

# **Relationships or results? A multiple-case study exploring how three school leaders find a balance.**

**Joe Williams**  
**MA thesis**

## **Abstract**

This study explores how three headteachers in the Greater London area manage to champion the value of personal relationships in their schools despite the growing pressures to focus on examination results. It is critical of the view that an education is primarily a means to produce well-qualified workers and seeks to understand the practical steps that these headteachers take to promote all aspects of an education, not just the measurable ones. It finds that, although challenging and slower, it is possible to improve a school by focussing on relationships rather than results first.

## **Introduction**

For three years, I have been teaching science at a comprehensive school, one that does not have selection requirements on entry, in South-East England in an area of social deprivation. There are “thirty-two neighbourhoods” in the surrounding area of my school that are “ranked in the 20% most deprived nationally and 12 ranked in the 10% most deprived” (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2015). Since I have been working at the school, many students have struggled to achieve good General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) qualifications. Both in 2015 and 2016 the percentage of students gaining at least a grade C GCSE in English and maths was 35%, compared to a 59.2% average in 2015 and a 63.0% average in 2016 for English state-funded schools (U.K. Government, 2017). These poor results led to staff fearing the next Ofsted inspection. This was fuelled by school leaders using the threat of Ofsted as justifications for new initiatives. For example, a new book-marking policy was introduced in 2015 that focussed on students responding to teacher marking so that a written conversation between teacher and student was visible. The justification for this was not that it was evidence-based and promoted accelerated progress in the students’ learning, but that Ofsted inspectors would be looking for it in books and therefore we had to do it. The headteacher left in July 2016 to move to a school away from the area, although many of the staff felt she ‘jumped ship’ before the overdue inspection.

With a new headteacher, the school started on the path of improvement in September 2016. Given the challenging context, particularly the poor GCSE results in previous years, the attention of school leaders and teachers shifted heavily to the cohort of year 11 students who were next to take their public examinations. Teachers held ‘interventions’ before and after-school every day for students who were not getting satisfactory grades, students would practice taking exams while a teacher guided them through the mark scheme in ‘walking-talking’ mocks, and from a department perspective, it was policy for students to work on an exam question in every lesson. I became growingly concerned that the school was attempting to become a “high performance organisation” that is “dominated by outcomes” (Fielding, 2006). I did not however blame the school for choosing this path of improvement. Rather, my criticism was directed towards the growing rhetoric from the Government of the United Kingdom (U.K.) that “outcomes not methods” (Department for Education, 2016) are what is important. This was designed to give schools more freedom in choosing their methods, but I

believe has actually acted as further motivation for schools to focus primarily on examination results. In my opinion, this culture is detrimental to the development of children. School should be places where children learn about the world around them and learn about how to interact and cooperate with others, not just learn how to pass exams.

Given the tension between my educational values and current Government rhetoric, I became interested in the subject of headteachers whose values were challenged by policy introduced by either local or national Government (Rayner, 2014; Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015). I decided to focus my research on headteachers who led schools that did not conform to the “high-performance” school Fielding (2006) described. In particular, I wanted to find answers to the following questions: (a) how do school leaders who maintain a focus on personal relationships in schools manage to balance their values with the pressures to comply with performance targets related to outcomes? (b) What challenges have these leaders faced, given their non-conformity? (c) how have they overcome these challenges? and finally, (d) when these headteachers encounter Ofsted inspectors or Government officials, are they honest in their approach or are they forced to ‘play the game’ (Eacott, 2011, Addison, 2009, quoted in Rayner, 2014)?

### **Critical Literature review**

I will begin this review by contrasting opposing views to the question posed by Young (2011): “What are schools for?” or, in my own words, what is the purpose of education? I will explore three answers to this question: (1) that education is a means to get qualifications, a well-paid job and therefore contribute to the national or global economy; (2) that education is a means of promoting human flourishing and well-being; and (3) that education is the transmission of knowledge. Recent rhetoric from the U.K. Government suggest that they take the first answer to be true, while many academics believe in either the second or third. I will then explore how this debate affects school leaders; in particular, how leaders of schools that are funded by the Government, and are therefore accountable to them, cope when their answer to the question ‘what is the purpose of education?’ is at odds with the Government’s answer.

### **The purpose of education: defining the debate**

The debate on the purpose of education has been happening for thousands of years, and it certainly continues today (Beard, 2016). The UK parliamentary education select committee recently carried out an inquiry into the purpose of education. One member (Education Committee, 2016) summarises the purpose of the enquiry, “One of the things that led us to this inquiry was this vexed question about what is the output of our system about. Is it about producing, in a utilitarian way, units for the labour market or is it about producing well-rounded human beings who can function well in all strands of society, including the labour market?” This comment is reflected in the literature that addresses the purpose of education; most views can be placed somewhere on a spectrum between the idea that education is a means to get a good job and help the economy, or that education is a means to promoting all aspects of human flourishing and well-being. In the following section, I shall start by exploring ideas at the former end of the spectrum and work my way through to the latter end.

Young (2011) argues that the recent prevailing belief of neoliberalism by U.K. Governments has had a profound effect on the education system: “New Labour... argued that the market offered the best solution for improving the public as well as the private sector – and

education in particular. This had... consequences that are relevant to the question ‘what are schools for?’ One has been the attempt to gear the outcomes of schools to what are seen to be the ‘needs of the economy’”. In the Department for Education’s (2010) white paper, a document that sets out future policies, the foreword written by the former Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister states, “what really matters is how we’re doing compared with our international competitors. That is what will define our economic growth and our country’s future. The truth is, at the moment we are standing still while others race past.” This view is echoed by former Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, “for all the well-intentioned efforts of past governments we are still falling further behind the best performing school systems in the world... that matters because business is more mobile than ever, and employers are more determined than ever to seek out the best-qualified workers. Global economic pressures, far from leading to a race to the bottom, are driving all nations to pursue educational excellence more energetically than ever before” (Department for Education, 2013). Using this argument as justification, Gove proceeded to make widespread changes to the British education system. Speaking on these reforms, the current Secretary of State for Education, Justine Greening, writes, “we have revised our GCSE qualifications in England to make them more rigorous, with more demanding content so our young people have the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Britain and to match those of their peers in high-performing education systems elsewhere in the world” (Department for Education, 2017). The dominant rhetoric from recently previous and current Governments is that the purpose of the education system is to provide well-qualified workers to strengthen the economy, or as the Minister of State for School Standards, Nick Gibb, puts it “education is the engine of our economy” (Department for Education, 2015b).

The position that education is a means to improve the economy is fuelled by international comparisons of students (Department for Education, 2010; 2013). The most-cited comparison is the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which is carried out by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). PISA assess the ability of a sample of 15-year-old students in science, maths and reading from many different countries (for example, in 2015 72 countries took part (OECD, 2015)). The foreword for the 2010 Department for Education’s (2010) white paper states “In the most recent OECD PISA survey in 2006 we fell from 4th in the world in the 2000 survey to 14th in science, 7th to 17th in literacy, and 8th to 24th in mathematics. The only way we can catch up, and have the world-class schools our children deserve, is by learning the lessons of other countries’ success.”. To add to the comparisons, news outlets run headlines such as “PISA tests; UK lags behind in global school rankings” (Coughlan, BBC, 2016) and “UK schools fail to climb international league tables” (Adams *et al.*, The Guardian, 2016). There are however several flaws to PISA methodology which arguably makes international comparisons illegitimate. Coe (2013) makes convincing arguments that PISA rankings should not be compared over time. For example, he explains how in the 2000 and 2003 PISA rankings 15-year-old students from year 10 and 11 were chosen, whereas in 2006 and 2009 only 15-year-olds in year 11 were chosen. Moreover, some countries such as China are allowed to take samples from their most-educated cities, such as Shanghai and Beijing, rather than from the country as a whole (Sands, 2017). According to Sands, this means PISA is contributing to a “cover-up of the huge disparities in education among Asian provinces. Almost two-thirds of all Chinese children live in rural areas, where school attendance rates can be as low as 40%. A survey by the China Association for Science and Technology showed only 6.2% of the Chinese people held basic science literacy in 2015.” This is not to say that PISA is totally illegitimate, but that using it to highlight national failings against competing countries should be done with caution.

Perhaps most damningly, an open letter written by educational academics to the director of PISA states “by emphasising a narrow range of measurable aspects of education, Pisa takes attention away from the less measurable or immeasurable educational objectives like physical, moral, civic and artistic development, thereby dangerously narrowing our collective imagination regarding what education is and ought to be about” (Guardian, 2014). One such example of this in the English education system is the introduction of the English Baccalaureate (EBacc). In the past schools have been judged by the percentage of students who gain five A\*-C GCSE grades in subjects including English and maths. Now, schools will be judged, among other targets, on the percentage of students that enter and achieve EBacc. To achieve the EBacc a student must get a ‘good pass’ GCSE (a grade 5 in the new 1-9 GCSE grading system, equivalent of a low B or a high C in the old grading system) in English Language, maths, at least 2 sciences, history or geography and a language (Department for Education, 2017). The government wants to make the percentage of students entering and achieving the EBacc a headline figure for Ofsted to use as part of their inspections and so parents can compare schools (Department for Education, 2017). They have set a target of 90% of students entering the EBacc by 2020; in 2016 only 36.8% of students took the subjects that entered them for the EBacc (U.K. Government, 2017). This target means that more students will take the core subjects mentioned above, which means fewer students will experience a wider curriculum, such as studying creative arts, social sciences or vocational subjects. Robinson (2010) is critical of current education systems as he believes they only celebrate one type of intelligence, academic intelligence. This, he argues, has led to students being categorised as academic, and therefore successful, or non-academic, and therefore a failure. Rather, there are several different types of intelligence. The U.K. Government’s introduction of the EBacc sends the message that academic intelligence is the only, or at least the only *valuable*, type of intelligence. The rationale behind the EBacc and the 90% target is that it will “make sure that pupils get the rigorous academic education they need to succeed – whether that is getting a place at university, starting an apprenticeship, or finding their first job” (Department for Education, 2015a). This highlights the government’s current view on the purpose of education: that an education is a means to get a good job and contribute to the economy. This belief, along with international rankings such as PISA, has inspired the Government to re-design qualifications in the education system in order to produce “the best-qualified workers” (Department for Education, 2013).

Biesta (2013) agrees that one of the purposes of education is to provide “*qualification* – that is, the ways in which it qualifies children and young people to do certain things. Qualification is about the acquisition of knowledge, skills and dispositions, both those that allow children and students to do very specific things... and function in modern society”. Sir Michael Wilshaw, the former Chief Inspector of Ofsted, which inspects and evaluates all publicly-funded schools across the England, not only believes that qualifications are important, but goes further in suggesting that they lead to happiness:

*When you educate children well they tend to do well in life. The more qualifications they get the more skills they get, the better chance they have to get a good job and to do well in life and to be happy as well...If they get a job and they do pass their exams and they see themselves as successful academically then they will be happy and contented individuals.*

(Education Committee, 2016)

While I understand Wilshaw's point that academic success *may* lead to happiness, this is only one of many factors that contributes to a person's happiness and it is entirely possible to be academically successfully but thoroughly unhappy. Indeed, although Biesta (2013) believes that qualifications are important, he argues they should not be the sole focus of an education system, "whilst I do not deny the importance of work, it is neither the be-all and end-all of education, nor the be-all and end-all of life. It is therefore, rather narrow-minded to tie up education so strongly with the global economy". Instead, he argues that there are many purposes of education, the second one being *socialisation*. "Socialisation can be understood as the ways in which through education children and young people become part of particular traditions and practices – that is, of particular cultural, social, historical, political, religious (and so on) 'orders'". Dewey (1934) agrees with this view: "The purpose of education has always been to every one, in essence, the same—to give the young the things they need in order to develop in an orderly, sequential way into members of society". An example of *socialisation* in schools across the UK is the Government's expectation that schools are explicitly teaching 'British values', such as the rule of law and individual liberty, to students (Department for Education, 2014), as well as their academic subjects. Finally, Biesta describes a third purpose of education called *subjectification*, which "has to do with the ways in which education contributes to the formation of the person". For Biesta then, education is a means to develop good, kind and responsible human beings, as well as a means of getting qualifications and therefore a good job.

