from the participant interviews as a way of introduction to the leadership paradigm reflected in the discourse of the participants. Headmaster from school UK3 (see Tables 3.1 and 3.2, pages 67 and 68 respectively) discloses:

In practice, I probably do as much management as leadership, although I think in theory my role is leadership rather than management.

(UK3)

UK3 considered leadership to be his primary role, yet his task as manager was equally significant.

At present, leadership is seen as a potent combination of strategy and character; it is influential, courageous and visionary (Kars, 2006), taking place over multiple contexts
and through multiple stakeholders. One traditional view of leadership referred to by Senge (1990), declares that leadership has been based on:

assumptions of people's dependence and powerlessness, their lack of personal vision and inability to master the forces of change, deficits which can be remedied only by a few great leaders.

(Senge, 1990: 340)

In response to this traditional view, a new philosophy of leadership has emerged, which is sometimes referred to as 'post-heroic' (Huey, 1994). This new attitude toward leadership is based on a bottom-up transformation fuelled by leadership attributes that focus on shared power; it is variously termed dispersed, roving, distributive, collective or group-centred (Sandmann and Vandenberg, 1995). This leadership style focuses 'on the people involved – relationships between them, in particular – and requires an approach that seeks to transform staff feelings, attitudes and beliefs... not embodied in the actions of any single individual, but... available to everyone' (Gold, Evans, Earley, Halpin and Collarbone, 2003: 128). The need to manage people is now reduced (Pellicer, 2003) because people manage themselves in accordance with a shared vision that requires a change in personal practice, conceptual thinking and organisational application (Nirenberg, 1993). Probing the attributes of leadership framework explored in the data chapters and strongly embedded within the participants' leadership enactment and discourse, I argue that leadership has shifted from being individual-centred to collective-centred, concentrating on building relationships as a 'fluid concept', focusing on behaviours and attributes that collectively propel 'the work of the group forward' (Nirenberg, 1993: 198).

This research was not an exercise in comparing evangelical Christian schools with secular schools. Instead, it was a unique opportunity and an attempt to listen to some evangelical Christian school leaders as they represented their respective schools' cultures through their accounts, descriptions and perceptions of their leadership. This thesis features the personal voices and life stories of the participants and explores how they express themselves through their sacred discourse regarding their values, opinions and
experiences, and conveys the cultural, spiritual, moral, intellectual and educational practices in their schools (Grace, 2000). Although the term ‘Christian education’ does not occur in the Bible, the Bible does speak of the moral and spiritual instruction of believers in general and of children in particular where the purpose of training (schooling) is the directing of the process of human development towards God’s objectives: godliness of character and action (Bell et al., 1978).

Weber (2009c: para. 5) contends that the evangelical Christian school is to be a place of integral education of the whole person where the ‘whole community builds itself up in love’ and is expressed through a clear educational mandate with Christ as the foundation. In The Catholic School on the Threshold of the Third Millennium (1997), Pope John Paul II was adamant regarding the purpose of the Christian school within the Catholic context, and yet his statement is entirely relevant for the evangelical Christian schools that I visited and for the leaders to whom I spoke. Pope John Paul II declares:

The Christian school should be a place of evangelization where faith, culture, and life are brought into harmony… not merely adjunct to the educational process… its educational activity must be a fundamental part of its very identity and the focus of its mission.

(John Paul II, 1997: 4)

Pope John Paul’s statement is corroborated by the participants throughout the data chapters and is an example of the appurtenance and distinctiveness of the sacred discourse of the participants.

Evangelicalism and education have a distinct correlation, generating within the hearts of school leaders the actions necessary to remain sufficiently mindful of their calling and heritage and the mandate to be as faithful to the Gospel as were their forerunners, while maintaining unity of purpose (Harris, 2004) and stewardship of the evangelical Christian school community. This research, therefore, looks at the segment of Christian education that is designated evangelical Christian education.
Inherently involved in the biblical model of education presented in the thesis is the whole concept of schooling (Garrick, Graham, Braley and Haystead, 1974) and the vitally important leadership component of this genre of education. Throughout the two thematic data chapters, the thesis argues on the one hand that the key purpose of evangelical Christian education is distinctly sacred, with its mission to establish a school culture and community of believers. Here the overarching constant, even vision, is that family, church and school should work together for the intellectual, moral and spiritual direction of the child, while winning the hearts and minds of children to Jesus Christ (Sikkink, 2009). On the other hand, the research argues that, where attributes of leadership and community building are concerned, the participants' sacred discourse often overlaps with and corroborates the discourse of the secular, scholarly literature around educational leadership. The two discourses are referred to as the 'sacred' and the 'secular', with quotations only when the discourse names stand alone. The link between the two discourses is the core of the research, contributing to new knowledge and communicated throughout the data chapters.

It is important in this introductory chapter to define basic expressions within the sacred discourse that the reader will encounter throughout the research. Terms that are chapter specific will be defined in those data chapters. The first definition is the term ‘Christian’, which essentially means ‘one who professes belief in the teachings of Jesus Christ’ (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2009). The term, ‘evangelical’, means ‘to bring or to announce the good news’ (Stott, 1975: 58), denoting that everyone who is a proclaiming Christian is called to promote the teachings of Jesus Christ. McGrath (2001), an evangelical Anglican theologian, combines both terms to characterise an evangelical and a Christian as a follower of Jesus Christ who shares the Gospel of God’s Word (the Bible), declaring the supreme authority of Scripture; in other words, someone who is an evangelical Christian is a believer in Jesus Christ and is faithful in promoting and sharing the good news.

One of the initial findings in the research arose from a survey of the on-line documents of the schools that I selected for the study. The word, ‘evangelism’, or any form thereof, was mentioned in only six of the 12 schools’ web documents. However, after personal
contact with each school’s senior leader through an initial email, the participants all confirmed that their schools were evangelical in philosophy and ministry.

The evangelical Christian school is a community where faith and education meet, forming and nurturing young people as disciples of Christ (Musco, 2009). The participants’ evangelical Christian schools exist to assist children in acquiring and deepening their Christian beliefs, attitudes and values, and the dispositions to act in ways that reflect biblical tradition; educating the whole person, including his or her critical powers (DeRuyter, 1999).

1.2 International Dimension and Rationale
As a result of my involvement in both secular and evangelical Christian school education both at home in the US and abroad, one of the intentions of this study was to engage with the international component of the evangelical Christian school domain in order to find out if the senior leaders in the participant schools expressed their leadership enactment in the same way. This was not to be a comparative study between the 12 schools or between countries, as I cannot generalise about national cultures or generalise with such a small sample size, but what the schools that I visited and the senior leaders to whom I spoke do have in common is a particular evangelical Christian background and philosophy. I anticipated learning something about the international context of leadership; beginning to forge some ways of thinking about leadership internationally that might move the field forward, even in a small way.

This is an international doctorate so the international dimension is critical. I thought that it might be interesting to visit schools in Canada, the UK and the US to find out what perceptions senior leaders have regarding their leadership in the evangelical Christian school context. Since I was coming to the UK regularly to attend university and since I live in the US, not too far from Canada, it was convenient for me to carry out the research in these three countries. I also thought that as someone with a background of travelling, leading and teaching internationally, I would carry out the research in a way that would fit in with the rest of my personal and professional life. I welcomed the opportunity to visit the participants’ schools.
This exciting research journey led me to explore the link between evangelical Christian school leadership and school leadership in general within a sociological as opposed to a theological perspective. This is something that has not previously been explored in a qualitative manner, or through the two ('sacred' and 'secular') discourses. Four senior evangelical Christian school leaders were interviewed in each of three Anglophone countries, where the problem of language translation was not an issue (Heck, 1996). These participants were from schools in Canada, the UK and the US, because research of an international nature must not be confined to one narrow cultural setting (Heck, 1996), even though the schools, all belonging to the 'Christian community', would be likely to share the same ethos. The objective, therefore, was to look at a purposive and convenient sampling of 12 schools and their senior leaders, rather than the educational systems of selected countries. More on the international dimension can be found in the research sample in the methodology chapter (see pages 65–69). A selection of representative literature from each country regarding the major conceptual frameworks around leadership, school leadership, evangelical Christian school leadership and leadership attributes provided valuable theoretical and practical perspectives and helped to establish the research paradigm concerning the investigative arena.

The research paradigm that I have adopted is a result of my worldview, personal beliefs, convictions, values and perspectives. The attempt to break down the complexities of the real-world issues (Ladson-Billings, 1995) addressed in this thesis also influenced the methodological stance adopted to accomplish the research. Methodologically, I favour a constructivist/interpretivist paradigm, which Denzin (1983) defines as follows:

> Every instance of social interaction represents a slice from the life world of participants that is the proper subject matter for interpretive inquiry... carrying its own logic, sense of order, structure and meaning.

(Denzin, 1983: 133–134)

Keeping in mind the interpretivist/constructivist structure of the thesis, this qualitative study facilitated the discovery of how the evangelical Christian school leaders that I
interviewed, represented by similar statements of faith (see Appendix C) and perspectives of evangelical Christianity, perceived their enactment of leadership in their schools.

1.3 **Emphasising Worldviews – the ‘Sacred’ and ‘Secular’ Discussion**

Sergiovanni (1999) gives a compelling suggestion that it is the integration of the ethos and worldview of a particular people that forms a culture. Ethos represents a group’s moral and aesthetic style and mood as well as its tone, character and quality of life (Pazmiño, 2008). Educational leadership, ensconced in the spiritual or sacred discourse of the participants, brought about discussion that was at times external to the normative worldviews and paradigms (Dantley, 2003) of the secular/humanist educational tradition, and yet the sacred discourse of the interviewees was not entirely at odds with the discourse found in the secular literature.

Whorf (1959: 214/235) coined the phrase ‘linguistic relativity’, maintaining that the set of norms and a specific language that one brings to this world is social and is called a ‘worldview’. A worldview is established as a way ‘to bring order to this world, fashioning in it meaningful and controllable objects, properties, and actions’; thus, a value system through which people live in community comes into existence. The *Merriam-Webster’s Learner’s Dictionary* (2011) defines ‘worldview’ simply as ‘the way someone thinks about the world’. While the data shows that each of the participants interviewed expressed their evangelical Christian worldview in unique ways (some more persuasively than others), interviewee UK3 set the tone for the research and the voices of the participants, stating his position very succinctly, embodying the sacred discourse and the biblical worldview:

> The worldview that I’m talking about is one which is centred on Jesus Christ... I think that the longer I’m in the game the more I understand the way in which each individual can be treated by God in a slightly different way. We don’t have a sort of mould that we crush onto each of our pupils like it’s a factory... I think once they’ve [the students] accepted that their worldview needs to have
Jesus at the centre, then they are going to establish a Christ-centred worldview.

(UK3)

UK3's contribution and discourse regarding worldview suggested that every person or group has a culture, a particular discourse and a worldview which will be voiced (Jenkins, 2006), and that expressions of commonality in individual worldviews make up the cultural worldview of the group, giving rise to its collective community and social culture.

Watson (2000), while investigating whose model of spirituality should be used in the spiritual development of schoolchildren, affirmed that, to evangelical Christians, a supernatural God is essential to spirituality and spiritual growth. However, in the secular discourse, when atheists were interviewed by Watson (2000: 94), they were found to disagree strongly, 'arguing that their concepts of spirituality were rooted in the material'. Hand (2004: 396) suggests that education in the spiritual context may be considered to be 'educating hearts... education of the human spirit'. Watson found that atheists and agnostics, as well as nominal Christians interviewed, based spirituality within a 'naturalistic human experience and believed that everyone had the opportunity to grow spiritually, whether or not they believed in God'.

Woods and Woods (2008: 111), researching democracy and spiritual awareness, provocatively suggest that at the root of all educational frameworks is a process that engages the spiritual capacity inherent in the human being: a kind of reciprocal interdependency revealed in the research that shows characteristics of collegial leadership involving profound participation and a dependency on a ‘fluidity of spiritual energy’, additional to individual personality and group dynamics. In the secular/humanist tradition, the fundamental purpose of the ‘cultural structural framework is to facilitate the affective... and spiritual nature, by encouraging and providing spaces for people’s creativity imbued by spiritual awareness’ (Woods and Woods, 2008: 111-112).

Fry’s (2003) work on spiritual leadership theory was useful to both the secular and the sacred discourse of the research, allowing me to gain further insight into the process and development of school transformation and change. Fry's theory of spiritual leadership
incorporates vision, hope, faith, altruistic love and theories of workplace spirituality where the leader accesses the fundamental needs of both leader and follower in order to create congruence of vision and value across the individual, the empowered team and at various organisational levels. Operationally, spiritual leadership comprises the values, attitudes and behaviours that are intrinsically necessary to motivate school leaders and, in turn, their schools' stakeholders (Malone and Fry, 2003).

I began this research with the notion that the secular discourse and the sacred discourse were oppositional binaries; however, through reading the more secular, scholarly literature and listening to the voices of the participants, I realised that there was less opposition than I had thought there would be. The sacred and the secular divide did not appear to be antithetical to the enactment of leadership in evangelical Christian schools, there was an overlap and a linkage between the sacred discourse of the participants and the secular discourse, yet there was a distinctive evangelical Christian dimension or add-on that set the two discourses apart.

1.4 The Researcher, Discourses (‘Sacred’ and ‘Secular’), and Voice
This research has afforded me the opportunity to explore both the philosophical and the sociological spheres of research posited by Durkheim, Bernstein and others. Entrenched in the sociological discourse, Durkheim (1915) contended that everything must be described twice: first in its own terms as ‘practical’ theory; then again in its social form. As I examined the literature, the secular view engaged with the practical theory and the sacred was expressed as the social form through the articulated discourse of ‘voice’ of the participants operating in a ‘horizontal’ knowledge structure (Bernstein, 1996) and through the Christian scholarly literature.

1.5 Conclusion and Road Map of the Thesis
1.5.1 Chapter One: Introduction
This chapter is a general overview of things to come, giving direction to the three frameworks of the thesis and addressing, in part, the research questions that will be answered throughout the data chapters and summarised in the conclusion. Providing a road map to the remaining chapters, the reader is drawn to the literature review, the methodology, the data chapters, the discussion and the thesis conclusion.
1.5.2 Chapter Two: Literature Review

The literature review chapter explores the notion of discourse examining, to some extent, the *sacred* and the *secular* discourses that primarily frame this research. This chapter also surveys numerous theories and models of leadership that specifically pertain to and have emerged from the interview data and the relevant, secular scholarly literature. While transformative models of leadership prevail and are sought after, some of the practitioner participants remained engaged in transactional methods of leadership; therefore, both theories are mentioned in the literature, while the transformational theories are emphasised.

There are two main sets of literature that guide the second framework of the thesis. First, the conventional leadership literature was read and helped to inform the initial research question and sub-questions. The second set of literature undergirds the final research question and sub-questions and comprises the relevant transformational/relational/ethical leadership literature. Both sets of literature support the first framework substantiating the two discourses: the *sacred* and the *secular*. This primary framework emerged quite surprisingly and unexpectedly following deeper scrutiny of the participant data.

1.5.3 Chapter Three: Methodology

Chapter Three is an extensive methodological presentation involving a multitude of research techniques that served in triangulating the research for validation purposes. This qualitative research took on a constructivist/interpretivist framework that began with a pilot study which served to determine the direction that the research would take and helped to formulate the interviewing schedule. Given the hierarchical nature of the interview schedule, it did not change dramatically following the pilot study except to ask if those who did not refer directly to servant-leadership had heard of the concept.

Next, school website documents, in three countries, were located that gave me a set of criteria from which to determine the school leaders that I would contact for interviews. The web documents were read and analysed, and interviews arranged. Subsequently, semi-structured interviews and observations were carried out with the school senior leaders in the form of mini case studies. The final data gathering procedure, a more in-depth case study, carried out in one school, was implemented. I adopted a hybrid
grounded theory approach with which to analyse the data, identifying the common themes to emerge from the analysed data (see Tables 4.1 and 5.1). From these themes and data, ideas were generated in order to build an argument that established and linked into the development of a comprehensive model on how evangelical Christian school leaders enacted leadership in their schools, looked at intently through the dual lens of discourse.

1.5.4 Chapter Four: Calling, Stewardship and Serving in Leadership
Chapter Four represents the data revealed through the sacred and the secular discourses framework within which one finds the attributes of leadership framework and reveals theories found in the third framework which is the conventional leadership literature, each articulating the way in which the participants perceive their enactment of evangelical Christian school leadership. This chapter, entitled Calling, Stewardship and Serving in Leadership, explores the three integrative attributes of leadership revealed through the analysed data.

1.5.5 Chapter Five: Community Building through Leadership
Chapter Five, the second data chapter, entitled Community Building through Leadership surfaced as the most referenced aspect of school life by the participants. Some of the participants, over the past few years, and some quite recently, had found themselves in the precarious position of change leader, rebuilding and transforming their schools’ cultures in order to build a stronger learning, spiritual and relational community. The participants contend that to build community implores a notion of schooling that is described as organic and holistic; where school cultures are transformative, vibrant, innovative, flexible living systems with leaders who empower, engage and connect people in collaborative relationships (Osborn, 2005). The research argues that the integration of the three attributes of leadership explored in Chapter Four resulted, in part, in the building of community in the evangelical Christian schools that participated in this research.

1.5.6 Chapter Six: Discussion
Chapter Six is a comprehensive discussion of the research findings supported by the data, and answers the new research question and sub-questions. Chapter Six serves to clarify the linkage and/or distinctions between the sacred and the secular discourses and the role...
that I, as researcher, performed as interpreter, translating one discourse to another. Chapter Six also suggests where the core values that inform the two discourses originated. The core values are immersed within the three key leadership attributes and the community-building aspects of leadership established through the data analysis. This chapter also addresses the relevance of the appurtenance (add-on) to the thesis; that which gave the evangelical Christian school leaders’ discourse its distinctiveness.

1.5.7 Chapter Seven: Conclusion

While the research questions are answered throughout the thesis, this concluding chapter draws each chapter together, summarizing the findings and problematic areas within the research. Implications for professional learning and the value of the study are highlighted. As with any research endeavour, there are limitations to the study, and these are discussed. The conclusion specifies the research contribution to professional knowledge and explores implications for further research in school leadership and evangelical Christian school leadership. This chapter concludes with dissemination of the findings.
2.1 Introduction to Leadership Literature

This chapter comprehensively introduces the relevant constructs of leadership literature that support the research question and sub-questions and the resulting arguments. Initially, and quite prematurely, I set off with one set of thoughts and one set of literature around conventional leadership as well as literature, specifically around the notion of servant-leadership, because I was curious whether the evangelical Christian school leaders to whom I spoke were enacting servant-leadership in their schools and/or if they espoused the fundamental values that inform it (Page and Wong, 2000). I therefore established the initial research question and sub-question as follows: Might the evangelical Christian school leaders in three countries (Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States) be servant leaders? and Can major stakeholders in an evangelical Christian school perceive the values of their schools' leaders? The initial research question guided the qualitative research methodology (see Chapter Three) and led to the initial formulation of the interview schedule. However, I realized that this initial literature did not help me make enough sense of the data, and did not offer appropriate theoretical frameworks to explain and support my research findings. I also realised that given the quality, the richness and the revealing nature of the data that I had acquired from the schools’ web documents, from the pilot interview and from subsequent participant interviews, I needed to go in a different direction with a new set of research questions and a new set of literature that illuminated more of the transformational/relational/ethical models and theories of leadership. The data revealed a broader view of leadership attributes apart from servant-leadership and conventional theories. Therefore, I reformulated the research question and sub-questions to encompass a new framework: attributes of leadership and community building through leadership, and let go of the initial research questions.

Defining constructs of leadership, Podolny, Khurana and Besharov (2010: 65) contend that leadership has been too ‘loosely defined in the literature and is ultimately an amalgamation of behaviours and attributes’. Sergiovanni (1999) wrote about the heart,
head and hand of leadership expressing the need to include various dimensions of leadership in the discourse on educational leadership.

Exploring two diverse discourses regarding school leadership entailed looking at the scholarly, conventional leadership literature and the scholarly, transformational leadership literature from both the secular and the sacred discourses. The leadership literature in this chapter investigates and supports the data regarding leadership behaviours and attributes of evangelical Christian school leaders. Leadership theories are always changing and developing; as a result, the theories that will be identified here cannot possibly include all of those that exist, but instead, are those that are particularly relevant to the thesis.

Upon closer examination of the discourse of the participants and the new set of literature, I discovered that there was an interesting overlap between the sacred and the secular discourses, and a much broader view of leadership. This was particularly true with the participants, as their headship was defined more comprehensively by an assortment of leadership attributes. This idea of two sets of literature and two discourses marked a sort of breakthrough in my own thinking, expanding and redefining my own personal views regarding school leadership, strengthening the focus of the research. The more conventional secular definitions, theories and models of leadership of the transactional domain contributed to my initial look into leadership, decisively embedding my work within an overall leadership paradigm. These conventional theories are relevant, in part, to the research and help to illustrate the findings in a general leadership framework. The servant-leadership literature was part of the focus of the first set of literature that I read; however, I am including it in the relational/ethical section of this literature review on account of its relationship to transformational leadership theories, to particular leadership attributes, to its relevance to the new research question and sub-questions, and to its connection to both discourses.

The transformational/relational/ethical models of leadership represent the new set of literature to emerge following more intense scrutiny and readings of the participant data. This new set of literature is an amalgamation of the literature that supports both the 'sacred' and the 'secular' leadership theories and models, leading me to the conclusion
that there was not much difference between the two discourses. There was, however, a certain distinction or ‘appurtenance’ that makes evangelical Christian school leadership unique. This language of discourse (the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’) is the foundational framework and heart of the research, and is important to consider before delving into the relevant literature.

2.2 The Language of Discourse – The Sacred/Secular Discussion

An introduction to the language of discourse explains the sacred/secular discussion in this literature review chapter as well as in the data chapters where reference is given to the participants’ voices and to the secular literature. It is important that I remain cognisant of Hyatt’s (2004) definition of ‘the specific language of a particular discourse community’:

meaning a group of people who share a similar and specific way of talking related to their professional interests or their social philosophy.

(Hyatt, 2004: 44)

Consequently, the participants’ shared faith in Christ represents a specific discourse (the ‘sacred’) that explained, to some extent, their enactment of certain attributes of leadership that led to the building of community in their schools.

To introduce the secular discourse I examined Fairclough (2003: 124) who perceives discourse as a way of representing aspects of the world – the processes, relations and structures of the ‘mental world’ of thoughts, feelings and beliefs. The two discourses represented in the research may be seen, at times, as different perspectives on the world, and are associated with the different relationships people have to the world. In turn, these relationships are dependent upon a person’s positions, their social identities and their social relationships, which may complement one another, compete with one another, dominate another or foster cooperation with one another.

One way to examine and understand prevailing mindscapes is to look at the metaphorical language found in discourse (Sergiovanni, 2005). Metaphors are shortcuts to understanding and were useful for comparing the different understandings of the same
phenomenon that emerged from the participant data. Two metaphors used in the research are *the sacred* and *the secular*, which represent the two discourses.

Bernstein’s (1990: 38–39) notion of the ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ distinguished between the two discourses as that of ‘radical otherness and separateness... two worlds between which there is nothing in common’. Referring to the discourses as the ‘sacred’ and the ‘profane’, Durkheim (1915) in (Beck, 2002: 619) insisted that the discourses represented ‘polarity into two classes radically excluding each other’. Grace (2002: 6) postulates that the ‘profane is perceived as having the potential to pollute and devalue the purity and integrity of that which is sacred’. Bernstein (1977) argues that there is a strong separation between what he terms the ‘intrinsic/sacred’ and the ‘extrinsic/profane’ aspects of education:

This socially constituted division between the sacred and the profane is integral to the form and process of cultural reproduction instituted in education.

(Bernstein, 1977: 190)

While I agree in part with the sacred/secular divide, the overlap between the two discourses from an educational leadership perspective poses an interesting phenomenon and dilemma.

Before differentiating between the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’ in dialogue, it is critical to define *sacred* and *secular* as they pertain to the research. The ‘sacred’ has implications of something set apart from the everyday world which inspires attitudes of awe or reverence among believers (*Social Science Dictionary*, 2011). The sacred discourse plays a central role in the way the evangelical Christian school culture represents a synthesis of the core symbols integrated around root paradigms (Turner, 1974) establishing boundaries between discourse cultures and the discourse of the participants themselves. Durkheim (1915) related both inwardness and sacredness to the shaping of the unique characteristics of Christianity.
‘Secular’ is referred to as ‘an outlook or philosophy that advocates human rather than religious values’ (*The Free Dictionary*, 2011). The Council for Secular Humanism (2011) states:

Secular suggests a worldview where dogmas, ideologies and traditions, whether religious, political or social, must be weighed and tested by each individual and not simply accepted on faith...a commitment to the use of critical reason, factual evidence, and scientific methods of inquiry, rather than faith and mysticism in seeking solutions to human problems.

(Council for Secular Humanism: 1)

In some respects I agree with Jensen (1995: 31), who considers the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’ as ‘two autonomous but interdependent discourses within a multiplicity of categories of meaning that interpret different modes of existence’ which, ultimately, may well be an accurate description of the two discourses in this research as they were revealed through the data analysis to overlap, corroborate and relate to one another. Throughout the data chapters, I will not only distinguish between the two sets of discourses: the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’, as somewhat distinct pedagogic identities (Beck, 2002), but I will also show that there exists a language of descriptors and common characteristics between the two articulated discourses.

The purpose of this study was not to debate issues between the two discourses. Instead, I have endeavoured to explore the discourses to identify the divergent and common characteristics of both from this dual lens. This interpretation or translation between the discourses occurs often in the data chapters, for when I introduce or quote data from the evangelical Christian school participants, I link it immediately with the most appropriate secular literature to illustrate the overlap. Further clarification of discourse and its use in the investigative process is explained in the methodology chapter (see page 63).
2.3 Conventional Leadership Literature

2.3.1 Introduction
Leadership studies began early in the twentieth century by examining the traits or personal qualities of leaders, but those traits gave little insight into what an effective leader does (Reave, 2005). Consequently, other forms of leadership were explored that looked at both leader and follower characteristics and behaviours. Leadership theories have evolved from a focus on traits, to contingency theories, to more contemporary transformational approaches. The theories of leadership introduced here represent the wider, secular body of literature of a conventional/transactional nature that informed the initial research question and remains part of the general leadership literature framework (see Figure 1.1, page 20).

2.3.2 Early Leadership Theories
While leadership theories have been variously classified, I have chosen to look at an abbreviated review of early leadership theories vital to the initial research which remains, in part, supportive of the final research question and sub-questions. These have been classified into three groups by North Georgia College and State University [NGCSU] (2008): nature versus nurture theories; organisational theories; and relational/ethical theories. The nature versus nurture theories include: the ‘great man’ notion of heroic leadership; trait theories; and behavioural theories. Both trait theories and the great-man theory have been widely discredited by empirical evidence and sound theoretical arguments (Walker, 2006). Behavioural theory is based on the belief that leaders are made, not born. This theory, prompted by such scientists as Maslow (1943), Freud (1938), Erikson (1964) and Fromm (1941), is rooted in behaviourism, where the focus is on the actions of leaders, not on mental qualities or internal states. The evolution of this school of thought represents the first time that people began to see leadership as something that might be learned (Yaverbaum and Sherman, 2009).

The organisational theories of leadership are explored very briefly here, offering some insight into the qualities of successful leaders. March (1984: 32) suggests that leaders conduct the affairs of a school according to how the ‘sentiments, expectations, commitments and faiths of individuals concerned with the organization fit into a structure of social beliefs about organizational life’. A plethora of conventional/organisational
theories began to emerge in the 1960s and 1970s that included: path-goal, participative, situational, contingency and transactional. Arising out of path-goal theory, and compatible with this research, is the participative theory proposed initially by Coch and French (1948), who sought to find a theory that would facilitate openness and a readiness to affect organisational change; a theory more democratic, taking the input of others into account and focusing on the leader consulting with subordinates about work, tasks and paths to resolving goals collaboratively through shared decision-making (VanWagner, 2008).

Transactional theory, known also as management theory, focuses on the role of supervision, organisation and group performance. The underlying psychology is Skinner’s (1953) behaviourism. Transactional leadership, first described by Weber (1947) and furthered by Bass (1981; 2008), bases its strengths on a system of rewards and punishments as the best way to motivate people where there is a clear chain of command and a clear structure for followers. The most common model representing transactional theory is the authoritative model, emphasising decisiveness by administrators and deference by subordinates (Nystrand, 1981). It is based upon clearly defined lines of authority, responsibility and communication. Transactional leadership takes on more of a ‘telling’ style, while it’s opposite, transformational leadership, has more of a ‘selling’ style (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 1996). Authoritative leadership is in direct contrast to the leadership models to emerge from the transformational and relational/ethical theories of leadership that support the research data. This shift in focus regarding leadership enactment has been from the individual to the collaborative enactment of leadership, with an emphasis on the leader’s role in relationship to followers and leadership that focuses on leadership behaviours (Cox and Meda, 2004) and attributes.

I found that, at times, the school leaders that I interviewed proposed the enactment of transactional methods of leadership prior to attempts to implement specific changes in the educational and community dynamic of their schools. Then, upon successful pre-implementation of some desired changes, more transformational/relational/ethical methods of leadership were employed. Those relational/ethical models and theories of
leadership are explored in Section 2.4 and offer supporting evidence to the participant data.

2.4 Relational/Ethical Theories of Leadership

2.4.1 Introduction
Contemporary relational/ethical theories and models of leadership that have emerged from existing theory currently represent a range of leadership frameworks being used in organisations today, including the evangelical Christian schools that I visited. This set of leadership literature, which arose more profoundly out of a deeper scrutiny of the participant interview data analysis, explores the models and theories of leadership that are more transformational, identifying the attributes required of persons in leadership positions who facilitate the leadership process. In the twenty-first century, a school leader’s relationship to stakeholders and the institution, and their response to diverse contexts, is observed in models of leadership that are more people-centric (Kars, 2006), offering a distinction between the process of leadership and the socially-constructed role of leader brought forth in the research. Current relational/ethical theories of leadership tend to focus on values, empowerment and leadership that is more collegial and distributive; whereas prior to the twenty-first century, the management literature that was then very influential would have contrasted much more strongly with the data that I collected from the participant interviews.

Burns (1978) coined the term ‘transformational leadership’, supposing that one should aspire to higher moral positions:

Transforming leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality… Transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral leadership in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspirations of both leader and led, thus it has a transforming effect on both.

(Burns, 1978: 20)
Transformational leadership is a two-way process whereby leaders are, moreover, transformed by those they lead, espousing and practicing more relational/ethical and distributive forms of leadership that provide a strong motivation to task enactment. Webber (2009a) argues that transformational leadership affects both academic and non-academic student outcomes, and that leaders adhering to a transformational leadership model first become transformational thinkers then go on to inspire and motivate followers by helping them see the importance of the task, leading and empowering followers to achieve their full potential. Transformational leadership theory goes beyond transactional leadership theory, starting with the development of a vision, then exciting and converting potential followers, and finally forming connections between leaders and followers (VanWagner, 2008).

Schools have increasingly focused their attention on transformational or ‘facilitative’ leadership which relies on trust, letting go of control and allowing others to function independently, interdependently and successfully within a common framework of expectations and accountability (Conley and Goldman, 1994). It is a type of trust that Uslander (2002: 3) refers to as ‘strategic’ trust, where leadership places confidence in the people they know based upon the leader’s experience with them. As a form of what Putnam (2000: 136) considers ‘thick’ trust, I have found that evangelical Christian school leadership is particularly embedded in stakeholder relationships that are trustworthy, strong, frequent, and embrace the wider network of the school community.