White (2007) states that we all want children to have a successful life, which he defines as "success in worthwhile activities and relationships which they have freely engaged in and which they pursue wholeheartedly". The first indicator of success in this statement, carrying out worthwhile activities, is similar to Peters' first criterion of what constitutes an education: "education implies the transmission of what is worth-while to those who become committed to it" (Peters, 1966, pp.45). However, this idea is problematic; what is considered worth-while depends on cultural, religious and moral upbringing and so the usefulness of this criterion is limited in understanding the purpose of education. Peters (1966, pp.25) concedes that "this is an entirely conceptual point... [it] does not imply any particular commitment to content." Similarly, White (2007) admits that this view is can lead to paternalism.

White's (2007) view that the purpose of education involves learning how to have successful relationships with other people echoes Biesta's (2013) "formation of the person". This view is shared by Fielding (2006; 2012). Fielding (2012) is critical of the view that an education is a means to get a good job, "whilst the insistent realities of earning a living, then as now, must necessarily and properly feature in education they should not comprise the whole or even the most part of it". Rather, having an education is about "learning to be human" (Macmurray, 1958). Fielding has been heavily influenced by the work of Macmurray, particularly on relationships in schools:

*Macmurray suggests that 'functional' or instrumental relations are typical of those encounters that help us to get things done in order to achieve our purposes... In contrast, 'personal' relations exist in order to help us be and become ourselves in and through our relations with others and part of that becoming involves our mutual preparedness to be open and honest with each other about all aspects of our being*  
(Fielding, 2006)

To illustrate these types of relationships, Fielding (2006) uses the example of the functional act of marriage an an expression of the love within a personal relationship. This, according to

Fielding, is the ideal type of human relationship: “Personal through the Functional... Within systems of compulsory education, schooling (the functional) is for the sake of education (the personal)”. Schools in which all functional actions are for the sake of the personal relationships that are flourishing is, according to Fielding (2006), the most desirable type of school; the “person-centred school”. In reality, “the personal is as subservient to the functional as it has ever been... The high performing school is an organisation in which the personal is used for the sake of the functional.” Reflecting on my own experience, I can remember the leader of a training session stressing the importance of good relationships with students, but for the primary purpose of improving their exam results, and therefore improving the overall exam results for the school. Here, personal relationships are being used, or even exploited, to better a functional outcome. The growing culture of schools focussing on qualifications through high-stakes testing is having a detrimental effect to the personal nature of education. Indeed, Peters’ distinction between ‘training’ and ‘education’ questions whether our current education system can even be called an ‘education’ system. He argues “‘training’ has application when a skill or competence has to be acquired which is to be exercised in relation to a specific end or function” (1966, pp. 34) whereas an education “suggests a linkage with a wider system of beliefs” (pp. 32). Using this distinction, are examinations testing how well-trained children are rather than how well-educated they are? At times, when dedicating numerous lessons to teaching how to unpick the details of a mark scheme, it feels I am training my students to pass their science exam rather than educating them to see the world from a scientific perspective. This culture is worrisome for the new Chief Inspector of Ofsted, Amanda Spielman (2017), “as a visitor to schools and as an observer of some of our inspections. In some of those, I have seen GCSE assessment objectives tracking back into Year 7, and SAT practice papers starting in Year 4. And I’ve seen lessons where everything is about the exam and where teaching the mark schemes has a bigger place than teaching history.” She goes on to say, ““Yes, education does have to prepare young people to succeed in life and make their contribution in the labour market. But to reduce education down to this kind of functionalist level is rather wretched. Because education should be about broadening minds, enriching communities and advancing civilisation. Ultimately, it is about leaving the world a better place than we found it.” This is an interesting change from Wilshaw’s, the former Chief Inspector, view, “My ambition at Ofsted is to see children doing well academically. We want our children to read and write well. We want them to go to secondary school and get their five A\*-C grades” (Education Committee, 2016). Spielman’s view on the purpose of education seems to be much broader than Wilshaw’s and this may lead to future changes in the education system. Spielman (2017) concedes that Ofsted are partly to blame in that they provide the standards that schools aspire to. I agree with this; I believe schools focus on exams and their mark schemes in lessons out of fear for the consequences of poor examination results. One of the consequences could be an Ofsted inspection that leads to a negative grading, which could in turn lead to changes in management and fewer students applying to the school (Jones and Tymms, 2014). Ofsted then certainly do need to share part of the blame for the growing focus on examinations in schools.

To continue exploring the view that education is a means for “learning to be human” (Macmurray, 1958), Foshay (1991) concurs, stating:

*The one continuing purpose of education, since ancient times, has been to bring people to as full a realization as possible of what it is to be a human being. Other statements of educational purpose have also been widely accepted: to develop the intellect, to serve social needs, to contribute to the economy, to create an effective*

*work force, to prepare students for a job or career, to promote a particular social or political system. These purposes offered are undesirably limited in scope, and in some instances they conflict with the broad purpose I have indicated; they imply a distorted human existence. The broader humanistic purpose includes all of them, and goes beyond them, for it seeks to encompass all the dimensions of human experience.*

Foshay (1991)

While I agree that focussing purely on qualifications will lead to “a distorted human experience” (Foshay, 1991), I believe this concept is too broad to practically work with. What does it mean to be human? The question itself is so broad, can we expect school leaders to take the most important parts of ‘being human’ and successfully make it part of the education they provide? In my experience as a teacher, I have not found an example of an education that “encompasses *all* the dimensions of human experience” (Foshay, 1991, italics added) and I think I will be looking for a long time to come.

Young (2011) disagrees with Foshay’s (1991) view that “developing intellect... impl[ies] a distorted intellect”. Indeed, he argues it is the only purpose of education that has intrinsic rather than instrumental value (Young, 2011). He argues specifically that education as a *means* to promote human happiness and well-being is only giving education instrumental value. Similarly, Peters (1966, pp.27) is critical of the view that education is a means to improve the economy, “it is only too easy to conceive of education as a neutral process that is instrumental to something that is worthwhile which is extrinsic to it... [i.e.] children must be educated in order to provide them with jobs to increase the productivity of the community as a whole”. But Peters argues that having this as a goal would mean that ‘training’ not ‘education’ was taking place, as ‘education’ requires intrinsic purpose such as “the development of intellect and character” (pp.27). Youngs (2011) goes on to propose that schools have “the very specific purpose of promoting the acquisition of knowledge” and that they “provide access to concepts which enable young people to move beyond their experience in ways that would not be open to them in their families and communities”. Indeed, Young observes that “a focus on the acquisition of knowledge is at odds with the more instrumental purposes that are increasingly supported by governments.” A focus on economic output may be too narrow and a focus on the entire human experience may be too wide; perhaps school leaders should focus instead on Young’s (2011) view and avoid the debate altogether.

The question ‘what is the purpose of education?’ is a challenging philosophical one, and I have only touched on a few answers. I have shown, however, that there are many different answers to the question and that, broadly speaking, the answers from the Government differs to answers from academics; notably the Government believes education is a means to qualifications and therefore economic ends while some academics believe it is either a means of “learning to be human” (Macmurray, 1958) or that it is for the transmission of knowledge that students would otherwise not have access to. I will now go onto exploring the effects of this tension on schools and school leaders.

### **The effect on schools and school leaders**

The accountability of the UK education system has been steadily increasing over the past 20 years (Young, 2011) through the use Ofsted inspections, performance targets and league tables of schools’ examination results. I am going to focus on the effect that Ofsted has had

on schools and school leaders as, according to a survey of teachers and school leaders, Ofsted inspections are the accountability measure that causes the most concern (Hutchings, 2014).

Since 2006, it has been law that Ofsted's primary purpose is to encourage the improvement of schools (Jones and Tymms, 2014). However, only 19% of teachers believe that Ofsted is a "force for improvement in England's education system" and 69% believe "Ofsted exists primarily to help the government of the day advance its education agenda" (Ofsted, 2017). This disapproval has been recognised by the new Chief Inspector of Ofsted, who wants Ofsted to be seen as a "force for improvement" (Adams & Weale, 2017). Jones and Tymms (2014) created a program theory which described the ways in which an inspection leads to school improvement. The outcome was five if/then statements. The first states:

- 1. Setting standards. If schools are given details (criteria and descriptors) on the standard of performance expected of schools then they will attempt to meet those expectations and this will have a positive impact on average*

Ofsted have significant power over schools as school leaders are expected to focus on meeting the "standard of performance expected of schools" (Jones and Tymms, 2014). Therefore, if Ofsted focuses on schools' examination results, schools will do too. It would be unfair to describe Ofsted as focussing purely on academic results, inspectors make judgements on five key areas, of which "outcomes for pupils" is only one (Ofsted, 2015). However, when in charge of Ofsted, Wilshaw (Education Committee, 2016) was clear he wanted to focus on "children doing well academically... We want them to go to secondary school and get their five A\*-C grades". Similarly, the Department for Education (2016) celebrate that they are concerned with "outcomes not methods", which they believe gives more autonomy to schools. Young (2011) argues that schools are "required to concentrate on outcomes and pay little attention to the process or content of delivery... With schools driven by targets, assignments and league tables, it is no wonder that pupils become bored and teachers experience 'burn out'." A culture of 'outcomes over methods' has meant some schools, due to excellent examination results, have not had an Ofsted inspection in seven years (Telegraph, 2017). The issue here is that these schools could be focussing too much on examinations, leaving their students unhappy and alienated, but are not held to account for the happiness of their students. This has been recognised by the new Chief Inspector of Ofsted who, as I have already mentioned, has visited schools where teaching the mark scheme to an exam was more prevalent than teaching subject content (Spielman, 2017). Spielman believes the reason for the focus on examinations is that "if told our job depends on clearing a particular bar, [we] will try to give ourselves the best chance of securing that outcome". Perhaps change is on the way in which "Ofsted inspections must explore what is behind the data, asking how results have been achieved". While this is an interesting change in rhetoric, these comments are recent at the time of writing and so no concrete change to Ofsted frameworks have yet been made.

I discussed earlier of Fielding (2006; 2012) and Macmurray's (1958) work on functional and personal relationships and how this affects schools. Fielding (2006) criticises the growing culture of accountability as "fundamentally corrosive to human flourishing". His work describes four types of school: the 'impersonal', 'affective', 'high performance' and 'person-centred'. He argues that the person-centred type of school should be the goal for school improvement in which "the functional is for the sake of the personal". This means that the function of preparing students for an exam is for the sake of that student's academic development. Instead, the "'high performance' learning organisation... currently dominates

much of contemporary advocacy and practice”. Fielding believes that ‘high performance schools’ are “dominated by outcomes, by measured attainment” and “the significance of both students and teachers rests primarily in their contribution, usually via high-stakes testing, to the public performance of the organisation”. Contrastingly, a person-centred school is “committed to wider human purposes”.

Wilshaw defends the growing culture of accountability by recalling a time where schools were less accountable:

*As somebody who taught in the 1970s and the 1980s when standards were abysmally low and where this country failed generation after generation of children because of poor accountability, poor teaching and poor leadership, and because Governments did not take as much of an interest in education as they do now. Have things improved? Yes, they have. One of the reasons they have improved is because schools are much more accountable, not just to Ofsted but through the examination and testing system that we have.*

(Education Committee, 2016)

I agree with Wilshaw that there should be an element of accountability in the English education system, all publically-funded organisations have a duty to prove that the money they receive is being spent on providing a satisfactory service. However, the consensus of many academics is that this focus on accountability has gone too far (Fielding, 2006; White, 2007; Young, 2011; Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015), particularly as the view that the education system has improved in the last 30 years is contentious at best (Coe, 2013).

School leaders have the challenging job of choosing the direction in which to lead their schools. If the direction that they want to take their school in is in-line with Ofsted’s or the Government’s direction, that they should focus primarily on student examination results, then they should face relatively few challenges on the journey. However, if the school leader’s direction contrasts with Ofsted and the Government’s, it is often not that simple. Smith and Bell (2011) highlight a paradox for school leaders; while the head teachers they interviewed and academic literature (Shields, 2010) prefer transformational leadership as a favourable style for school improvement, they are forced to adopt transactional leadership “to respond to external pressures exerted upon head teachers to embed policies, deal with underperformance or respond to Ofsted inspections” (Smith and Bell, 2011). Hammersley-Fletcher (2015) writes about “the tension [head teachers] face when juggling government prescription and government initiatives, which may be antagonistic to their educational values and beliefs”. She summarises this as a “value vs. values” debate where “the term ‘value’ is used in relation to school productivity of outcomes, and ‘values’ is used in relation to educational ethical positioning”. Her research comprised of written reflections from head teachers. There was clear evidence that head teachers followed their own values:

*As a leader I try to introduce those changes that I and my team believe will benefit the experiences and attainment of our pupils and minimise change if it goes against my personal values*

*If I turn my attention to local or national government I have to turn my back on the pupil*

*I keep coming back to the basic principle that the children come first and I am their champion so that helps me maintain sanity*

(Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015)

However many head teachers, including the same head teachers who made the statements above, wrote of the difficulty of balancing external pressure with their own values:

*I think it is easy to forget what your educational values are with the maelstrom of decisions that we have to take all bound up with legalities and the threat of Ofsted*

*If I'm honest I'm terrified of failure and the punitive approaches that the Government set for school inspection/improvements*

(Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015)

These findings led Hammersley-Fletcher (2015) to conclude that “it is not uncommon for people to weaken in their values-driven stance when under great pressure.” She cites the work of Lumby (2012) who indicates cynically that, “the threat of sanctions and public judgement are weapons that can be used to focus head teachers more fully on meeting publically recognised targets rather than leaving them to question the political environment in relation to educational practice”. While interesting, it is important to note that the sample size for the research carried out by Hammersley-Fletcher (2015) was small (eight head teachers) and that it was rather one-sided in that it only took headteachers opinions into account. In this research, there was no attempt to justify why value-based principles had been introduced into education.

Precey (2016) believes that the core element of leadership is values “that motivate and direct the leaders as to why and how they do the job”. He goes on to write that “leaders need thought-through values that enable ethical decision-making that keeps that organisation on course with a sharp focus”. These values are perhaps best tested in what he called the “Critical Junction” (2008). He describes a metaphor where head teachers are deciding which train to get on. One leads to a place called ‘Standards’, while the other leads to ‘Every Child Matters’. Every Child Matters was a U.K. Government policy that responded to the failings of many public institutions, such as social services and the NHS, to save the life of Victoria Climbié. Its aim was to “ensure that every child has the chance to fulfil their potential by reducing levels of educational failure, ill health, substance misuse, teenage pregnancy, abuse and neglect, crime and anti-social behaviour among children and young people.” (Department for Education, 2003). The destination of the Standards train was “successful employment in a competitive global market” (Precey, Clapham Junction), whereas the Every Child Matters train led to a place where “people are happy, healthy, wealthy and wise”. Precey describes school leaders’ fear of following their own beliefs instead of Ofsted’s:

*Many [school leaders] firmly believe that their values, their hearts and their inner minds tell them they must be guided by a holistic approach, seeing the child as a whole human being. But they are painfully aware that an inspector might appear at any moment to make sure they are on the Standards train.*

(Precey, 2008)

Wilshaw (Education Committee, 2016), however, would not see a distinction between the two destinations; he argues “the more qualifications they get the more skills they get, the better chance they have to get a good job and to do well in life and to be happy as well.”. The

two agendas are linked, standards of academic education must be improved for students to go onto lead happy and successful lives. Furthermore, Wilshaw stresses the importance of the fundamentals: “If [students] cannot read and they cannot write and they do not understand the nation’s history and they do not understand our place in the world they are going to be limited.” Again, I partially agree with Wilshaw. Schools do need to equip students with the basic skills, they are places where people can get qualifications, and I understand the importance of qualifications; they give you the opportunity to do what you want to do later in life. Schools must therefore focus on getting students the qualifications that the students want and need. The argument I am developing is not anti-qualifications, rather it is anti-schools-that-focus-*only*-on-qualifications, “high-performance” schools (Fielding, 2006).

In this section, I have illustrated a challenge for school leaders: when leading a school, do they follow their own values or do they try to meet the standards set by Ofsted and the Government? This leads me to my first and second research questions, in which I have used Fielding’s (2006) typology of schools:

- 1. What challenges do school leaders of ‘person-centred’ schools face when they try to lead to schools that differs from the ‘high-performance’ school advocated by the government and Ofsted?**
- 2. How do they overcome these challenges?**

### **“Values vs. Value”: Finding a balance**

Hammersley-Fletcher (2015)

In the face of increasing globalisation and social change, Biesta (2013) challenges school leaders to be responsible rather than responsive. In the context of the “value vs. values” (Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015) debate, what is the *responsible* course of action for school leaders? This tension between raising standards of academic education and developing the whole child will continue for a long time to come. The practical question to ask then is not ‘which side is right?’ but ‘how to head teachers find a balance?’. Precey (2008) describes school leaders trying to find a “middle way” while Hammersley-Fletcher (2015) writes “the reality is therefore developing interplay between value and values in a manner that allows the head teacher to survive”.

Striking a balance between value and values requires careful and ethical decision-making from school leaders. For example, a head teacher in a study by Rayner (2014) describes a challenging ethical decision of the school’s policy on exclusions. On the one hand, this head teacher felt permanently excluding a student was giving up on them and inherently wrong and therefore against his *values*, while on the other hand it would be beneficial for the other students in the class and therefore add *value* to their school lives, including their examination results. Robbins and Trabichet (2009) describe several schools of thought for ethical decision-making, but note “educational leadership training programmes are lacking a consideration of ethics”. Perhaps then the most effective leaders, who can find the balance, are aware of how they make difficult ethical decisions.

The idea that head teachers should be finding a balance rather than choosing a side is supported by a recent study of 411 UK head teachers (Hill *et al.*, 2016). The results describe five types of head teacher: the Surgeon, Solider, Accountant, Philosopher and the Architect. The Surgeon sees their job as primarily improving the next set of exam results, or as

Hammersley-Fletcher (2015) would say “adding value”. “To quickly boost exam scores, they typically remove poor performing students, cut out non-essential activities, move the best teachers to the final year, reduce class sizes and increase revision” (Hill *et al.*, 2016). According to this study, results do go up while the Surgeon is around but, once they have left, results then dramatically decrease. This is because younger students have been neglected and under-resourced. The study is critical of the current climate whereby surgeons are the most valued type of head teacher, typically receiving 50% more pay than the other types.

Another type of head teacher, at the opposite end of the spectrum in the “value vs values” debate (Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015), are the Philosophers. “Philosophers debate and discuss, focussing on values... they believe schools fail because they’re not teaching their students properly” (Hill *et al.*, 2016). This is exciting for teachers initially but “fundamentally, nothing changes. Students carry on misbehaving, parents are still not engaged, and performance... stays the same”. Out of the 411 head teachers interviewed in the study, Philosophers made up 82%, making them the most frequently appointed. However, the authors write “they were the worst performing leaders in our study, both during and after their tenure”. A leader that focuses only on *values* may be as bad as a leader that focuses only on *value*.

Hill *et al.* (2016) proposes the best type of head teacher is the least recognised and least rewarded: the Architect. “In short, they take a 360-degree view of the school, its stakeholders, the community it serves, and its role in society”. They make changes “to transform students and communities”. “Performance is slow to improve... But then examination results start improving in the third year of their tenure and continue improving long after they’ve left”. The Architect seems the type of head teacher that finds Precey’s (2008) “middle way” of leadership, both improving examination results and improving the other aspects of the students’ lives. Hill *et al.*’s (2016) study asks why more Architects are not appointed. They suggest changing the way we measure a head teacher’s impact towards one that appreciates long-term improvement. Currently if a school receives a Requires Improvement judgement from Ofsted, they will “usually have a full re-inspection within 2 years + monitoring visits” (Roberts & Abreu, 2017). In theory then, the school could be re-inspected long before examination results improve under the leadership of an Architect. A second negative inspection could add pressure for the Architect to leave, before the long-term benefits are seen. Somewhat cynically, many believe school leadership is a game to play, with the rules set by policy-makers (Eacott, 2011, Addison, 2009, quoted in Rayner, 2014). For Architects to survive and bring about the transformational changes Hill *et al.* (2016) describe, do they need to be able to play the game? For school leaders, finding a balance of following their values and improving the value of the school’s examination results is key to success. This brings me to my third research question:

### **3. How do school leaders of ‘person-centred’ schools balance the development of the whole person while meeting performance targets?**

Continuing with this metaphor, when playing the game, is it wise to change tactics when playing different opposition? Would a leader change the decisions they make and the message they deliver if they were in front of parents, teachers, students or even Ofsted inspectors?

Bennis and Thomas, (2002) describe one of the four essential leadership skills as “adaptive capacity”, the ability of a leader to adapt to different contexts, or even different audiences. El-Sawad *et al.* (2004) goes further to say people use what they call “doublethink” to appease

two contradictory beliefs. They define doublethink as “when one individual holds simultaneously two (or more) conflicting beliefs”. The act of doublethink is “not conscious” and therefore people who use it do not notice they hold two contradictory beliefs. “Participants in our study have more than one personal narrative. Whilst each individual narrative may be internally consistent and coherent, it frequently conflicts with and contradicts other narratives which the individual articulates”. Do school leaders hold conflicting views that changes depending on the situation they are in or audience they are in front of? If so, do they know the beliefs are contradictory?

George *et al.* (2007) disagrees with the use of doublethink for leaders. Instead, they praise the authentic leader; “Authentic leaders demonstrate a passion for their purpose, practice their values consistently, and lead with their hearts as well as their heads. They establish long-term, meaningful relationships and have the self-discipline to get results”. Instead of changing leadership style to suit a specific situation or audience, the best leaders “tested themselves through real-world experiences and reframed their life stories to understand who they were at their core. In doing so, they discovered the purpose of their leadership and learned that being authentic made them more effective”. This disagreement on whether leaders should be authentic or adaptive raises my fourth and final research question:

- 4. To what extent does the message leaders convey of their values and type of school they lead change depending on the situation they are in or the audience they are in front of?**

## **Methodology**

My research is an exploratory multiple-case study (Yin, 1984; 2009, cited in Cohen, 2011, pp.291). I will begin the methodology by explaining my choice of design, and evaluating the benefits and drawbacks of it. I will then explain the choice of data collection methods and how I carried them out, taking into consideration the ethical implication of each. Finally, I will comment on the validity and reliability of my research design.

## **Research design**

My research focused on the leaders of “person-centred” schools and the challenges they face when the leaders and regulators, the Government and Ofsted, of the English education system support school improvement in the direction of “high-performance organisation” (Fielding, 2006). I therefore chose to write case studies on selected ‘person-centred’ schools and their leaders. This type of research has been described as “collective case studies – groups of individual studies that are undertaken to gain a fuller picture” (Stake, 1994, cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp. 291) or “*multiple-case design* e.g. comparative case studies within an overall piece of research” (Yin, 2009, cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp. 291). The major benefit of multiple case studies is the ability to compare between them; Campbell (1975, pp.180, cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp. 291) suggests that having two case studies for comparative purposes is preferable than having double the amount of data on a single case-study. Data for each case study came from three sources: a semi-structured interview with headteachers, analysis of documents found on the school website and analysis of published data on school performance tables on the Government’s (2017) website.