Contemporary models of leadership that support this research have evolved from transformational leadership, inspiring various attributes of leadership and dimensions of community building. Transformational leadership is viewed by some to be an antecedent leadership style informing the servant-leadership model (Lashway, 1996), and was particularly articulated through the dialogue with the stakeholders in the case study school (see Chapter Four, pages 105–108).

Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber (2009) consider the transformational leadership theories to be new-genre leadership theories. As a way of introducing the prevailing concept of leadership attributes and behaviours and the community building aspects through the
secular discourse, I advocate the definition of leadership from Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004):

Leadership can be defined as the nature of the influencing process and its resultant outcomes that occurs between a leader and followers and how this influencing process is explained by the leaders' dispositional characteristics and behaviors, follower perceptions and attributions of the leader.

(Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg, 2004: 5)

Blanchard and Hodges (2007), who write from a sacred perspective, suggest that leadership is a process of influence:

Any time you influence the thinking or behaviour of people towards accomplishing a goal in their personal or professional lives you are taking the role of leader.

(Blanchard and Hodges, 2007: 4)

Consistent with the general view of Christian leadership, Spry and Duignan (2003) articulate leadership from their Catholic Christian perspective as being an influencing relationship; a collaborative process supporting a community of Christian believers pursuing a transformational cause. Wofford (1999), with a view toward transformational leadership, affirms the 'sacred/secular' distinction and overlap:

Christian leaders have a spiritual dimension that is unlike that of their secular counterparts. They do have in common with secular charismatic leaders a strong commitment to their vision, a need to influence others in pursuit of the vision, a high sense of confidence, and optimism about future results.

(Wofford, 1999: 102)
The above descriptions of the prevailing concepts of leadership have one particular aspect in common that brings transformational/relational/ethical theories to the foreground: 'influence'. This influencing process is what explains school stakeholders' perceptions and school leaders' attributes revealed through the participant data and corroborated through the secular scholarly literature.

Part of the sacred discourse is a spiritual dimension unique to evangelical Christian school leaders that is exemplified in the research data. It is this 'appurtenance' or distinctive nature of the participants' discourse that sets it apart from the discourse of secular school leadership. The theories or models of leadership presented in the following sections are not intended to cause any linguistic confusion, but rather to explore the leadership literature encompassing the two discourses, sacred and secular. Both discourses are represented within each transformational/relational/ethical leadership theory or model (the secular first and then the sacred) because the major argument and heart of the thesis and the research question and sub-questions claim that although there is a definitive overlap between the two discourses, there is also an important distinction (an appurtenance) embodying the sacred discourse.

2.4.2 Moral and Ethical Leadership
Burns (1978) legitimised the concept of moral leadership, emphasising that it emerges from and always returns to the fundamental wants, needs, aspirations and values of followers. Historically, ethics comes from the Greek word ethos, meaning customs or usages, especially belonging to one group as distinguished from another, referencing disposition or character, customs and approved ways of acting (Shapiro and Stepkovich, 2005).

Hauerwas (2003: 54) poses a definition of Christian ethics as 'a form of reflection in service to a community deriving its character from the nature of that community's Christian convictions'. I found that identifying and expressing a strong evangelical Christian ethos were critical stewardship attributes of evangelical Christian school leaders in sustaining an ethical focus in their leadership and building a sense of community.
One of the guiding principles of the ethical leader is to seek to build community among stakeholders (Sullivan, 2009). Leadership that is oriented towards democratic values within the community is about more than just individual behaviour, but involves the way in which members of a moral/ethical community live their communal lives (Foster, 1989: 55). This relationship between the ethical focus of leadership and the concept of ‘community’ (see page 58) is particularly relevant to the exploration of the community-building aspect of leadership explored through the data (see Chapter Five).

2.4.3 Values-Centred, Values-Driven or Principle-Centred Leadership

This research shows a strong intersection of two paradigms: values and leadership (Robinson, Goleby, and Hosgood, 2006). Values are basic conditions and foundations for one’s life (Huber, 2004), where articulation of values has been considered the core of successful school leadership (Hallinger and Walker, 2013). Values-centred leadership is leadership which focuses on the core beliefs that guide or motivate one’s attitudes and actions (Chappell, 1999). An important aspect of a holistic approach to education takes into account one’s leadership values, which affect one’s expectations, attitudes and attributes (Whitty and Willmott, 1991).

While it is difficult in a pluralist society to find a framework of shared values to underpin the mission of a school, this definition of ‘values’ from Halstead (2005) best explains an overall view of values for this research in the secular discourse, but is also relevant to the sacred discourse in terms of the convictions of evangelical Christian school leaders:

The term values is used to refer to principles, fundamental convictions, ideals, standards or life stances which act as general guides to behaviour or as points of reference in decision-making or the evaluation of beliefs or actions and which are closely connected to personal integrity and identity.

(Halstead, 2005: 4)

A more broadly defined understanding of leadership in schools today is based on educational beliefs integrating the values of a democratic society (Huber, 2004). Sacred
and secular leadership literature relevant to this research, as well as data obtained from the participant interviews confirms that in a world of broad and changing values, a values-centred, values-driven, or values-based leadership paradigm within a transformational/relational/ethical model of leadership based on democratic ideals encourages a flattening of the organisational hierarchy with the intent to empower stakeholders and teams at the lower end of the structure; a form of distributed leadership which is about sharing leadership across the organisation (Hartley, 2007). Morrison and Mujtaba (2010: 95) contend that using ethical principles to understand values, ethics and morals, ‘an organization can form a framework for effective decision-making’.

Principle-centred leadership is not unlike values-centred leadership in that the principle-centred leader is committed to personal growth and improvement, necessitating ‘organizational, personal managerial, interpersonal and personal leadership’ (Covey, 1992: 31). Principle-centred leadership begins with what Gold et al. (2003: 136) describe as ‘principled individuals with a strong commitment to their ‘mission’, determined to do the best for their schools… clearly values-driven’.

Values-driven leadership flows from a philosophic position or worldview which, in this research is exercised in conjunction with the leadership of those who reflect on their leadership values, attributes and enactment as being transformational, visionary, spiritual, and of a servant-leadership model (Sendjaya, Sarros and Santora, 2008: 402), which is compatible with the Judeo-Christian worldview (Wallace, 2007). Malphurs (2004) contends that values are either sacred or secular. For the participants in this research, sacred values are sourced in God and established in the Bible; however, ‘not all sacred values are found in the Bible, hence the term ‘sacred’ as opposed to biblical (italics, Malphurs) values. Those areas of ‘thought and life that are not under the control and influence of authentic, biblical Christianity’ (Malphurs, 2004: 35) are purported to be secular values.

Pejza (1994) argues that leadership based on the leadership of Christ is distributed and looks to the entire school community to empower others. Pejza goes on to suggest that traditional leadership models are inappropriate for Catholic schools as values-based
Christian school leadership must not be synonymous with position or authority, but rather relying on the interdependence of a school’s leadership and its various stakeholders.

2.4.4 Distributed Leadership

Transformational leadership as part of the distributed leadership paradigm is underpinned by a particular set of values associated with ways of thinking, world-views or paradigms (Robinson, Goleby and Hosgood, 2006). Distributed leadership is essentially about sharing leadership across the organisation.

Sergiovanni (2001) closely associates values-based leadership with ideas-based leadership, as well as the development of a community of responsibility in which leadership is shared, or distributed. Transformational/relational/ethical views of leadership expand one’s values to the point where collegiality helps to build a virtuous school through a covenant of shared values (Sergiovanni, 1992). Shared or distributed leadership in this research, and substantiated by the participant interviews was suggested to be collegial, informal, emergent, dispersed and empowering, distanced from the organisational hierarchy (see UK1’s comment page 121-122). Known as team-centred leadership, distributed leadership’s aim is to empower others, yet it requires an understanding of leadership values and attributes and the distribution of leadership tasks (Spillane, Halverson and Diamond, 2001).

As part of the new model of transformational leadership viewed from the sacred perspective, ‘distributed leadership’ focuses on the group and its members’ individual gifts to serve the school community, and is a re-distribution of power (Schubert, 2007). Leadership must look at the relationships which exist between members of the school community where certain characteristics are essential: ‘compromise, teamwork, group vision, collaboration, concern for one another’, all of which must be developed if a group is to assume its proper leadership role, where leadership is transferred and shared throughout the organisation (Pejza, 1994: 8). The way power is distributed may be seen through the behaviours and perceptions of both school leaders and school stakeholders (Schubert, 2007).
2.4.5 Spiritual Leadership

'Spirituality' is a sense of attachment or relationship with someone greater than oneself, giving one a transcendent sense of purpose (Starratt and Guare, 1995). Dent, Higgins and Wharff (2005: 629) define spirituality as 'transformational, moral, and ethical'.

Starratt (1999) advises that there is room for a secular spirituality surrounding the secular/humanist discourse; however, a conceptualisation of education as an applied social science 'does not admit to the language of spirituality'. While there is emerging evidence that spiritual values and practices are related to leadership effectiveness (Reave, 2005), the vast majority of the literature emphasising moral, ethical and emotional aspects of leadership does not speak to the place of spirituality in how school leaders perceive and enact their leadership (Woods, 2007). Furman (1999: 11) contends that 'spiritual persons engaging in genuine leadership tend to bring a depth, sensitivity, and reverence to all or most of what they do', as it is thought to be leadership of a servant nature, yet representing a secular view of spirituality (Fry and Matherly, 2006).

Spiritual leadership theory is a contributing leadership theory for organisational transformation comprising the 'values, attitudes, and behaviours required to intrinsically motivate oneself, and others, in order to have a sense of spiritual well-being' (Fry and Matherly, 2006: 4). Spiritual leadership in this secular dimension overlaps with the sacred dimension in so far as it has the propensity to create vision. Leaders and followers experience a sense of calling, membership, and team empowerment – key components in the leadership paradigm of this research.

The biblical notion of spirituality seeks to influence the leadership values of evangelical Christian school leaders, and is expressed through one's adherence to the doctrines of the evangelical Christian church. Evangelical Christian school leadership as an extension of the church incorporates the evangelical dimension into Christian school leadership. It is leadership described as 'evangelicalism', where 'biblical Christianity thrives in contemporary culture' as leaders lead their schools in 'devotion to the sure Word of the Lord clustered around biblical authority' (Nettles, 2001: 263). Spiritual leadership based on evangelicalism holds to a set of corporate values based on the 'promise of redemption, love of others, denial of self, and a real expressed way of living' (McGrath, 1999: 9). I
found it to be a type of leadership arising from a synthesis of the participants’ faith and life lived out authentically and effectively, stemming from a Christ-centered, biblical spirituality (see Chapter Five, pages 135-136).

Williams (2001: 113–114) insists that evangelical Christian schooling must be a ‘Bible-based, theologically sound, and Holy-Spirit empowered’ education, ‘encompassing the elements of teaching, learning, serving and equipping’. This is what gives an evangelical Christian school education an obvious distinctive element. The historical documents of evangelical Christian schools confirm, and I contend, that unless a spirit of evangelism exists as the main purpose of the Christian school community, the school will sooner or later cease to be evangelical in any meaningful sense (Harris, 2004).

2.4.6 Servant-Leadership

Writing about servant-leadership emerged from two sources: the ‘secular’ and the ‘sacred’. In the secular domain, a comparison has been drawn between servant-leadership theory and Burns’ (1978) theory of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders are inclined to view leadership from a moral and ethical framework with a deep desire to serve and ‘to pursue a vision from the basis of humility, empathy, compassion, and a commitment to ethical behavior’ (Lad and Luechauer, 1998: 64).

Bridging the sacred/secular divide and making an important contribution to the discussions on educational leadership, the first source of contemporary servant-leadership theory came from Greenleaf (1977: 4), who yearned for a future when ‘leaders would bend their efforts to serve with skill, understanding, and spirit; and followers would be responsive only to able servants who would lead them’, emphasising the leader’s duty to serve followers. Leadership thus arises out of a desire to serve rather than to lead; indeed, I found that some evangelical Christian school leaders went so far as to equate serving with leading (see Chapter Four, pages 117–118).

The sacred discourse around servant-leadership springs from the belief that Christ was the ultimate servant, and therefore the model for a life of serving and servant-hood for evangelical Christian school leaders. In his examination of the servant-leadership role of
Catholic high school principals, Grace (2000: 142) finds the servant leader construct to be central to the cultures of faith-based schooling as the ‘moral purposes of schooling derive their inspiration mainly from the Christian religion and a certain set of Christian beliefs around the teachings of Jesus Christ that stemmed from the idea of one’s being a servant (Nair, 1994). ‘No other leader in the history of the world has so lived out the philosophy of servant-leadership than Jesus, demonstrating the missing element in leadership’ (Sullivan, 2004: 11).

Drury (2004), from her doctoral study of the espoused values of servant-leadership, writes from a sacred discourse and advocates an operational definition of servant-leadership, which I have embraced for this study. Drury explains the linkage between leadership and servant-leadership toward the building of community:

Servant-leadership is an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader. Servant-leadership promotes the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity... and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual, the total organization, and those served by the organization.

(Drury, 2004: 8)

Positing that servant leaders are by default transformational leaders (Farling, Stone and Winston, 1999), servant-leadership emphasises ‘collaboration, trust, empathy and the ethical use of power through the empowerment of others’ (Sullivan, 2004: 11). Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) call servant-leadership a radical concept where leadership is displayed through acts of selflessness, refining the meaning and attributes of leadership from ‘power over’ to ‘power to’ and leading ‘with’ rather than ‘over’ others (Ferdig, 2007).

Spears (2010), Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) and Spears and Lawrence (2002) were the first to investigate empirically the servant-leadership construct. Research conducted by Parolini (2007) and expanded in Parolini, Patterson and Winston (2009) analysed the
distinction between transformational and servant-leadership, concluding that transformational leaders are differentiated by their focus on the needs of the organisation, whereas servant leaders are differentiated by their focus on the needs of the individual, as suggested by the participants' perceived commitment to stewarding the needs of their stakeholders. Servant leaders display trust and allegiance toward stakeholders most often by influencing them through unconventional service that empowers them and offers freedom and autonomy (Parolini et al., 2009). An emerging yet under-researched leadership paradigm for the twenty-first century (Page and Wong, 2000), servant-leadership has increasingly been viewed as an ideal leadership model to which people and institutions aspire (Spears, 2010).

2.4.7 Visionary Leadership

'Vision' means the 'act of seeing' (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2010). It is the development, transmission and implementation of a desirable future, giving life to an organisation (Manasse, 1985). Sergiovanni (1990: 58) describes 'visioning' as an articulation of a 'leader's hopes and dreams' with the goal of creating a 'realistic, credible, attractive future for an organization' (Nanus, 1992: 7). Rafferty and Griffin (2004) propose that vision is a focused sub-dimension of transformational leadership.

Visionary or vision-driven leadership, a major component of leadership theory (Fullan, 1996), involves 'making happen what you believe in' (Barth, 2001: 46). Vision-driven leadership was prominent in the discourse of evangelical Christian school leaders and has been in the foreground of the general school leadership discourse in recent years (Haydon, 2007). I found that evangelical Christian school leaders enact school leadership with a visionary emphasis in much the same way as Bush and Glover (2003) describe:

Visionary leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of a desired purpose. Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values. They articulate this vision at every opportunity and influence their staff and other stakeholders to share the vision. The philosophy, structures, and
activities of the school are geared towards the achievement of this shared vision.

(Bush and Glover, 2003: 8)

Sashkin (1988) described visionaries as pioneers; people who venture into unexplored territory — foot soldiers in the campaign for change and inevitably the ones who need to take the lead in the achievement of strategic vision.

According to the *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, the concept of 'vision' exhibits a double aspect in the biblical narrative:

In one aspect it proposes a revelation for immediate direction in the way of prophetic instruction and insight; and in another aspect it deals with the development of the Kingdom of God as conditioned by the moral ideals of the people who are persuaded that the laws of God expressed in self-control, truth, justice, and brotherly love, are supreme.

(2010: para. 3)

I found the visionary leadership of evangelical Christian school leaders to corroborate this dual assessment of vision, yet the research shows a more secular conception of vision expressed through the participants' perceived leadership enactment.

Palestini (2003), while studying the works of Ignatius of Loyola (a young priest from the Spanish aristocracy who founded the Society of Jesus in the sixteenth century), encountered the Ignatian vision, which advocated that a sacred, multi-dimensional and integrated approach to schooling in general and school leadership in particular gives a 'larger social context to the idea of administration':

This process requires educational administrators to be reflective practitioners introspectively regarding leadership behaviour that should be sensitive to participative decision-making and collaborative efforts... encouraging an
equitable representation of all segments of the school population.

(Palestini, 2003: 3/48)

The outcome of visionary leadership described by Palestini is transformational leadership, collaboration and shared vision, creating cooperation and empowerment (Pellicer, 2003). Visionary leadership emerged as a powerful component of the stewardship attribute advocating an empowering leadership style.

2.5 Leadership attributes

The above relational/ethical paradigms of leadership have been explored to support the attributes of leadership that emerged from the data analysis of the participant interviews. What follows in this section is a review of the scholarly leadership literature from both discourses, providing a brief overview of those elements, characteristics or attributes of leadership ('calling', 'stewardship' and 'serving') that have arisen out of the data analysis of the participant interviews.

2.5.1 Calling

The *Cambridge Dictionary* (2009) defines 'calling' as 'a strong wish to do a job, usually one which is socially valuable'. Dent, Higgens and Wharff (2005) contend, from their empirical assessment of spirituality and leadership that humans are looking for meaning. People are seeking value (Hodgkinson, 1991) and a sense of calling (Fry and Matherly, 2006) in life. I have found that transformational/relational leaders are more inclined than others to impart to their stakeholders an extension of their calling to serve (see Chapter Four, CA page 94).

Leadership as a calling is both organic and holistic in the sense of responding to a higher purpose in life through the 'purpose of serving others' using one's 'natural gifts and yearnings' (Leider, 2006: 290–293). Conceptualising it as a philosophy of 'inside-out leadership', Braskamp (2008), who writes from a sacred discourse, suggests:

Leading is holistic (all italics Braskamp) in nature and purpose. The core theme of the conception of leadership is
this: leading is *inner-based and outer-focused...* is anchored by *vocation*, a sense of calling to a higher purpose. Vocation begins with an understanding and feeling of being called in life, a very rich and lifelong psychological and spiritual process... reflecting on one’s gifts, strengths, and opportunities... a discovery of one’s life purpose by living with vocation, leading with vocation, and developing community with vocation.

(Braskamp, 2008: 1–2)

Leider advances the notion that leaders ‘who heed their calling have three characteristics in common: service, passion and fit’. These are characterised, I found, by evangelical Christian school leaders who recognise that they are *called* to evangelical Christian education and to their respective schools (see Chapter Four, pages 92–95).

‘Calling’, the first leadership attribute explored in this research, typically takes on a spiritual or religious tone. It denotes ‘a profession or occupation’ – a vocation (in Latin, *vocare*, meaning to call); especially as a ‘divine call or vocation to the religious life’ (*Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, 2010). Reave (2005) confirms, in the form of anecdotal evidence (there is no empirical evidence yet to support the finding), that the cause of transformational behaviours in many leaders is often described in spiritual terms as ‘a calling,’ ‘grace’ or ‘a miracle’ (Neal, Lichtenstein and Banner, 1999: 179). For this research, *vocation* and *calling* are seen as interchangeable terms and an overlapping discourse used both in secular and sacred discourses, though one attribute – ‘calling’ – clearly carried a strong spiritual and sacred connotation for the participants.

2.5.2 *Stewardship*

The core ethos of ‘stewardship’ is placing the ‘the long-term best interests of a group ahead of personal goals that serve an individual’s self-interests’ (Hernandez, 2008: 122). Stewardship theory proposes a moral and ethical imperative (Donaldson, 1990) to the ‘sociological and psychological approaches to governance’, suggesting, I have found (see Chapter Five, CA4 page 134), ‘more open forms of management that build trust and collaboration... between leaders and subordinates...’ with the purpose of establishing a
community culture of 'pro-organizational rather than pro-self-values' (Davis, Schoorman and Donaldson, 1997: 20).

In support of the research argument, it is important to note that 'collaboration' means 'working jointly with others especially in an intellectual endeavour (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2010) such as an educational setting. Collaboration, as part of the relational/transformational leadership paradigm, I found, provides a favourable context for the reinforcement of trust that is necessary for innovation, improving organisational and individual effectiveness, creating opportunities to learn and fostering continuous improvement (Hargreaves, 1998) toward the building of a relational community.

Stewardship, conveyed through the secular discourse, is an attribute of leadership that is not the traditional top-down management construct where leadership alone exercises strategies of control, vision and direction for the organisation (Gooden, 2002). Rather, I found transformational stewardship (see Chapter Four, US4 and UK1 pages 121-122) to focus on serving, facilitation and empowerment, not control of stakeholders (Davis et al., 1997). In their empirical investigation of stewardship as leadership, April, Peters and Allison (2010: 58) link stewardship to serving, asserting that 'service over self-interest' is a pillar of stewardship.

Examining leadership integrity, Bogue (1994), proposed a secular, but spiritual dimension to his concept of stewardship:

> The spiritual meaning of stewardship is to honour what has been given to us, to use power with a sense of grace, and to pursue purposes that transcend the short-term self-interest.

(Bogue, 1994: 22)

Senge (1990) introduced the concept of stewardship within the context of what he called personal mastery, whereby persons move beyond competence and skill into the realm of spiritual growth.
Correspondingly, ‘Christian stewardship’ has been broadened over the years to include areas that were not contemplated in earlier forms of stewardship (McMahon, 1985). The data in this research extends the meaning of stewardship in both discourses to include the valuing of relationships ‘where one is not taking another for granted, but instead giving one-hundred per cent to the relationship’ (ChristiaNet, 2009, para. 3). Kantonen (2010: 1) quotes James Denny, the Scottish theologian, who affirmed a particular Christian distinctiveness whereby the motivation of Christian stewardship is ‘the love of Christ compelling us’. Central to one’s evangelical Christian leadership mandate is a strong and compelling commitment to stewardship of the organisational ethos, ultimately resulting in the building of relational evangelical Christian school communities.

Reinke (2004: 46), a retired United States Air Force officer and an ordained deacon in the Episcopal Church, suggests that ‘stewardship’ may one day emerge as a valid and promising leadership alternative. She proposes that stewardship has a threefold purpose for leaders: to put the needs of others and the organisation before their own personal needs; to practise a participatory leadership style; and to demonstrate commitment to the growth of stakeholders. Stewardship is, at its foundation, a commitment to serve and lead in partnership rather than patriarchy, and empowerment instead of dependency (Keith, 2008).

2.5.3 Serving

The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* (2010) defines ‘serve’ as ‘to be a servant’. The *Free Dictionary* (2011) characterises ‘serve’ as being ‘of assistance to or to promote the interests of... or to be of service... in achieving something or fulfilling a purpose’ (*Word Reference English Dictionary*, 2011). As an increasingly important attribute of leadership, ‘serving’ articulates the meeting of shared interests, rather than attempting to control or steer someone or something in a new direction (Denhart and Denhart, 2011).

Greenleaf (1991), in his foundational work *The Servant as Leader*, explained his core belief, that service is the leader’s top priority:

> Leadership begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, serve first... That if one is a servant, either leader or
follower, one is always searching, listening, and expecting; servants first striving to meet the highest priority needs of others; not the person who is leader first and who later serves out of the prompting of conscience or in conformity with normative expectations.

(Greenleaf, 1991: 7.9.13–14)

Serving is a key attribute of leading and servant-leadership (Blanchard, Hybels and Hodges, 1999; Kouzes and Posner, 1995). For the evangelical Christian school leader, the act of ‘service’ is doing work for God willingly and cheerfully with all your spirit, soul and body (Christian Forum, 2011).

Grace (1996: 74), while investigating the responses of Catholic head teachers to the changing culture of the English schooling community, found that many of his participants saw a ‘social ethic of serving others as central to the mission of the Catholic school’. I found that ‘serving’ was a fundamental mission of the evangelical Christian school leaders as well; that evangelical Christian school leaders purport to model Christ in acts of service (see Table 4.1, page 90).

2.5.4 Community

‘Community’ is defined as ‘people with common interests and characteristics’ and ‘a social group... whose members... often have a common cultural and historic heritage perceived or perceiving itself as distinct... from the larger society within which it exists’ (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2010). Using cluster analysis in their study of community, MacQueen et al. (2001) formulated a definition of community as

a group of people with diverse characteristics who are linked by social ties, share common perspectives, and engage in joint action in geographical locations or settings.

(MacQueen et al., 2001: 1929)

Sergiovanni (1994a) similarly holds that communities are collections of people who come together through common values, ideas and commitments, and are organised
around relationships and ideas that provide the ‘optimum conditions for creating a sense of ‘we’ from the ‘I’ of each individual’ (Sergiovanni, 2000b: 56). Hayden (2007: 93) embraces the notion that community is often identified as ‘people conceived to share a common culture’, yet ‘in schools there are some desirable features that would not be shared by just any school’.

Relational communities are thought to be organic in the sense that they promote the interdependence of component parts within the social system (Osborne, 2005). Among the best known interpreters of the holistic education movement, Miller (2000) suggests that organic communities in which the members appear to be interdependent on one another in maintaining the balance and the stability of the social system are also holistic; concerned with ‘wholes or complete systems’ (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2011); this is referred to in the research as a ‘three-legged stool’ (see Chapter Five, UK2 page 129).

Holistic school communities are based on the hypothesis that each person finds identity, meaning and purpose in life through connections to spiritual values (Miller, 2000), to the local community, to the global community, to the home and to the church, which I found related directly to those attributes of leadership that continually promoted the building of community.

As an extension of the spiritual dimension of community, evangelical Christian school leaders make this distinction; they see the school community as an aggregate (a body) of believers (see Chapter Five, PR page 145) in relationship, who ‘share common goals, experiences, mission, vision, likes, dislikes and, most importantly, values’ (Kuczmarski and Kuczmarski, 1995: 27). Community may also be seen as an ‘eco-system in which leadership is embedded in the patterns of relationships’ (Lambert, 2002: 49). Konstant (1981), writing in Signposts and Homecoming to the Bishops of England and Wales on the educative task of the Catholic Christian community, argued a sacred discourse as an ‘appurtenance’ to the unique calling of the Catholic school:

The ultimate distinctive element is that its life is based on the vision of Christ in which all learning, growing, service, freedom and relationships are seen as... growth in the
knowledge, love and experience of God... There is a deliberate hope that the experience of belonging to the school will encourage personal commitment to Jesus Christ, mark an important stage in the process of conversion and will lead to the discovery of the Christian vocation.

(Konstant, 1981: 106–107)

The convergence of the relevant 'secular' and 'sacred' discourses through the scholarly literature added depth and breadth to the attributes of leadership and community building framework of the research; thus, as a result of analysing the participant data in greater depth, the research question became:

❖ How is the sacred discourse of the participants in the 12 evangelical Christian schools in three countries (Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States) expressed in terms of their leadership enactment, and is there an overlap or linkage with the relevant, secular scholarly literature regarding attributes of leadership and community building?

The sub-questions in this study are now:

- What attributes of leadership most often appear to direct the leadership of the evangelical Christian school leaders to whom I spoke?
- Is it possible that the sacred and secular discourses are complementary, with no perceived dissimilarities between the two, or are these discourses an oppositional binary with certain fundamental distinctions?
- Is there an appurtenance (an add-on) to the sacred discourse expressed by the participants that adds a richness and distinctiveness to their discourse?

2.6 Conclusion

Over the past 75 years, there have been significant advances in the study and practice of leadership, setting standards to which many leaders today aspire (Cox and Meda, 2004). This chapter is a body of literature that supports the leadership characteristics and attributes of the evangelical Christian school leader participants in this research.
Leadership is no longer thought of exclusively as a form of persuasion and power demonstrated in a transactional approach, but instead, leadership, in the twenty-first century, calls for more collaborative models requiring a philosophical shift in leadership thinking towards a form of leadership that inspires followers and enlists them in team decision-making for systemic and strategic change toward the building of community. Balswick and Wright (2005: 14) suggest a 'complementary-empowering model of Christian leadership'... where the evangelical Christian school leader is committed to stakeholders..., 'empowering them for service and leadership'; a statement which I found authenticates the mission of the evangelical Christian school and the calling and vocation of the evangelical Christian school leader.

The definitions, models and theories used in a particular study of leadership depend upon the 'purpose of the study and the topics under investigation' (Bass, 1990: 19). The intention of this literature review, consequently, has been first to position the research within a theoretical context examining various general and conventional theories and models of leadership that framed the initial research question. Second, the literature review's intent was to explore both the relevant secular and sacred scholarly leadership literature of a transformational/relational/ethical nature, which supports the new research question and sub-questions and informs the research regarding attributes of leadership and the resultant aspects of community building. Third, the literature review further clarifies the use of discourse in the research.

Scholars of leadership agree that school leaders must employ a number of leadership paradigms (Garrett, 2007) in the day-to-day leadership of their schools; current leadership literature therefore leans toward an integrative, multi-dimensional approach. Some of the research, however, seems to suggest that aspiring school leaders may be especially reluctant to explore new leadership paradigms, further exacerbating the leadership challenges in schools (Winter and Morgenthal, 2002). This review of the leadership literature surveyed the transformational/relational/ethical theories and models of leadership which, along with the research data, will be persuasive in convincing school leaders from both discourses to consider leadership that is more collegial and transformational. The literature review underpins the data chapters, offering support to the findings, and assists in answering the new research question and sub-questions.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This qualitative study employed a constructivist/interpretivist means of data collection and analysis. Spending time in schools with senior leaders using investigative and interpretive procedures required observational and interviewing techniques to provide answers to the research question and sub-questions. In an attempt to uncover how the evangelical Christian school leaders who participated in the research perceived that they enacted leadership, I used semi-structured interviewing with 12 senior school leaders, and school stakeholders in the case study, 'listening to their voices' (Spears, 1998) and observing interactional behaviour. Using qualitative analysis, I engaged in the fine art of 'hearing data' (Rubin and Rubin, 2005).

3.2 Qualitative Theoretical Framework – Constructivist/Interpretivist

'Interpretive research begins and ends with the biography and self of the researcher' (Denzin, 1989a: 12). Therefore, this qualitative research deems that, as the researcher, I am an important part of the process and cannot be detached from the topic being studied. Social constructionism, the ontological and epistemological framework guiding this research, emphasises the hold a specific culture may have on my interpretations and can shape the way in which I see things (Crotty, 2003). As part of the research strategy, both subject and object contributed to the construction of meaning where the sacred and the secular discourses and the attributes of leadership and dimensions of community building became the subjects and frameworks. At the same time, the evangelical Christian school leaders and other school stakeholders (in the case study) became the objects, which were explored intently and simultaneously. Social information processing theory holds that work attitudes are, in part, socially constructed, and imply that leaders do not behave in a vacuum in which their individual attitudes completely determine their behaviour. As the research revealed, the actions of stakeholders provided behavioural cues that may have significant influence on leadership behaviour as each of the research environments was generally regarded as a strong social context (Schneider, 1987).
From an interpretive paradigm, the research was designed to explore the social realities of senior school leaders; i.e. their knowledge, views, understandings, interpretations, experiences, perceptions, interactions, attributes and their perceived enactment of leadership within their individual school cultures (Mason, 2002). I engaged in a process of enquiry to explore, interpret and incorporate into my knowledge base (Schutz, 1976) how the participant schools' senior leaders perceived their leadership attributes, their enactment of leadership and their leadership experiences on the basis of the meanings that these experiences had for them. By talking to the participants, listening to them, gaining access to their accounts and articulations, and subsequently using the rich readings (Leonard, 2005) of their texts as data accounts, I began to enter the worlds of the participant interviewees.