I chose a case study approach as I felt it was the most appropriate method to explore my research questions. The research questions focus on the experiences of school leaders; this

means I was interested primarily in their stories of events that have occurred or decisions they have taken, and their perspectives and reflections of those events or decisions. My main source of evidence therefore was their answers to the semi-structured interviews that were conducted; this provided the narrative. I decided to use documents and data from the schools' and the Government's website as further sources of evidence for three reasons: (1) to collect more data on emerging themes that arose from the interviews, (2) as triangulation to improve the "concurrent validity" (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.179) of the study and (3) to prove that the schools were meeting the 'performance targets' referred to in my third research question.

Before writing the case studies, I analysed the interview transcripts and documents using content analysis (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.559-573; Brundrett and Rhodes, 2014, pp.145-149). The case studies are therefore a product of interview and document analysis, and were used to "selectively illustrate specific themes" (Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.552). I discuss how I carried out this analysis of the data later in the methodology.

In writing the case studies, I chose to follow a narrative structure; the studies were written in prose with relevant figures and quotes interspersed throughout (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.301). Where applicable, I have attempted to follow Yin's (2009, pp.33, cited by Cohen *et al.*, pp.302) advice that the case studies should report rival explanations of the findings and indicate how the explanation adopted is better than its rivals. While I will use the interview transcripts to generate themes for my findings, a significant advantage of case studies is that they summarise the key points of the interview while providing added evidence from other sources. The evidence as a case study is therefore "more easily understood" and "immediately intelligible" (Nisbett and Watt, 1984, quoted in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.293) to a wider audience than if I were to use the transcripts alone. Further advantages of this research design are that "they can be undertaken by a single researcher without needing a full research team" and "they can catch unique features that can otherwise be lost in larger scale data; these unique features might hold the key to understanding the situation" (Nisbett and Watt, 1984, quoted in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.293). The latter advantage is particularly important; given that it is recommended to become a "high-performance" school instead of a "person-centred" school (Fielding, 2006) it follows that finding enough schools for a large-scale study would be challenging if not impossible, and that it would be more appropriate to focus on a small number of school in order to discover their *unique features*.

According to Nisbett and Watt (1984, quoted in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.293), one major weakness of case study research is, "the results may not be generalizable except where other readers/researchers see their application". Given that I have not carried out random sampling, the sample is not representative of all the different types of schools across the country and it is therefore true that any findings I propose cannot be generalised to the wider population. For example, I cannot infer that the challenges faced by the headteachers in this study are the same challenges faced by headteachers across the country. However, Yin (2009, cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.294) argues that case studies can lead to analytical generalisation, if not statistical generalisation, as "the concern is not so much for a representative sample (indeed the strength of the case study approach is that the case study only represents itself) so much as the ability to contribute to the expansion and generalisation of theory". It is the expansion or exploration of this field of research that I am interested in and so my research design is an *exploratory* multiple-case study which is designed to act "as a pilot to other studies or research questions" Yin, 1984, quoted in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.291).

Instead of random sampling, I conducted “purposive sampling” as it “allows [me] to choose a case because it illustrates some features or process in which [I] am interested” (Silverman, 2014, pp.60). For this research, I selected five ‘person-centred’ schools within the Greater London area: one secondary school, two primary schools and two all-through (primary and secondary) schools. These schools were selected based on recommendations from my University tutor and my own experience and knowledge of these schools. Of the five selected, three agreed to take part, the secondary school and the two primary schools.

Selecting what we considered to be ‘person-centred’ schools raises some methodological issues. It could be argued that this was selection bias – I chose the schools I wanted to study based on my thoughts and opinions and recommendations from my tutor. This is an issue highlighted in the literature, “[case studies] are not easily open to cross-checking; hence they may be selective” (Nisbett and Watt, 1984, quoted in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.293). However, because I decided to use purposive sampling rather than random sampling, in theory I did not see selecting cases as a methodological weakness; although after carrying out the interview, I realised the way this initial selection was carried out did cause two issues. Firstly, relying purely on our opinions to select schools meant there was no criteria as to what actually constituted a ‘person-centred’ school, and secondly that during the interviews none of the headteachers described their schools as ‘person-centred’. Therefore, to call this a study of leaders of ‘person-centred’ schools would be a false label for the headteachers and the schools. I therefore changed the wording of my research questions. To do this, I used the criteria I used to select the schools: schools that seemed to value personal-relationships as well as or more than the value of examination results. Thus, my research questions changed to:

- 1. What challenges do school leaders face when they try to lead to schools that differs from the ‘high-performance’ school advocated by the government?**
- 2. How do schools leaders overcome these challenges?**
- 3. How do school leaders find a balance between being relationship-focussed and meeting external performance targets?**
- 4. To what extent does the message leaders convey of their values and type of school they lead change depending on the situation they are in or the audience they are in front of?**

## **Data collection methods**

### **Interviews**

For this section, I will begin by explaining why I chose to use interviews as a method of data collection. I will then discuss how I designed the interviews and how they were carried out. Next, I will explain how I analysed the data, and finally I will discuss steps I took to ensure the interviews were carried out ethically.

Given that this research is an exploration of this topic, I wanted to start my data collection by co-exploring the experiences of school leaders who I thought were able to balance the development of relationships within schools, while meeting external performance targets. It was obvious then to choose interviews as my initial source of data collection as I wanted my

participants to “discuss their interpretation of the world in which they live” (Cohen *et al.*, 2000, pp.267).

The interviews were carried out from March to April 2017, at a date of the interviewee’s choice. The time of each interview was between 4-5pm as I had to travel from my school to their school. I chose to carry out the interviews at their school as I wanted them to be comfortable in their surroundings. This would hopefully allow them to open-up about their experiences. It is possible that this had the opposite effect as the headteachers may have felt defensive of their schools but I did not notice any sign of this in the interviews. Additionally, logistically it would have been more complicated and time-consuming for the headteachers to meet at a neutral setting, and these were factors I wanted to minimise on their part.

To give some freedom to the discussions I decided to use semi-structured interviews, “where topics and open-ended questions are written but the exact sequence and wording does not have to be followed with each respondent” (Cohen *et al.*, 2000, pp.278). Appendix 1 shows my first attempt at writing an interview schedule, complete with an introduction to the topic, the questions and probes and prompts to use if the dialogue was faltering or the interviewee needed clarification of the question (Cohen *et al.*, 2000, pp.278). At least 24 hours before each interview, I sent a copy of the questions, without probes and prompts, to each headteacher. After each interview, I edited the order and the wording of the next set of questions I would ask the next headteacher. This is notable when comparing appendix 2 and appendix 3, the first and last set of questions I sent the first and last headteachers I interviewed. Editing the interview questions had the drawback that it would be more challenging to compare interviews in my analysis (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.393). However, I felt it necessary to remove parts of the interview that I did not use and provide added structure with the ‘what, how, why’ subtitles, although in practice this had little effect on the order of questions I asked.

I was influenced by Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski’s methodology in their study of wounded leaders:

*Our intent was to facilitate narrative telling and not interfere with the participant’s responses. Thus the discourse of an interview was conversational, not standardised questioning.*

*We did not rush participants, instead letting them speak at great length without interruption. This one-to-one, in-depth approach to interviewing was appropriate because it supported telling personal, sensitive experiences.*

Ackerman & Maslin-Ostrowski (2002, pp.139)

My first research question dealt with understanding the experiences of school leaders when their values were challenged by educational policy or by the standards set by Ofsted. Given this, I decided the best way to draw out these difficult experiences was to adopt Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski’s (2002) conversational approach. Therefore, the re-ordering of the questions between appendix 2 and 3 was designed to provide a smoother flow of conversation, using my experience of previous interviews. However, I may have taken the conversational approach too far when interviewing. Comparing the interview transcripts (Appendices 4, 5 and 6), the order and even content of the questions show little similarity to each other, and to the proposed questions in appendix 2 and 3. In practice, the interviews become more “*unstructured*” (Brundrett and Rhodes, 2014, pp.81) than *semi-structured*, or

an “informal conversational interview” in which “questions emerge from the immediate context and are asked in the natural course of things” (Patton, 1980, quoted in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.413). As I have said, this is partly because I wanted to follow Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski’s (2002) conversational methodology which enabled participants to open-up about their own experiences. Admittedly, it was also partly due to my inexperience as an interviewer, which I will discuss further in my reflexive analysis.

To reveal leaders’ important experiences and how it affected them, Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski (2002, pp.146) use the case *storey* methodology. This is a five-step process that involves written accounts, interviews, and group reflections. It was my intention to take ideas from this and incorporate it into my own methodology. For example, I had planned to follow up my initial interview with a secondary interview that had a more-focussed line of questioning. However, I finished writing the interview transcripts in June and by that time in was nearly the end of the school year. I felt that designing a second round of interview questions, each individualised for each head teacher would be rushed. Additionally, I was aware that the head teachers had already given up an afternoon of their time and that I had not asked for a second interview before. This highlights a weakness of interviews as a data collection tool, “[to carry out an interview] takes much longer than place a tick in a rating scale response box” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.393). The time-constraint of interviews was a particular issue for me as the head teachers were from schools in the Greater London area, whereas I was teaching at a school in Medway. This meant I was confined to visiting in after-school hours.

Before any data analysis, “the researcher must be clear what s/he wants the data analysis to do as this will determine the kind of analysis that is undertaken” (Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.358). This is so that the analysis can be judged as *fit for purpose* or not. Given that I want my research to act as an initial exploration of the subject, I decided the purpose of the analysis was to “generate themes” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.538). From my methodological research, I then decided that “content analysis” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.559-573; Brundrett and Rhodes, 2014, pp.145-149) would be suitable as it enabled categorisation of the data into themes. Following the recommendations of Cohen *et al.* (2011, pp.559-573) in carrying out content analysis, I began by coding the transcripts. The codes were generated responsively (after the data collection) for the simple reason that I did not know what I would find out. A list of the codes and the criteria I used for text to be labelled with the code can be found in appendix 11. I used the codes to develop themes that I then categorised; one for each research question and the last entitled ‘additional themes’ for any interesting themes that arose but did not fit as answers to the research questions. Here, Cohen *et al.* (2011) recommends quantification of the analysis, such as counting the number of times a certain theme arises. However, I diverged from these recommendations as I believed a counting exercise would have provided a shallow exploration of the subject. Inspired by the presentation of Rayner’s (2014) article, I preferred to summarise the “key concepts and key areas for subsequent investigation” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.568) in the ‘findings’ section, quoting verbatim extracts from the transcripts as well as exploring my own interpretation of the analysis.

Cohen *et al.* (2011, pp.442) describes three main areas of ethical consideration for interviews: “informed consent, confidentiality and the consequences of the interview”. I approached each participant via e-mail and received reply e-mails of consent from four out of the five headteachers selected, although only three took part in the study as one had to postpone the interview on numerous occasions and eventually cancelled. In my initial e-mail and before the interview began, I guaranteed the three participants their confidentiality, and that of the

school and any colleagues they mention. I also explained to the participants that I would be recording the interview, writing a transcript of what was said and then deleting the only copy of the recording. I ensured that the transcripts did not contain any material that could identify the headteachers or the schools. For example, I called school A's curriculum the "EF curriculum" as its full name would identify the school with a simple internet search. Full details of the ethical considerations can be found in appendix 12.

Given that this research was designed to be an exploration of participants' experiences, there was the possibility that discussing these experiences could cause emotional harm. I therefore was careful to judge whether they felt uncomfortable in responding to my questions and if they were, I would move onto a different topic. I did not note any such behaviour from any of the participants. Finally, each participant was aware that the transcript of the interview would form part of my dissertation. I therefore sent the transcripts of the interviews back to each participant to give them an opportunity to revise or edit any of their responses before it became public knowledge. Only one out of the three participants replied to suggest a revision, which I made immediately.

### **Document Analysis**

I chose to carry out a document analysis as I believed I could not rely on interviews alone in this study. "What an interview produces is a *representation* or *account* of an individual's views or opinions" (Bryne, 2004, quoted in Silverman, 2014, pp.172). While, research questions one, two and four seek headteachers experiences and opinions, an answer to research question three required more than the "*account* of an individual".

### **Research question 3: How do school leaders find a balance between being relationship-focussed and meeting external performance targets?**

Firstly, evidence was needed to support the assumption that the schools I selected for this study meet the Government's performance targets. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the conversation during the interview may have missed an important decision or action that the school leader has taken to find a balance between relationships and results. It was therefore useful to carry out an analysis on documents such as Ofsted inspection reports to shine a brighter light on possible answers to research question 3.

To carry out document analysis, Brundrett and Rhodes (2014, pp.110) recommend a similar process to content analysis: "identify the documents to be analysed, decide on the unit of analysis, decide on the categories you wish to use for the analysis... run the analysis". Although similar to content analysis, I did not use the same categories as for the analysis of the interviews. To focus this analysis, I considered only research question 2. I used four categories for the document analysis. The first was 'context'. This was to provide evidence that the schools were at least meeting performance targets. The second and third categories were 'relationship-focussed' and 'results-focussed'. After the content analysis of the interview transcripts, I decided to add a fourth category to my document analysis, 'curriculum'. This was a recurring theme in the interviews and so I was interested to gather more evidence in order to support my findings. The main documents to be analysed were the schools' websites, Ofsted inspection reports and the Government's website that published examination results, among other data on the schools. For each school, I analysed additional documents that I found on their websites. I tabulated my analysis for each school, which can be found in appendix 7, 8 and 9.

There were fewer ethical considerations for document analysis than for interviews because all the documents I used were already in the public domain. It was therefore unnecessary to ask for permission to use the documents. One issue, however, was when documents contained names of other schools or organisations, or if the documents were critical of named people. It would be unethical to include the names of the organisation or people without consent. To overcome this issue, all evidence collected in the analysis and used to write the case study was anonymous.

## **Validity and Reliability**

### **Validity**

There are many types of validity, but in the interest of clarity I will examine only the *internal* and *external* validity of this study (Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.186). Internal validity “seeks to demonstrate that the explanation of a particular event, issue or set of data which a piece of research provides can actually be sustained by the data”. For findings to be sustained by the data, the collection of the data itself must be valid. I will now look at the validity of the data collection.

Discussing how to carry out a valid interview, Cohen *et al.* (2011, pp.204) writes “the most practical way of achieving greater validity is to minimise the amount of bias as much as possible”. I have already discussed the potential bias in selecting participants for the study, although this could be argued as purposive sampling (Silverman, 2014, pp.60). The question to ask now is: was there bias during the data collection? Cohen *et al.* (2011, pp.204) provides some examples as sources of bias during interviews. The first is “attitudes, opinions and expectations of the interviewer”. Unaware that this would reduce the validity of the study and in-keeping with my belief that a conversational tone would elicit more profound responses, I fell into the trap of giving my own opinions on subjects. The following is a statement made by me during the first interview (appendix 4, line 412), “it really shocked my coming into this profession that it was so heavily focussed on attainment”. The next source of bias is a “tendency of the interviewer to seek answers that support her/his preconceived notions” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.204). Again, a question I asked from the third interview did just that (appendix 6, line 289), “the reason I am doing this research is because I believe my school is heading down the ‘high performance’ route of school improvement, by battering the student with exam papers etc. What would be your advice to head teachers trying to strike that balance?” My preconceived notion of what I thought my school was doing wrong was likely to influence the participant’s response. A third source of bias in interviews is “misperception on the part of the interviewer of what the respondent is saying”. Again, I found examples of this happening during the interviews. This extract is from the second interview, appendix 5:

*Q: So are you saying that being a person-centred school is first and then the results look after themselves?*

*A: No, I’m not saying that*

Appendix 4, line 25

There are two issues with this extract. Firstly, I misunderstood the participant’s previous response. Secondly, I wrapped up my interpretation of that response into a leading question. A leading question is “where the question influences the answer perhaps illegitimately”

(Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.205). Fortunately, on this occasion the participant had the confidence to disagree with the direction of my question. However, I also identified several leading questions littered within the interview transcripts. Here are two examples of leading questions from the interview transcripts:

*Q: So if you need more time to go down the person-centred route, does it feel like a systematic problem?*

Appendix 4, line 386

*Q: And where did that come from? Was it from speaking to the children?*

Appendix 5, line 121

I unknowingly, through inexperience and lack of preparation as an interviewer, selectively gathered data to fulfil my initial prejudices. As an attempt to recover at least part of the validity of the interview data, I decided to discount any responses that were made to leading questions. These questions and responses are marked with an asterisk (\*) at the start of the question and response (appendix 4-6).

Regarding the internal validity of the data *analysis*, it is important that “findings and interpretations derive from the data transparently” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.295). To this end, I included all the transcripts, document analyses and case studies in the appendices. In the findings section I included the line number of the evidence and, where appropriate, quoted verbatim to ensure transparency.

External validity is “the degree to which the results can be generalised to the wider population” (Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.186). As this study has not used random sampling to obtain participants, it can be argued that the findings cannot be generalised. However, Yin (2009, cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp.294) believes case studies can possess analytical generalisation which means they can “contribute to the expansion... of theory”. Cohen *et al.* (2011, pp.187), citing Lincoln and Guba (1985), states “[Lincoln and Guba] argue that it is not the researcher’s task to provide an index of transferability... rather, [Lincoln and Guba] suggest, researchers should provide sufficiently rich data for the readers and the users of research to determine whether transferability is possible”. Given the issues with the internal validity of my study, I followed this advice from Lincoln and Guba; I provided all the evidence I used and left it up to the reader to decide the generalisability of my findings.

### **Reliability**

In seeking the reliability of a study, Kleven (1995, quoted in Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.203) suggests asking three questions:

1. *Would the same observations and interpretations have been made if observations had been conducted at different times?*
2. *Would the same observations and interpretations have been made if other observations had been conducted at the time?*
3. *Would another observer, working in the same theoretical framework, have made the same observations and interpretations?*

I did not think the first question was relevant to this study; I was concerned about leaders’ experiences of the way they had led schools and so the results of this study would

inescapably be affected by time, but that did not make the findings any less reliable. The second question was more problematic. For example, would the findings have been the same if I had collected data by observing the relationships the students had with each other and their teachers? I cannot answer this question, but it raises a criticism in that the study relies primarily on one-sided data collection methods in favour of the head teachers.

From these questions, it is clear that reliability has to do with the ‘observations and interpretations’ a researcher makes. Reliability is therefore no so much about data collection, rather about data analysis, in this case the reliability of my content analysis. One issue is that:

*Documents may be limited, selective, partial, biased, non-neutral and incomplete because they were intended for a different purpose other than that of the research*

(Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp. 572)

This can lead to unreliable conclusions as the documents selected do not tell the ‘whole story’. Although I used documents from the schools’ websites that would have been favourable towards the school, I ensured that I used objective attainment data from the Department for Education’s website and numerous Ofsted reports that would have found weaknesses in the schools as well as strengths.

A further source of un-reliability is:

*Category definitions and themes may be ambiguous*

(Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp. 572)

*Classification of text may be inconsistent..., because of human error, coder variability... and ambiguity in the coding rules*

(Weber, 1990, quoted in Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.572)

These problems link to Kleven’s (1995, quoted in Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.203) third question mentioned above. If another observer read same interview transcripts and documents, would they (a) create the same coding system and (b) categorise the codes into the same themes as I did? These questions I cannot answer. As with the external validity of the study, I left the judgement of reliability on the reader.

## **Findings**

From my analysis of the data that I have collected, I will now explore each research question. It is important here to bear in mind that these are not complete answers to the research questions, rather they provide an initial exploration in this area of study that is limited by the size and location of the study, and validity of the data collection. I have organised the findings into the four research questions, with the emerging theme as subtitles under each question.

- 1. What challenges do school leaders face when they try to lead to schools that differs from the ‘high-performance’ school advocated by the government?**

### **Headteacher A’s CHALLENGE**

Headteacher A has taken school A on a twelve-year journey of development. Case study A (Appendix 10) shows this journey; the school went from being the last favoured in the area (Appendix 4, line 10) to having more applications than year 7 places (Appendix 7), from only 15% of students achieving five or more A\*-C GCSE grades, including English and maths, in 2005 to 67% in 2016 (Appendix 10, line 10). Along the road, headteacher A describes a major challenge for the school and for him as a leader. Due to a change to the English grade boundaries in 2012 (appendix 7; appendix 4, line 200), the percentage of students achieving five or more A\*-C GCSE grades including English and maths fell for the first time in eight years (2005-2012) to 35%. This was below the floor target of 40%, and therefore an Ofsted inspection was imminent. Headteacher A describes this experience:

*Ofsted came around after the results, we knew they were going to come in, and the inspector came expecting a nut house and he struggled because he had the rubric and DfE in his ear on the one hand but he couldn't tally it. He said, "I'm knackered, the system is against me, they're not going to let me do any more for you, I know your results are going to be 55% next year but I'm going to have to put you in [Requires Improvement] because of your [previous] results".*

Appendix 4, line 208

All but one of the areas in the inspection, including leadership, quality of teaching and the behaviour and safety of pupils, were classed as "Good"; only "Achievement of pupils" was "Requires Improvement". The inspection report stated, "[Leaders] have worked relentlessly to address the dip in the 2012 results, which had not been anticipated but has been explained" (Appendix 7). Despite this the inspector had to give the school a "Requires Improvement" grade which was demoralising for headteacher A:

*It did affect me very very badly because we had worked so hard to get from 15% of what were white, working class students. We dragged it to 42% which took some doing to get there and we had year on year improvements. But when it happened I knew damn well Ofsted were going to knock on my door*

Appendix 4, line 228

Unlike Headteacher A, Headteacher B or C did not discuss a challenge to their leadership from Government or Ofsted. Perhaps this was because my interview questions were not designed sufficiently well to explore challenges they faced, or maybe the lack of challenge is because their results are so far above the national average (Appendix 11 and Appendix 12). When asked why Ofsted hadn't inspected school B, Headteacher B stated:

*I think they are too busy, our results are so good it's hardly worth throwing money and time and resources at us.*

Appendix 5, line 289

Similarly, Headteacher C said:

*We are in an easy position, it would be easy for me to preach, we don't have anyone breathing down our necks or anything and we work hard to make sure that doesn't happen*

Appendix 6, line 304

The difference between the experience of Headteacher A and Headteachers B and C regarding challenges from Government and Ofsted highlights the fact that as a school leader,

you are safe from punishment as long as you are meeting the performance targets set by the Government. The issue here is the “outcomes not methods” (Department for Education, 2016) culture that I explored in the literature review, specifically that a school can use any method they choose if they are meeting the Government’s performance targets. Conversely, despite Ofsted recognising that school A’s methods of focussing on relationships were “a real strength” and that parents believed their children were making good progress, it was punished for falling short of an arbitrary target that it had achieved the year before and, Ofsted noted, was highly likely to exceed the following year (appendix 7).