3.3 The Use of Discourse in Research
Discourse as data (Wetherell, Taylor and Yates, 2001) was representative of the participants in the evangelical Christian schools through their sacred conversations and through the discourse of the secular literature. In the qualitative sense, I was interested in discourse because I endeavoured to find a form of expression that might expose what I first suspected to be a dichotomy between the two discourses. Critically examining the discourses required that I look for patterns in the language in use, the special family of terms, and the meanings surrounding various expressions (Taylor, 2001) that are associated with the key themes of the data. This approach to discourse exposed language as it is specifically situated in relation to the participants' spiritual, social and/or cultural contexts.

3.4 The Research Process, Procedures and Design
3.4.1 Introduction
Investigating the research phenomena consisted of seven steps of data collection conducted over a nine-month period. The first step was to obtain documentary evidence from the websites of 30 evangelical Christian schools, ten from each of three countries, to narrow down the search. Second, following careful examination of the documentary analysis of the websites, a sample of 12 websites was selected that fit the overall research criteria (see Section 3.5.2). Third, I conducted a pilot study (see Section 3.4.7) with the senior leader of one of the schools selected from the documentary evidence. Fourth, after
being granted access to the institutions, I formulated the initial interview schedule, gleaning from the information presented in the websites and data analysed from the pilot interview. Fifth, I began the formal interviewing process, conducting semi-structured interviews (see Section 3.4.8) with the 12 senior school leaders regarding the descriptions and perceptions of their particular schools' cultures. Expecting to stimulate further reflection about their perceived enactment of evangelical Christian school leadership and the school leadership phenomena, I engaged diverse perspectives and explored critical issues in order to facilitate the construction of knowledge (Veal, 2002). Sixth, I undertook a more in-depth case study (see Section 3.5) of one school to reduce my researcher bias and to further corroborate and triangulate the research data by looking at the convergence of multiple data sources (Denzin, 1978; 1989b). Finally, I gleaned data from the field observation journal in which I made notations following each interview in an attempt to validate and strengthen the reality of the data and the argument. I suspect that all 12 of the schools may justifiably be considered case studies in themselves due to the multiplicity of data gathered at each site, the time that I spent at each school and the variety of people with whom I spoke. However, I did do a more in-depth case study of one school, US1.

3.4.2 Collecting Data from Documents
Documentary evidence of each school's website was a way of formalising the research with a set of initial criteria that captured my attention visually (Creswell, 2003) and assisted in building a portrait of each school. The analysis of the web documents (see Appendix B) was similar to that of the semi-structured interviews. I used a systematic procedure where I looked for general categories, then used that initial data to further determine the presence of certain words, concepts, themes, phrases, characters or sentences within the texts. I then coded the text, breaking down those themes, etc., into manageable categories (Berelson, 1952). Analysis of the schools' websites provided valuable information regarding the context, cultural patterns and focus of the participating institutions (Weber, 1990), including their evangelical ethos. This was the first stage of research that aided in the triangulation of information. These documents also offered another way for me to read between the lines of the research data, providing access to information that might have been difficult to obtain via an interview and also contained raw, not yet interpreted data (Fitzgerald, 2007). Because the documentary data
sources tended to be category-bound and were not surrogates for other kinds of data, I was not able to learn, merely through these written records, how the participants actually perceived or conveyed their leadership. The documents alone did not allow me to witness how leadership was expressed day-to-day (Silverman, 2005). Thus, semi-structured interviews and observations of the senior leaders’ interactions with staff and students made the site visits mini case studies.

3.4.3 The Research Sample

The primary focus of this research was to embark on a qualitative study that would hopefully add more than just anecdotal evidence (Bowman, 1997), observations and reflections (Page and Wong, 2000), but would also help to generate discussion around some very powerful leadership concepts and the use of discourse in research. The findings generated by the data did not offer generalisability, due to the small sample size, and involved participants who would not be representative of the larger population (Heck, 1996) of school leaders or evangelical Christian school leaders. Denzin (1983) best explains the interpretivist rejection of generalisation:

The interpretivist rejects generalization as a goal and never aims to draw randomly selected samples of human experience. For the interpretivist, every instance of social interaction represents a slice from the life world that is the proper subject matter for interpretive inquiry... carrying its own logic, sense of order, structure, and meaning.

(Denzin, 1983: 133–134)

This purposive and convenient sample size did allow me the opportunity to engage in extended visits with many of the school leaders, spending time in their schools. These schools had some fundamental aspects in common: a clear sense of mission, accreditation by a governing body and adherence to high academic and spiritual standards.

I determined that a small sample size would be more useful in examining a situation in depth and from various perspectives (Myers, 2000). This small sample size enabled me to understand the social and cultural world from the viewpoint of the participants through
detailed descriptions of their cognitive and symbolic actions associated with their evangelical Christian school communities and their perceived attributes and enactment of leadership, while exploring the use of the sacred and secular discourses. This held particularly true with the more in-depth case study, referred to as the case study.

From an examination of the web documents, I created a ‘recipe of the research criteria’ (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984), using five basic criteria to identify which school leaders to interview (Light, Singer and Willett, 1990). First, I looked at inclusion criteria involving only those school leaders who would give me the best representation of the population (see Table 3.1, page 67). Second, I examined exclusion criteria, excluding those school leaders who had not related personally to the phenomena. The third criterion, expected effect size, was a sampling of schools between 300 and 800 pupils (see Table 3.2, page 68). I would have liked to have found schools of the same size, but most evangelical Christian schools in each country were too small to be considered. Participants are listed in the data tables and are designated by initials and numbers, indicating the country, the school or the participant. For example, UK1 designates the first school visited in the United Kingdom and also indicates its senior leader/participant. CA denotes Canada and US represents the United States. The participants were very forthcoming with school data information and readily responded to my follow-up questions. Fourth, I selected school leaders who had been in their current leadership position for at least two years, as they would have, by then, adjusted to their leadership role. In respect to experience relative to the task, school leaders in their first year of leadership are relatively immature (Southworth, 2004). Lastly, I looked at feasibility, interviewing school leaders who could accommodate me relatively easily as I attempted to respect the participants and the research environments. Four evangelical Christian school senior leaders from each country were selected to participate in the research (see Table 3.1, page 67).
### Table 3.1 Evangelical Christian School Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and Leader</th>
<th>Gender and Position</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Years in Leadership Position</th>
<th>Education and Course Work</th>
<th>Professional Leadership Training</th>
<th>Teaching Experience and Subjects</th>
<th>Currently Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK1</td>
<td>Female Head Teacher</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>BA Education, Maths, Computers</td>
<td>Educational Management, Headship Qualification</td>
<td>30 Years Maths, Computers</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2</td>
<td>Male Head Teacher</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>BA French</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10 Years French</td>
<td>Yes, French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK3</td>
<td>Male Head Master</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>BA Economics</td>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK4</td>
<td>Female Head Teacher</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>11 Years</td>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td>University Courses, Conferences</td>
<td>15 Years Kindergarten</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>Male Superintendent</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>14 Years</td>
<td>BA Geography, BA Psychology</td>
<td>MA Coursework</td>
<td>24 Years Geography</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Male Superintendent</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
<td>BA Education, BA Music</td>
<td>Courses, Conferences, Evaluation Teams</td>
<td>11 Years Elementary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3</td>
<td>Male Superintendent</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>18 Years</td>
<td>BA Theology</td>
<td>MA Ed Leadership</td>
<td>38 Years Bible, Computers</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA4</td>
<td>Male Superintendent</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>8 Years</td>
<td>BA History, English Bible Courses Teacher Certification</td>
<td>MA Leadership, Seminars/Conferences</td>
<td>19 Years History, English Maths, Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US1</td>
<td>Female Superintendent</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>BA Bin Ed Education, MA School Admin</td>
<td>Conferences, Workshops</td>
<td>13 Years Elementary</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2</td>
<td>Male Head Master</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>13 Years</td>
<td>BA Business, Phy Ed, MA School Admin</td>
<td>Mentore Relationships, Conferences</td>
<td>3 Years Business, Phy Ed</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US3</td>
<td>Female Superintendent</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>BA Public Relations, MA Business Ed, PhD, Ed Dl, Higher Ed</td>
<td>MA Christian Ed, Conferences, Workshops</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US4</td>
<td>Male Superintendent</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>BA Ed Theology, MA/PhD Psychology, PhD School Admin</td>
<td>Air Force Officers School, Air Command College, Christian Ed Leadership</td>
<td>8 Years Bible, Maths, Psychology</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants were selected using purposive or criterion-based sampling strategies to identify the target population from which I could learn the most (Merriam, 1988). I chose to use all-age, co-educational schools [PreK-12 in Canada and the United States and Nursery-5th or 6th form in the United Kingdom] (see Glossary, page 16) in each country. I located schools that were large enough for the senior leaders (i.e. gatekeepers, administrators, superintendents, headmasters, head teachers – all interchangeable terms for this research) to have significant leadership responsibilities and to represent their school districts in a significant leadership capacity. Ultimately, leadership denotes leading and working with other people, who, in turn, deliver the learning rather than the senior school leaders delivering the learning themselves. The school leaders led schools large enough for them to evaluate their perceived enactment of leadership, yet small enough that they maintained some contact with students. Only UK2 had a teaching schedule. I located a gender mix of eight men and four women, with one woman participant of African-American ethnicity.

The interviewer selection process took nearly three months. Following the examination of the schools’ web documents, I contacted the schools via email or telephone to
determine the size of the school, to gather other demographic data and to establish that the Christian schools were indeed evangelical, based upon the operative definition of evangelical (see page 26). An overwhelming majority of the schools’ leaders were very cooperative, although one school in the UK clearly did not want to divulge any information as to its evangelical position. Eventually, I located 12 evangelical Christian schools that fit the research criteria; one school in each country with 300+ students, one school in each country with 500+ students, one school in each country with 600+ students and one school in each country with 700–800 students. All schools were co-educational.

### Table 3.2 The Evangelical Christian schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and School</th>
<th>Professional Affiliation</th>
<th>Church Affiliate School</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Number of Team Leaders</th>
<th>Number of Pupils Confessing Christ</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Student Ethnic Diversity</th>
<th>Staff Ethnic Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK1</td>
<td>TISCA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>PreK-6th Form</td>
<td>93% Caucasian 07% Other</td>
<td>98% Caucasian 02% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2</td>
<td>TISCA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>PreK-6th Form</td>
<td>98% Caucasian 02% Other</td>
<td>98% Caucasian 02% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US1</td>
<td>TISCA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Intent is 100%</td>
<td>81% Caucasian 09% Other</td>
<td>95% Caucasian 05% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2</td>
<td>ACSI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>PreK-12</td>
<td>78% Caucasian 22% Asian</td>
<td>98% Caucasian 01% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the schools were church affiliated and eight were independent with no church affiliation. All of the schools in the United States and the United Kingdom were fee-paying, meaning that parents pay a yearly tuition fee and the schools receive no government financial assistance. Two of the schools in Canada were fee-paying with a minimal amount of government financial support. The leaders of these Canadian schools...
assured me that despite providing financial assistance, the government did not intervene in school affairs in any way.

Shared faith statements enabled the research to start officially from a common spiritual framework, as the school leaders hold a common view of evangelical Christianity. I had initially determined to contact only schools affiliated to the Association of Christian Schools International [ACSI] (see Glossary, page 16), since it is an international organisation, but most of the schools were too small for reliable study and did not fit the research criteria. Upon further investigation, I found affiliations in the United Kingdom and Canada that held to a similar evangelical Christian statement of faith (see Appendix C) as ACSI. Those were the Society of Christian Schools in British Columbia [SCSBC] in Canada and The Independent Schools Christian Alliance [TISCA] in the United Kingdom. Gaining access to the participating schools and interviewing the senior school leaders began, taking nine months, and involving a great deal of travel.

3.4.4 Gaining Access

In an attempt to gain access to the institutions for the purpose of interviewing the schools' senior leaders, an initial email (see Appendix D) was sent to the 12 school leaders via the website contact address explaining the reason for my request. I informed the school leaders or office personnel that I had located their websites while searching for evangelical Christian schools, that I was interested in evangelical Christian school leadership and that I anticipated arranging an opportunity for an interview with the school's senior leader. Researchers in the past, particularly in the United Kingdom, had found that school leaders were somewhat unfriendly and responded negatively to educational research (Reynolds, Sammons, Stoll, Barber and Hillman, 1996). However, as an insider/outsider researcher (see Section 3.4.5), I found that there was a very favourable climate toward educational research in the schools that I visited, perhaps because the participants considered that I might be someone who would share their values and with whom they would be 'safe' to divulge any sensitive information.

Gaining access was a positive experience. Of the 12 senior school leaders, eight communicated personally with me throughout the research process, including any necessary follow-up conversations. Three-quarters of the school leaders in the United
Kingdom communicated through their personal assistants, while the opposite was true of those in Canada and the United States, with only one leader communicating via the personal assistant. All 12 leaders responded optimistically, giving me permission to interview them on school premises.

3.4.5 The Insider/Outsider Researcher

For this practitioner research, my role as interviewer took on an insider/outsider position. I acknowledge that this has been my life's work and that this research is deeply impacted by my faith and in evangelical Christian schooling, with which I have been involved for more than 30 years. At present, I lead a team of teachers as a principal in an evangelical Christian school. As a researcher placing myself within my own community of practice, I have a knowledge base and familiarity with the world of education, the issues educators face in compulsory education, and the various leadership theories, styles, perspectives and attributes. In this regard I am an insider. However, I was not acquainted with any of the school leaders participating in the research, nor was I familiar with the school cultures of the participants, which I believe protected me from the worst of researcher bias (Gallais, 2003) as an outsider. An insider/outsider relationship can be seen as representing two different perspectives (Olson, 1977), which I suspect holds true for this research.

The participants appeared to respond to me comfortably both as insider and outsider and, moreover, as colleague. Hockey (1993) asserts that there is the possibility of enhanced rapport between participants and researcher, suggesting that participants are more likely to divulge intimate details of their lives to someone considered empathetic and with a partial knowledge of their educational mission. Having partial insider status had its benefits, because the degree to which I was able to exhibit an awareness of the setting and context of the research arena was also the degree to which it may have enhanced my credibility and trustworthiness (Robson, 2002). UK2, in fact, divulged sensitive information to me, prefacing his comments with:

This is off the record and very confidential.

(UK2)
While striving to seek objectivity (Bell, 1993), I felt it important to facilitate disclosure of pertinent and perhaps sometimes sensitive information; thus, I needed to permit my researcher’s self to empathise with participants, possibly eliciting more authenticity from the participants than would be possible by endeavouring to ‘extract out’ emotion (Hubbard, Backett-Milburn and Kemmer, 2001) during the interpretive phase of analysis, yet respecting the ethical constructs of the research design (see pages 84-86). However, I did guard against taken-for-granted assumptions, not presuming that my insider knowledge of the field of study or preconceptions about educational or leadership issues and solutions (Robson, 2002) would reflect the full picture of the research environments. As an insider researcher in my own community of practice with my own set of values, it was imperative that I allow the voices of the participants to speak rather than trying to interpret what they were saying, which I found challenging at times. Upon reflection, I felt competent to illuminate an understanding of the various qualitative methodologies more concretely and tangibly, and, in the end, my own insider/outsider researcher position (Mehra, 2002) may not have been compromised as the research process continued.

### 3.4.6 The Research Journal and Summary Forms

Throughout the study I kept a research journal as an effective means to record (Robson, 2002) my thoughts, interpretations, observations, reflections, frustrations, comparative codes and just simply as an ‘aide memoire’ (Burgess, 1984). Summary forms of web documents, interviews, discussions and observations (see Appendix A) were generated from suggestions in Miles and Huberman’s (1994) work on qualitative research methods and became part of the research journal. Summary forms were written up as soon after the data gathering appointments as possible. These forms included key information: values, beliefs, themes, main issues and anything that struck me as salient, interesting or illuminating, regarding the interviews and my observations, and were used as part of the data analysis and corroborating evidence with which to triangulate the data.

### 3.4.7 The Pilot Interview

A pilot interview was conducted as a trial run to develop and test the initial interview schedule, to explore opportunities for further research questions, to help hone my skills in the interviewing process regarding feedback and dialogue and to determine areas that
might be covered in subsequent interviews. The pilot interview became a surprisingly useful tool in helping me fine-tune the hierarchical focused interview agenda. The pilot interview also helped me understand the need for extensive probing regarding the descriptions and perceptions of the interviewees.

The pilot interview was conducted with an evangelical Christian school leader in the United States, whose school had a student population of 500+ students (see Table 3.1, page 67 and Table 3.2, page 68). This well-educated and experienced superintendent had been in his particular leadership position for two years.

Prior to the actual pilot interview, the superintendent gave me a personalised tour of the school. We entered classrooms and observed briefly as he acknowledged students and teachers. I considered this type of activity beneficial and observational, and endeavoured to gain that same kind of access within the other participants' schools. The superintendent invited me to participate in the team leadership meeting where school leaders graciously welcomed me. Following that meeting, I joined the leadership team for lunch. Directly after lunch, we began the interview in the office of the superintendent. No interruptions took place during the interview.

During the interview, I discovered that the superintendent presumed that I knew a great deal about the research topic at hand and withheld general information, requiring me to probe and query for more detailed descriptions. As I probed for details, the participant continued to withhold information. I then gently reminded him that all information would be held confidential, and that participants would remain anonymous in the writing up of the research. The mention of anonymity enabled trust to develop. Determined to ensure the best possible use of the pilot results (VanTeijlingen and Hundley, 2001), US4, the pilot study interviewee (see Table 3.1, page 67), became part of the general participant inventory within the main body of the research, as the data collected from his interview immediately began to inform themes, and later influenced the primary framework of the research.

US4 expressed his thoughts in a succinct and spiritual discourse. I realised that his interview would affect the outcome of the research and helped to formulate the initial
research question. However, it was not until all of the interviews were completed and the data analysed, that I fully grasped the critical thread of the argument. The sacred and the secular discourses illuminated the data, and it became clear to me that it was important to explore these two discourses, not necessarily as oppositional binaries, but as discourses that might converge or overlap. While I did little to alter the initial interview schedule, I did analyse the data with a new view toward the sacred and the secular discourse as embedded within the second framework of the research, regarding the perceived leadership attributes of evangelical Christian school leaders and the subsequent community building dimension of schooling.

3.4.8 Semi-structured Interviews

Qualitative semi-structured interviews impacted on the research in three ways: to construct the meanings of central themes in the life world of the participants (Kvale, 1996); to acquire the story behind a participant’s experiences, personal feelings and opinions (McNamara, 1999) and to reveal the sacred discourse of the participants. Semi-structured interviews, in particular, tend to be most favoured by educational researchers (Wragg, 2001) and were indispensable in this research.

In order to document the culture — the perspectives and practices — of the participants and to elicit spontaneous accounts, ‘hierarchical focusing’ (Tomlinson, 1989) of the interview schedule was used in an attempt to gain access to participants’ perceptions, actions and reactions with a minimum amount of framing. To minimise my researcher influence, I raised topics only when necessary, while keeping in mind the research agenda. This ‘top down’ approach to interviewing allowed a gradual progression from open to closed framing with a non-directive style of interaction, starting with the general end of the agenda hierarchy eliciting the elaboration and expansion of interviewees’ accounts. If this method failed to produce exhaustive coverage of the research agenda, then I went to the next most specific topic, doing so iteratively throughout each interview. While the basic questions were addressed during the interview, the order in which they were covered occasionally varied.

The traditional conceptualisation of the research interview is grounded in a positivist paradigm taking on a more formalised interviewing process. This paradigm assumes that
power in the relationship is dichotomous and asymmetrical and favours the interviewer. Critics argue that this asymmetry creates a depersonalising, exploitative and patronising relationship (Limerick, Burgess-Limerick and Grace, 1996), which was not the objective of the data gathering. Because there were numerous relationships that could have existed between the interviewees and me in a one-to-one interview from peer, friend, counsellor to remorseless interrogator (Watts and Ebbutt, 1987), interacting with the participants in a conversational structure allowed me to dismantle any power relationships that might have existed (Stanley and Wise, 1993). The interview accounts were not simply ‘collected’ from the participants (Coar and Sim, 2006) but were ‘co-authored’ and a joint production; a co-production between me and the participants (Wengraf, 2001). I endeavoured to respect the fact that the interviews were a gift of time and text, as it was my story of their stories that formed the written reports (Limerick et al., 1996). The outcomes of the interviews were not only enlightening for me, but at the conclusion of each interview several participants expressed appreciation of the opportunity to engage in reflective thought. UK2 commented:

I just realised that I don’t often find or have the time to be reflective, so this was a useful exercise.

(UK2)

A week prior to the interviews, I contacted the participants by email so that they could nominate a meeting time and location, thus empowering the interviewees and shifting the dynamics of power from me to them (Powney and Watts, 1987). One day before the interview a reminder phone call was made. Participants were given an overview of the study, but not so much information that it would evoke discussion of the study prior to the actual interview or bias the course of the interview (Platt, 1981). Permission to use the voice recorder was granted by each participant. They were informed that their individual responses would not be shared with peers and were reassured about such matters as confidentiality and anonymity. Each school leader readily gave his/her permission to be interviewed; none refused. I personally transcribed each interview, forcing myself to pay attention to what each interviewee said. Transcribing each interview prior to the next allowed me to anticipate and prepare for each successive interview.
The interviews were conducted during the school day and on the schools' premises in the offices of the participants, where they would feel comfortable, safe and secure and at ease enough to speak freely and openly about their perceptions and experiences (Kvale, 1996). The interviews were about one hour in length. Three of the 12 participants had time constraints; therefore, I kept track of the time, honouring their prior commitments. In the end time did not become an issue.

I began each interview with ‘warming-up’ questions to put the participants at ease. Establishing a conversational setting and encouraging free, open, evolving and informal conversation (Stoughton and Sivertson, 2005), the aim was to allow the participants to engage in free-flowing thought and to determine the direction that the interview conversations took. I chose not to take notes during the interviews so that the participants could sense my complete attention to the task. This allowed the integrity of the conversation to remain intact and enabled me to fully engage in the production. I endeavoured to convey a neutral non-judgemental stance towards the interviewees in conjunction with ‘active listening’ (Tomlinson, 1989). I carefully regarded what each participant said, offering encouragement when necessary to help sustain the dialogue.

The flexible interview schedule enabled me to be sensitive to the specific dynamics of each interaction (Mason, 2002). With this in mind, I tried to limit my own contributions to the conversation and found that if I was patient, gave way to silences, waited for the interviewees to reflect before responding to my enquiries and kept the exchanges informal, then I could avoid any manipulative pitfalls. In some instances, I had to resist the temptation to give advice, to impose constructs or to make recommendations due to my expertise in the field and I had to maintain my role as a neutral party (Mehra, 2002). I had to respect just how far relationships could be pressed (Hannabus, 2000), keeping in mind the strict code of ethics (see Section 3.7).

3.4.9 General Observations

Representing a first-hand account of the participants’ worlds (Merriam, 1988), the field observations gave a holistic approach to the research which led to a description of people, school cultures and everyday events, narratives and constructions of meaning, rather than a reproduction of such events (Robson, 2002). Critics of participant observation as a data-
gathering technique point to the highly subjective and therefore unreliable nature of human perception (Merriam, 1988). Therefore, I attempted to divorce my underpinning values and beliefs from the ways in which I might have perceived an observational situation, or even what I expected to occur (Moyles, 2002). Another concern was the extent to which my observations might affect that which I was observing; thus, I attempted to become a neutral figure, not changing the situation in any way so as to affect the data (Bogdan, 1972). In order to ensure that the activities of those being observed might not be altered (Kazdin, 1982), I strove to develop a relationship with participants in advance via email so that they might not be concerned with being judged or assessed. General observations included touring the campus with the senior leaders in 10 of the schools, sitting in on morning worship and prayer in two schools, attending a team leadership meeting in three schools, and speaking with various staff members in several schools. Data from these observations are included where applicable in the data chapters.

3.5 Data Collection in the Case Study

3.5.1 Introduction

With a good portion of the data analysis accomplished, and following the interviews and mini case studies with the 12 evangelical Christian school senior leaders, a case study school in the United States, near my home (US1) (see Table 3.3, page 77) was selected for a more in-depth analysis of the sacred discourse of evangelical Christian school leaders and their stakeholders. Although the data coding process proceeded at all times during the research, I found that new data collected from the case study participants emerged which furthered the iterative process, forcing me to recode and enter new themes and concepts as they emerged, while reconfirming the other established analysed data. The case study was intended to extend the research experience, adding strength to the argument, and emphasised a detailed contextual analysis of a more in-depth real-life situation using multiple sources of evidence with which to investigate both the emerging leadership attributes and the community building aspect of leadership.

For the case study, I employed semi-structured interviews (see Section 3.4.8), observations, documentary analysis, shadowing and a focus group discussion, given that the use of interviews as sole data sources should probably be treated with scepticism (Gronn, 2007). I desired to get to know the environment under study (Robson, 2002), and
was fortunate to find a school that encouraged me to spend time with them in order that I might acclimatise myself to their unique culture. Doing the case study at US1 made it convenient for me to make multiple visits to the campus.

The case study was particularly useful in representing the voices of a variety of the school’s stakeholders (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, and Pickeral, 2009), who may have been previously silenced or marginalised by the hegemony of more dominant voices (Moore and Mullar, 1999). The case study participants’ voices were represented by pseudonyms, and included the superintendent’s US1, teachers’ TE1 and TE2, a principal’s PR, a parent/board member’s PB and six students’ voices ST1-ST6 (see Table 3.3). Each case study participant confirmed their evangelical Christianity. The case study potentially illustrated specific examples of ‘leadership in action’ and ‘values-driven leadership’ (Gold et al., 2003: 136) that were central to the leadership of US1. Numbers were assigned to the teachers in the order interviewed, and assigned to the students according to their seating arrangement during the focus group interview (see Table 3.3 below).

### Table 3.3 The case study participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Years at the School</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7th-12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Parent Board Member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>9th-12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>7th-12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triangulation across roles was emphasised to ensure that an accurate picture emerged (Heller and Firestone, 1995) from the participants. Besides the need for triangulation, I
utilised the case study to gain even deeper insight into how the sacred discourse was revealed through the data analysis. I also wanted to see how the enactment of school leadership attributes toward the building of the school community might be perceived and operationalised in the school by interviewing a variety of the school’s stakeholders and observing small segments of the school’s culture (Fitzgerald, 2007). The process of collecting data within the case study was broken down into three stages: gaining entry, data collection and exiting the premises.

3.5.2 Gaining Access
To gain access into the school, I emailed the school superintendent, explaining each step of the research process (see Appendix F). I expressed pleasure regarding our interview and conveyed that I hoped I might carry out a case study in her school. US1 was hesitant at first, saying that much thought had been given regarding the case study and that she was not sure if their school should be ‘showcased’. I spent time respectfully overcoming her objections careful to maintain research ethics. I was not argumentative or manipulative in any way and, in the end, US1 agreed, remarking: ‘Yes, I really need to do this for a colleague as a way of serving.’ I realised that she was agreeing to serve me and that it may not necessarily reflect upon her leadership of the school. While I could not construe that she was willing to serve her stakeholders just because she wanted to serve me, I found her statement intriguing and thought-provoking. During our conversation I believe I resolved some ethical issues, including the fear of disempowering the participant and the fear of the school being exploited for the sake of the advancement of the research (Pendlebury and Enslin, 2001).

After gaining access, I remarked to US1 that I valued the unique relationship that we had developed, and that I found the school’s website to be very professional and informative, as it thoroughly explained the school’s mission and objectives. I also explained that the school was large enough to provide me with an opportunity to interview a variety of the schools’ stakeholders, observe meetings and shadow her during the school day. By selecting a school with a significant number of secondary students, I would also be able to lead a student focus group discussion. It is important to note here that ‘stakeholders’ are those individuals linked to an organisation because they and the organisation have consequences upon each other and have a stake, ‘an interest or a share in an undertaking’
(Carroll, 1989: 56). As father of the stakeholder concept, Freeman (1984) gave this classic definition of 'stakeholder':

A stakeholder in an organization is any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives.

(Freeman, 1984: 46)

Gangle's definition of stakeholder was extremely relevant for the case study school:

Stakeholders are those individuals who have clear-cut involvement in what is changing and make up the key participants in the change process because their lives will have been or are being directly affected by it.

(Gangle, 2002: 210)

Following the semi-structured interview and prior to the suggestion of the case study, US1 had shown me around the school and introduced me to several staff members and other key leaders. When it came time for the case study I prepared an interview schedule (see Appendix G). US1 gave me access to school personnel, arranging for interviews with a school board member/parent (PB) and the secondary principal (PR). I realised that the superintendent might be choosing participants who thought highly of the school's leadership. US1 encouraged me to attend a school board meeting and team leadership meeting. Following the interview with PR, she arranged for the teacher interviews and the student focus group discussion. She also invited me to observe a secondary staff meeting. Conducting the case study in the secondary school helped to validate the data gathered from the student focus group.

Because social power was involved, having gatekeeper approval may have enhanced my credibility with the participants and made their participation less risky, more comfortable and ethically relevant; their responses may have been influenced by the knowledge that I had been given access to them (Sikes, 2004). Sampling politically important participants may have increased the perceived usefulness of the study results (Mertens, 1998).
3.5.3 Case Study Observations

Appreciative of US1 ‘greasing the skids’, so to speak, by introducing me to key personnel around the school, the way was paved so that when I entered the observational settings and was introduced by the chair of the various meetings I did not come across as an intruder, but rather as a guest. Observation became an important tool with which to corroborate data evidence where the purpose was to ‘see’ what happened during meetings and what attributes of leadership were enacted, giving both hard and soft evidence about the school and its leaders. Gold (2004) contends:

Meetings are key information-giving and decision-making spaces demonstrating unusually visible ways of displaying a leader’s value system and an indicator of power relations within an organization.

(Gold, 2004: 14)

Observations included: general observations as I toured the campus with the superintendent, a secondary staff meeting, an all-school team leadership meeting, a school board meeting, individual meetings with the superintendent and the secondary administrator and shadowing the superintendent during her early morning routine and throughout the day at various intervals. Throughout the observational process, I gained valuable insight and felt very welcomed each time I visited the campus.

3.5.4 Shadowing

Shadowing is a qualitative research technique, akin to participant observation, that has seldom been used, but which lent a distinctive contribution (McDonald, 2005) to the data analysis. To corroborate the evidence and vary the methodology, I used ‘shadowing’ as an observational technique to uncover not just the shape of US1’s day in terms of her actions, but also to reveal the subtleties of perspective and purpose shaping her actions in the real-time context of her school day (McDonald, 2005). I vowed to guard my status when shadowing with an openness and flexibility that allowed me to be surprised by the fieldwork, and maintained diffused attention to the flow of action (Meunier and Vasquez, 2008). I chose to shadow US1 with intensity at intermittent intervals throughout the
Meunier and Vasquez (2008) suggest that there is an intrusive character specific to shadowing; therefore, I attempted to transform the experience into a comfortable situation for both of us. Shadowing US1 prior to the opening of the school day enabled me to observe her early morning routine. Following that, I attended a team leadership meeting. I left the school at noon and returned in the evening to attend a school board meeting, which I included as general observation and shadowing. I enjoyed this observational opportunity as it solicited US1’s opinions and behaviours concurrently. We discussed her perceptions of some of her encounters with staff, students and parents along with my perceptions of those encounters during leisure time in her office.