Headteacher and school A may find another challenge in their journey. The Government is set to put in place a target of 90% of students entering the English Baccalaureate (Department for Education, 2015a). Discussing the EBacc, Headteacher A stated:

*If the child wants to do the EBacc we fully support that. If you want to do it, do it. If you are fully passionate about it, fantastic. If our weakest child is passionate about rivers and that drives them to do geography, fantastic. What we don't do is “you're bright, you have to do geography and history and a language”. We don't do that at all, we allow kids to follow their passions.*

Appendix 4, line 318

As of 2016, only 16% of students at school A entered the EBacc (U.K. Government, 2017). If the Government continues with its plans for schools to be accountable to this target in Ofsted inspections, headteacher A will face a dilemma: keep allowing students to study the subjects they want to do or start forcing most students to follow the subjects the Government wants them to do. This could be a future tension between “government prescription” and headteacher A’s “educational values and beliefs” (Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015). To overcome a tension such as this, academics recommend finding a “middle-way” (Precey, 2008) or an “interplay” (Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015) between the two viewpoints, although I am unconvinced that a balance is possible in this example and therefore headteacher A will have to make a challenging ethical decision in the near future.

## **2. How do school leaders overcome these challenges?**

### **RESILLIENCE: follow your VALUES**

Headteacher A reflects on when the school results fell below the Government’s floor target which led to a ‘Requires Improvement’ Ofsted grading:

*There was a point when I thought ‘I give up’ but you have to show a bit of resilience, you keep doing what you're doing, keep believing what you're doing, not reverting to type and sure enough the results were up to 55% the following year and our results were among the most improved in the country. I went through a period of self-doubt but in fairness, on reflection, it's made us a better school and it's made me a better leader because you need to go through something like that to come out of it stronger. We are better for it.*

Appendix 10, line 76-99

Ackerman and Maslin-Ostrowski (2002) write about leaders who face challenges, or as they describe it, leaders who have been wounded. They ask, “how does a leader with good intentions preserve a healthy sense of self in the face of a crisis that in the best of times

challenges the self and in the worst of times leads to deep wounds in the heart?”. They find that some leaders “experience an epiphany when he or she realizes the paradox of wounding: we spend our lives avoiding and rejecting our vulnerability, only to find our true selves by working through that pain”. Headteacher A suffered a wound, but through resilience of following his “thought-through values” (Precey, 2016), recovered and became a stronger leader for overcoming the challenge. Appendix 10 (line 101-111) shows the effect of this perseverance: results continued to improve and the school received a “Good” Ofsted grade in 2015, with an “Outstanding” grade in the “Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare” category.

### **3. How do school leaders find a balance between focussing on relationships while meeting external performance targets?**

#### **RELATIONSHIPS, RESULTS and finding the BALANCE**

Headteacher B observed that the design of my interview questions insinuated that a ‘person-centred’ or relationship-focussed approach is mutually exclusive to a ‘high-performance’ or results-focussed approach (Appendix 5, line 1). This was an unintentional flaw in the interview questions; my aim for the research was to find whether schools and school leaders could balance good relationships with good results, rather than choosing between the two. To this end, Headteacher A and C believe that schools should focus first on developing positive relationships:

*It comes back to the fundamental argument, get relationships right, engage and enthuse the kids, results will look after themselves*

Headteacher A, Appendix 4, line 339

*I feel that if we didn’t build those relationships [with the students], we wouldn’t be able to have such good results*

Headteacher C, Appendix 12, line 37

Headteacher C illustrates her point above with a touching example:

*This chess board here [headteacher C points to a chess board on the table] is Jonathan’s who is the head of [managing the] site. There was a boy who had been excluded 7 times before coming to us and they used to play chess every lunchtime. So when he was doing his [SATS papers], Jonathan was again in the back of the room because that was a person he trusted. It was that whole thing that the child had an adult in the room that they trusted, and that’s valuable.*

Headteacher C, Appendix 6, line 356

This was the school’s response to the new Key Stage 2 SATS papers, which were introduced in 2016 and are far more challenging than previous years. Students and staff at school C have deep and trusting relationships. The school can then rely on these relationships to help vulnerable students such as the boy above cope in challenging circumstances. Cynically, it could be argued that the relationship between the boy and the member of staff was exploited to get a better performance out of the boy. However, it would only be an exploitation if the intention was for the school to produce outstanding results. Headteacher C is adamant that this is not the case:

*We value the children here, that's number one. The results are incidental, the results are great and they keep people off our backs but actually what's of more value to us is that we can send the children off to secondary school with a good start and we can say to them 'we've done well by you'*

Appendix 6, line 126

On the other hand, headteacher B had to shift school B to focus on results when she arrived as headteacher:

*It was a child-centred school and the only thing that mattered was the interests of the child, and following their interest. If they didn't want to do maths that day then that was fine because they were following their interest by looking at the tadpoles, or hammering away on the woodwork tables.*

Appendix 5, line 31

Peters (1966, pp. 36) discusses the difference between people following their *interests* and doing what is *in their interest*. He argues this is particularly important for children who may not have a proper understanding of what is in their interest. In this case, it was in the children's interest to focus on reading and writing, rather than following their own interests. Headteacher B wasn't so much focussing on results, rather she was focussing on the parts of an education that are measured by the qualifications the students get. This raises a subtle but important difference that I had considered: throughout this study I have thought of a school 'focussing on qualifications' and 'focussing on results' as one in the same but clearly, they are not interchangeable. If the school is focussing on examinations to get the students the best qualifications and therefore the opportunities to follow their passions, then it is doing it *in the interest* of the students. This is what Fielding (2006) would call "the personal through the functional". If, however, schools are focussing on examinations to get the best results, succeed in league tables and satisfy Ofsted, then it is exploiting students for its own benefit, the hallmark of Fielding's (2006) "high-performance organisation". Future studies in this field will need to address this issue: the question to ask is not 'what is the school focussing on?', but 'what is the underlying *reason* for the school's focus?'

## **CURRICULUM**

One way that a balance is achieved in schools is through the curriculum. Headteacher A and B have thought carefully about how to design their curriculum to find the balance between developing relationships and acquiring qualifications. School B has a "dichotomised curriculum" (headteacher B, appendix 5, line 42). In the mornings students study the core curriculum, learning literacy and numeracy. In the afternoons, students study the International Primary Curriculum, which "provides rich learning experiences through thematic topics, designed to inspire, engage and delight the children and provide high levels of enquiry" (Appendix 11, line 50). According to school B, this combination means:

*The children are well-challenged by the whole curriculum, which creates a wealth of memorable experiences and rich opportunities for high-quality learning, social and cultural development, and is an excellent preparation for their secondary education and future employability*

Appendix 11, line 52

Headteacher describes the morning sessions as the “bread and butter” (appendix 5, line 37). The students must learn how to do these fundamental skills or they will not be able to access any further education. Again, this illustrates the point that a school can focus on results, but for the sake of the student learning the skills, rather than for the benefit of the school. Indeed, headteacher B makes the point that it is the student who owns the attainment, not the school (appendix 5, line 13).

Headteacher A also uses the curriculum to find a balance between developing relationships and acquiring qualifications in school A, but in a way that knits the two together rather than dividing the curriculum. After international visits for inspiration, school A introduced the EF curriculum. This is a competency-based curriculum that uses project-based learning. Each project has a core objective which is one of the nine values of the school. Importantly, during these projects “the kids are given time to do things, trusted to do them, they’re allowed to go to the break-out rooms to do [an activity], there isn’t a teacher sat there controlling the whole lot.” (Appendix 10, line 61). School A uses this curriculum to develop trusting relationships with students and engage the students and headteacher A believes that this is the key to the school’s improving examination results.

### **LISTENING to students**

All headteachers spoke about the importance of listening to students:

*We then took 30 kids out [to a school in Copenhagen], a real mix, and put them in for a week to see what they thought.*

Headteacher A, appendix 4, line 93

*For parents, children and staff we do something called Kiazen which is the Japanese quality circles. A quality circle is when you get people together to talk about what’s working, what’s not working... that’s why we did a radical change of lunchtimes*

Headteacher B, appendix 5, line 184

*We’ve got solar panels on the roofs over there because children in year 5 and 6 did a project discussing the value of it so we’ve got it up on the building now. We make sure we don’t ignore it, we put it into practice.*

Headteacher C, appendix 6, line 119

Schools A, B and C listening to students and allowing their opinions to drive change is perhaps unsurprising, as these are schools that value student-teacher relationships highly. However, the fact that these schools do listen to their students may have had a positive impact on the trust between students and teachers. More work would need to be done to prove this, particularly studies that spoke to the students themselves.

For schools trying to focus more on relationships and less on qualifications, student voice could be a useful starting point. However, Ruddock and Fielding (2006) warn schools of thinking about implementing student voice properly before jumping in. They argue schools should consider the power-relations between students and teachers, ensure that the reasons for introducing student voice are authentic and ensure that it is inclusive of the total student population. It would be interesting further research to use this framework to assess schools’ student voice programmes, and evaluate the effect of student voice on the development of trusting relationships between students and teachers.

## **TIME to think about future CHANGE**

The following three themes deal with how a school changes and the time it takes to do so. Firstly, headteacher A recognised that he would not have changed the school in the way that he did if he wasn't given the time to think about it:

*I had only been a head a year then. I was still firefighting, learning on the job and I hadn't had a minute to sit down and think a philosophy of how to run a school*

Appendix 4, line 101

*I'd like to claim I would have come up with a fantastic idea myself but if I'm totally honest I would doubt it very much because I would have been institutionalised... and would have been driven with the obsession with the way we do things here and the need to do things better here, so I have been very lucky... being given the opportunities to think about it differently.*

Appendix 4, line 113

School A was awarded the One School Pathfinder, which was part of the Department for Education's Building Schools for the Future programme. This provided the impetus for headteacher A to think about, in his words, a philosophy to run a school. In this sense, school A is somewhat of an anomaly. Studies on headteachers indicate that their values can be weakened by local or national policy context (Rayner, 2014; Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015). Headteacher A however was allowed time to develop his values on how a school ought to be run and therefore not weaken in times of difficulty. To become stronger leaders, headteachers need to be given more time to develop their "thought-through values" (Precey, 2016).

## **Make the CHANGE immediately**

Headteacher A and B both stressed the importance of making changes immediately:

*We need to be immediate. Immediacy is really important. If something needs to be done, do it now. Don't make a to do list, do it now.*

Headteacher B, Appendix 5, line 207

*We realised there was no point in waiting. I think that was possibly where the other [One School Pathfinder] schools might have suffered, in that they thought they could move to a new school and everything changed when they got there. We made the conscious decision of, despite the confines of the old building, we are going to put some of the practices and structure in place in the current school so that we could develop.*

Headteacher A, appendix 4, line 141

While deciding how to change may take time, once the decision has been made the change needs to happen straight away. Kotter (1995) describes the first step of a successful change is "establishing a sense of urgency". This urgency is reflected in headteacher A and B's delivery of their changes; although Kotter's first step is concerned with persuading employees of the *sense* of urgency rather than the urgency to make the change itself. This aspect of the headteachers' leadership, how they interact with their employees to promote change, is beyond the scope of this study but would be interesting further research.

## Effects of CHANGE takes TIME

Finally, building trusting relationships is a time-intensive process. Therefore, the effects of relationship-focussed changes take time to become visible:

*This is not a quick fix... If you want to do it the values-driven way you've got to give it time. It's a human process. There will be peaks and troughs, it's not linear.*

Headteacher A, appendix 4, line 345

*We started in 2011... By the time Ofsted came in at 2014, systems were in place... But I would say now there is an even bigger shift; now there are children and parents who have travelled through who trust us.*

Headteacher C, appendix 6, line 51

Hill *et al.* (2016) found that the Architect, the type of headteacher that leads a school to develop so that examination results keep improving after the headteacher has left, are appointed far less than Surgeons, who take an unsustainable approach to school improvement. Part of the reason for this was that the changes Surgeons make have quicker success. The study recommends the Government moving towards longer-term accountability measures to give Architects the time to be successful. If this change was made, perhaps more headteachers would be prepared to follow headteacher A and C's lead by spending time on building relationships first, and letting the results follow.