3.5.5 The Focus-Group Discussion
The hybrid form of group interviewing known as the focus interview was another component of the case study that aided in bringing triangulation to the research. It was also important in assessing whether or not the findings in the focus group corresponded to the perspectives (Powney and Watts, 1987) of the other stakeholders whom I interviewed. PR selected a homogenous group of high school students representing a particular segment of the school’s population currently involved in the associated student body [ASB] (see Glossary, page 16) leadership, yet not themselves close friends. PR arranged the time for the group interview and collected the signed consent forms (see Appendix H) from students, which also required parental permission for their child to be interviewed. The form instructed the student and parent that the student could withdraw from the study at any time.

Because the participants were not randomly sampled from the student population, I could not freely generalise from the results. Two boys and four girls participated, with one boy and one girl of an ethnic minority (see Table 3.3, page 77). We met privately as a group in a classroom during the school day, which limited the interviewing time to 50 minutes. Open discussion was encouraged under the conditions of complete anonymity and confidentiality.
The discussion opened with the presentation of a Starbucks Coffee gift card and a bottle of water to the participants. These first few opening moments of the focus group were critical for putting the student participants at ease, creating a comfortable, thoughtful and permissive atmosphere, stating the ground rules and setting the tone of the discussion (Krueger, 1994).

The structure of the focus group interview schedule (see Appendix I) was similar to the semi-structured interviews of the senior leaders. Its intent was to investigate the opinions, perceptions, thoughts and impressions of this selected group of students regarding the topic under investigation (Milena, Dainora and Alin, 2008). Focus group participants may commonly act according to their personality (Krueger, 1994); therefore, I directed the discussion in such a way as to allow and encourage a candid, normal conversation to which all participants might contribute, understanding that some might be more reticent than others.

I attempted to control for group dynamics or power hierarchies that might have affected who spoke and what was said. The focus group interview did not surface intensely personal issues or issues where I had to probe an interviewee’s perceptions with a succession of follow-up questions (Powney and Watts, 1987). Since I did not have an assistant during the focus group, I paid special attention to participants’ voices, noted who spoke in turn and noted the intonation of each voice so that during transcription I could easily identify each speaker. Student participants commented positively regarding the experience. I followed up posting a thank-you note to each student.

3.5.6 Leaving the Field

Leaving this field of study might have been more difficult for me than gaining entry because breaking attachments can sometimes offend those one has interviewed or observed, leaving them feeling betrayed and used (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984). However, it was with ease that I gradually reduced the frequency of my visits, explaining that the data gathering portion of the research was coming to a close. None of the participants seemed offended and encouraged me to keep in touch. To show appreciation for the participants’ contributions, I followed up with a thank-you note. To the principal and superintendent I sent a floral bouquet.
3.6 Research Data Analysis

To begin the research data analysis, I took the following systematic steps, developed by Creswell (2003): I made visits to the field to interview the participants, to gather raw data; I informally analysed data between each interview to create initial categories for the purpose of improving the interview schedule (Silverman, 2005); and lastly, I selected categories and attempted to position them within a theoretical model. I then began to explicate a story from the interconnection of the categories that illuminated and brought life to the data (Mertens, 1998).

The representation of voice is seen as transforming the cold world of secular rationalism into a warm world of human characters constituting a particular description of the participants' worlds (Gellner, 1974). Therefore, the participants' voices were encountered in text, and as I brought their voices to light from the data, they became recontextualisations (Bernstein, 1990). The interviews were transcribed and analysed using the software NVivo (see Glossary, page 16) to handle the participant interviews. I read and highlighted the interviews in the form of open coding by selecting specific and meaningful portions of the interview texts (i.e. behaviours, events, activities, strategies, meanings, descriptions, relationships, etc.). Following this procedure, I began to further cultivate themes from the data systematically gathered and analysed (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). I found it necessary to sort the broad codes, using a form of non-hierarchical axial coding, generating more specific groups and themes (Robson, 2002). The categories were then refined, merged, or split and their descriptions further modified (see Table 4.1, page 90 and Table 5.1, page 126).

This hybrid method of coding, analysing and inductive theory building would not require coding every passage or term, but allowed me to select only those concepts and themes that were most closely related to the research question and sub-questions. As the iterative process of coding and analysis continued, clear indicators began to illuminate theory grounded and developed inductively from within the corpus of data that included the values, understandings, qualities and strategies through which the school leaders perceived their leadership attributes and community building dimensions, and their subsequent enactment of leadership. From this process a more hierarchical arrangement
of themes developed. Owing to my inexperience with Nvivo, I also used Microsoft Excel (see Glossary, page 16) spread-sheets to further codify the sub-categories of data.

Qualitative data explicated from the participants’ voices (Amankwaa, 2005) began to generate theory (Glaser, 1992). The research was layered (Fallis and Opotow, 2003) and iterative as each new activity — collecting, analysing and presenting research findings — led to new research questions, additional data collection and analysis of the interviews and observations. This gave attention to objectivity and allowed for iterative cycles of theory development (Mulford and Silins, 2004).

A hybrid form of constructivist grounded theory was the dominant interpretive strategy used in the study as a specific form of ethnographic inquiry and inductive theory building (Crotty, 2003) from the ground up (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). My decision to use this hybrid method of grounded theory was determined by a review of methodological processes most amenable to exploring a smaller project, and one with which I was somewhat familiar. This constant comparative, hybrid method of analysis developed by Rubin and Rubin (2005) was perfectly suited to the research timetable.

The research argument seemed to be as much a discovery for me as was the iterative process that continued to resolve it (Glaser, 1992). It was this iterative process of analysis that brought me to the surprising discovery that ‘discourse’ would play such a significant part in the research, and also was to account for the discovery of the new themes to emerge from the data, which then led me to formulate a new research question, taking me on an stimulating and different journey through the data and the research.

### 3.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethics has more to do with giving than getting. Ethics is the application of moral principles that prevents doing harm to others, promotes good, shows respect and demonstrates a sense of fairness (Sieber, 1993). Therefore, I emphasised three basic ethical principles in my research practice: beneficence, respect and justice (Mertens, 1998).
Beneficence, the first ethical principal, meant maximising good outcomes for the participants, remembering that those participating in the research have their own interpretation of what is going on regardless of my intentions. There is special worth when participants enjoy the interviewing process, thus, I was careful of deception as it must not be part of the constructivist paradigm (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). While some say that research benefits from interviewees being fully informed from the start (Powney and Watts, 1987), at the other end of the continuum, Bulmer (1982) contends that all field research involves giving misinformation or less than full information. Placing myself somewhere between the two extremes, I conveyed the general purpose of the study, never withholding information about its true nature (Robson, 2002), so that the participants could reasonably expect what to anticipate during the research process before deciding to participate. I informed them that the research pertained to evangelical Christian school leadership. Only two participants asked for more information, with which I complied. My own professional leadership history is long-standing, and undertaking this research might have been seen as compromising or threatening to those in positions of leadership. Consequently, I carefully introduced myself, constantly reflecting and analysing the ways in which my researcher’s self might show through the process of the research.

The second ethical principle was respect. During the interviewing process, I focused on respecting the participants and the field of study (Creswell, 2003). This entailed referring to the school leaders as ‘interviewees’, or ‘participants’, rather than ‘subjects’. As a qualitative researcher and a guest in the lives of the participants, the research enquiries were conducted with good manners and a strict code of ethics (Stake, 1998). Some of the research data was sensitive; therefore, protecting the anonymity of all participants was paramount. For that reason, no detailed description of the individual participants was included in the write up, as this could lead to their identification. Quotations from participants were attributed to a particular case by initials only (see Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). Coupled with showing respect was the dissemination of data to the general public (see page 178). Participants were informed that the research would be publicly disseminated; at least made available through the university library.

The third basic ethical principal was justice, which ensured that those who bore the risk in the research would be the ones who would benefit from it (Mertens, 1998). I ensured
that the procedures for carrying out the research were reasonable, non-exploitive and administered fairly. Interviewees were told that there would be observation, reportage, data analysis and interpretation. While interpreting the data, I created an accurate written verbatim account of the information collected during each interview (Creswell, 2003). I informed the participants that audio tapes would be held secure and that after the study was complete the data would be discarded so that it would not fall into the hands of other researchers for other purposes. During the interpretation and analysis phase of the research, I acknowledged my own sacred discourse and any theoretical frameworks that might influence my interpretation and analysis. I understood that working in a somewhat familiar setting might unconsciously cause me to bring in my own unexamined interpretive agendas, lending opportunity for what might be considered unreliability and lack of validity (Brown and Dowling, 2003).

The writing-up phase of the research was not to be neutral. The use of the word ‘I’ was used so as not to hide behind the text. I tried not to make the research neat and unproblematic. I endeavoured to ‘tell it like it is’ even if things went wrong such as with UK3 who was late and appeared hurried, or when parts of the discussion seemed controversial or sensitive (Sikes, 2004); nevertheless, I had to keep in mind how the participants’ discourse might appear in the final written report and whether their interests, individually or collectively, would be affected by the writing (Robson, 2002). Three of the participants (US1, UK1 and UK3) have asked to see a copy of the thesis, and I will respectfully comply with their request.

3.8 Conclusion

The importance of methodological data organisation, collection, analysis and evaluation, and the presentation of ethical dilemmas, particularly in the area of insider/outsider research, was the focus of this chapter. Operationalising the constructivist framework involved a qualitative methodology during each phase of the research. Collection of data from documents, using a purposive and convenient sampling of participants from which semi-structured interviews were drawn, the use of observation and the implementation of the case study led to the coding and subsequent data analysis. Utilising a hybrid form of grounded theory assisted me in identifying themes to emerge from the data.
While it was a near impossible task to achieve objectivity, I did strive to obtain it throughout the research process (Bell, 1993), knowing that my research experiences and the meanings that I attributed to them will be shaped by my background, the different environments in which the research took place and the participants with whom I interacted (Gallais, 2003). Ethically, I attempted to maintain exemplary stewardship of the field of research so as not to take advantage of the participants, the participant data or the secular, scholarly literature.

Looking forward, the methodological aspect of the research is advanced through the next two data chapters. These chapters explore the three frameworks underpinning the research: the sacred and the secular discourses, the attributes of leadership and community building dimensions of leadership and the conventional leadership theories, which emanated from the evangelical Christian senior school leaders’ interview data.
CHAPTER 4
CALLING, STEWARDSHIP AND SERVING
IN LEADERSHIP

4.1 Introduction

In order to present the primary framework of this research, the sacred and the secular discourses, I introduce two thematic, data-led, discourse-infused chapters centred around attributes of effective leadership — 'calling', 'stewardship' and 'serving' — and the resultant outcome, 'community building' (see Chapter Five), which emerged from the data analysis of the participant interviews. For this reason there are two data chapters showing that the attributes of leadership (Chapter Four) result in the building of community through leadership (Chapter Five). From the first three leadership attributes various functions or actions of leadership arose, specifically those carried out collaboratively by the participants in order to strengthen their schools’ cultures and to build collaborative, relational and spiritual school communities.

Lewis and Murphy (2008) view leadership as a collaborative process, contending:

If leadership is seen as a function of interactions within a system, then leadership development is a much more complex process than just the development of individuals. It requires a systemic approach, which might be closer to organisational development, with attention focused on working with the leader to enable the whole system to learn together.

(Lewis and Murphy, 2008: 143)

The data from this research suggests that the majority of the participants expressed commitment to developing collective leadership and a sense of community in their schools, where leadership is distributed to other stakeholders (Lewis and Murphy, 2008), asserting three key attributes of leadership.
I will begin this chapter by defining the term 'attribute' as a 'quality or feature regarded as a characteristic or an inherent part of someone or something' (Oxford Dictionaries, 2011). Therefore, the discourses around leadership attributes are a result of the data analysis drawing out something new, thought-provoking and exciting, where the sacred discourse of the participants, the discourse of the scholarly, Christian literature and the discourse of the secular literature come together collaboratively. Initially, I hypothesised, that contemporary leadership theories, that is, the secular theories, would be utterly antithetical to the expressions of leadership in the sacred context. However, after reading the secular literature and listening to the voices of the participants, I realised that there was an overlap between the two discourses. This finding surprised me: that ultimately there was little difference between the sacred and the secular discourses; that the attributes of leadership and community building discourses were much more similar than I had thought, yet there was an appurtenance – an add-on – which was the specifically Christian dimension expressed through the participants' conversations.

The attributes of 'calling', 'stewardship' and 'serving' are therefore explored in this chapter, articulated through the two discourses as three intricately woven leadership attributes. The first attribute, calling, was so pronounced with 10 of the 12 participants that I pursued the notion, finding that each participant for whom calling was an important attribute of their leadership linked it in some way to the other attributes of stewardship and serving.

The combination of the three leadership attributes provides a framework for addressing the difficult challenges the participants mentioned that they faced as evangelical Christians 'called to serve' and lead their schools (Gooden, 2002). Exploring each attribute individually, I have been able to highlight the specific characteristics of each in light of the data, and to show how essential these attributes are to the leadership of the participants. Table 4.1 (see page 90) provides an overview of the key findings from the research in relation to the attributes of leadership most mentioned by the participants.
### Table 4.1 Attributes of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calling</th>
<th>UK1</th>
<th>UK2</th>
<th>UK3</th>
<th>CA1</th>
<th>CA2</th>
<th>CA3</th>
<th>US1</th>
<th>US2</th>
<th>US3</th>
<th>US4</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PB</th>
<th>TE1</th>
<th>TE2</th>
<th>ST1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Reference to Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Intervention/Hand of God</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Ministry/Vocation/Respective Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving School/Local/Global Communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Gifts/Talents/Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Reference to Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard/Protect/Cling On To Of the Christian Ethos</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Serving Stakeholder Needs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Vision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Reference to Servant-Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Reference to Serving/Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving is Leading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading to Create Culture of Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ-Centred</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins with an Attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Example or Modelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering Stakeholders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 is colour-coded to differentiate between the three leadership attributes. Double lines are used to further distinguish between the three attributes, while the last vertical double line between participants UK4 and PR separates the school leader participants from those in participants in the case study.

Using excerpts from the interviews with the participants and the discourse through the scholarly sacred and secular literature, I have been able to indicate where the sacred and
the secular discourses meet or overlap, thus adding richness to the reading and meaning of both texts. One methodological application contributing originality to the research was for me (as researcher) to stand in the doorway, interpreting then translating one discourse to the other. The discourse evidence shaping both data chapters is primarily a result of the transformational/relational/ethical collection of literature and of a greater scrutiny and analysis of the participant interview data.

4.2 The ‘Calling’ Attribute of Leadership; Motivation to Task Enactment

4.2.1 Introduction

‘Calling’ does not appear to be well defined in Western culture and is clarified in this chapter through both discourses. Historically, ‘calling’ has been defined from a religious or sacred perspective, referring to the idea that God or a Higher Power calls people to use their talents in the service of others through their work (Hardy, 1990). Williams (2006) contends that Christian leadership begins with God’s calling, and that the call comes in two parts: the first part is the desire to serve God and the second is that those who will be served recognise specific elements or attributes of character and the vocational gifts which qualify one called to serve. Later in this chapter I will introduce some literature that looks at calling from a secular perspective, showing the overlap of the secular and sacred discourses, which supports the research argument.

MacDonald (2003) found that:

Over time it seems that newer expressions such as the hand of God, vision, being led, gifted and passion appear to be common place in the call to Christian leadership and have come to dominate a Christian’s vocabulary. Words less heard are: ‘God clearly called me’.

(MacDonald, 2003: 3)

Several participants conveyed that they recognised their life’s calling to come from God. The sacred literature suggests that it might also be argued that every person — not only the Christian — has a life calling or vocation that will influence their vocational choices and is a motivation to task enactment (Kuhl, 2005). ‘Motivation’, put simply, is ‘the reason for
an action... gives purpose and direction to behavior' (Huitt, 2001). ‘It is your “why” and is literally the desire do things; the crucial element in setting and attaining goals’ (Psychology Today, 2011).

I suggest that calling surfaced as a vital attribute or pre-attribute for the participants, in order for them to ‘withdraw and discover or rediscover’ (Kuhl, 2005: 38) that which they perceived God has called them to do, which then gave them the motivation to lead and equip their schools’ stakeholders to make the tasks and vision happen. Gangle (1996), former director of ACSI (see Glossary page, 16), insists:

Central to the proper functioning of all Christian schools are competent and spiritual leaders who are called to lead, reflect on, and rediscover the nature of their calling.

(Gangle, 1996: 312)

4.2.2 The Calling Attribute of Leadership

While only seven of the 12 participants, including two participants (CA3 and US4) who are church pastors, expressed a clear sense of what they described as a ‘calling to the ministry’, to evangelical Christian school leadership and to their respective schools, three other participants stated that it was ‘God’ who led them to their respective schools. The significance of ‘calling’ arose as a result of my introductory question during the participant interviews: Why did you choose to become involved in evangelical Christian education and with this school in particular?

Representing the majority of the participants, CA1 explained his inimitable call to the evangelical Christian school in this manner:

They (the Christian school) had a huge vision... At first I did not agree with the starting of this Christian school... but then, I had what I call a ‘Damascus Road’ experience; and I then knew, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that this was where I was supposed to be... Within the motivation realm, I think that for me, clearly, I need to know where I am
going. I need to know the vision and direction in which we are heading... I was designed and shaped for this call...

Coming here was a *call*.

(CA1)

CA1 recalled a Christian spiritual incident (his Damascus Road experience) – a calling in the spiritual sense, and a calling to his particular vocation and school in the practical sense that was confirmation of and a motivation to his leadership enactment. UK1 expressed what she considered the direct influence of God’s intervention in this way:

> I wasn’t determined I was going to come here; I was just very open to where God wanted me to be... as a Christian and evangelical... It seemed a bit strange initially, God’s hand in bringing me here; but I have seen God’s hand in everything... with my knowledge and familiarity with early years education... with the situation that the school went through... God was preparing me.

(UK1)

UK1 conveyed that she was open to what she saw as God’s leading her into a particular vocation and position. Three of the team leaders at the school commented to me that God brought UK1 to their school. Cappel (1989), reflecting on the role of the Catholic school principal, suggests that principals in Catholic schools are called: that they are spiritual persons who become Catholic school principals, to use their gifts, and not the other way around. This sense of leading was perceived by the participants as sudden and spectacular, accompanied by a process of leading, teaching, learning and understanding from their personal and spiritual experiences (Bernbaum and Steer, 1986) which, in turn, they perceived as a strong motivation for their leadership.

Winston (2009: 1) contends, from his examination of servant leader behaviour, that calling is ‘something that comes from God; doing what God wants you to do and is not necessarily something that one can be educated or trained to receive’. CA3 assessed the attribute of calling in leadership quite succinctly with its accompanying functions or
actions representing eight of the 12 participants who also recognised that their gifts or talents enabled them to attempt to affect change within their schools as well as within the local and global communities:

You are ‘called out’ from the world unto something... to use those gifts. It’s a vocation; a calling from God that will affect the world, change the world, love the world, win the world... to serve my community... to empower and equip... is to lead my community.

(CA3)

CA3 expressed that he felt a particular calling to leadership, suggesting that there was a particular call to steward his gifts as from God and for the common good (Weiss, Skelley, Hall and Haughey, 2003) by serving and contributing to his school and the global community; thus depicting an overlap of the three leadership attributes. Similarly, yet through the secular discourse, Hall and Chandler (2005: 157), in an empirical piece of research, suggest a ‘calling model of psychological success’ confirming the notion that a sense of ‘calling’ or ‘inner direction’ is a motivation towards one’s goals or purpose in life:

We define a calling as work that a person perceives as his purpose in life... a broader secular view characterized by an individual doing work out of a strong sense of inner direction... and internal motivation... When an individual feels a sense of or is enacting a career ‘calling’... she will have a strong focus on goals that reflect her purpose.

(Hall and Chandler, 2005: 157/160)

Dobrow (2004) suggests a secular, more generalised view of calling, underscoring how work is consciously viewed as a calling toward ‘serving the community, or the larger society’ (para. 7). US1 contemplated her calling very succinctly, yet emotionally:
Coming here is just like God called me to do ministry... the Lord is the one who gives us these talents, and skills, and backgrounds... I have never had a question about God’s calling on my life... and here I am where God wants me to be... I almost have tears in my eyes when I think about it.

(US1: case study)

During this reflection upon the nature of her calling, US1 relayed that she waited for what she saw as God’s timing, viewing her leadership position from the perspective that God was in it (Habecker, 1996), gifting her with the experience, skills and talents necessary to lead. Case study school participant PB (see Table 3.3, page 77) remarked that for several years there had been unrest among various school stakeholders over what she had referred to as a lack of consistent and caring leadership, and described what she identified as God’s hand in bringing US1 into the new leadership position:

You think, how could, this – dysfunction – have gone on for so long... We went through... different candidates and could not find a good match, which was a great challenge to our faith... His (God’s) timing is perfect... Hiring her (US1) was remarkable; and this is where it is hard to separate God’s hand... He (God) just brought the right person... Now it (leadership) is solid and moving forward.

(PB: case study)

US1 and PB perceived there to be a special significance and consequence of being called to leadership. US1 suggested that in answering the call to leadership she felt most particularly called to utilise what she thought of as her God-given skills and talents, wherever that call may lead (Wilcox, 2002). A secular affirmation derived from Novak’s (1996: 34) research identifies four qualities relating to calling, one of which is that ‘a calling involves preconditions, such as talent where a calling must fit one’s abilities’.

Hodgkinson (1991: 23) maintains that education has ‘an idealistic and humanistic quality which renders it distinctive among the callings and occupations’. Fry (2003) describes
calling within a secular leadership framework as making a difference and giving one's life meaning.

Halper (1988), in a piece of empirical secular research regarding successful male executives, found that 58 per cent of the leaders interviewed felt unfulfilled in their leadership, that they had wasted their lives, and that their life's work had little meaning. She went on to conclude that those who had examined their leadership motivations and their sense of calling or purpose for leadership had appeared to accomplish leadership tasks more meaningfully. Steger, Pickering, Shin and Dik (2009) uphold recent secularised views of highly altruistic individuals regarding calling:

A calling is an existential experience of work... At the heart of calling theory, people who approach their work as a calling have a career that engages them at a deep level and provides them with a highly valued sense of contribution and worth in their work lives.

(Steger et al., 2009: 10–11)

The notion of calling explored in this section through both discourses has been revealed to be a leadership attribute that not only precedes leadership outcomes, but also contributes to a person's motivation to lead using their specialised gifts and talents, increasing their personal fulfilment in leadership.

4.3 The 'Stewardship' Attribute of Leadership

4.3.1 Introduction

Stewardship emerged from the data as an important attribute of leadership for 100 per cent of the participants. Blanchard (1999) suggests:

Leaders who are servants first and are called to lead are not possessive about their position, but view their leadership as an act of stewardship rather than ownership... serving others' interests, not their own.

(Blanchard, 1999: 42–103)
Showing the relationship between calling and stewardship, Pelzel (2010) contends that there is a two-fold calling involved in stewardship:

First, one must be able to recognize and realize the personal and unique call to stewardship and second, that once the call is understood, one must respond to that call by making the appropriate gifts of time, talents and treasure.

(Pelzel, 2010: 1)

Theologically, stewardship is applied to all aspects of life, often defined in terms of 'time, talents, and treasure' (Livingstone, 2006: 549).

To begin this discussion, it is important to consider the definitions of stewardship that are applicable to this research. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2010), 'stewardship' is:

the conducting, supervising, or managing of something; especially the careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one’s care.

The Free Dictionary (2012) suggests various synonyms for steward including 'custodian, keeper, defender, guardian, protector and shelterer — all meaning a person who cares for persons or property'. From a purely theological perspective, Kantonen (2010: 1) quotes James Denny, who believed that stewardship becomes a 'Christian philosophy of life which determines all of life’s orders: home, citizenship, business, industry, science, art, and education'.

Pieterse (2002) and Birch (2002) differ in their views of stewardship and its relationship to leadership. Whereas Pieterse (2002: 332) claims that the 'crucial connection between stewardship and leadership is relatively clear'. Birch (2002) argues that:

Little attention has been paid to leadership as an issue of stewardship and that few in Christian leadership have
suggested that leadership is fundamentally a stewardship issue… yet stewardship may one day arise as a framework for leadership development.

(Birch, 2002: 359–368)

The participant data suggested an important relationship between stewardship and serving that was relevant for nine of the 12 participants. Therefore, I drew on the sacred scholarly literature of Spears (1998), which identifies stewardship as one of the ten attributes of servant-leadership:

a servant leader’s behavior is grounded in his/her concept of self as steward of an organization assuming first and foremost a commitment to serving the needs of others.

(Spears, 1998: 7)

Krejcir (2003: 22) contends that stewardship is ‘lived out in community’ (see Chapter Five); it is about ‘being in community; working collaboratively, complementing one another’s gifts and abilities’ (see Table 5.1, page 126).

In his study of biblical stewardship, Krejcir (2003: 22) found that most people in evangelical circles do not see stewardship as important, commonly responding that ‘all one needs is to have is a good heart, or to be sincere in one’s faith; that money and possessions and how they are managed are irrelevant’. Specht and Broholm (2004: 188), who developed a theological model of organisational life as a ‘framework for observing things holistically’, describe three dimensions of organisational life, the third of which is stewardship. They maintain that:

Jesus modeled an understanding of leadership in which serving, empowering, facilitating, and persuading are the primary tools for making things happen in organizations.

(Specht and Broholm, 2004: 188)
Two of the 12 interviewees (US1 and US4) specifically applied the word ‘stewardship’ to their leadership, and CA1 referred to stewardship in the school’s mission statement. While not all participants used this particular expression to define this leadership attribute, the data analysis revealed that the other ten participants expressed their role as that of caring for, holding to, clinging on to, keeping, guarding, managing, overseeing, protecting or acting as custodian of their schools’ communities. While the data revealed that a majority of the participants expressed a tangible understanding of the various components of stewardship, perhaps some did not refer to their leadership enactment as stewardship because they had not been introduced to the language around stewardship through professional leadership development; or perhaps they reject the word, broadly, seeing it as a more concrete application pertaining to the stewardship of resources.

In order to examine the stewardship attribute, I explore the three functions of stewardship to emerge from the data analysis. To begin, however, it is important to define the term ‘function’ as ‘any of a group of related actions contributing to a larger action’ (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2010). A function is also an ‘activity, behaviour, mission, service, role or task’ (Roget’s Thesaurus, 2011).

The first function of stewardship to emerge from the participant data was that stewardship manifested itself through the guarding of the Christian heritage: the primary ethos and mission of the school. Second, stewardship was revealed to be a commitment to keeping the needs of stakeholders in the forefront of its mission. Third, stewardship was revealed to be forward-looking where leadership engaged stakeholders in carrying out and managing the vision for the school. Although each stewardship function is critical to the overall stewarding of the evangelical Christian school, the participants asserted that their call to stewardship ‘is a theological issue before it is an economic or social one’ (Pieterse, 2002: 331).

4.3.2 Stewardship of the Christian Heritage and Ethos

Gangel (1996) contends that Christian schools are God’s schools where leaders are to serve as stewards having temporary control over, but not ownership of, an inheritance and heritage with an obligation to steward, preserve and pass along the Christian ethos even better and stronger than it was when received. The data revealed that stewardship
implies an element of trust and responsibility on the part of school leaders and their stakeholders (Payton and Moody, 2010). In so far as stewardship means to hold something in trust for another, stewards in the evangelical Christian schools were, therefore, called to act responsibly as protector rather than owner of their organisations’ heritage (DeGraaf, Tilley and Neal, 2004). McLaughlin (2005: 306) finds ‘ethos’, as a ‘form of educative influence, relatively underexplored’; yet he aims to bring the educative importance of ethos into clearer focus, contending:

An ethos of teaching and schooling not only facilitates the kinds of educative influence which teachers and schools seek to exert, but also in an important sense constitutes and embodies (significant aspects of) that influence... involving the shaping of the dispositions, virtues, character and practical judgment of persons in a milieu in which tradition, habit and emulation play an important role.

(McLaughlin, 2005: 316/307)

The secular discourse of Brown, Busfield, O’Shea and Sibthorpe (2011: 119), from their study on how particular aspects of education are delivered, suggests a working definition of ethos as ‘an essential characteristic of a school, an agreed set of values expressed formally or informally’.

The participants expressed that they felt accountable to God to lead their schools in recovering and/or sustaining their unique spiritual cultural heritage and ethos (Parsons, Fenwick, Parson, English and Wells, 2002) in furthering a solid biblical worldview whether through discipleship or evangelism. CA3 expressed the mission in this way:

We are very strong in our discipleship mandate. Our goal is to disciple these children. To see them first converted... We tend to almost exclusively work with Christian families so that’s not always the issue. We want to make disciples. So, the educational academic program often, I’m not going to say it takes a second seat to it... it doesn’t because it is interspersed and immersed into the discipleship process.
So, why do you take high-end mathematics?... because God has called you to affect the sciences or... statistics or other areas in our culture or society... So we really work hard on that orientation on Biblical worldview and seeing our education component as a real big part of that.

(CA3)

Maintaining a delicate balance between evangelism and discipleship, US2 commented:

We believe the blend of the believer in the classroom along with the non-believer is the essence of Christian schooling from an evangelical standpoint. Some schools in our community... are entirely discipleship schools. They won’t admit a non-believer. We don’t believe that’s part of our mission as a school... We can’t evangelize people who are already saved. There’s a delicate balance here. If you have the wrong two or three kids in a classroom... you can make it hard for Jesus to have the floor because those two or three will sometimes (who aren’t of a faith persuasion by their activities, actions, behaviors) can darken the room. It can darken the experience for the faith kids.

(US2)

Prior to the interview, I discovered on the website of CA1, the following statement:

One of our core values is biblical stewardship... We consider ourselves to be accountable to God for the responsible management of our lives and resources... to assist students to respond to God’s call upon their lives.

(Web Document, CA1)

CA1 emphasised his perceived responsibility for the future direction of the school and for the spiritual lives of the students:
Stewardship is a core value. My responsibility is primarily to raise children who can bring redemption to any job they pursue. If they are going to be lawyers, bring God’s Word into that field... doctors... plumbers; whatever they are going to be, there is something that they can bring to redeem that discipline... in terms of philosophy... not just for salvation... That’s what I see as the mission of the Christian school.

(CA1)

CA1 suggested that he saw his stewardship responsibility to be that of helping students to take their faith and the Christian ethos into the community locally and globally. CA4 stressed the importance of stewarding the students’ lives in preparation for the Christian life:

Christ-like qualities are reflected in how leadership conducts their lives and interacts with the students whom God has entrusted to us... We are guardians/custodians... of our students... preparing them for life... helping them find purpose in the kingdom of God.

(CA4)

CA4 suggested that there is an ethic of leadership as stewards of the children’s lives. UK1 expressed her view that it is important to preserve the school’s evangelical Christian ethos and heritage:

Our existing school motto from 1 Peter... ‘Grace and Knowledge’... growing in the knowledge and love of the Lord Jesus Christ... It encapsulates the past of this school and heritage... that we want to cling on to.

(UK1)

UK4 reflected upon continuing the school’s legacy:
My assuming the leadership... was a huge commitment... a deepening experience... keeping it up for the next generations... myself as a link in the chain that protects what we’ve got – the Christian ethos, because it’s so important and it’s becoming so rare. I suppose I’m seen as that of protector.

(UK4)

Stewardship, in terms of holding on to, protecting, passing along and sustaining the Christian ethos and heritage to future generations, was an attribute of leadership best expressed by CA1, CA4, UK1 and UK4, whereby they saw themselves as perpetuating the evangelical Christian tradition, ethos and heritage for the next generation.

One of the participants, who wished to remain anonymous, made this declaration about stewardship of the school’s mission:

There are challenges out there. If we don’t prepare them (the students) for those challenges, then we’re not educating them basically; and if we don’t help them to think Christianly about the big issues of life, then I don’t think we are preparing them spiritually for life after school either... that is terribly important. So we, in this school, have many children who are from no Christian background whatsoever. Many of them are from other religions, and we welcome them with open arms. In fact, I should probably say this off the record... I was down at another Christian school visiting this week and someone said to me, ‘How many Christian parents have you got?’ And I said oh, maybe %%. They were very shocked at this and said, ‘Oh dear, how many would you like?’ And what I said was provocative... ‘0% is my target’. It’s not by the way, but still a slightly provocative comment because we can add value so much more to a child who has no Christian input
into their life... into their hearts at all. You know, we live in a probably Biblically illiterate age... spiritually impoverished in many ways, and to get a child into this school or a school like this every day of their lives, experiencing Christian input with a Christian ethos and a Christian atmosphere; what a great mission field that is.

(Anonymous)

This anonymous participant’s reflection on the stewarding of a strong ethos is substantiated through the secular discourse of MacBeath (2011), who suggests that a critical leadership imperative is to sustain a strong school ethos.

The stewardship of teaching and learning lies at the heart of educational leadership (Nowlan, 2001), and was expressed by nine of the 12 participants who subscribed to carefully guarding the Christian ethos and how it is represented within the curriculum taught in their schools. Guardianship of the curriculum to sustain the evangelical Christian ethos was critical for UK2:

I teach French... I design my own materials... because... there is a politicisation of the curriculum in the UK, and this is a French course... I don’t think Christians are appreciating what is going on in education, because people say well it’s French and what does that have to do with Christian truth? But it’s fundamentally got to do with it because... ultimately, the view that is symptomatic in that kind of textbook is there is no such thing as absolute truth; reliable truth that you can rely on and count on. It’s all relative. Let’s just use French to teach social engineering... It’s a good thing to educate children on drug use... on equality and race... They’re good issues, but the curriculum has been taken over... hijacked... and that’s bad for French.

(UK2)
While expressing the desire to guard the teaching and learning as it relates to the Christian ethos of his school's culture, UK2 used an example of a French course that he believed was being unnecessarily socially engineered to engage students with matters other than learning French. Confirming an intersection with the secular literature, the comment by UK2 suggests what Noddings (2006) points out: that the efforts to encourage the skilful and diligent use of reason on matters of moral and social significance are frequently haphazard or absent from the curriculum altogether. Austin (2008) posits that good stewardship, which provides an intellectual context for social matters, could function as a bridge between a school's formal curriculum and its emphasis on moral and social issues, which is what UK2 may have implied. UK2 did not seem to be suggesting the dismissal of the teaching of moral and social matters, but that those matters must be discussed in places other than the formal subject curriculum and must embrace the evangelical Christian ethos of the school. From the secular perspective, Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Leithwood and Kington (2008) noted, from a former research study (PriceWatersCooper, 2007: 10), one of six main areas of responsibility for head teachers to be strategy: setting the strategic ethos of the school.

4.3.3 Stewardship of Stakeholder Needs

Biblical stewardship fits in part under the pastoral life of the organisation in the evangelical Christian school and proposes that success in the Christian life is not measured by an abundance of possessions, of wealth or of power; but instead is measured by an abundance of faith, hope, love, relationships and generosity (Cimarron Presbytery, 2010). McCurry (2010: 116), writing on the intersecting of stewardship and the Christian faith, quotes Winston Churchill, who stated: ‘We make a living by what we get; we make a life by what we give.’ Karakas (2010) proposes a positive management education (PME) model based on six principles, one of which is building a collective spirit and a sense of community through deep caring, concern, love and compassion for students as conveyed here by case-study participant leaders. US1, PR and PB suggest that the consequence of a commitment to biblical stewardship is meeting stakeholders’ needs (Turner, 2009):

They (parents and students) love that I do care. I think kids would know that I care about them a lot. I especially like to
support the C teams (the sports’ teams that do not compete at a high level) because they don’t always feel important... I have my visibility... parents say you are at everything and care and I do.

(US1: case study)

PR remarked that meeting the needs of stakeholders is a priority in her leadership:

I think to understand people and to be able to connect with them whether it is with staff, with students, or with parents is critical. I think my role is to care very much about my teachers; their professional growth and development. We also need to figure out how to serve every child in our school to the very best of our ability... I feel that we as a school fail if we are not able to meet the needs of students that we have accepted. So that is probably a driving factor in my personal, educational beliefs; that we need to do what’s best for every student. Staff needs are secondary and my needs follow third.

(PR: case study)

PB relayed a specific incident:

It was not long ago when we honoured the artists in the student body; not the best academically, but their art skills were amazing... In the past they would not have felt a part of the student body... We must honour the gifts that the Lord has given. Now these students are not just ignored or shoved into a corner because they’re not athletes... Some parents felt that this school was just about athletics and wanted to take their kids out... now we try to recognise all students for their individual gifts. It just broke my heart that
in the past our school was not able to honour and care about all students.

(PB: case study)

Case study teachers and students remarked that they feel valued and cared for. TE1 declared:

It is a very loving environment. One of the best staff I've ever been around... really caring about each kid... People really, really love the kids and you can see it!

(TE1: case study)

Representing the students' voices, ST2 conveyed:

A few years ago they didn't really care... but with (US1) we had a whole class time where we talked... and they definitely want to know our input and they care about what we have to say.

(ST2: case study)

All of the case-study participants perceived that demonstrating an ethic of caring is a commitment to steward the needs of stakeholders through acts of serving (see Table 4.1, page 90). Both stewardship and serving may be antecedent leadership attributes that result in a servant-leadership model of leadership.

Nine of the 12 participants affirmed that they see stewardship as action-oriented, committed to serving the needs of followers (Winston and Patterson, 2006). US2 spoke succinctly for the participants regarding his commitment as to who is to be served, emphasising the 'calling' aspect of serving the needs of others:

It's all of the family that we're called (emphasis US2) to serve... The person who needs your help is the person that you need to serve... on a spontaneous basis, when their
need is greater than my time... That person in front of you is the most important appointment... Jesus modelled that.

(US2)

US2 suggests that meeting the needs of others by serving is ‘altruistic in nature’ (Whittington, 2004: 163) where commitment to the stewardship of stakeholder needs leads to a form of caring that is ethical and can contribute to ‘social capital’, because the emphasis is not only on the person in need of care, but subsequently impacts the entire school family toward a ‘give and receive’ relationship (Johansson, Leonard and Noonan, 2012: 45).

The distinction between stewardship of the organisation and stewardship of the individual is revealed by who serves in the school and who is served. Sullivan (2009) claims:

Where ethics remains at the core of effective leadership... there will be service, as ethical leaders are servants. They seek ways to meet the needs of their followers and to build leadership skills within those followers.

(Sullivan, 2009: 2–8)

Stewardship suggests a vision of servant-leadership where the ‘principalship’ becomes ‘a calling to genuinely lead others with the desire to provide for the needs of individuals under his/her care (Brumley, 2012: 18).

4.3.4 Stewardship of the Vision

With collaborative stewarding of the vision of the school, the future doesn’t just belong to the senior leader (Jelfs, 2010); instead, leadership is about enacting and articulating others’ visions (Kouzes and Posner, 2006) concerning the direction that a school should take. CA3 expressed the view of 75 per cent of the participants, declaring that stewardship of a vision occurs by building alignment and commitment to the vision through inspiring and equipping stakeholders toward the building of community:
My biggest role is to constantly hold the direction and vision of the school... There is a strong sense of community value. I have delegated as much management away from me as I can, so I can concentrate on managing the vision... I am continually taking the temperature of the school... constantly speaking into the vision... to keep us on vision and on scope. I like the metaphor: someone has to climb the tree in the forest and see the bigger picture and tell everybody... ‘We have to go this way!’... Then, it’s the manager’s job to move the community through the forest to where we ought to go... Then, to inspire and gather people to go there with you... You just can’t do it on your own. Finally, to equip people along the way... I don’t know how to build the road to get there... I have to find those to teach us how to build the road.

(CA3)

CA3 suggested that stewardship is more than maintenance. It is about visionary management and assessment; keeping it, and managing it for the purpose of reaching the goals of the school (Payton and Moody, 2010). CA4 explained the full implication of vision as a collaborative process:

Once the vision is cast... defined... communicated... talked about... shared, allowing the team to build the structure and skeleton along with leadership... Leading is being able to cast a vision, but then... to link arms... to work with the troops to get there.

(CA4)

Presenting a brief overview of the visionary process, CA4 communicated what he believed to be vital in terms of visionary leadership: collaboration. Similarly, through the secular discourse, a good steward is ‘master in keeping vision, mission and goals at the forefront of everyone’s attention’ (Murphy, 2007: 73). ‘Shepherding occurs when leaders
act as stewards, keepers and promoters of the vision, inspiring others to align their vision with the school’ (Murphy, Elliott, Goldring and Porter, 2006: 11), breaking through barriers to make vision a reality (Christensen, 1992).

Identifying the vision and recognising the strategies by which their vision might be achieved in order to excite stakeholders, the participants suggested that they created a culture of joint involvement (Coleman and Glover, 2010) between leadership and stakeholders. The participants became ‘stewards of the vision’ and purported to listen to the visions of other stakeholders, realising that their personal vision was part of something larger, ceasing to be a possession and becoming ‘a calling rather than just a good idea’ (Senge, 1990: 346/142).

Sharing the vision with the school community is part of what institutionalising the vision (Bush and Glover, 2003) requires. A bottom-up approach to stewardship through leadership was ultimately aimed at connecting the school leader participants to their stakeholders, leading their communities on a journey that created an atmosphere where individuals were encouraged to coalesce around a compelling and shared vision (Senge, 1990). Bryk (1994: 16) asserts that master leaders are competent at ‘translating vision into operation’, by building commitment to the vision and organising stakeholders so that they are aligned to that vision (Beckhard and Prichard, 1992). The vision is shared as long as the principal’s leadership style represents the common educational beliefs of the whole school community (Goldman, 1998).

UK2, while emphasising the stewardship aspect of his vision, conveyed the source of vision for evangelical Christian school leaders in this research, revealing the appurtenance: the Christian distinctive element in the participants’ discourse:

My vision – small ‘v’, not big ‘V’… emerged 20 years ago and has become stronger now… God is behind our vision… My job is predominately… to safeguard… to preserve the vision, and I will do that almost at all costs, because it’s a difficult world we live in… The vision was very clear… the strength, the permanency… There are
visions, and there are visions which people call visions, which last five minutes and disappear very quickly...

Having stood the test of time... preserving the vision is the most important thing; to safeguard the vision so that the Christian gospel is not being compromised.

(UK2)

UK2 acknowledged his stewardship of the vision, which he believed that God is behind; nevertheless, he referred more often to the general construct of ‘vision’.

‘Vision’ emerged from the data analysis as an important construct of leadership for nine of the 12 participants. CA3 and CA4 were the most passionate regarding vision. CA3 made references to vision 14 times during the one-hour interview, with CA4 commenting on it 11 times. CA4 explained to me that when he arrived at the school he was frustrated with the lack of a relevant vision:

There was a lot of infrastructure, systems that had not been put in place... all these silos that were not interconnected... so, now we have a common vision moving forward... not so much changing the original vision, but how to control that vision and make it real in the current, relevant culture... creating a learning community.

(CA4)

CA4 inferred that it took strong stewardship of a shared vision to move his school forward. US1 asserted:

I believe what it says in scripture: ‘Where there is no vision the people perish.’ It’s really easy to just show up every day and say this, but... when there is a strategic plan, and I am accountable... then our goals are met.

(US1)
US1 contended that without vision her leadership might have been unrestrained or lacking in direction, and that vision marked the beginning, not the end, of a process. She posited that a critical dimension of stewardship was seeing to it that school vision shapes and is shaped by leadership that is accountable to stakeholders, anchoring the school’s organisational systems (Dwyer, 1986).

The basic concept of stewardship has shown to be a critically important leadership attribute (Ghamrawi, 2011). Sergiovanni (2000a) affirms that leaders with foresight can be trusted to be stewards, to make sound decisions and put what is best for their followers ahead of their individual agendas. The participants desired to develop shared visions that were rooted in history, values and beliefs (Deal and Peterson, 1990), preserving and acting as stewards of the vision at all cost. April et al. (2010) maintain that stewardship has begun to gather momentum as a legitimate form and attribute of leadership whose primary consideration is a focus on building a sense of community — not just stewarding the needs of the individual. Critical leadership means stewarding the depth and breadth of the school in a more holistic understanding of the various aspects of school life (Smith, 2001). Stewardship ideally promotes a system of guardianship and democratic leadership in that it develops the skills and character of all stakeholders, extending guardian authority to all (Gastil, 1994). The research suggests a two-fold responsibility in stewardship: keeping a ‘strong sense of personal and community values’ (Biott and Gulson, 1999: 113) and using one’s talents which are given primarily to serve the school community (Starratt, 2007), while moving the vision of the school forward.

4.4 The ‘Serving’ Attribute of Leadership

4.4.1 Introduction

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. [MLK] (1968) preached a sermon, ‘The Drum Major Instinct’, from the pulpit of Ebenezer Baptist Church, 4 February, remarking:

> Jesus gave us a new norm of greatness, but recognize that he who is greatest among you shall be your servant... It means that everybody can be great, because everybody can serve... You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.
Leadership is defined as service, which is realised by giving and serving, and may apply to all leaders (Phillipy, 2010).

William Wilberforce, a social reformer elected to the British parliament in 1807, dedicated himself to the abolition of slavery. Anchored in a biblical theistic worldview, Wilberforce embodied the virtues of servant-leadership (Phillipy, 2010). Love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment and service were the core values of his life and leadership (Patterson, 2001). Hibert (2000), in his writing on mentoring leadership, suggests that leadership is about serving others, exhibiting compassion and social justice, echoing the cries of King and Wilberforce.

The framework developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006: 318), in their development of the servant-leadership questionnaire, which rendered servant-leadership operational for empirical research, supports the integration of the attributes of leadership and specifies that ‘calling – the natural desire to serve others – is a key attribute fundamental to the servant-leadership philosophy’. They suggest that servant-leadership is:

a leader’s deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in other’s lives... putting other’s interests ahead of their own... Servant-leaders have a natural deeply-rooted, value-based calling to serve others creating serving relationships with their followers.

(Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006: 318)

UK3 viewed serving as coming from the Christian heritage:

Serving is an outward-looking view of the world in which we live so that society as a whole can benefit; and it’s easy to see how that springs from our Christian heritage.

(UK3)
UK3 suggested that leadership, at its heart, is the genuine desire to lead by serving (Page and Wong, 2000) so that all can benefit. This outward-looking view of serving and service cannot, in twenty-first century leadership, be examined without some mention of servant-leadership beyond its introduction in Chapter Two (see pages 50–52).

4.4.2 Servant-Leadership

School leadership can be transforming, shared, empowering and a democratic enterprise (Grace, 1995), significantly influenced by school leaders playing out in practice a servant-leadership model (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003). Servant-leadership has attracted the attention of leadership scholars emphasising serving and acts of service rather than acts of leading (Spears, 1995). During the interviews US1, US3, US4 and UK1 mentioned that servant-leadership was a particularly significant articulation of leadership. UK1 expressed how she saw her leading:

I’m sent here by God… at this time, to be His servant and to lead this school in servant-leadership.

(UK1)

US3 remarked about her mission as leader:

That’s what you do… the Word (the Bible) talks about servant-leadership and that’s part of what you do as a Christian. You serve others. You have and you give.

(US3)

When I asked about her leadership style, US1 began our conversation with this statement:

I really see servant-leadership… It’s about rolling up your sleeves and coming alongside people… filling the gaps wherever the need is… It’s being a servant… Christ was the ultimate servant.

(US1: case study)
These initial and unsolicited responses from UK1, US3 and US1 led me to probe further regarding servant-leadership. In order to explore the relationship between leadership and serving, I asked the participants if there was one word that might best describe their leadership style (see Appendix K). US1 believed her leadership style to be ‘Christ-centred, servant-leadership’ expressing the appurtenance that sets evangelical Christian school leaders apart from their secular colleagues.

Immediately following the initial interview, US1 and I were walking down the hallway when she introduced me to TE2 and told her about my research. Suddenly, and without hesitation, TE2 exclaimed: ‘US1 and PR are such servant leaders!’ It was then that I realised this school might be valuable as a case study for two reasons: first, the mention of servant-leadership during my visit and second, because the data analysis revealed that this school had undergone significant change since the hiring of US1. By doing a case study in this school I thought I might find it easier to see the impact of US1’s leadership on the organisation. During the case study data gathering, the stakeholders, whom I interviewed, commented very positively on the initial impact to the school by US1 and PR. Mindful of TE2’s earlier remark, I was particularly interested in interviewing her. TE2 communicated her feelings concerning the appointment of US1 and PR:

The administration has changed quite a bit... we weren’t growing... things got stagnant... very difficult... we have gotten over that... They (US1 and PR) are Christians first... The school is different now... PR is a servant leader. She models it... That tells me what the standard is.

(TE2: case study)

TE2 perceived that some of the change in the school was due to the modelling of servant-leadership. Coincidently, PR had a very insightful comment regarding her own leadership where calling preceded service:

I feel very much called to serve; to be a light or a witness to my students and co-workers. First and foremost... my role is to be a servant... to lead by example and modelling... to
understand people... to connect with staff, with students or with parents.

(PR: case study)

PR stated that she desired primarily to be a servant, committed to stewardship of her school's stakeholders by caring and connecting to them much in the same way that Greenleaf (2002) advocates:

The best test of servant-leadership... is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?

(Greenleaf, 2002: 13)

UK2, while remaining sceptical about the labelling of such terms as servant-leadership, saw himself as committed to serving and leading his school, thus showing a strong link between the three attributes of leadership towards the building of a strong evangelical Christian school community:

I am a little bit wary of these terms [servant-leadership]... because there is sometimes the view that they are absolute truth, or someone found a shaft of wisdom which has made everything clear; and it's never the case... The concept is a very powerful biblical one. I don't go to the extent of... washing the feet of my senior team, but part of my role is to help them (the team members) do their jobs... We're all in this to serve others... We will not run a Christian community unless we are focused on serving others. We are not in it for ourselves.

(UK2)

UK2 intimated that servant-leadership is more complicated than one might expect, but that serving, nevertheless, is selfless in leading an evangelical Christian school
community. Senge (1990) suggests that cultures undergoing change require a variety of leadership styles where servant-leadership may be one vehicle for promoting and initiating change in a school’s culture. Servant-leadership is demonstrated by empowering and developing people; by expressing humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance and stewardship and by providing direction (Van Dierendonck, 2010).

For those school leaders who did not describe their leadership style as servant-leadership, I inquired if they had heard of the concept. One hundred per cent of the participants responded in the affirmative, and went on to explain their perception of how ‘serving’ was carried out in their schools. ‘Serving’ was an attribute of leadership perceived by 92 per cent of the participants; ‘creating a culture of service’ was perceived to be desired by 50 per cent of the participants as a part of their leadership paradigm. Four key aspects of the serving attribute of leadership were revealed during the data analysis and are explored below.

### 4.4.3 Serving is Leading

The notion that ‘serving is leading’ was mentioned by six of the 12 participants. Although the remaining six participants did not mention a dichotomy between the constructs of leadership and service (Koshal, 2005), they did, however, perceive leadership to be a critical determinant in how serving and acts of service were implemented into their schools’ cultures. UK3 explained the construct of service and leadership:

> Let’s hope our students say that we set them up for a… Christian life of service or leadership... The two might be interchangeable.

(UK3)

CA3 spoke guardedly of the term ‘servant-leadership’, yet confirmed its relationship to ‘calling’ and ‘vision’:

> I think that servant-leadership is kind of redundant... leadership is serving... the whole paradigm of being a
leader is to serve people. I serve by leading... my gift, my role. If I’m using my gifts to serve my role... and my full attention in the school is how I lead the school, then that is my servant-hood to the school... However, servant-leadership – I appreciate the different metaphors in Jesus’ life – doesn’t translate necessarily into good service. If I don’t lead the organisation into the callings and directions... that God has given us, then no one else is going to do that.

(CA3)

CA3 equated serving with leadership as part of the calling to evangelical Christian school leadership. Several participants equated serving with leading, concurring with Sergiovanni (1992: 125) who maintains that ‘servant-leadership is more easily provided if the leader understands that serving others is important’.

4.4.4 Serving Begins with an Attitude

Everything a leader does flows from his inner reality which, in servant-leadership, means a fundamental commitment to serving others in the community with humility (Page and Wong, 2000) and an appropriate attitude (Bender, 1997). Eighty-three per cent of the participants mentioned valuing an attitude of humility, professionalism and service, which is not a leadership of power and control (Nouwen, 1999). Matteson and Irving (2006: 39) argue, in their three-fold framework for conceptualising an integrative model of servant-leadership, that ‘one’s ontological (being) character provides the basis for one’s attitudinal (thinking) mind-set. In other words one’s being influences one’s thinking which in turn influences one’s doing’. Greenleaf (2002) centred servant-leadership on attitudes. US2 best explained an attitude of serving:

Servant-leadership starts with an attitude... I’m a firm believer in serving the person that’s in front of you... I speak that to our people... Serving needs to be viewed as an honourable thing. Sometimes there is that perception that leaders lead and everybody serves them.
US2 advocated that a servant leader begins with an attitude of service, which ultimately influences how leaders work with followers in carrying out their leadership (Page and Wong, 2000). CA4, metaphorically, articulated an attitude of humility. He affirmed that he need not place himself at the centre. Instead, having ‘the interests of the institution and its constituents at heart’ (Kouzes and Posner, 1995: 185), he could place others at the centre:

Servant-leadership plays a huge part... I don’t need to be the spokes-person or the ‘sage on the stage’. I can lead from the back. I don’t need to be the ‘glossy photo on the front’.

(CA4)

CA1 expressed at attitude of professionalism and humility:

I came on here as a teacher and ...very quickly realized that this was the way I was designed and shaped for this call, and I just lent my hand to help develop the school spiritually and professionally at the same time.

(CA1)

The above participants perceived themselves as promoting the development of each stakeholder by modelling, inspiring, teaching, delegating and serving with an attitude of humility, creating a spirit of professionalism and service (Sandmann and Vandenberg, 1995) within their schools.

4.4.5 Serving is Modelling Appropriate Leadership Behaviours

The participants conveyed that they view ‘serving’ to be a demonstration of their Christian faith (Liden et al., 2008). In other words, 11 of the 12 participants suggested that they demonstrate their Christian faith by serving others, and assist stakeholders in achieving their spiritual potential by serving as role models toward this end, so that the
stakeholders, in turn, will serve others. CA4 communicated his view of serving in this way:

You need to model servant-leadership... in the words of Francis of Assisi: ‘Share the Gospel at all times, and if you have to, use words’... in other words, serve by modelling, modelling, modelling.

(CA4)

US2 expatiated 30 times the serving aspect of his school’s mission and the importance of leadership that models or sets an example of the serving aspect of the evangelical Christian faith:

Part of the balance in an evangelical Christian school... part of that holistic approach to education... is the element of students serving, and then our passion and our persuasion to educate them... to model and teach that spiritual aspect – learning to serve like Jesus.

(US2)

US1 commented:

It’s that modelling... as Christ-centred servant leaders...
It’s about integrity... honouring Christ... That is what leadership is about... Christ-filled, servant-leadership... He (Christ) is the ultimate model.

(US1)

The above responses of CA4, US2 and US1 indicated that if one desires to instil the serving attribute of leadership into the school’s stakeholders as an educational imperative, one must model servant-leadership behaviours. Covey (1998) argues:
You've got to have institutionalization of the principles at the organizational level and foster trust through individual character and competence at the personal level. Once you have the trust, then you lead people by... example and modelling. That is servant-leadership.

(Covey, 1998: xvii)

The data analysis asserts that servant-leadership is pre-empted by trust from followers then implemented by modelling appropriate leadership behaviours.

4.4.6 Serving is Empowering Stakeholders

Elmes and Smith (2001) contend that workplace empowerment has a strong spiritual and sacred discourse with its roots in Puritan ideas of hard work, Christian living inspired by biblical values and caring for others. ‘To empower’ is ‘to give someone the power or authority to do something’ (Oxford Dictionaries, 2011). While service in each of the participants’ schools began with their leadership and ideally trickled down to others in the school, 10 of the 12 participants expressed, vociferously, that it is critical for leaders to empower stakeholders to serve within the school and wider community. US4 affirmed that he sees empowerment through serving as permeating the whole school:

My success as a leader comes only when I empower others... to serve these ladies out here so that they can serve those who are utilising the services of the school.

(US4)

UK1 aspired to serve by inspiring and empowering others to assume leadership in one’s own sphere of the school:

There is an overall responsibility for the whole of the school... the administrative side that you kind of just get on with... the discipline, etc. If it was... a disciplinary matter; if I was going to exclude somebody from school I have autonomy to do that... but the chair of our board of
governors would always be told immediately that action was being taken... However, there's much more to leadership; the people skills — trying to inspire other people... giving them empowerment to go ahead with things. I would devolve leadership probably! Distributive leadership would be the kind of cliché phrase... where every decision made in the school doesn't need to come through me — the pupils, the parents, and other staff can take responsibility... I've distributed that autonomy... The facilities manager taking responsibility... is showing leadership... valuing the contribution that he makes; that is distributed.

(UK1)

US4 and UK1 affirmed that they value others’ contributions to the serving and stewardship culture of the school, and consider their leading as empowering (Sandmann and Vandenberg, 1995), granting all stakeholders the opportunity to share in the serving and decision-making so that they, in turn, could serve others in the school and larger community. Seeking a higher standard of leadership, the participants did not indicate that power should dominate their thinking about leadership. Instead, they claimed to 'place service at the core; for even though power will always be associated with leadership, it has only one legitimate use: service' (Nair, 1994: 59). For the participants, to lead was to empower stakeholders, to increase stakeholder participation and provide support for all stakeholders in the school community, moving decision-making as far down their organisations as possible (Bolman and Deal, 1993).

4.5 Conclusion

Expressed through the participants’ sacred discourse and the discourse of the secular literature, this chapter revealed that there was a persuasive link between calling, stewardship and serving, and that calling preceded all other attributes of leadership, thus motivating leaders to further task enactment. Miller (1995: 14) distinguishes between the sacred and the secular leader, stating that sacred leaders are ‘inhabited by a sense of a
holy call’, which is adjunct to the discourse of the sacred differentiating the sacred discourse of the participants from the discourse of the secular literature.

Three attributes of leadership emerged from the data analysis describing how the participants perceived their leadership enactment. The first attribute asserted that leadership was expressed as a ‘calling’ ‘to service, not simply a job or career’ and that leadership was ‘an integration of spirituality with work’ rather than a separation between the ‘private life of the spirit’ and the ‘public life of work’ (Delbecq, 1999: 346).

The second attribute revealed that the participants perceived ‘stewardship’ of their schools as a ‘calling rather than just a good idea’ and saw a ‘sense of purpose lying behind their visions and goals’ (Senge, 1990: 142) in meeting the needs of stakeholders and the school community. The participants expressed their leadership through stewardship when seen in relationship to the building of community in their schools, ‘indicating service to those in one’s care’ (Miller, 1995: 14).

Third, the participants viewed the ‘serving’ attribute of leadership in part as servant-leadership with a commitment to stewardship, advocating service over self-interest (April et al., 2010), with a visible serving of the common good (Sergiovanni, 1992). By enacting leadership through serving, the participants perceived themselves as building capability in others by supporting and enabling stakeholder ‘empowerment to participate at every level of the system’ in authentic and shared leadership (Banathy, 1996: 236).

In their efforts to re-conceptualise leadership for change, the participants expressed a determination that successful change resulted not just from the work of one key leader, but from the effective utilisation of the three leadership attributes by a variety of school stakeholders (Heller and Firestone, 1995). The next thematic data chapter entitled Community Building through Leadership is evidence of the effective implementation of the three attributes of leadership, expressed through the participant data.
CHAPTER 5
COMMUNITY BUILDING THROUGH LEADERSHIP

Changing the metaphor for the school from organization to community changes what... leadership is and how it should be practiced... Connections among people are not based on contracts but on commitments.

(Sergiovanni, 1994b: 217)

5.1 Introduction
An intense analysis of the participant data revealed that a direct reference to 'community-building' was cited by 83 per cent of the participants, with 'community' as the single most referenced aspect of school life by the same participants. Consequently, I was curious as to how this became such an important component of the life-world of the participants' schools, and how evangelical Christian school leaders went about rebuilding and re-culturing their schools in the form of communities (Heller and Firestone, 1994). The research argument suggests, therefore, that the manifestation of 'community building' occurred for the participants when there was a successful amalgamation and execution of the three leadership attributes ('calling', 'stewardship' and 'serving'), whereby the leaders themselves were transformed, becoming authentic, non-hierarchical and values-driven, building community (Webber, 2006). Figure 5.1 (see page 125) depicts diagrammatically the relationship between four components discovered to be necessary when building community through leadership. These components were found to be ultimately linked to the three attributes of leadership, facilitating the desired result (Intagliata, Ulrich and Smallwood, 2000): community building.
Barth (1990) suggests that stewarding and building up the school as a community provide an ideal setting for the 'leader of leaders' in which to develop the construct of serving and servant-leadership by embracing all members of the school as community and all those who are served by the school community. Leopold (2000: 224–225) expresses it thus: 'A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the... community'. This second data chapter, entitled *Community Building through Leadership*, warrants its status as a separate chapter for a number of reasons.

Besides being the aspect of school life most referenced by 83 per cent of the participants, community building was considered by the participants to be an essential leadership activity in which, as they perceived it, building community was centred particularly on the relational and spiritual dimensions of schooling. Finally, the data analysis revealed that ten of the 12 participants suggested that community building through leadership emerged as a bottom-up approach to their leadership. They perceived their leadership to be accomplished holistically, not through strong hierarchies; rather leadership was accomplished through team leadership, collaboration and the empowerment of all school stakeholders toward the developing of relationships. The following Table 5.1 (see page 126) summarises some of the key findings from my research in the areas of community
building that were critical to the leadership of the participants, including stakeholders in the case study.

**Table 5.1  Community Building through Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of School Life</th>
<th>Direct reference to Community Building</th>
<th>Most Essential Aspect of School Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK1</td>
<td>UK2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct reference to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Essential Aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of School Life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual Dimension</th>
<th>Integration of Spiritual &amp; Practical</th>
<th>Through Prayer &amp; Trust</th>
<th>By Expressing Christian Love</th>
<th>Keeping Christ at the Centre</th>
<th>Through Spiritual Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 7 10 1</td>
<td>3 5 1 2 2 2 3 1 1</td>
<td>2 6 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>1 4 11 11 6 12 8 8 16 6 3 5</td>
<td>1 3 6 2 2 5 3 2 2 3 6 4 2 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 7 10 1</td>
<td>3 5 1 2 2 2 3 1 1</td>
<td>2 6 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>1 4 11 11 6 12 8 8 16 6 3 5</td>
<td>1 3 6 2 2 5 3 2 2 3 6 4 2 7 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottom-up Leadership</th>
<th>By Empowerment</th>
<th>Teamwork and Collaboration</th>
<th>Offering Autonomy/ Non-hierarchical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 9 5 4 10 5 4 17 7 22 8 11</td>
<td>2 5 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 5 2 3 3 1 4 5 2 2 4 4 2 3 3 4</td>
<td>2 5 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing Relationships</th>
<th>Creating Climate of Openness</th>
<th>Holistic/3-Legged Stool/3-Fold Chord</th>
<th>Creating Sense of Belonging</th>
<th>Creating Family Atmosphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1 2 2 11 1 4 12 2 3 2 8</td>
<td>3 4 1 1 4 1 3 2 5 1 2</td>
<td>6 1 1 1 1 5 2 4 6 3 3 1 2 1 4 6</td>
<td>3 3 1 1 2 1 2 2 3 2 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 is colour-coded and uses horizontal double lines to distinguish between the four key areas concerned with community building. The vertical double line between UK4 and PR signifies the division between the school leader participants and the case study participants.