- 4. To what extent does the message leaders convey of their values and type of school they lead change depending on the situation they are in or the audience they are in front of?**

## HONESTY

Throughout educational leadership literature there are references of successful school leaders being able to 'play the game' (Rayner, 2014; Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015). I therefore wanted part of my research to explore this idea. When asked whether they change their message on the type of school they lead depending who it was they were speaking to, the headteachers replied:

*I try not to because I actually think that everyone appreciates honesty and transparency so I've always tried to say it how it is, so if we've messed up, which we have, we say so*

Headteacher A, appendix 4, line 262

*It doesn't really, I think if we were to capture the school in one sentence I would say we hit the sweet spot of warm relationships and high attainment*

Headteacher B, appendix 5, line 80

*No I would always say we value the children here, that's number one. The results are incidental, the results are great and they keep people off our backs but actually what's of more value to us is that we can send the children off to secondary school with a good start and we can say to them 'we've done well by you'.*

Headteacher C, appendix 6, line 126

These answers are in keeping with George *et al.*'s (2007) authentic leader as opposed to the view that leaders, knowingly or unknowingly, contradict themselves when they speak to different people or organisations (El-Sawad *et al.*, 2004). As a future leader myself, this is comforting. I have always thought that an honesty in one's approach, coupled with the confidence that it is the right approach to take, is important to be a successful leader. I therefore saw school leadership as less appealing when reading that the leaders have to play games to survive and be successful. Hearing the consistency in the headteachers' answers that it is best to be honest, has given me renewed motivation to follow in their footsteps.

## **5. Additional themes**

While they do not answer any of my research questions, the unstructured interviews raise some interesting themes that ought to be pointed out. Firstly, the difference between phases; primary and secondary school.

### **PHASES**

From speaking to all the school leaders in this study, it felt as though headteacher A was more radical in focussing on relationships, while it was more the norm in primary schools. Indeed, headteacher B said that school B was far too relationship-focussed before she arrived. Moreover, she pointed out the differences between primary and secondary school children make it easier to get primary school children to learn (see appendix 4, line 64 and 98). Admittedly, before this study, the last time I stepped foot in a primary school was when I attended one myself. My experience therefore of primary schools was very limited. The rationale for this study, that schools in England are focussing too much on qualifications and not enough on relationships, may have not been appropriate for primary schools; the rationale was formulated from my experiences as a teacher and visitor of other secondary schools only. Perhaps then future studies on this topic should focus solely on one of the phases, rather than both.

### **OFSTED**

The role of Ofsted in the English education system is a contentious one. Despite being an independent regulator, 69% of teacher surveyed by Ofsted believed it "exists primarily to help the government of the day advance its educational agenda" (Ofsted, 2017). Jones and Tymms, (2014), with consent from Ofsted, stated that to promote school improvement, Ofsted sets standards that schools should follow. Ofsted therefore has a considerable amount of power over schools. Without admitting it initially, I began this study with a negative perception of Ofsted. I believed, like the majority of the teachers surveyed, that Ofsted was complicit in forcing schools to focus too much on qualifications. However, from the interviews with the headteachers, particularly headteacher A's comments, my perception of Ofsted has begun to change:

*When they came [in 2013] they were lovely. They made you feel alright but you knew what was coming*

Headteacher A, appendix 4, line 231

*So I think Ofsted actually appreciate it, particularly if you get a team of head teachers. Last time, we had 3 of 5 in the team as current head teachers who value what we are doing. As long as your headline figures are ok.*

Headteacher A, appendix 4, line 336

Despite the major challenge of his leadership of a “Requires Improvement” grading from Ofsted, headteacher A did not blame Ofsted itself in any way. Whereas before I believed that Ofsted were just one of the means by which the Government enforced unpopular policy, despite their apparent independence, I have started to understand from headteacher A’s experience that there was in fact a distinction between the two. Indeed, Spielman’s (2017) recent speech is a departure from recent Government and Ofsted rhetoric and may be the start of a greater distinction.

### **Reflexive analysis**

When deciding what to study for my dissertation, I was certain I wanted to choose an area that I was passionate about. This led me to the question ‘what is the purpose of education?’ I am adamant that what I do for work has more value than preparing young people for a job. That is no doubt an important part of what I do, but I believe I have the opportunity and therefore the responsibility to shape how people think, how they see the world and, most importantly to me, how they interact with one another. However, this philosophical question was so broad that, despite many hours of challenging reading, I hardly touched the surface in trying to answer it in the literature review. I realised that this question that was driving me was far too broad for and so, inspired by articles on the topic (Precey, Clapham; Rayner, 2014, Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015) chose to look at how leaders managed to find a balance if their views of what it was to ‘have an education’ differed from the Government’s view.

I started the study with a good degree of bias, although I did not admit this to myself until I reflected on it during the data analysis stage. I was opposed to the direction that my school was heading in: of morning and afternoon revision sessions every day; of ‘walking-talking’ mocks in which students would sit a mock-exam while the teacher unpicked every aspect of the mark scheme; of an exam question in every lesson. This initial bias made me blind to a subtle point that was only highlighted in the findings. Just because a school focuses on examination results, it does not mean that they are not doing it for the students. The issue I had was not that schools were focussing on results, but that I believed that they were focussing on results for their own benefit rather than the students’ benefit. Headteacher B made me realise that my bias against all results-focussed schools was perhaps slightly misplaced. Additionally, having spent another year at my school teaching students with high aspirations who *need* qualifications to pursue their passions, I have begun to see greater value in the results-focussed approach, so long as the reason is for the students to leave with the best possible qualifications they can get and not so the school does well in performance tables or an Ofsted inspection.

When designing my research, I was initially confused over whether this would be a cross-sectional study, “one that produces a ‘snapshot’ of a population at a particular point in time” (Cohen *et al.* 2000, pp. 175), or a case study. Hence, I decided to interview five separate headteachers; as a case-study approach the data from this would have been far too shallow given time restraints. Only after I set-up the interviews, I realised that a case study was a better fit for my research questions. Had I thought about the methodology more before jumping into data collection, I would have focussed on researching one case study rather than

three, despite Campbell's (1975, pp.180, cited in Cohen *et al.*, 2011, pp. 291) assertion that two comparative case studies are more useful than one in-depth case study. This way I would have had the time for more diverse data collection methods. For example, seeing as this study spoke in detail about the value of a school that focusses on relationships, it seems odd in hindsight that I did not observe how the students interacted with one another and with their teachers. Collecting data from teachers, students and support staff would have meant greater triangulation, and therefore greater internal validity, of the data (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, cited in Cohen *et al.* 2011, pp.185)

This study was influenced strongly by Fielding (2006, 2012), specifically his typology of different schools. I had imagined that the study would look at different "person-centred" schools and how they cope in a political climate that favoured "high-performance" schools. However, I did not give much thought to how I would select these schools and this led to me dropping the labels 'person-centred' and 'high-performance' mid-study. Perhaps I could have created criteria for a school to meet to be called 'person-centred' to overcome this issue, although this would have created more work for an already stretched teacher-researcher.

Finally, I had not anticipated the challenge of interviewing. I had had experience as an interviewer but this was with work colleagues. The experience of interviewing headteachers that I did not know was a little intimidating. My lack of experience and feeling slightly intimidated led me to adopt too much of a conversational approach. This led to my asking leading question and discussing my own views on questions I was about to ask. This, in turn, meant the internal validity of the data collection was compromised. Knowing what I know now, I would have designed my research to incorporate other data collection methods, such as asking the headteachers to write freely on a challenge they have faced, as well as interviews. However, I would still carry out the interviews as it has been an invaluable experience in my personal development as a researcher.

## **Conclusions**

### **Lessons as a researcher**

I have discussed in depth the shortcomings of my methodology in the reflexive analysis. These flaws have taught me two important lessons as a future educational researcher. Firstly, plan the whole methodology before data collection starts. In the future, I will think carefully about the type of study I want the research to be, and only then decide on how to find a sample of participants and which data collection methods to use. For example, if I were to do I case study again I would choose only one case with a greater variety of data collection methods. Secondly, be honest about initial bias. I do not think that my bias in favour of relationship-focussed schools was itself an issue, but had I been honest in the beginning I would have been more aware of remaining impartial as an interviewer and therefore ensuring the internal validity of the data collection.

### **Lessons as a leader**

All three headteachers agreed that they preferred honesty to 'playing games' with different stakeholders. This, I think, comes from a strong moral purpose in what they do. There is therefore no reason to give different messages to different stakeholders, as they truly believe that what they are doing is morally just. This trust in their approach is best demonstrated by headteacher A's trust in the path he had led school A; despite the poor examination results in

2012 and the following “Requires Improvement” grading from Ofsted, he did not “weaken in [his] values-driven stance” (Hammersley-Fletcher, 2015) but trusted that his approach was the right one for the students. This highlights the importance of a leader understanding what they stand for and sincerely believing in them. I feel that dishonesty in order to keep different stakeholders happy, ‘playing the game’, may be more appealing when a leader is unsure of their own values. Having said this, all three schools currently have examination results that are above national standards and so perhaps it is just that they do not *need* to play the game rather than they do not play it at all.

Following on from this, I have learnt that there are examples of schools that can produce students with outstanding qualifications, while not losing their personal touch. I have a greater appreciation in the value of a school working tirelessly to get students their qualifications, although I continue to be critical of schools that focus purely on this particularly if it is for their own sake instead of their students’ sake.

The curriculum offered by a school has a powerful influence in the type of school it is. Headteacher A and B both point towards the curriculum as a means for balancing good relationships with good results. Spielman’s (2017) speech discusses in length the importance of the curriculum, and has proposed a working group to assess whether the curriculum should form a distinct part of the next Ofsted inspection framework. This would be a welcome change to the framework in my eyes as it would help to discourage schools in following the “high-performance” (Fielding, 2006) model, in which ‘teaching-to-the-test’ is rife.

Headteachers A and C both lead successful schools on many measures, not least student attainment. But the changes they made to get there took a long time to have the desired effect, because, as headteacher A puts it, “you’ve got to give it time. It’s a human process. There will be peaks and troughs” (appendix 4, line 349). This comes back to the importance of leaders having a moral purpose, and believing firmly that the path they have taken is the right one, even if the journey takes a long time. For this reason, I fully support Hill *et al.*’s (2016) recommendations of moving towards long-term accountability measures for headteachers and schools, rather than fixating on the short-term end-of-year examination results. If this were already the case, perhaps the Ofsted inspectors who visited school A could have considered that their results had been improving for six years in a row prior to the dip, rather than being forced to consider only the most recent results that fell below the Government’s floor target. If Spielman does want to move away from the ‘teaching-to-the-test’ mentality in schools, then her organisation and the Government needs to allow more time for sustainable school improvement.

## **References**

Ackerman, R. H. and Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2002) *The wounded leader: how real leadership emerges in times of crisis*. 1<sup>st</sup> edn. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Adams, R. and Weale, S. (2017) ‘New Ofsted chief: ‘I want everyone to see us as a force for improvement’, *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/jan/09/ofsted-chief-inspector-schools-amanda-spielman>

Adams, R., Weale, S., Helena, B. and Carrell, S. (2016) ‘UK schools fail to climb international league table’, *The Guardian*. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2016/dec/06/english-schools-core-subject-test-results-international-oecd-pisa>

Addison, B. (2009) 'A feel for the game – a Bourdieuan analysis of principal leadership: A study of Queensland secondary school principals', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 41(4), pp.327-341.