Cohen *et al.* (2009) advocate that, in the twenty-first century, school leaders will need to focus less on what Sergiovanni (1999: 75) calls the ‘systems-world’ of the school, which encompasses the political, structural, bureaucratic and policy aspects of the institution,
placing community at risk. Instead, school leaders must refocus on the ‘life-world’ of the school, which finds culture, meaning, significance, norms, values and beliefs to be the focal point, engaging all school stakeholders in creating a vibrant school community.

Community was broadly defined and introduced in the literature review (see pages 58–60) representing the sociological, theological and philosophical dimensions setting the stage for its exploration. The faith-based, evangelical view of a living community is explained by Leith (1977), through the scholarly Christian discourse:

The Christian community is a living community of believers... following in the tradition of Jesus Christ... with the purpose of transmitting the Gospel.

(Leith, 1977: 18)

Confirming the need for asserting a strong sense of community in schools, and concerned with the current agenda in education, Bottery (2006a: 176) suggests, through the secular scholarly literature, that a ‘new neo-liberal political and economic agenda became centre stage’ in the early part of the twenty-first century, ‘demanding a more global understanding of the forces that impact upon educational leadership’. Part of this agenda included values of competition, private enterprise and the market; and yet in retreat were many critical former values, one of which was community (Bottery, 2006a). Bottery (2006a: 182) concludes that ‘relational frames of context may provide the most profitable complex framings of our understandings’, which I argue have impacted on the way in which the participants led while building community in their schools.

5.2 Community Building: Most Essential Aspect of School Life

When I asked the participants what they considered to be the most essential aspect of school life, 10 of the 12 participants responded that it was ‘community’, with the goal of building relationships, fostering communal trust and cultivating and protecting the spiritual ethos within their respective schools (Spears, 1998). Gregg (2008) explains the biblical notion of community in this way:
The Christian school community... draws near to God, experiences forgiveness, helps each other to hold fast and not waver in the faith, spurs one another on to love and good deeds, and encourages one another.

(Gregg, 2008: 2)

In other words, Gregg suggests a collective stewardship toward the building of the Christian school community, with all stakeholders collectively participating in the process. CA4 pointed out two critical aspects of school life, one being community:

I think to me the ethos of the school is at the heart of it. I think there are two components to it: the academic and the community aspect. I think for a healthy school you have to have both... they are the... centrality of a successful school.

(CA4)

US1 had come into her leadership position recognising the need to bring all school stakeholders together, into a cohesive unit:

Building a school community... is about relationships, trust and prayer. Those are key... When I came there were some challenging issues. I developed... 'Conversations with the Superintendent'... once a month... I gave them (the parents) a topic ahead... The first 20 minutes would be around that topic... Then the last 40 minutes will be any questions you want to ask the superintendent. People loved it. I had quite a good turnout. I think part of it was a trust thing... They got comfortable with me.

(US1: case study)

US1 relayed some key ingredients for opening up communication, initiating a process of change and building community in her school. She opened up the school environment by
creating a culture in which parents could, through prayer and the developing of relationships, gain trust in her leadership.

The data analysis revealed community building through leadership to be a key aspect of school life carried out in diverse ways, and is supported from the following interviewees’ statements. UK2, using two metaphors to describe what he saw as the vision for his school, suggested that there is an integration of the spiritual and the practical in building community:

It's the Christian ethos of the school... to reflect the love of God to children through education... We do try and put a bit of ‘flesh on the bone’ as far as that vision is concerned... This is a ‘three-legged stool’... Take one of the three legs away... and the whole thing collapses... We've got to be a Christian community and if we're not, then the whole soul of the place gets ripped out, disappears.

(UK2)

UK2 proposed a collaborative effort (using the word 'we') in fostering a strong community and described an equilibrium that emanated from the vision for the school where building community was a manifestation of the integration of various attributes of leadership. UK3 suggested that preserving community is a critical spiritual dimension of the school (Habermas, 1987) and a fundamental aspect of his leadership:

The most important aspect of school life here (emphasis UK3) is an expression of community life; of common humanity... the school being greater than the sum of its parts... One has to... try to remove the barriers to it [community building]... The number of pupils who come into the school of a strong faith and expectation that they should express Christian love gives the vehicle [the building of community] a rolling start... It is then self-
propelling. Then, you’ve to recruit staff who are going to model it [community].

(UK3)

The above assertions from US1, UK2 and UK3 indicated that building community is the most essential aspect of the ‘life-world’ (Sergiovanni, 2000b) of their evangelical Christian schools. UK3 advocated that leadership distributed throughout the school impacts on the spiritual climate of the school, which in turn will impact on the type of community to emerge. From a secular perspective, Quick and Normore (2004) emphasise:

the school head, as a moral role model, must work to create and sustain culture, community and climate -- the life-world that exemplifies the very values that he or she espouses.

(Quick and Normore, 2004: 346)

The sacred and secular discourses corroborated above assert that community is at the ‘heart of a school’s life-world’ where members of the school community are committed to ‘thinking, growing, and inquiring’ (Sergiovanni, 2000b: 59). I argue that the data analysis revealed community building to be recognised as a core value by the participants.

5.3 Community Building: Strengthening the Spiritual Dimension

The data analysis revealed that a strong spiritual climate, distributive leadership and community building were considered to be inextricably linked (Furman, 1998). One hundred per cent of the participants referred to their evangelical Christian schools as a community with Christ at the centre, and nine of the 12 participants considered spiritual formation of its young people and strengthening the spiritual dimension of the school the central focus in building community in their schools. CA1 spoke often of his school as a community, mentioning ‘community’ no fewer than 25 times. He expressed the importance of the spiritual formation of students:
My heart is in developing the spiritual gifts that children have. That would be my highest priority... to train them in a spiritual capacity... You would see a... Christ-first school. The whole spiritual component... is very strongly reflected in the community.

(CA1)

UK1 spoke of creating a spiritual climate as part of her personal leadership responsibility:

The Lord's with us as a school community. Christ is central to what we're doing... leading by example, having my own personal prayer life, my Bible study and similarly within the leadership team.

(UK1)

UK4 corroborates this notion:

This is a Christ-centred school. Jesus is the key; otherwise you might as well pack up and go home, if you leave Him (Jesus) out of it.

(UK4)

It was expressed by CA1, UK1 and UK4 that making Christ central is paramount to the strengthening and leading of their schools' communities, and that the corporate and individual, personal spiritual component is central to building and maintaining the evangelical Christian school community ethos (Webber, 2009b).

The web document of US1, substantiated by two of the case study participants' responses, declared that the school was to be a 'Christ-like community of believers', and that strengthening the school's spiritual community was their dominant strategy toward building the broader school community. US1 corroborated this declaration from her school's web document, during the interview, indicating that she saw the Christian component not simply as an add-on, but integral to the entire mission of the school:
Our Christian school should be exemplary as a Christ-like community of believers... enhancing the spiritual life as the number one priority. When you say Christ-centred there is no baloney about it. Christ-centred really makes it straightforward.

(US1: case study)

PR recalled the spiritual life of community being advanced in the school:

This year I have been working with the student chaplains at every grade level to ask students where they are at, spiritually... The student chaplains, in the past, would pray before chapels... and that was the extent of it... Now we meet monthly... I spend some time praying with them and we talk about the spiritual growth within our school. What are our students’ needs? We put together some surveys... asked students anonymously about what their needs are... We are working on every student in the school having some feedback and voice about what’s going on at school spiritually... You can see God’s hand at work!

(PR: case study)

PR stated that students have an opportunity to engage in the leadership process to advance the spiritual life of their school community. PR told me that the school aims to provide students with the moral, intellectual, social and spiritual resources to live and fully serve God, stressing that the evangelical Christian school community is purposefully committed to Godly teaching, to the building of relationships and to prayer (Hekman, 2007), which emerged persuasively through the data analysis.

5.4 Community Building: A Bottom-Up Approach to Leadership
The participants asserted that a dynamic school culture acknowledges the need for one another so that there is an interdependency or reciprocal relationship between all members of the school community, motivating them toward a common goal (Schimmer,
2002) fostered by leadership that is non-hierarchical extended through to the building of community by modelling and teamwork (Spears, 2004). Ten of the 12 participants revealed that building community was best achieved through a less hierarchical approach to leadership. UK3 explained what he perceived to be the role of leadership and the building of community in his school:

You can’t, I don’t think, have an effective community through strong hierarchies... you have to remove the barriers and build community organically... there is a cultural cycle... Once established it [community] becomes the expectations of the older pupils... therefore self-propelling through the staff who are going to model it [community].

(UK3)

A team approach to leadership was strongly sought after by 100 per cent of the participants. CA2 expressed it this way:

I’m very much with the team. I don’t see myself as the big ‘kahuna’. I don’t like the word, ‘superintendent’; ‘super’ doesn’t fit me... The team concept is very important. Nobody has all the answers.

(CA2)

US1 reflected upon the staff’s working together on their school’s strategic plan, following years of perceived dysfunction in the school:

It wasn’t just two people over here working out this. It was our (emphasis US1) plan. We had some central office people, business office people, the Parent-Teacher Fellowship... We had a continental breakfast. Each of the committees had someone representing each sector of the
CA4 made direct reference to his school as 'community' 16 times during the interview. When I asked him, 'Who creates community in the school?' he emphasised his leadership as the catalyst, but that he values collaboration when building community:

There needs to be a sense of a collaborative learning community, which is the centrality of a successful school... but there needs to be a spark... a critical thread laid out... then modelling that... I can impact on my leadership team and they, in turn, impact on the rest of our core culture.

(CA4)

UK3, CA2, US1 and CA4 envisioned the hierarchical, autocratic mode of leadership giving way to leadership which initiates the creation of a dynamic school community by first identifying goals and core values, and then linking those values to broader organisational goals (Hallinger, 2003; Barth, 1990; Lambert, 2002). Building community non-hierarchically ultimately gave form to the participants' school cultures. Effective stewardship commitment and the serving attribute of leadership helped to shape collaborative team leadership and empowerment (Quick and Normore, 2004; Heller and Firestone, 1995).

5.5 Community Building: Developing Relationships

5.5.1 Introduction

The word 'relationship' means 'to carry back' or 'to both give and get' (Filson, 2006). At the very core of community building, there is the notion that relationships are fostered by people serving and caring for one another (Hybels, 2002). Reinke (2004), in a theoretical
discussion on servant-leadership, proposed that leadership is a relationship, not a position:

Leadership is a complex relationship between the characteristics of the leader, the attitude and needs of the followers, the organization and its characteristics, and the environment.

(Reinke, 2004: 34)

From the data analysis, it emerged that 100 per cent of the participants considered the 'development of relationships' to be a task paramount to creating a successful school community, yet how relationships developed, and the part that leadership played in the developing of relationship differed. When I enquired about her priority in leadership, UK1 emphatically affirmed that through leadership and the collective efforts of stakeholders, relationships were developed, and community built:

It's relationships! Absolutely! Building relationships – yes, a new sense of community... that is a bit new for this school, sadly... but we are growing as a community... Building a school community comes about through my valuing individuals... then seeing them in God's light... Philosophically, it is from the individual to the group... caring for one another... our Christian responsibility to show love, care, compassion for one another... It's our hearts, the core Christian values, and the ethos of the school: to be welcoming and inclusive... We absolutely build community.

(UK1)

UK1 suggested that community building is about growing as a community through relationships: connecting to one another. Moreover, representing her fellow participants, UK1 explained the Christian mandate: that biblical leadership and stewardship calls for leaders to possess a sincere commitment to care for others (Brown, 2007). CA4 asserted
that modelling servant-leadership develops relationships, thus showing the link between serving and community building:

We build relationships... by having a soft touch... by modelling servant-leadership. Ultimately the only thing we can bring to heaven is our relationships. Nothing else matters: the programmes, the scholastics, great accomplishments, but the relationships and the people that we’ve influenced and impacted.

(CA4)

When I inquired of CA2 if he could use one word to describe his leadership style, he immediately likened leadership to relationship:

That would be relationship, which is the key to it all! Leadership is relationship... the person-before-policy approach... to value and to be valued... It’s our relationship that holds us in Christ... That would be our main goal... to build relationships... relationships with Christ, relationships with each other.

(CA2)

UK1, CA4 and CA2 advocated that leadership is about relationships, and that leadership builds and sustains the community ethos; that the whole culture of a school is determined by the kind of relationships that exist among different members of the school community (Jahangeer and Jahangeer, 2004). Popper (2004: 120) offers three explanations for relationship, one of which is ‘developmental’, fitting in with the transformational leadership style characterised by the emotional influence that causes both leader and follower to be influenced by one another. The transformational/relational view of leadership allows a more integrative association of leaders, followers and circumstances that evolves into ‘close leadership’, where developmental relations are expressed through empowerment, coaching and increased autonomy, resulting in close interpersonal interactions (Conger and Kanungo, 1998).
The case study provided me with a shadowing observation of US1, where I witnessed numerous casual conversations between her, the staff and the students in an attempt to build community and 'follower commitment' (Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006: 308–309). She commented that she valued visibility along with the developing of relationships between all school stakeholders:

Relationships are huge! They are key along with visibility, but beyond the visibility it's the relationships… that parents know that I know them by name, and their student… that they are significant.

(US1: case study)

That leadership plays a critical role in the building of community through the developing of relationships was expressed by PR:

I think it is important to my role to be relational… With students we are doing some things where we are building relationships across age group levels… where they (the older students) take on mentorship roles in building relationships. We are helping build community for them.

(PR: case study)

TE2 spoke about how she valued the cultivating of relationships in the school, which resulted in building a strong community:

People are just looking for that fellowship and developing relationships… I would say they (the staff) love the close-knit relationship aspect of students with students and teachers with students… Students would not necessarily remember the content that we are teaching, but its relationships… There is that really strong community now.

(TE2: case study)
During the case study focus-group discussion, I asked the students what things had changed in the school regarding the new leadership. Concurring with TE2, ST2 relayed how she felt about students’ relationships with teachers:

The teachers… are not just your instructors; they are your mentors… they (the teachers) become your friends… They are not just teaching you… I mean they’re there (emphasis ST2) for you… a deeper relationship.

(ST2: case study)

ST3 articulated:

They [the leadership] still have their look of officiality (emphasis ST3), and they still keep their authority, but that doesn’t mean that they won’t talk with you… I don’t even think I really ever talked to our old superintendent… Ms. (US1) gave us a whole class time where we talked… They (the school leaders) don’t just blow us off… They listen and respond… For a superintendent, that’s a pretty big feat.

(ST3: case study)

I had to concur with ST3, for in my observation journal (29/4/09) I recorded that, at every turn, during my shadowing of US1, I witnessed her commitment to creating a relational environment, which extended from the greeting of parents and students in the morning to taking time in the hallways to sit down and chat with students at length, congratulating them on various achievements and always addressing them by name. She exhibited a genuine desire to connect with students. Comments by these US1 stakeholders indicate essentially that relationships through visibility, mentoring, fellowship and two-way communication build community, not the power and authority of traditional, hierarchical leadership.

Corroborating the sacred discourse, the secular discourse expounded that developing and valuing relationships individually and collectively is the organisational means to achieve the broad purpose of caring in community (Habermas, 1987). Building relationships
established a sense of community (Pollard, 1997) among stakeholders, which ultimately had a profound multiplying effect on the overall cultures of the participants’ schools (Fullan, 2002). The participants’ engagement with students affirmed that stewarding schools in the twenty-first century requires a caring, collegial style of leadership (Acker, 2012) which sustains an ‘articulated ethos of caring relationships’ (Comber and Nixon, 2009: 10).

While there are many factors that contribute to the building of community, I found two themes to emerge from the data analysis that contributed to the compelling evangelical Christian school community relational dynamic: ‘creating a climate of openness’ and ‘creating a sense of belonging’. Each of these themes was expressed by the participants, through links to servant-leadership, stewardship, serving and various forms of transformational leadership.

5.5.2 Creating a Climate of Openness

Creating a climate of openness and providing opportunity for building healthy holistic communities through openness was a value expressed by 100 per cent of the participants. ‘Openness’, in the MacMillan Dictionary (2009), means ‘to be available and to engage in honest communication’. Being ‘open’ suggests ‘being vulnerable and receptive to new ideas and arguments’ (The Free Dictionary, 2011); being able ‘to think about, accept or listen to different ideas or people’ (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, 2011). Reinke (2004) proposes:

Leadership that puts the needs of others and the organization first is characterized by openness, vision, and stewardship and results in building community within the organization (p. 43)… With its focus on the creation of a trusting community, servant-leadership is highly consistent with Judeo-Christian philosophical traditions and teachings.

(Reinke, 2004: 34)

US3 best represented the participants’ concerns regarding communicating with stakeholders in order to create a culture of openness:
Communication is going to be key! Transparency... we want to be vulnerable and open to a degree. Compassionate... the listening falls in with communication because you want to be able to hear what’s being said by a parent, a teacher, or student... so you’re seeking to understand before you’re understood.

(US3)

All of the participants stressed the value of having an open-door policy. UK1 identified the open door as an important avenue for communication:

An important thing for communication... [is] being seen around the school... to be available so that people can talk... just a passing comment... I’ve got two doors in the room so it tends to be that one of them is open... that through the day... folk can get me.

(UK1)

US3 and UK1 encouraged a climate of openness and affirmed the link between openness and communication by being available to school stakeholders.

Building school communities ‘holistically’ and ‘organically’ (see pages 54–55) were terms that emerged from the data analysis, suggesting integration with and interdependency on one another in maintaining the balance and stability of the participants’ schools. Kroeber (1948) suggested that if you take the term ‘organic’ and apply it to the evangelical Christian school you get an organic service to the Christian school community in the form of a natural spiritual education. Ten of the 12 participants stated that they sought to be ‘holistic practitioners’ (US4) when building a school community; a community in concert with the school, home and church, working collaboratively based on the hypothesis that each person finds identity, meaning and purpose in life through connections to the community and to spiritual values (Miller, 2000). Webber (2009b) asserts that an important key leadership capacity is:
to think holistically; to see the big picture, integrating the spiritual and the practical, identifying and analysing both internal and external patterns, and recognizing how each part relates to the whole.

(Webber 2009b: 1)

CA4 encouraged a holistic culture of openness, fostering a risk-taking and enquiry climate (Christensen, 1992) where even dissension was valued:

My leadership team... impacts the rest of our core culture... All have an equal part even though the platforms are different... It's a matter then of myself to impart that set of core values... encouraging my team members to carry that out, so that in this openness... there is freedom... in a collaborative fashion... a sense of healthy tension, as we wrestle through the different viewpoints... maybe a voice of dissention... To share opposing views... helps to create a holistic and healthy community and, in turn, I entrust that teachers will do the same within their classes.

(CA4)

Although CA4 was the only participant to refer to building community through healthy tension in communication (Lambert et al., 2002), he best represented the participants' voices when suggesting that leadership must impart core values to its stakeholders when building community through openness and collaboration. The participants' values conveyed the ethos of values for everyone (Gold and Evans, 1998) in the school, fostering a climate of openness toward the building of community through leadership. Being open creates a sense of belonging as a result of a 'relational ethic of caring' (Noddings, 2010: 391) which is another component of building community explored in the next section.
5.5.3 Creating a Sense of Belonging

The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* (2010) defines 'belonging' as 'having a close or intimate relationship'. Belongingness is a basic psychological need that is fulfilled when stakeholders experience a sense of community within the group (Osterman, 2000). Furman (1998) explains that community is not present until members experience feelings of belonging and can trust in one another.

Extracted from the data analysis and central to the leadership of 92 per cent of the participants was creating a sense of belonging in their schools. US2 proclaimed that community is heightened by creating a sense of belonging, and is something that grows, emerging out of leadership and biblical teaching:

> God opened a door... I see my leadership extending into this entire faith community... It's the relationships... It gives a sense of community... It is the New Testament teaching in Corinthians... a sense of unity and belonging.

(US2)

One hundred per cent of the case study school participants related particularly strongly to the concept of community building through creating of a sense of belonging among stakeholders. TE1 expressed it best regarding the positive feedback from PR which made him feel valued:

> I feel valued. I feel that the kids, parents and the administration value what I do... PR came into my room one day to see what is going on in the classroom... She wrote a little note and put it in my box. I told her: 'Keep doing things like that. That really means a lot to a teacher.' Most principals don't seem to have time or take time to do something like that.

(TE1: case study)
US2 and case study participant TE1 stated that an important attribute of leadership is giving encouragement and recognition (Firestone and Corbett, 1988), which they saw as being valued, creating a sense of belonging and connectedness to one another. Sergiovanni (2000b) wrote that to be valued and to value others creates a sense of belonging. McMillan and Chavez (1986) contend that one aspect of community is belonging:

A sense of community is a feeling that members have belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to be together.

(McMillan and Chavez, 1986: 9)

The metaphor that best describes relationships within the community of the evangelical Christian school is belonging to the *Family of God* (Grudem, 1994: 859). The Bible uses metaphors drawn from family life where evangelical Christians are ‘to relate to one another as independent beings who love and care for one another’ (Wright, 1993: 224). UK2 best expressed the views of eight of the 12 participants who valued the importance of creating a sense of community and belonging, desiring stakeholders to feel a part of the school family:

We’re a family to commit long-term... We want to develop a relationship with you as a family (students and parents), and I hope that creates a sense of community, a sense of loyalty, that we are all... part of a family... We want long term relationships; relationships which last not just whilst the child is at school, but beyond. We always... actively welcome people back into school long after they’ve left...

Then we do develop real community, real relationship.

(UK2)

UK2 recognised that a critical dimension to the concept of community and a sense of belonging was that of ‘family’, where stakeholders are united by certain convictions or a
common affiliation (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, 2011). It is leadership that initiates the vision and process of preparing stakeholders to participate in the on-going life of the community as involved stewards of the common good (Starratt, 2007).

Case study participant TE2 recalled what she regarded as challenges in her school when the family atmosphere had been compromised:

From my perspective things became very difficult. There were some problems... issues, and it is hard when you are a family of faculty and staff, and then you have some differences... Now, we have gotten over that (the difficult issues)... We are a close-knit family spiritually.

(TE2: case study)

PB concurred that she felt that the family atmosphere at US1 had been restored, and that this was the result of a collaborative effort:

There have been many changes... this past year I got to the point where I can be really proud of where I send my children and I think it is because of three things: accountability, a level of excellence, and a Christ-like family atmosphere which has truly changed the school dramatically. We have become more of a family... it’s a team effort.

(PB: case study)

ST3 remarked on what she saw as the openness and closeness of the students, and the family atmosphere that she perceived as developing within the school as a result of the strong community of faith:

There is a sense of closeness here; like a family... I know ASB has kind of turned into like a little family... You get close to each other and it provides opportunity to have like
a deep relationship because of your faith – that you can share openly.

(ST3: case study)

ST4 suggested that the sense of family in the school created trust among stakeholders:

Being able to have a set time where you can like discuss spiritual things and what’s going on in your life definitely brings you closer and more like a family, ’cause there are often things that you only share with your family or don’t share with anyone.

(ST4: case study)

PR maintained:

I think because we are a body of believers that is part of which makes us have community instantly.

(PR: case study)

Haydon's (2007: 98) secular discourse corroborates PR’s comment, acknowledging that ‘faith schools may be recognizable as communities by the sharing of beliefs and worldview.’ While case study participants envisioned their school communities as family, albeit with some challenges, Haydon (2007) argues that the concept of the school community as family is questionable, because a family may not share values or a common goal. According to A. Gold (personal communication, 12 August, 2011), some educationists think that comparing schools to families denies the professionalism necessary to build an effective educative organisation. She went on to say that communities may be seen as a more professionalised term, whereas in families, uncomfortable and unprocessed feelings and actions may occur. Assuredly, unprocessed feelings and actions were said to have occurred, according to the stakeholders in US1. However, the perceived goal in building community in the case study school was to attempt to restore relationships, bring harmony and establish a closer family feel within the organisation in order to build lifetime relationships (Karakas, 2010).
Some scholars envision the school metaphorically as a family (Earley and Weindling, 2004; Haydon, 2007), which was a dynamic strongly sought after by two-thirds of the participants. Likewise, Hodgkinson (1991) recommends the notion of a school as a family. Using Stoll and Fink's (1996: 192) analogy of the school as a ‘caring family’, a crucial leader attribute for the participants was to serve and steward others in such a way that together they would not only accomplish desired results (Filson, 2006), but that school would be as much like a family as possible (Noddings, 1992). School environments may take on the characteristics of a family, contributing to a sense of community, where caring leadership serves the school communities.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter’s exploration into community building demonstrated its link with leadership, based on the participants’ views of leadership as relationship and from the notion that, in the secular discourse, leadership is also viewed as ‘a relationship, not a position’ (Reinke, 2004: 34). The analysis of the sacred discourse of the participants suggested that spiritual and relational evangelical Christian school communities were being built through trust, openness, caring, a sense of belonging and the creation of values-driven relationships (Riley and Louis, 2000), confirming Webber’s (2006) assertion that:

The leader’s union with Christ will be expressed in the leader living together with others in community... through self-giving love... true servant-hood and in the nurturing of accountable relationships.

(Webber, 2006: 1)

Filson (2006: 1) contends, through the secular discourse, that the global marketplace has created a need for new leadership, whereby ‘ordering people’ has been replaced by encouraging and motivating people to ‘want to’ proceed from point A to B. This, he suggests, has a sacred or spiritual and a secular aspect in that ‘all humans are interconnected through relationships’ by sharing and gathering together when there is a need to accomplish great things. In other words, leaders in the secular domain may find what may be considered to be a spiritual or deeply held values-driven dimension to their
leadership, where the spiritual has its origin in deep, human relationships and is not related merely to a religious purpose.

From the sacred perspective of the evangelical Christian school leader participants and the sacred and secular scholarly literature, there is an admonition to leaders to live and operate in an integrated way in community and in service, highlighting the value of connecting as a relational community. Four key areas were identified by the participants as contributing to a sense of community in their schools.

First, I found that the participants regarded community to be one of the most important aspects of school life. Community building was suggested to be an essential leadership activity that necessitated engagement with others if all school stakeholders were to have significant input into the educational process (Bottery, 2006b).

Second, building community through leadership led to the spiritual advancement of the participants’ schools as communities. Community is achieved when leadership provides opportunity for and actively encourages the sharing of power and the implementation of ideas from stakeholders, which particularly enhances the spiritual life of students and the school community (James and Connolly, 2000).

Third, building community through leadership was more persuasive as a bottom-up, non-hierarchical attitude toward leading a school. Community building is best accomplished through team leadership, unity of purpose and with the collaboration of leadership and the schools’ stakeholders, in moving school communities forward for the general good of all (Loewen, 1982).

Finally, the participants expressed as paramount to their leadership the valuing of ‘tightly held webs of meaningful relationships through a feeling of openness and creating a sense of belonging; optimistically creating such a milieu’ that those in the school would ‘find it unthinkable to sever the bonds’ that connect one to another (Durkheim, 1915: 71). Building community by creating a climate of openness through communication and a sense of belonging, particularly as in a family, all driven by biblical values (Lambert,
2003), was perceived as vital to the creation of a healthy and holistic Christian school culture.

Community building through leadership is a manifestation of the cultivation of relationships and a direct outcome of the three attributes of leadership explored in Chapter Four, particularly through ‘stewardship’ and ‘serving’. The commitment to stewarding and serving ideas and people in community has caring and love as its cornerstone through the developing of relationships (Sergiovanni, 2000a). Building relationships is the ‘resource that keeps on giving’ (Fullan, 2002: 7).

This chapter illustrated the overlap between the participants’ sacred discourse and the discourse of the secular literature regarding the building of community through leadership. There is, however, an add-on, a clearly evangelical Christian distinction expressed through the participants’ sacred discourse. While respecting and valuing individual roles and contributions to the school community, the community dimension of the participants’ evangelical Christian schools was fostered not merely from a sociological position, but from a theological and sacred position as well: a place of complete formation of the individual through interpersonal relationships with school stakeholders, yet with Christ at the centre (Congregation for Catholic Education, 1997).
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

6.1 Introduction to the Discussion
This discussion of the research findings is a culmination of the data analysis in which the research has brought together new perspectives from two discourses (the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’) by using an iterative process of reflection and examination of the thematic frameworks. Three main findings emerged from this research. The first finding answered the main research question and the second and third sub-questions (see page 19), where the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’ discourses emerged as the primary framework showing an overlap between the two discourses. However, the data also revealed an ‘appurtenance’ or ‘add-on’ to the sacred discourse which gave the evangelical Christian school leadership discourse its distinctiveness, setting it apart from the secular discourse both in language and intent. The ‘attributes of leadership’ and ‘community building through leadership’ themes emerged as the second key framework gleaned from the participant interviews and corroborated through the transformational/relational/ethical and conventional, secular and sacred scholarly leadership literature, answering the main research question and the first sub-question (see page 19). Finally, my voice as researcher emerged as interpreter and translator between the two discourses, augmenting the originality of the thesis.

6.2 The Central Argument
The central argument proposes that there is a discourse around evangelical Christian school leadership that is not unlike the discourse of their secular counterparts, yet there is an ‘appurtenance’ (an add-on) to the spiritual language of the evangelical Christian school participants; a distinctive element that sets their discourse apart from that of secular educators. This distinctiveness or appurtenance amplifies the message of the evangelical Christian school leaders, providing a rich description of their leadership attributes. The sacred and secular discourses were encapsulated within the ‘attributes of leadership’ and ‘community building through leadership’ themes, indicating there to be little difference between the conversations around school leadership, instead revealing an unanticipated overlap of the two discourses. The themes and findings discussion that
follows concerns the two primary frameworks, and correspondingly addresses what I perceived as distinctive elements within the discourse of the research expressing the whole notion of new knowledge.

6.3 Data Themes and Findings

6.3.1 The Sacred Discourse and Appurtenance

Fairclough (2003: 130-131) suggests that ‘different discourses may use the same words, but they may use them differently, and it is only through focusing upon semantic relations that one can identify these differences’ while recognising and appreciating their similarities. Deeply embedded in the primary framework of the thesis is what Kofman and Senge (2001: 2) refer to as the ‘poetic power in language’ and the idea that ‘language brings forth distinctions’. While the participants’ sacred discourse and that of the secular scholarly literature revealed an unexpected overlap, offering corroborated results from the constructs of the second framework, i.e. ‘attributes of leadership’ and ‘community building through leadership’, some distinctions arose that presented an appurtenance to the discourse of the evangelical Christian school leader participants.

This key finding from the participants’ sacred discourse offers a glimpse into the distinctiveness of the evangelical Christian school leaders’ language. CA1 and UK1 offered a comprehensive description of evangelical Christian school leadership with its spiritual and practical dichotomy illustrating this ‘appurtenance’ to the sacred discourse, yet at the same time revealing the overlap with the practical and secular discourse in terms of leadership attributes:

There is a God... and stepping out of the way, but then taking the talent and the skill-set that we have... walking humbly within it with the power of God’s spirit. That is in a spiritual sense. In a practical sense... it’s like leading or driving an oil tanker... one course degree at a time versus a speed bolt... Leading is modelling; laying out the critical thread with the leadership team, but allowing the team to build the structure and the skeleton with you rather than a single man’s or woman’s vision, and then holding them
accountable; and for them to do the same with the people that they lead.

(CA1)

The appurtenance establishes that CA1 deemed God to be the source of his leadership in both a practical and spiritual sense when considering attributes of leadership that are more distributive, collegial, constructive and empowering. UK1 articulated her position with a particular sacred distinction:

Our core values would be Bible-centred; looking for wisdom... not just the wisdom of the world, but God’s wisdom... Philosophically, it comes about through my valuing individuals, seeing them (the students) as individuals, then seeing them in God’s light... God doesn’t just see them as humanity. God sees each of us... I have a duty to ensure... that we don’t just have a... group of children... that we have a group of individuals all precious to the Lord.

(UK1)

Likewise UK1 regarded the wisdom and core values directing her leadership as coming from God and having a Biblical focus. Therefore, there is a strong sacred distinction to the discourse of CA1 and UK1, reflecting the views of 100 per cent of the participants, all of whom hold to a strong belief that the core values of their leadership emanate from Christ and are a deep-seated biblical conviction (Malphurs, 2004). The appurtenance to the discourse of the participants has provided an increasingly rich and useful description of what effective evangelical Christian leaders do (Goldring, Porter, Murphy, Elliot and Cravens, 2007), indicating that their leadership, grounded in faith in God, is pre-eminent (Wallace, 2000) for carrying out their evangelical Christian and educational missions.

CA4 spoke of his frustration regarding the Christian distinctiveness and spiritual formation within his school:
Even though we say that our distinctiveness is Christ-likeness... we have all the trappings of Christianity: chapel, Bible courses... but is the rubber really meeting the road in the lives of our students? What would it look like if we have spiritual formation as our core value and build the school around that, rather than have the Bible as an appendage around the school?... This became my on-going vision... to build into the elements of the culture of the school... the heart of connecting to the Father [God].

(CA4)

Likewise US1 maintained:

You can be Christian, but you can sort of have it as a backdrop... When Christ is at the centre... it’s not Christian – as tack-on.

(US1)

CA4 and US1 asserted that the nucleus of the core values of the evangelical Christian school centre on Christ and must not be an appendage, an appurtenance, to the culture of the school. Christ-centeredness (see Table 4.1, page 90) is to be a characteristic that incorporates the values that emanate from the Christian faith (Jelfs, 2010) with the mandate to align those values to the school’s spiritual philosophy. While there may be a tendency in school leadership to lose sight of core values and beliefs (Creighton, 1999), the sacred discourse of the participants confirmed that they consider evangelical Christian values to underpin their leadership attributes and subsequent leadership enactment toward the building of a spiritual and relational school community.

The findings indicated clear connections between the school leaders’ espoused values and their leadership attributes. Contrary to the biblical worldview of the participants regarding the emanation of leadership attributes and values as coming from God, Gold et al. (2003: 61) and Earley and Weindling (2004: 136) suggest that the ‘origin of values is not always clear’ but contend that values may be broadly defined as ‘social democratic or
liberal humanist in nature'. Foucault (1988) intimates that there are taken-for-granted assumptions that draw on humanist values, thus illuminating the ‘appurtenance’ or evangelical Christian distinctive to the discourse of the participants. The findings, therefore, indicate that leadership values expressed through ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ discourses are analogous, and much of the time indistinguishable. However, the values and attributes may differ in expression and meaning for the participants, periodically revealing the appurtenance to or distinctiveness of the evangelical Christian school leaders’ discourse, communicating the origin of their values and their leadership attributes.

Much of the time, the research suggested that the two discourses were complementary, with no perceived distinctions. However, in terms of the sacred discourse, where there were references to the evangelical Christian dimension, there were certain fundamental distinctions which may be deduced by those in the evangelical Christian school tradition as oppositional binaries, yet may be construed as the ‘appurtenance’ (add-on) in answering the second and third research sub-questions (see page 19). Grace (2000: 241) maintains that ‘modern professionalism may itself be understood as a secular and mediated form of an earlier sacred conception of the responsibilities of educational leadership.’ In other words Grace suggests that secular values have emanated from sacred values, underscoring the distinction and/or overlap between the sacred and the secular discourse. The findings therefore suggest that evangelical Christian school leadership is largely indistinguishable from that of any other school in the majority of its activities, and that quite often the sacred discourse of the participants overlaps with the discourse of the secular literature. There is however a distinct evangelical Christian sacred dimension to the participants’ discourse which is conceived to be an appurtenance, as the participants’ propose their values to be Christ-centred and foundational, stemming from Scripture.

6.3.2 Attributes of Leadership

The second general finding disclosed in the thematic data presented in Chapter Four revealed three inextricable key attributes of leadership and their underlying theories, dimensions and subsequent functions that were most often perceived to direct the leadership of the evangelical Christian school participants. Thus, the first sub-question of the new research questions was answered (see page 19).
With the participants making 145 direct references to leadership as opposed to 14 direct references to management (see Appendix J), the sacred discourse of the participants expressed an intentional move from ‘management’ to ‘leadership’ as a changing discourse, a paradigm shift supported by the discourse of the secular literature regarding educational leadership, in which leadership is replacing the term management (Worrell and Appleby, 1999). Earley and Weindling (2004: 13), for example, contend that ‘leadership as a concept is in the ascendency':

School leaders are returning from the managerial role of the 1980’s to the twenty-first century role of lead professional — leading the learning, sharing the vision and empowering school stakeholders to shape and change, when necessary, the overall culture or sub-cultures of their particular schools.

(Earley and Weindling, 2004: 45/20)

The research participants, in conjunction with the secular literature, confirm that leadership enactment in the twenty-first century is best centred in groups or organisations, rather than individuals, engaging the group spiritually in heart, mind and action (Sandmann and Vandenberg, 1995).

The findings from the participant data, the sacred scholarly literature, and the secular scholarly literature substantiated the idea that ‘organizations are indeed alive and that we must not forget the dynamic’ (Spears, 2004) of the living organism embedded within the culture of the evangelical Christian school. During our conversations, four of the participants conveyed to me that their schools had moved forward from challenging circumstances to more positive and relational school communities. In fact, the participants found that ‘when adversity obscures prospects of success, and organisational morale falters, dynamic and articulate leadership’ (Bibeault, 1982: 219) expressed through three key attributes of leadership not only triggered change, but transformed the culture, vision and sense of community of the participants’ schools (Grinyer, Mayes and McKiernan, 1988).
Three essential attributes provided indicators of the values, understandings, qualities, strategies and skills through which the participants enacted leadership in their schools, and were also perceived by the stakeholders in the case study school to influence the school’s leadership. The findings affirmed that school leaders are the key constituents when leading the life-worlds of their schools. The data from the participants as well as from the secular literature showed that specific leadership attributes have to be enacted, but who enacts them is not so critical (Heller and Firestone, 1995). The key attributes of leadership to emerge from the research data were: ‘calling’, ‘stewardship’ and ‘serving’.

**The ‘calling’ attribute of leadership** — the initial and frequent spiritual response to leadership, to ministry and to vocation — revealed itself as motivation to task enactment, affirming a sense of meaning in life, having both a practical and spiritual influence in the leadership and personal lives of the participants. Therefore, the vision that the participants have for their schools, as well as how they lead and manage in their ‘calling and vocation’ (Buechner, 1973: 95) was shown to be significantly influenced by their commitment to evangelical Christian school leadership as a calling (Jelfs, 2010). Calling was distinguished as not merely an occupation (Sergiovanni, 1994a), but rather was found to form a bridge between the participants’ evangelical Christian beliefs and leadership service to their respective schools’ constituents as well as to the local and global communities (see CA3, page 94). Likewise the secular discourse referred to work as a ‘calling’, suggesting that it may have an impact on society in some way (Bellah, Sullivan, Tipton, Madsen and Swindler, 1996). According to Buechner (1973: 95), ‘calling’ is the ‘place... where your deep gladness and the world’s hunger meet’. Secularised notions of calling were shown to overlap with the sacred discourse of the participants, indicating that calling is more expansive, whereby one finds personal fulfilment in one’s work and perceives work as meaningful and purposeful when following or pursuing ‘one’s path with a heart’ with the ‘intensity of a calling’; a work that culminates in service to a community (Hall, 2004: 9/11). Consequently, ‘as a subjective construct’, calling was found to be ‘consistent with psychological success and actually precedes objective outcomes’ (Hall and Chandler, 2005: 162).

Being ‘called’ to their particular schools and to Christian education was more strongly avowed by those participants from the US and Canada, whereas participants from the UK
asserted that they recognise divine intervention in their lives, but used terms such as 'God’s hand' and 'God preparing me' (see UK1, page 93), both expressions denoting a sense of calling. The secular literature asserted that the early conception of calling was expressed as a divine inspiration to do morally responsible work (Weber, 1958; 1963).

The ‘stewardship’ attribute of leadership – the commitment to caring for and tending to all aspects of leadership – manifested itself in the safeguarding, protecting and overseeing of the various aspects of the participants’ schools’ cultures. In contrast to the ‘me and mine’ perspective of ownership, stewardship implied representing or being part of something else; an expression of interdependence and service, where the participants were guided by a shared or common vision, mission and value system (Covey, 1998). Stewardship emerged as an attractive image of leadership for the participants, embracing all members of the school as a learning community. From the perspective of the participants and from the secular literature, leadership as stewardship placed the participants ‘in service to ideas and ideals and to those who are committed to their fulfilment’ (Sergiovanni, 2007: 59). The three most significant dimensions of stewardship to emerge from the data analysis were stewardship of the Christian heritage and ethos, stewardship of the commitment to serve stakeholder needs, and stewardship of the vision. These components of stewardship confirm the secular literature, which suggests that there is a broader definition of stewardship than simply the stewardship of resources, one that encompasses a stewardship of ethics and moral leadership (Caldwell and Boyle, 2007).

**Stewardship of the Christian Heritage and Ethos**

One hundred per cent of the participants carefully guarded their schools’ evangelical Christian heritage and ethos so that it would be maintained for future generations; however, the school leaders in the UK were particularly adamant regarding their desirability of maintaining an evangelical Christian heritage. Perhaps this was a central part of their stewardship commitment because the majority of students in these schools did not claim a Christian faith. UK2 was vociferous in this declaration. Since his school’s student population is only 10 per cent Christian, he may have been concerned that secular, non-Christian attitudes and philosophies would permeate or influence the overall ethos and spiritual mission of the school.
An interesting finding was that each of the schools in the UK had a strong commitment to evangelism and the preservation of their Christian heritage and ethos. I am aware that evangelical Christian schools in the UK are more subject to the state demands on school leadership; therefore, I expected these evangelical Christian schools to be less evangelical in their spiritual mandate, and that the evangelical Christian testimony of their leadership might perhaps be weaker, with a diluted gospel message. However, their 'spiritual capital' (Caldwell, 2008) and evangelical Christian message and ministry were strong and uncompromising (see UK1 and UK4, pages 102–103). As I observed chapels in UK4, and visited with staff in the other UK schools, this revelation was confirmed and added another dimension to the new knowledge regarding the appurtenance to the evangelical Christian dimension of the participants’ leadership discourse.

Adhering to the evangelical Christian ethos, participant UK3 had supported students in organising a spiritual union directed solely by the students for the purpose of evangelism and discipleship. In the school communities in the US and Canada, the opposite was true, as discipleship, not evangelism, was the spiritual goal of participant leaders, where the intent was that students would confess a Christian commitment. Canadian and US participants (see CA3 and US2, pages 100–101) were guardedly evangelistic, yet with discipleship as the main emphasis. While I did not find this particularly problematic for the schools engaged in discipleship, I argue, along with US2, the participants from the UK and the Anonymous participant (see pages 103–104), that the mission of the evangelical Christian school should be to engage in evangelism at some level.

The participants saw themselves as leading for a sustainable future, which encouraged them to provide opportunities and activities that put 'sustainability at the heart of their school’s vision and ethos' (Fullan, 2005), engaging school stakeholders in that effort (Porritt, Hopkins, Birney and Reed, 2009). 'Sustainable schools have a caring ethos’—caring for oneself, for each other in terms of the current culture, and for future generations (Porritt et al., 2009: 6). The secular discourse corroborates the sacred discourse whereby stewardship of an ethos means that leaders as stewards foster the preservation, teaching and protection of the ethos that has been given, and must be faithful to the trust that is ineradicable in relationships (Pellegrino, 2012: 228), indicating the connection to community building through leadership. These effective school leaders
are strong ‘moral stewards’, holding on to their beliefs and values (Murphy, 2002). Fostering a school’s ethos reflects the principles of these educational leaders (Donnelly, 2008) so that the evangelical Christian ethos is integrated into every aspect of school life. Lewis and Murphy (2008: 142) reported on a study by Ofsted (2003a) which, although it focused on enhancing the achievement of Black Caribbean pupils, found that student success came as a result of good leadership practice that focused upon ‘ensuring a school ethos which gains confidence of parents as well as pupils’.

**Stewardship Commitment to Serving Stakeholder Needs**

The findings confirmed that, for the participants, serving the needs of stakeholders was a commitment to biblical stewardship expressed through selfless acts of love, care and the creation of deep relationships (Scarborough, 2009). The overlap of the stewardship and serving attributes of leadership was found to be particularly evident in participant schools where restorative measures were taken in order to build a greater sense of community. The data revealed that the effects of leadership in case study school, US1, were corroborated by the participant stakeholders (see pages 106–107), who recognised and valued a new, more empowering and caring leadership. Stewardship, through both discourses, incorporates caring for its individual members above all else (see US2, page 109), ensuring that all needs are met within the school community (Biott and Gulson, 1999). Stewarding the needs of the individual through a serving model of leadership (Liden, Wayne, Zhao and Henderson, 2008) was found to strengthen the pastoral care offered to stakeholders within the school community (Brown *et al.*, 2011).

**Stewardship of the Vision**

With a total of 49 references to vision by the participants, the visionary dimension of stewardship was a key finding, particularly among those participants from Canada who mentioned it directly 38 times. UK2 was the only UK participant to mention vision specifically, referring to it in both the biblical and practical context (see Appendix L). While other participants used synonyms such as ‘ideas’, ‘insight’, ‘direction’ and ‘perspective’ to express the concept of vision, I found it somewhat problematic that the term was not referred to directly by any of the participants except UK2 and US1 who used ‘vision’ in a biblical context to show the consequences of a lack of vision to be less than positive in a practical and spiritual sense (see pages 110–111). Although vision
might be assumed to be represented theologically through the sacred discourse of the evangelical Christian school participants as a particular distinctive element in their leadership, a surprising finding emerged from the data whereby the participants rarely spoke of the biblical context of vision; rather, the conversation took on more similarities to the secular discourse.

Therefore, the main thrust of vision from the view of the participants was that it should be a collaborative process in which leaders envision stakeholders as empowered to contribute to the community-building endeavours within their schools (see CA3 and CA4, page 109). Similarly, the secular literature corroborates this view. For example, Fullan (1992) maintains that creating alignment to a shared vision allows for collaborative school cultures. Promoted by Murphy in 1996, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium [ISLLC] (2008) (see Glossary, page 16) established a set of standards for school principals in the United States corroborating the sacred discourse:

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

(ISLLC)

Smith (2001), from his comments regarding the learning organisation proposed by Senge, insists:

Stewardship involves a commitment to and responsibility for the vision but it does not mean that the leader owns it; the leader’s task is to manage it for the benefit of others.

(Smith, 2001: 9)

Consequently, as stewards of the vision, the evangelical Christian school leaders invited participation and articulated a shared vision back to their schools’ communities (Digiorgio, 2008) and beyond. For instance, CA3 stated that evangelism was a critical component of the vision:

159
I am always managing the vision... my biggest job. Then I need to find ways for us to do this (evangelism) outside of our four walls better: global citizenship... our international Christian on-line school... Building our team... working with other schools, partnering, taking our expertise, helping people around the world... In the priority of our leadership, building up new vision so our latest endeavour is both growing and maintaining our kids among us, and then reaching out. So, that is the evangelical part of it.

(CA3)

Just as the mainstream secular literature regarding school leadership declares that a shared vision is not driven from the top of the hierarchy but is derived from a collaborative process where all of the stakeholders determine the goals and vision of the school community (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1996), the participant leaders also communicated this view of visionary leadership. The participants valued shared purpose and meaning where stakeholders join leaders as team members in determining and carrying out various dimensions of visionary stewardship. The participants’ views concurred with the secular discourse that there is an obligation to the vision to make a contribution to the world; to respond to some minimal sense of stewardship (Starratt, 2007). ‘Doing what it takes through faith’, the participants became stewards of their institutions committed to a ‘clear and compelling vision that produced a sense of calling’ (Fry and Matherly, 2006: 5). While the findings did not reveal unequivocally that the participant leaders would call what they do stewardship, they are, nevertheless, serving as stewards of their schools’ cultures, committed to guarding and protecting their schools’ heritage, stakeholders and vision.

The ‘serving’ attribute of leadership — which facilitates transformational and servant-leadership — was expressed through the participant data in four key areas. I had initially read the literature around servant-leadership and found servant-leadership to be a concept to which evangelical Christian school leaders aspired. Four participants made a direct reference to servant-leadership. Three participants described their leadership style as servant-leadership (see Appendix K), but for some participants, it was a model of
leadership more ethereal than practical. Participant UK2 remarked that he did not ‘go so far as to wash the feet of my leadership team’, and that he had a certain scepticism about such labels as servant-leadership, yet recognised the concept as a very powerful biblical one. Nonetheless, the Christian school community is validated by its focus on serving others (see UK2, page 116). From a secular discourse, Bass (2000: 33) notes that ‘servant-leaders select the needs of others as their highest priority’, revealing an attitude toward stewardship, service and an ethical dimension to leadership. Servant-leadership emerged as a practical leadership expression and attribute, yet in the most fundamental biblical sense it was an ‘appurtenance’ in which no participant engaged.

_Serving is Leading_

First, serving surfaced not only as a distinct attribute of leadership, but half of all the participants perceived there to be no distinction between the constructs of leading and serving (see Table 4.1, page 90). Within the secular discourse, Van Dierendonck (2010: 1231) posits that ‘serving and leading become almost exchangeable where being a servant allows a person to lead; being a leader implies a person serves.’

_Serving Begins with an Attitude_

Second, the data revealed that serving begins with an attitude toward service; that one’s ‘attitudinal mind-set provides the basis for servant-leadership behaviours’ (Matteson and Irving, 2006: 39). Ten of the 12 participants perceived that they led their schools with an attitude of professionalism (Sahlberg, 2011), service, and humility (see US2, CA4 and CA1, pages 118–119). Thus, serving the individual, the school and the local and global communities was a high priority. Likewise from the secular discourse, Pollard (1997) posits what a true leader is, and that a true leader is _not:_

the person with the most distinguished title, the highest pay, or the longest tenure... but the role model, the risk taker, the servant; not the person who promotes him/herself, but the promoter of others.

(Pollard, 1997: 49–50)
Serving is Modelling Appropriate Leadership Behaviours

The third aspect to emerge within the serving attribute of leadership was modelling appropriate leadership behaviours. Eleven of the 12 participants perceived that they led their schools by setting a personal example (Riechmann, 1992), particularly in the outworking of their Christian faith toward the service of others (see US2 and US1, page 120). Likewise the mainstream secular literature suggests that the principal need no longer be the ‘headmaster or instructional leader’ but may, instead, act as ‘head learner…modelling and celebrating what is hoped and expected that teachers and pupils will do’ Barth (1990: 45–46). Participant school leaders serve as role models setting examples for stakeholders that are consistent with the school’s values, goals and vision by ‘modeling desired leadership dispositions and actions’, enhancing stakeholders’ beliefs about their own capabilities and passion for change (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003: 4).

Serving is Empowering

Fourth, the belief that serving is empowering gives stakeholders a certain amount of autonomy in carrying out their specific school tasks. Participants’ successful schools had spiritual climates that were dependent on the creation of cultures of empowerment and distributive leadership (Hargreaves and Fink, 2003). One hundred per cent of the participants put an emphasis on team-building and working collaboratively (see Table 5.1, page 126), while 75 per cent placed a strong emphasis on empowering stakeholders and distributing leadership as far down the stakeholder chain as possible (see US4 and UK1, pages 121–122 and Table 4.1, page 90).

While I have heard many accounts from the evangelical Christian worldview in my discussions in schools, from the participants, and in the discussions that took place during the interviews and on-site visits, I also know that the secular literature clearly substantiates this discussion on school leadership and workplace empowerment. Empowerment proposes that ‘everyone is free to do what makes sense as long as stakeholders’ decisions embody the values shared by the school community’ (Sergiovanni, 2007: 83). Thomas and Velthouse (1990: 666) argue more broadly that ‘empowerment’ is ‘increased intrinsic task motivation manifested in a set of four cognitions: a sense of impact, meaningfulness, competence and choice, which reflect on one’s orientation to fulfil a work role’. The findings around attributes of leadership
conclude that although organisational structures, models and theories of leadership are significant, they do not matter as much as the attributes and ‘behaviours exhibited by the leaders of the organisation’ (Feiner, 2003).

6.3.3 Community Building through Leadership

Community building through leadership — exposing the heart of a group’s relational expression — was an outgrowth of the three integrated attributes of leadership. Often the building of community through leadership was employed through a stewardship-theoretical lens, evoking a particularly strong correlation between stewardship and community building. The social conditions and acts of community building in the participants’ schools were perceived to satisfy stakeholders’ ‘psychological need for relatedness which, in turn, enhance[s] autonomy, trust and collectivism’ (Bammens, Van Gils and Voordeckers, 2010: para. 10) in four key areas.

Community building: an essential aspect of school life — a core value and part of the participants’ schools’ ethos (see CA4, page 128) — focuses predominantly on the relational and spiritual dimensions, the school community being greater than the sum of its parts (see UK3, pages 129–130). The secular discourse confirms this argument, expressed best by Sandmann and Vandenberg (1995: 4/2), who suggest that community is a core value and considered to be the ‘heart of a group’s leadership’ and the ‘conceptual setting in which the leadership relationship’ with stakeholders takes place.

Community building: the spiritual dimension — a core value in evangelical Christian school leadership — is where a Christ-centred sense of community is pursued not only to strengthen the school’s spiritual dimension, but also to strengthen its cultural and practical dimensions (see CA1, page 131). The secular discourse supports this notion: that core values are operational when a school becomes a community as a result of leaders being clear about the values, sentiments and beliefs that provide the reasons and conditions for that community (Sergiovanni, 1994a).

Community building: a bottom-up approach to leadership — non-hierarchical, holistic, and transformational — removed the barriers to building a strong school community for 83 per cent of the participants. While attending leadership team meetings
at UK1, US1 and US4, I observed this collaborative approach at first hand as senior leaders relinquished their decision-making to other team members, leading from the bottom, non-hierarchically, valuing a collaborative/team approach to leadership and community building (see UK3, CA2, US1 and CA4, pages 133–134). Collaborative and democratic evangelical Christian school communities attempt to evoke ‘maximum involvement and participation of every member... to spread responsibility rather than to concentrate it’ (Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962: 435). The secular discourse corroborates the participant data given that collaborative and non-hierarchical leadership implies ‘collegiality, acceptance, co-operation, teamwork, the sharing of ideas and mentoring’, all significantly contributing to individual and organisational development and the building of community in a school (Earley and Weindling, 2004: 180–81).

A strong message from the secular scholarly literature on leadership commences with Jones (2009: 153) who, while examining collaborative leadership in schools in England, found the PricewaterhouseCooper’s 2007 national study to conclude that ‘the role of school leaders has become more challenging in recent years, and the number and complexity of the tasks they are required to undertake has increased significantly’; therefore, ‘school leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed’. The participant discourse and the sacred scholarly literature confirm this notion; often, the participants’ ‘leadership tasks were not undertaken by themselves alone’, but by many of their schools’ stakeholders working together ‘in concert with each other’, pooling their ‘individual knowledge and expertise’ to produce better outcomes (Kruse and Louis, 2009: 11). Where leadership invites the participation of others there is ‘real empowerment in terms of true delegation of leadership power (distributed leadership)’ (Huber, 2004: 670).

Restorative experiences in some of the participants’ schools, as expressed through the data that emerged from UK1 and US1, resulted in building collaborative processes that enhanced and strengthened their schools’ spiritual and relational cultures, creating more positive school communities (James and Connolly, 2000). UK1 (see page 122) specifically recalled that giving autonomy to all stakeholders started at the top, with her board of governors giving extensive autonomy to her, which consequently enabled her to transform her school’s culture into a cohesive, relational, non-hierarchical community.
Where transformation/relational/ethical approaches to leadership were reported by one participant to have been unsuccessful, it was found that the board of governors retained an authoritative approach to leadership (see US4, Chapter Seven, page 177). The findings from both discourses support the idea that 'diffuse, rather than hierarchical' leadership (Day, Harris and Hadfield, 2004) is necessary for building community in schools.

**Community building: the developing of relationships** – the ‘putting people before policy’ approach to leadership – was often directly linked to the three attributes of leadership. The findings asserted that the participants likened leadership to a relationship (see CA2, page 136), expressing a calling to serve all of the ‘family’, specifically ‘the person who needs your help’ (see US2, pages 101–108); thus, building community by modelling a serving attitude regarding leadership relationships. From a secular perspective, building community denotes improving the culture, climate, and interpersonal relationships in schools where the developing of relationships has received too little attention (Kruse, Louis and Bryk, 1994: 8). Community building in schools means rebuilding relationships among all school community members (Liebermann, 1988). Earley and Weindling (2004) assert that leadership effectively engages with pupils and other school stakeholders by building relationships through being visible, talking and listening to them. This commitment to stewardship via leadership through relationship is twenty-first century leadership, and is seen as ‘moving from a categorical to an interpretive into a relational context’ (Bottery, 2006a: 172). This is a view of contemporary leadership that Popper (2004) calls ‘leadership as relationship’, which permits a view of leadership that is more relevant to the contemporary theories of leadership in the twenty-first century. Bottery (2006a) argues that the world is no longer seen as

being composed of atomistic individuals, affecting one another in some simplistic linear causal framework, but moving towards one composed of dense, complex and interconnected webs of relationships... which influence thoughts and actions in myriad ways.

(Bottery, 2006a: 172)
School leadership, when fully operational, was the key to developing stakeholder connectedness (Habermas, 1987) and relational trust, which became embedded within the culture of relationships (Fullan, 2003) across the participants’ schools in two significant areas: creating a climate of openness and creating a sense of belonging as in a family.

Creating a Climate of Openness

The data revealed that senior leaders carried out their commitment to stewarding and serving their schools’ cultures, transforming them into cultures of belonging, openness, connectedness (Fielding, 2004) and caring, creating relational environments where stakeholders can flourish and be valued as active participants in the educational process, while engaging in quality interactions and relationships with others (see UK1, CA4 and CA2, pages 135–136). The data from the secular discourse likewise suggests that school leaders, leading their teams in a less hierarchical setting with a more open style of leadership, are more effective at creating a climate of openness where stakeholders have a voice in the school and the freedom to bring ideas forward (Earley and Weindling, 2004), thus showing that leadership attributes influence a school’s climate and culture.

Creating a Sense of Belonging

The research suggested a general consensus among 11 of the 12 school leaders about the need to build community and develop relationships in schools by creating a sense of belonging, value, meaning, identity, involvement and connectedness, and a knowledge (see UK2, page 143) that school stakeholders count for something and are valued (see TE1, page 142). This results in the creation of tightly held webs of meaningful relationships (Sergiovanni, 2005) between members of the school family. The case study was an operational paradigm, showing that while systemic and strategic leadership are part of the systems world (Sergiovanni, 1999) of the school, and influence leadership in the process of transforming the school community, the emotional context of leading is accomplished through an open style of leadership enabling all stakeholders to see new possibilities for creating and enhancing the relational life-world of their school communities (see case study participants, pages 137–138).

The evidence from the participant interviews indicated that it is important to feel a sense of belonging because it will lead to affective stakeholder commitment, facilitating group
solidarity, relationships, and emotional bonds (Kanter, 1972). Experiencing a sense of belonging keeps people in communities and is the ‘goal of community building’ (Bacon, 2009).

My site visit observations indicated that rhetoric and reality are not always consistent. The behaviours and attitudes of leaders endeavouring to create a sense of belonging and community in their schools do not necessarily correspond with their rhetoric. In two of the 12 schools where the data did not confirm that transformational leadership models were the motivation behind the participants’ leadership enactment, more authoritative leadership was observed. According to the data (see Table 5.1, page 126), UK2 and US3 appeared to command more authoritative learning environments. While UK2 was very receptive and open to a student knocking at his office door during the interview, and also held that the creation of lasting relationships was critical to building community in the school, upon my departure I witnessed his rather harsh response toward a student who was being severely reprimanded by a teacher (Journal Entry 14/11/08). I had recorded in my research journal, following the interview, the headmaster commenting: ‘Sometimes I’m not, um... caring enough.’ When I asked UK2 what would be one word to describe his leadership style, he initially said ‘flawed’ (see Appendix K), revealing that he may be cognisant of shortcomings where his leadership as relationship is concerned.

In the interview, US3 stated that she believed her leadership style to be servant-leadership (see Appendix K). Yet walking down the hallway after the interview, I observed her disciplining a very young student in a rather demeaning matter (Journal Entry 5/2/09), disclosing a difference between her rhetoric and the reality. The research findings from both the participant data and the secular literature argue that one models servant-leadership by creating value for stakeholders and becoming a cultivator of relationships toward different stakeholders (Maak and Pless, 2006: 100). The school administrator with a spiritual leadership style works to enhance the value of everyone, practising a kind of servant-leadership that is central to caring about others (Thompson, 2012: 2)

An interesting finding in the data was that the only participant not to make reference to the building of community was US3. As Table 3.1 shows (see page 67), her extensive background in business and higher education, as well as her lack of experience as a
school leader, may possibly account for this finding. A year after the interview, I was informed that this participant had left her leadership position.

The case study produced some interesting findings in two ways: exploratory and explanatory (Yin, 1993) (see case study participants, page 144). The case study school (US1) had recovered from some leadership challenges, particularly within its affective and spiritual culture. While the case study was not an exercise in generalisation about school leadership or the responses of stakeholders, it was a valuable instrument for exploring the multifaceted relationships that occur in schools undergoing change, particularly in US1. The case study, observations and focus group discussion illuminated more clearly how relationships are strengthened. There were many instances in which the voices and personal stories of multiple school stakeholders commented on the calling, serving and stewarding attributes of their schools’ leaders, whom they regarded as strengthening their school community, providing especially convincing evidence for the overall leadership effects of PR and US1.

Stakeholders in the case study school (see pages 144–145) and 67 per cent of the leader participants (see UK2, page 143) explained their schools’ cultures as a ‘family relationship that exists among members of the school community, working together where ‘leadership helps to sustain unity in the school community’ (Jahangeer and Jahangeer, 2004: 251). Earley and Weindling (2004: 90/92) suggest that family, home and community are common metaphors for the school, but that ‘the family was the most frequently used metaphor’ and ‘a commonly found image’ among secular school leaders in the United Kingdom. The theory of school as community had led to the ‘school as family’ metaphor because schools provide for students’ needs as if the students were their own children (Sergiovanni, 1994b).

Only two of the four UK participants described the school metaphorically as a family (see Table 5.1, page 126). Because the majority of students’ families in eight of the schools in my research profess faith in Christ, these schools may be considered to share a strong sense of family and community. However, in the four evangelical Christian schools in the United Kingdom where a majority of families did not share the evangelical Christian faith, the participants nevertheless told me they felt that a strong sense of family and
community existed: through the strong educational convictions of parents, through the
developing of caring relationships, and through the creation of a sense of belonging
within the school. It was conveyed to me by UK1 that each of the leadership team
members shared a common evangelical Christian faith and values. The sacred discourse
of the participant leaders conveyed that being a family of faith and a community of
evangelical Christian believers was a vital aspect of school life that ultimately led to the
building of community in their schools (see case study participant PR, page 145). The
findings suggested that students and stakeholders who experienced their schools as
communities had acquired a sense of belonging (Battistich, Solomon, Kim, Watson and
Schaps, 1995) even as in a family.

From these findings it may be deduced that one’s leadership style, the three attributes of
leadership, and a common value system are critical to the building of community in the
evangelical Christian school. Through practices aimed at developing shared norms,
values, beliefs and attitudes, and promoting mutual caring and trust, relational
communities are built (Leithwood and Riehl, 2003). I found the majority of the
evangelical Christian schools that I visited to be believing, relational and integrated
Christian communities (Síon, Francis and Baker, 2009), sharing the desire of Konstant
(1981) that students should experience a sense of belonging to the school community, and
that its leadership would encourage personal commitment to Jesus Christ.

The findings suggest that no one particular leadership attribute can be linked to
organisational performance; therefore, it may also be construed that no one leadership
attribute on its own would yield organisational success (Currie et al., 2009); that success
is a compilation and integration of multiple attributes of leadership. The overall research
findings demonstrate that the attributes and community building aspects of evangelical
Christian school leaders are not so different from country to country and do not differ so
much from those of their secular colleagues, but differ in intensity and performance
where leadership styles differ, confirming that those who are more authoritative in their
leadership focus less attention on its relational aspects.
6.3.4 Voice of the Researcher as Interpreter/Translator between Discourses

Discourse, as embedded in language, is constructivist/interpretivist and a shared way of apprehending the world. This enabled me as the researcher to ‘interpret bits of information and put them together into coherent stories or accounts’ (Dryzek, 1997: 8). Each subsequent ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ discourse supported assumptions, judgments and contentions that provided the basic prerequisites for analysis.

This notion of interpreting one discourse to another was the third key finding of the research; that my voice, confirmed to be visible and audible in this qualitative research (Hasselkus, 2003), surfaced within each data chapter as I positioned myself strategically between the sacred and the secular discourses, translating, interpreting and illuminating the discourses one to the other. As researcher I attempted to reveal all potentially marginalised voices, especially those of the stakeholders in the case study school (Hazen, 1993). What I encountered early on as problematic was that at times my own voice aspired to be louder than the voices represented by the two discourses, due to personal bias, so that I had to adopt an impartial and lesser theological stance.

The sacred discourse of this research came from the stories or accounts of the senior leader and stakeholder participants in the case study regarding attributes of leadership and community building through leadership as well as through the sacred scholarly literature. The voice of the secular discourse came through the relevant secular scholarly literature. My voice became the interpreter and translator between the two discourses, suggesting an overlap or relationship between the two, yet highlighting where the discourses differed.

When I began the research, this interpreting of two discourses was not my intent, but as I began to reflect upon how I was analysing the data and reporting the findings, I realised that I was implementing a provocative methodological exercise. Therefore, I hope that this research may reach the target audience, reader or researcher who might entertain the thought of actively participating as interpreter and translator between two discourses, becoming co-creator of the meanings (Buchanan and Dawson, 2007) that discourses have for them, as they engage in research.
6.4 Conclusion

This discussion of the research provided a summary of the findings from two discourses: the 'sacred' and the 'secular'. The participating evangelical Christian schools’ web documents, semi-structured participant interviews and a field journal containing observations during the school site visits provided the sacred discourse alongside the sacred scholarly literature. The secular discourse emanated from the secular scholarly literature. The case study findings were a result of semi-structured interviews, shadowing and a student focus-group discussion. Methodologically, I determined that I could place myself in a unique position as researcher, interpreting, constructing, illuminating and translating one discourse to another, which contributed to the originality of the thesis.

A key finding from the analysed data was that the calling, stewardship and serving attributes of leadership served as catalysts to the spiritual, relational, experiential, organisational and instructional dynamics of the participants’ schools. The initial ‘call’ to leadership included the ‘calling’ attribute of leadership as motivation to task enactment. In other words a task-oriented motivation for the participant leaders came when they recognised the ‘hand of God’ or received a ‘call’ from God (Kuhl, 2005) to ‘act as strategic stewards’ (Mosbacker, 2007: 192) in an attempt to align their schools for service through a commitment to serving. The findings suggested that the call to leadership precludes all other attributes of leadership.

School leaders from both discourses suggest building community through collaborative, non-hierarchical leadership that produces relationship-oriented communities. Relational communities encourage feelings of openness and a sense of belonging as in a family, which are paramount in creating holistic school communities geared to meet the needs of all stakeholders and preparing students for the opportunities and challenges of the twenty-first century.

The sacred discourse, occasionally expressed as an ‘appurtenance’ (add-on) to the participants’ leadership discourse, was described as a ‘calling’ concerning the ‘serving’, ‘shepherding and stewarding of God’s people’ (Stott, 2002: 37) to create relational communities of faith. It is this appurtenance that sets the discourse of the evangelical Christian school leaders apart from that of their secular colleagues.
A number of transformational/relational/ethical leadership attributes have the potential not only to transform secular schools and evangelical Christian schools, but also to transform the face of school leadership globally. There is a consensus from both discourses that school leaders may be more inclined and equipped to embrace key leadership attributes that promote community building in schools.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction
This study was initially undertaken to investigate servant-leadership on account of the data gathered from the pilot interview as well as from reading the conventional leadership literature and the literature regarding servant-leadership. However, after a greater examination of the participant data, I realised that there was much more to explore in the area of school leadership. Therefore, I commenced with the voices of the school leader participants, the participants' schools' web documents and the information gathered from the case study school, which included semi-structured interviews, shadowing and a student focus-group discussion. I also began to read the relevant scholarly, secular transformational/relational/ethical leadership literature that corroborated the findings from the participant data.

Following a more dynamic and creative reflection upon the participant data, which gave this qualitative research its pulse (Kleinsasser, 2000), I found that not only did good data emerge, but that the new data carried my work in a more exciting direction, bringing new knowledge to the field through the analysis, interpretation and translation between two discourses: the 'sacred' and the 'secular'. The sacred discourse emanated from the participants' voices and the sacred scholarly literature, while the secular discourse came from the secular scholarly leadership literature. What I found was an unexpected overlap between the two discourses, indicating that in many ways both discourses are saying the same thing in regard to the transformational/relational leadership as investigated through leadership attributes and community building through leadership.

There was, however, a philological distinction within the participants' leadership discourse which, at times, became an add-on or appurtenance that set their discourse apart from that of their secular colleagues. It was a sacred/evangelical Christian articulation regarding the themes of the research expressed in accordance with the evangelical Christian school leaders' values and their evangelical Christian worldview. This revealing of two discourses brought about a more intense engagement with the data,
in addition to becoming the primary framework for the research which brought forth new revelations requiring a new research question and sub-questions, and therefore a letting go of the initial research questions.

The theoretical themes of the research became the second framework. Four main thematic findings emerged from the data analysis and are explained in the two data chapters (Chapters Four and Five). Innovative and transformational practices in the participants' schools (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978) emanated as leadership 'attributes' around 'calling', 'stewardship', and 'serving' which generated the fourth theme: 'community building through leadership'. One's 'calling' to a particular vocation was shown to be a strong motivation to task enactment and to fulfilment in one's leadership role. Stewardship of the Christian ethos, stewardship of stakeholder needs and stewardship of the vision were central components of the stewardship attribute of leadership. The serving attribute of leadership was found to be partly explained through a servant-leadership paradigm as well as other aspects of leaders' serving their school's constituents in order to empower them.

The findings disclosed that transformational leaders are hopeful that they can move their schools forward by building strong, relational communities where stakeholders value a sense of belonging and openness. The majority of the participants perceived their leadership as evolving from an emphasis on transactional forms of leadership, obedience to orders and top-down management control to less hierarchical and authoritative leadership enactment. School leader participants acknowledged the need to build a more stakeholder-empowered community, to develop stakeholders personally, and to encourage a collaborative approach to leadership (Hannay, 2009). Where fully deployed core values permitted empowerment to be taken to its extreme logical conclusion - systemic leadership - all members of the school community, particularly those in the case-study school, indicated that they shared the burdens, privileges and rewards of leadership (Edgeman, 1998).

The argument of this thesis communicates that through both discourses, transformational/relational/ethical theories of leadership emerged as more inclined to support what is happening with leadership in schools today. The findings from the
participant interviews, observational data and the sacred and secular leadership and school leadership literature revealed that while transactional leadership may be employed in specific situations, transformational leadership approaches were enacted and sought after by the majority of the participants in an attempt to change aspects of their schools' cultures.

While there are inevitably limitations to constructivist qualitative research, and generalisation from a small sample size can be tentative, surprising, interesting and potentially useful findings emerged from this piece of international research. Interviewing evangelical Christian school senior leaders in three countries was enlightening, inspirational and an extraordinary opportunity to tap into leadership descriptions, insights and challenges of the twenty-first century. Both discourses confirmed that whereas school leaders both 'lead' and 'manage' their schools, school leaders are implementing more transformational and relational approaches to leadership, and that 'leadership' is firmly established as the dominant concept in educational conversations (Bush, 2008).

7.2 Limitations of the Study
This research was not intended to be a full ethnographic exploration, but rather it was an exposition of what the participants disclosed to me. It was an attempt to listen to and represent a small sampling of evangelical Christian school senior leaders regarding the accounts and descriptions of their attributes of leadership and how community building occurred in their schools. It was also not intended to be a comparison between evangelical Christian schools and other schools. The findings do not have relevance across all school contexts or even across all evangelical Christian school contexts, nor will the findings have relevance for all school leaders or all evangelical Christian school leaders.

7.3 Implications for Professional Learning and Value of the Study
I anticipate that the data presented in this study will be useful as benchmarks for any school leader who wishes to take a closer look at attributes of leadership or the community building aspect of leadership from a less hierarchical position. Evangelical Christian school leaders may find this study useful when shoring up their school's
spiritual communities. Anticipating that the research might lead to further professional development and discussion, I submitted two papers on leadership (both of which were accepted): first at the international leadership conference in Beijing and second, at a leadership conference for evangelical Christian educators in the United States. However, owing to a personal emergency, I was unable to represent the findings at either conference, but look forward to doing so in the near future.

With this newly acquired knowledge, I am hoping that this research may be used to inform practice and policy, giving all educational leaders, not only evangelical Christian school leaders, the opportunity for reflection regarding their individual professional practice and the practice of leadership in their professional learning communities. The use of discourse, both from the participant data and the secular literature, particularly the way I, as the researcher, had opportunity to act as interpreter and translator between two discourses, adds value to the methodological advancement of research.

7.4 Recommendations for Further Research

I have found several areas of interest for future investigation. First, the matter of gender in leadership in education is interesting when you talk about power to, as it aligns itself more closely with the feminist tradition, servant-leadership and the concept of community (Sergiovanni, 2007). The notion of ‘power to’ is pertinent to this research because, from the observations and interviews of the research participants, it was disclosed that two of the female participants were leading for significant change in their schools and continue to hold these leadership positions. Although this study did not focus on gender and leadership, ethnicity and leadership or change leadership, these topics certainly warrant future study. Part of an anticipated study of gender might include a study of servant-leadership within evangelical Christian schools to ascertain whether servant-leadership is most often exhibited by female leaders. The evaluative method for such an enquiry would be to administer the Servant-Leadership Assessment developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) and Laub’s (1999) Organisational Leadership Assessment instrument.

Second, following up with the participants who had enacted leadership for specific change in their schools’ cultures might be a worthy endeavour. This idea came about as
the result of communication from one of the participants. A year after the interviews, s/he informed me (in confidence) that s/he had left the school because 'efforts at moving the school forward from an authoritative leadership model to one of collaboration had failed' and s/he could see that further change would not take place under his/her leadership, since the school’s governing body was an especially authoritative alliance. This type of research might take the form of a case study if stakeholders would agree to being interviewed. I also think that it would be beneficial to enquire if any other participants had faced similar challenges in terms of moving their schools forward from a less hierarchical position of leadership, and, if so, what challenges had they overcome, and how were the challenges surmounted.

A third opportunity for further research might be to interview secular school leaders to see if their views of leadership are expressed through a secular spiritual discourse. It might also be important to see if secular leaders suggest the same key attributes of leadership that the evangelical Christian school leaders have revealed.

Fourth, I might utilise a mixed-methods data analysis approach and a larger purposive sample of participants, engaging in a wider piece of research. I would like to see if there are any national differences in attitudes to education, school leadership and evangelical Christian education in particular.

7.5 Contribution to Professional Knowledge and Public Dissemination
As this research will be publicly disseminated through the University of London, Institute of Education library, distributed to interested research participants, written up in journal articles and presented in conferences, I am hopeful that this study will make several contributions to knowledge. First, the goal of this research was not specifically to find new ways of writing about leadership, but to show how the ‘sacred’ and the ‘secular’ discourses, as expressed through the evangelical Christian schools’ participants’ voices, the sacred scholarly literature and the secular, scholarly literature, were embedded within the ‘attributes of leadership’ and ‘community building through leadership’ framework.

Second, the research data revealed that an appreciable overlap existed between the two discourses. In many instances the discourses were not contrary to one another, and the
sacred discourse did not differ from the secular literature, which is another contribution to
knowledge. However, where there were distinctions, it was noted that within the sacred
discourse there is often an appurtenance that stems from and is expressive of one’s
evangelical Christian values and worldview.

Third, my research position as interpreter and translator between the two discourses
contributes to new knowledge. Standing in the doorway, interpreting one discourse to the
other as a unique methodological position, may be a useful tool for other researchers
writing from the context of discourse where oppositional binaries may be suspected.

Finally, the findings are not the final answer. They are, rather, the beginning of a
discussion of leadership within a transformational paradigm that is the dominant
discourse in leadership today, moving the discussion beyond any conceptualisations in
education leadership studies which remain transactional or authoritative. The ‘calling’ of
persons to school leadership positions will empower those leaders to find personal and
professional fulfillment. Transformational/relational/ethical leadership models that
demonstrate acts of ‘complete stewardship’ (McCuddy, 2008: 11) and serving articulate a
direction for existing and upcoming leaders to follow in helping their school communities
to not only survive but to thrive and to prosper.
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APPENDIX A

SUMMARY FORMS

Web Document Summary Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of document:</th>
<th>Where Recovered:</th>
<th>Date Recovered:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Name or description of document:
- Number of Students: Level of Students: Affiliation:
- Motto: Mission Statement:
- Probable author of document: Author’s probable intent in creating document:
- Key information about the author that might affect analysis:
- Significance or importance of document:
- What does document tell about values/beliefs of document’s author:
- Brief summary of main issues or themes in the document.
- Anything that struck as salient, interesting, illuminating, important in document:
- Any examples of bias, contradictions, or significant omissions in this document:
- Any photos that tell a story:
- Interviewing questions gleaned from the analysis of this document.

Interview Summary Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee:</th>
<th>Where interviewed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date interviewed:</th>
<th>Length of interview:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Name and description of institution:
- Significance or importance of interview:
- What does this interview tell about the values and beliefs of the interviewee?
- Main issues or themes in the interview:
- Brief summary of interview:
- Anything that struck as salient, interesting, illuminating, important from interview:
- Anything observable (emotions, gesticulations, etc.) from this interview:
- Further interviewing questions gleaned from the interview:
- Research questions/sub-questions relevant to this interview:
- Commonalities with other interviewees:
Observation Summary Form

What to observe:
- How many members make contribution to discussion – how long do they last?
- How many contributions are questions/add to the discussion?
- How do members talk about the school, staff and students?
- How actions/activities reflect perceptions of, attitudes towards the school culture?
- Antecedents/precedents of observed events – disagreement, praise, critical incidents

Context and circumstances:
- Context of the observation – staff, leadership, school board meeting.
- Overall environment – make an accurate plan to aid memory – meeting room.
- How many subjects were and who was involved at different points?
- Roles of the participants involved – chair, presenters – listen to the voices
- Time of day observation occurred – significant for participants’ responses
## APPENDIX B
### DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS CA2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td><strong>Core Values:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Parents as active partners in children</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Christ-centered curriculum as solid foundation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td><strong>To develop Christ-centered school community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Respect dynamic, multicultural diversity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To give and serve those in need within the community.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Building community — affirming the partnership of parents and other supporters we organize key events that help build ownership and community spirit.</strong> Communicate regularly to members of community**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Helping students develop sense of belonging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Invite parents to join staff in providing students with environment where they may grow academically, aesthetically, emotionally, physically, socially, and spiritually</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community will be impacted because of what God is doing in our school.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aim — for students to see faults, admit need to change behaviour, realise necessity of restoration of community spirit.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Ethos:</td>
<td><strong>Mission — to infallible Word of God, led by His Spirit, to provide quality, Christ-centered education, equipping students to serve Christ joyfully in all aspects of life.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving Mission</td>
<td><strong>Prepare students for life-long learning in service to our Saviour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Encouraged to see beyond four walls to needs of others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Have the heart/mind to serve school community for glory of Christ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Involved in outreach to others around world — especially children.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To promote Christian education — we are passionate about it and desire to help others to see importance in equipping students for life service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Welcome individuals who share same faith and vision to serve along with us in providing a quality Christ-centered Christian education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mindful of growth of students, developing personality that include basic self-concept, beliefs, values and attitudes — the important components of one’s character development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community impacted because of what God is doing in our school</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Equipping students to serve Christ:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>To strive to examine all of life from Biblical worldview</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>To develop skills/knowledge/wisdom for obedient service</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td><strong>Committed staff striving to model the love of Christ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Followers of Christ who display love and care for students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td><strong>Unique individuals with varied abilities encouraged to develop God-given talents and potential of students to become leaders and servants in world.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Vision — to equip students to discover/develop abilities/gifts, to love God with passion, prayer, intelligence, to love neighbour as themselves.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Help students discover interests and God-given talents in a call to serve using time/talents wisely.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Guiding students to a Christian response to world and its issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td><strong>Calling to bring up children entrusted to leadership in knowledge of God</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

STATEMENTS OF FAITH

Association of Christian Schools International

1. We believe the Bible is the inspired, the only infallible, authoritative, inerrant Word of God.
2. We believe there is one God, eternally existent in three persons – Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
3. We believe in the deity of Christ.
4. His virgin birth.
5. His sinless life and His miracles.
6. His vicarious and atoning death.
7. His Resurrection.
8. His Ascension to the right hand of God.
9. His personal return in power and glory.
10. We believe in the absolute necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit for salvation because of the exceeding sinfulness of human nature and that men are justified on the single ground of faith in the shed blood of Christ and that only by God's grace through faith alone are we saved.
11. We believe in the resurrection of both the saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the resurrection of life, and they that are lost unto the resurrection of condemnation.
12. We believe in the spiritual unity of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ.
13. We believe in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit by whose indwelling the Christian is enabled to live a godly life.

Society of Christian Schools British Columbia

The basis of the Society is the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the infallible Word of God.

The Bible: That God by His Holy Word reveals Himself; renews man's understanding of God, of man himself, of his fellowman and of the world; directs man in all his relationships and activities; and therefore guides His people, also in the education of His children.

Creation: That in their education children must come to learn that the world, and man's calling in it, can rightly be understood only in their relation to the Triune God, who by His creation, restoration and governance directs all things to the coming of His Kingdom and the glorification of His Name.

Sin: That because of man's sin, which brought upon all mankind the curse of God, alienates him from his Creator, his neighbour and the world; distorts his view of the true meaning and purpose of life; and misdirects human culture and also corrupts the education of children.
Jesus Christ: That through our Saviour, Jesus Christ, there is renewal of our educational enterprise, because He is the Redeemer of, and the Light and the Way for our human life in all its range and variety. Only through Him and the work of His Spirit are we guided in the truth and recommitted to our original calling.

The Independent Schools Christian Alliance

1. The one true God who lives eternally in three persons – the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.
2. The love, grace and sovereignty of God in creating, sustaining, ruling, redeeming and judging the world.
3. The divine inspiration and supreme authority of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, which are the written Word of God – trustworthy for faith and conduct.
4. The dignity of all people, made male and female in God's image to love, be holy and care for creation, yet corrupted by sin, which incurs divine wrath and judgement.
5. The incarnation of God's eternal Son, the Lord Jesus Christ – born of the Virgin Mary; truly divine and truly human, yet without sin.
6. The atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross: dying in our place, paying the price of sin and defeating evil, so reconciling us with God.
7. The bodily resurrection of Christ, the first fruits of our resurrection; his ascension to the Father, and his reign and mediation as the only Saviour of the world.
8. The justification of sinners solely by the grace of God through faith in Christ.
9. The ministry of God the Holy Spirit, who leads us to repentance, unites us with Christ through new birth, empowers our discipleship and enables our witness.
10. The Church, the body of Christ both local and universal, the priesthood of all believers – given life by the Spirit and endowed with the Spirit's gifts to worship God and proclaim the gospel, promoting justice and love.
11. The personal and visible returning of Jesus Christ to fulfil the purposes of God, who will raise all people to judgment, bring eternal life to the redeemed and eternal condemnation to the lost, and establish a new heaven and new earth.
Date ____________________

Dear ______________________,

I recently visited your website while locating Evangelical Christian Schools in the United Kingdom. I am currently a doctoral student at the Institute of Education, University of London researching on Evangelical Christian School Leadership.

I have two questions of you:

- How many students are currently enrolled in your school?
- Would it be possible for me to visit your school and interview you?

I will be in London this coming November from the 10th through the 21st. Following your response to my email, I will again contact you regarding the best date and time for a visit.

Thank you very much for answering my questions and considering the possibility of a visit and an interview.

Sincerely in Christ,

Kathryn McIntosh
USA (425) 922-7510
kaymac32@yahoo.com
APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Warming up Questions...
- How long have you been involved in Christian education?
- Why did you choose to become involved in Christian education? At this school?
- What age range do you fit into? -25 25-35 45-55 55-65 65+
- In what is your educational degree and at what level?
- What professional training have you had in school/Christian school leadership?
- How many students in your school claim to be of the evangelical Christian faith?

Leadership Questions...
- How would you explain the particular job that you do in your school?
- What are the most important aspects of leading a school for you?
- In what way do you prioritise your leadership?
- What do you believe to be the Christian dimensions of leadership?
- How do your Christian beliefs affect the way you lead the school?
- How does your Christianity impact the way you educate children?
- Do you believe evangelical Christian school leaders lead differently than those in secular schools? How would you describe the difference?

Values Questions...
- What would you say are the core values that influence you as a school leader?
- In what ways do your personal values contribute to your leadership? See above.
- What is it like putting those values into practice?
- How might putting those values into practice be different under different circumstances?

School Life...
- What do you consider to be the most important aspect of school life?
- Who do you consult when making decisions for the school?
- How do you respond to the myriad needs in your school?
- What do you do when a member of the school comes to you with a personal problem?
- In what way is listening important in this school?
- What structures are set up for listening to students, to teachers, to parents?
- How does the school work with families?
- How do you think students would describe their experience in the school?
- What are your goals for the students of this school? How is this being accomplished?
- How do you model Christ to your school community?

Servant Leadership Questions...
- The Bible talks about servant leadership. Do you think it plays a part in the leadership of a school? What part might it play in your school? How might you describe it? Can you give some examples of how it is accomplished in your school?
• What would you say is the linkage (relationship) between your Christian school leadership and that of being a servant?

Closing Questions...
➢ Is there one word that might define your leadership style and how would you explain it?
➢ How does your leadership fulfil the evangelistic aspect of your school?
APPENDIX F

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENT REGARDING CASE STUDY

Date __________________________,

Dear __________________________,

Thank you so much for the invitation to conduct a case study in your school. I feel very comfortable with you and your staff and look forward to meeting with you again very soon. I will attempt to make my visits as unobtrusive as possible, respecting your time and the learning environment.

With your permission I would like the case study to include the following:

- Interview with the secondary school principal
- Interview with two teachers
- Interview with a school board member
- Interview with a parent
- Focus group discussion with secondary students
- General observation
- Shadow observation with you
- Attendance at appropriate meetings

I will be in touch to confirm the best dates and times to conduct the case study.

Again, thank you for your time and generosity.

Sincerely in Christ,

Kathryn McIntosh
APPENDIX G

CASE STUDY PARTICIPANTS’ INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

A. Case Study Interview Questions for the Principal

1) What made you seek a position in a Christian school and why this school?
2) What is this school all about and what is it like being in this school?
3) Whose school is this and how is that demonstrated?
4) How would you describe the role that you play in the school?
5) What do you believe to be the school’s #1 priority? Who determines the priorities?
6) How would you describe the Christian aspect of the school?
7) How would you describe the leadership philosophy of the school?
8) What do you see leadership doing that makes this school successful?
9) What do you expect of your staff?
10) How are the needs of students met?
11) What do you think the students would say that your leadership has done for them?
12) How are you building the school community?
13) What structures are set up for listening to those in the school community?
14) How are decisions made in the school?
15) What if you have a good idea/ if something is worrying you? What happens?
16) How are the voices of the young people heard in your school?
17) Are things changed in the school due to the actions of stakeholders?
18) Has the spiritual life of the school changed since you have come here? How?
19) How do you think students would describe their experience in the school?
20) What is the significance of having a one-campus school?
21) What is a single word that best describes your relationship with the leadership? Explain?
22) What has the superintendent’s leadership brought to the school?
23) What are your goals for the students?
24) What is the greatest joy for you in working in this school?
25) Do your personal core values differ from the school leadership?
26) Is there one word that might describe your leadership style? Can you explain it?
27) Have you heard of servant leadership? Is it played out in the school in specific context?
28) How does your leadership fulfil the evangelistic aspect of the school?

B. Case Study Interview Questions for Teachers

1) What made you seek a position in a Christian school and why US1?
2) What is this school all about?
3) Whose school is this and how is that demonstrated?
4) Whose school is this and how is that demonstrated?
5) What is it like being in this school?
6) How would you describe the Christian aspect of the school?
7) How would you describe the leadership philosophy of the school?
8) What does the leadership expect of teachers in the school?
9) How do you know the leadership is interested in you?
10) What do you see the leadership doing that makes this school successful?
11) What is expected of you as a staff member?
12) How are the needs of students met?
13) Has the spiritual life of the school changed since you have come here? How
14) What structures are set up for listening to those in the school?
15) How are decisions made in your school?
16) What if you have a good idea if something is worrying you? What happens?
17) How are the voices of the young people heard in your school?
18) Are things changed in the school due to the actions of stakeholders?
19) How do you think students would describe their experience in the school?
20) What is one single word that best describes your relationship with the principal?
   Why?
21) What has the superintendent’s leadership brought to the school?
22) What are your goals for the students?
23) What is the greatest joy for you in working in this school?
24) Do your personal core values differ from the school leadership? How?
25) Have you heard of servant leadership? Is it played out in the school in specific context?
26) How does your leadership to students fulfill the evangelistic aspect of the school?

C. Case Study Interview Questions for Parent/Board Member
1) What made you decide to enrol your child/ren in US1?
2) What is this school all about?
3) How do you describe this school to your friends whose children do not attend?
4) What has been your experience as a parent in this school thus far?
5) What has been your child’s experience in the school thus far?
6) What does your child say about his/her experience in the school?
7) How would you describe the Christian aspect of the school?
8) How does Christianity affect the leadership of the school?
9) How do you know the leadership is interested in you?
10) Has the school leadership been responsive to your needs? In what ways?
11) As a parent, if you have a personal concern about your child, what can you do?
12) What do you know about the school’s strategic plan?
13) In what way, in the school, do your young people have a voice that is heard?
14) What do you feel your relationship with the school is?
15) How would you describe the school’s relationship to your children?
16) How are your child’s needs met in the school?
17) What makes you feel a part of this school?
18) Do you, as a parent, play a particular role in the school?
19) How do school personnel respond to you?
20) Do you feel heard by school leadership? In what ways?
21) What has the superintendent’s leadership brought to the school?
22) What structures are set up by the administration for listening to you and your children?
23) Has anything in the school changed because you were listened to?
24) What are the school’s goals/expectations for your child?
Dear Students,

My name is Kathryn McIntosh. I am doing a research thesis on evangelical Christian school leadership and am pleased to be interviewing members of US1. This thesis is part of my doctoral studies at the Institute of Education, University of London in London, England. I am directing my own project and can be contacted at (425)922-7510 for more information.

Thank you so much for agreeing to take part in my project as a co-researcher in a focus group discussion/interview. Thank you, parents, for allowing your child to participate. Before we start I would like to emphasize that:

• The student’s participation is entirely voluntary;
• The student is free to refuse to answer any questions;
• The student is free to withdraw at any time.

The interview will be kept strictly confidential, and data collected from the interview will be available only to members of my examination team at the university. Excerpts from the interview results may be made part of the final research paper to be completed in approximately two years, but under no circumstances shall your name or any identifying characteristics be included in this or successive reports.

Please sign this form to show that you have read and understand its contents.

Student signature: ________________________________  signed
__________________________  printed

Parent signature: ________________________________  signed
__________________________  printed

Date: ________________________________
APPENDIX I

CASE STUDY STUDENT FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1) Whose idea was it for you to attend US1 and why?
2) What is this school all about? Whose school is this and how is that demonstrated?
3) How do you describe this school to your friends who don’t go here?
4) What is it like coming to this school? Describe your experiences!
5) How would you describe the Christian aspect of the school?
6) Has the spiritual life of the school changed since you have come here? How
7) How would you describe some of your experiences in this school?
8) What makes you feel comfortable in school?
9) What makes you feel uncomfortable in school?
10) How and by whom are your needs met in the school?
11) How do you know the leadership is interested in you?
12) What has the superintendent’s leadership brought to the school?
13) In what ways is listening to students important in this school?
14) In what ways do those in leadership listen to you? Who in leadership listens to you?
15) What happens if you have a serious personal problem? Who can you go to?
16) How are decisions made in the school?
17) In what ways are you a part of the school’s decision making process?
18) What contributions have you as students been able to make in terms of making decisions?
19) Do things get changed in the school when you voice your opinions? How?
20) How have thing changed in the school? How do you take part in the decision-making?
21) What opportunities do you have to lead in the school? How did they occur?
22) Do you feel you connect with the leadership of the school and in what ways?
23) How do you know the leadership cares about you?
24) What do you think the school’s goals and expectations are for you?
## LEADERSHIP VERSUS MANAGEMENT DATA CODING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK1</th>
<th>UK2</th>
<th>UK3</th>
<th>UK4</th>
<th>CA1</th>
<th>CA2</th>
<th>CA3</th>
<th>CA4</th>
<th>US1</th>
<th>US2</th>
<th>US3</th>
<th>US4</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>TE1</th>
<th>TE2</th>
<th>ST4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

LEADERSHIP STYLE DATA CODING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flawed</th>
<th>Visionary</th>
<th>Servant</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Aggressive</th>
<th>Caring</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Pace-Setting</th>
<th>Empowering</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
<th>Gentleness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the participant mentions two leadership styles, the first is how they saw themselves when first took the position and the second is how they see themselves now.