Beard, M. (2016) 'Education Committee conference, "The purpose and quality of education in England' Keynote Speech', *Parliament*. Available at: <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/Education/Education-Committee-conference-keynote-speech-from-Professor-Mary-Beard.pdf>

Bennis, W. G. and Thomas, R. J. (2002) 'Crucibles of Leadership', in *Harvard Business Review's 10 must reads on leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Biesta, G. (2013) 'Responsive or Responsible? Democratic Education for the Global Networked Society', *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(6), pp.733-744.

Brundrett, M. and Rhodes, C. (2014) *Researching Educational Leadership and Management*, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, SAGE publications.

Bryne, B. (2004) 'Qualitative interviewing', in Seale, C. (ed.), *Researching Society and Culture*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. London: Sage, pp.179-192.

Campbell, D. T. (1975) 'Degrees of freedom and the case study', *Comparative Political Studies*, 8, pp. 178-193

Coe, R. (2013) 'Improving Education. A triumph of hope over experience', *Centre for Evaluation & Monitoring*. Available at: <http://www.cem.org/attachments/publications/ImprovingEducation2013.pdf>

Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2000) *Research methods in education*, 5<sup>th</sup> edn, RoutledgeFalmer.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2011) *Research methods in education*. 7<sup>th</sup> edn. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.

Coughlan, S. (2016) 'Pisa tests: UK lags behind in global school rankings', *BBC News*. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-38157811>

Department for Education (2003) *Every Child Matters*. Available at: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/EveryChildMatters.pdf>

Department for Education (2010) *The importance of teaching: the schools white paper 2010*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-importance-of-teaching-the-schools-white-paper-2010>

Department for Education (2013) *Oral Statement to Parliament: 2012 OECD PISA results*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/2012-oecd-pisa-results>

Department for Education (2014) *Promoting fundamental British values through SMSC*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/promoting-fundamental-british-values-through-smsc>

Department for Communities and Local Government (2015) *English indices of deprivation 2015*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015> (Accessed:

Department for Education (2015a) *New reforms to raise standards and improve behaviour*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-reforms-to-raise-standards-and-improve-behaviour>

Department for Education (2015b) *The purpose of education*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/the-purpose-of-education>

Department for Education (2017) *GCSE 9 to 1 grading: Justine Greening's letter*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gcse-9-to-1-grading-justine-greenings-letter>

Dewey J. (1934) 'Individual Psychology and Education', *The Philosopher*, 12.

Eacott, S. (2011) 'Preparing 'educational' leaders in managerialist times: An Australian story', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 43(1), pp.43-59.

Education Committee (2016) 'Oral evidence: Purpose and quality of education in England', *Parliament*. Available at: <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/education-committee/inquiries/parliament-2015/purpose-quality-education-england-15-16/publications/>

El-Sawad, A., Arnold, J., Cohen, L. (2004) 'Doublethink': The prevalence and function of contradiction in accounts of organizational life', *Human Relations*, 57(9), pp.1179-1203.

Fielding M. (2006) 'Leadership, personalization and high performance schooling: naming the new totalitarianism', *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), pp.347-369.

Fielding, M. (2012) 'Editorial: Learning to be Human: the educational legacy of John Macmurray', *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(6), pp.653-659.

Foshay A. W. (1991) 'The Curriculum Matrix: Transcendence and Mathematics', *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 6(4), pp.277-293.

George, B. Sims, P. McLean, A. N., Mayer, D. (2007) 'Discovering Your Authentic Leadership', in *Harvard Business Review's 10 must reads on leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Hammersley-Fletcher, L. (2015) 'Value(s)-driven decision-making: The ethics work of English headteachers within discourses of constraint', *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 43(2), pp.198-213.

Hutchings, M. (2014) 'Exam factories? The impact of accountability measures on children and young people', *National Union of Teachers*. Available at: <https://www.teachers.org.uk/sites/default/files2014/exam-factories.pdf>

Hill, A., Mellon, L., Laker, B. (2016) 'The One Type of Leader Who Can Turn Around a Failing School', *Harvard Business Review*. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2016/10/the-one-type-of-leader-who-can-turn-around-a-failing-school>

Jones, K. and Tymms, P. (2014) 'Ofsted's role in promoting school improvement: the mechanisms of the school inspection system in England', *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), pp.315-330.

Kleven, T. A. (1995) *Reliabilitet som pedagogisk problem (trans: Reliability as an educational problem)*. Mimeo for doctoral lecture, 17 February. Oslo: Institute for Educational Research.

Kotter, J. P. (1995) 'Leading Change. Why Transformation Efforts Fail', in *Harvard Business Review's 10 Must Reads on Change Management*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. (1986) 'But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic inquiry', in Williams D. D. (ed.) *Naturalistic Evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, pp.73-84

Lumby, J. (2012) 'Leading organizational culture: Issues of power and equality. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 40(5), pp.576-591.

Macmurray, J. (1958) 'Learning to be Human', *Moray House Annual Public Lecture*, 5 May.

Nisbett J. and Watt, J. (1984) 'Case Study', in Bell J., Bush T., Fox A., Goodey, J. and Goulding, S. (eds.) *Conducting Small-Scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London: Harper and Row, pp.79-92.

OECD (2015) *PISA 2015 Results in Focus*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2015-results-in-focus.pdf>

Ofsted (2015) *School inspection handbook*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-from-september-2015>

Ofsted (2017) *Annual teacher survey*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/annual-teachers-survey>

Patton, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Peters, R. S. (1966) *Ethics & Education*. Guildford: George Allen & Unwin.

Precey, R. (2016) 'The Future is not what it used to be: Preparing School Leaders Today for Tomorrow's World', *Management Quarterly*, 2016.

Precey, R. (2008) 'Trainspotting: leadership at a critical junction', *Forum*, 50(2), pp.235-242.

Rayner, S. (2014) 'Playing by the rules? The professional values of head teachers tested by the changing policy context', *Management in Education*, 28(2), pp.38-43.

Robbins S. and Trabichet, L. (2009) 'Ethical decision-making by educational leaders', *Management in Education*, 23(2), pp.51-56.

Roberts, N. Abreu, L. (2017) 'School inspections in England: Ofsted', *House of Commons Library*. Briefing paper number 07091.

Robinson, K. (2010) *RSA ANIMATE: Changing Education Paradigms*. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zDZFcDGpL4U>

Rudduck, J. and Fielding, M. (2006) 'Student voice and the perils of popularity', *Educational Review*, 58(2), pp.219-231, Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910600584207>

Sands, G. (2017) 'Are the PISA Education Results Rigged?', *Forbes*. Available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2017/01/04/are-the-pisa-education-results-rigged/#525ce9f31561>

Shields, C. M. (2010) 'Transformative Leadership: Working for Equity in Diverse Contexts', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), pp.558-589.

Silverman, D. (2014) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, 5<sup>th</sup> edn, London: SAGE publications.

Smith, P. and Bell, L. (2011) 'Transactional and transformational leadership in schools in challenging circumstances: a policy paradox', *Management in Education*, 25(2), pp.58-61

Spielman, A. (2017) *Amanda Spielman's speech at the Festival of Education*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/amanda-spielman-s-speech-at-the-festival-of-education>

Stake, R. E. (1994) 'Case Studies', in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage, pp.236-247

The Guardian (2014) *OECD and PISA test are damaging education worldwide – academics*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/may/06/oecd-pisa-tests-damaging-education-academics>

U.K. Government (2017) *Find and compare schools*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/school-performance-tables> (Accessed: March-August 2017)

Weber, R. P. (1990) *Basic Content Analysis*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

White, J. (2007) 'What schools are for and why', *IMPACT*, 14, pp. 1-51. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2048-416X.2007.tb00116.x/epdf>

Yin, R.K. (1984) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2009) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yorke, H. (2017) 'More than 1.200 schools have not received an Ofsted inspection for over seven years', *The Telegraph*, Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/2017/01/06/1200-schools-have-not-received-ofsted-inspection-seven-years/>

Young, M. (2011) 'What are schools for?', *EDUCAÇÃO, SOCIEDADE E CULTURA*, 32, pp.145-155. Available at: [http://www.fpce.up.pt/ciie/revistaesc/ESC32/ESC32\\_Arquivo.pdf](http://www.fpce.up.pt/ciie/revistaesc/ESC32/ESC32_Arquivo.pdf)

## **Appendices**

### **Appendix 1 – interview questions – with probes and prompts**

#### Interview

The aim of this research is to understand how head teachers are able to lead person-centred schools in a growing climate of accountability to meet external performance targets. In other words, how do head teachers champion student achievement (that is students excelling in all areas of their development) instead of focussing on student attainment (how well they do in their external examinations).

1. Michael Fielding categorised 4 types of school. Two of these were called the 'high performance' and 'person-centred' school. In reality, schools can't be categorised into one or the other and are more likely to be a combination. Where would you place your school on this line?

---

#### **High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

#### **Person-centred**

"Committed to wider human purposes"

Focus on student achievement

- 
2. In terms of this classification, how has your school changed since you have become head teacher?
3. What have you done, as a school leader, to change the type of school this is?

Prompt: What specific strategies have you or your SLT put in place to make your school person-centred?

What leadership style(s) have you used to drive the change?

- 
- 
- 
4. What has motivated you to lead the school in this way?

Prompt: What are your values as a head teacher?

How do these values shape the type of school you want to lead?

- 
- 
- 
- 
5. How do you know that the strategies that you put in place to improve student achievement does what it is meant to do?

Prompt: how do you measure the effectiveness of your strategies? (If measurement is possible at all)

Probe: what evidence do you have to show your strategies are having the intended effect?

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
6. Do you know if these strategies have a benefit on student attainment as well as other benefits?

Probe: If yes, how do you know? If no, why not?

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
7. To what extent is it practical to prioritise other benefits (e.g. improving student social skills) over student attainment?

Prompt: if you knew something you were doing have a benefit the development of the student but had a negative effect on student attainment, would you continue to do it?

Give an example – project-based learning having a positive effect on social skills but negative for GCSE attainment.

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
8. Coming back to the classification of your school, where would you ideally place your school?

---

**High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

**Person-centred**

“Committed to wider human purposes”

Focus on student achievement

9. If this is different to the earlier classification of your school, can you explain why it is different?

Prompt: what stops you from making your school the exact type you want it to be?

Probe: What are the biggest pressures to change the type of school that you lead?

Why do you think you are being prevented from making the school the type you want it to be?

10. Does the message of which type of school you lead change depending on the audience?

If so, can you show where you would place your school for each audience you speak to?

---

**High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

**Person-centred**

“Committed to wider human purposes”

Focus on student achievement

Prompt: When you are aware of an Ofsted inspection, do you feel pressure to improve outcomes over improving student achievement?

What do prospective parents look for in a school? Does this influence the message you convey?

Governors?

SLT?

Probe: How do you manage to lead a person-centred school, given the pressure to follow a high-performance style of school from Ofsted?

Some schools in Kent haven't had an Ofsted inspection in 10 years because they consistently get outstanding outcomes. How do you feel about this?

11. What advice would you give to head teachers who are trying to find the balance between leading a 'high-performance' and 'person-centred' school?

References:

Fielding, M. (2006) *Leadership, personalisation and high performance schooling: naming the new totalitarianism*. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), pp. 347-369

## **Appendix 2 – interview question for first interview**

The aim of this research is to understand how head teachers are able to lead person-centred schools in a growing climate of accountability to meet external performance targets. In other words, is it possible to champion student achievement (that is, students excelling in all areas of their development) rather than focussing just on student attainment (how well they do in their external examinations)?

1. Michael Fielding (2006) categorised 4 types of school. Two of these were called the 'high performance' and 'person-centred' school. Where would you place your school on this line?

---

**High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

**Person-centred**

"Committed to wider human purposes"

Focus on student achievement

2. In terms of this classification, how has your school changed since you have become head teacher?
  3. What have you done, as a school leader, to change the type of school this is?
  4. What has motivated you to lead the school in this way?
  5. How do you know that the strategies that you put in place to improve student achievement does what it is meant to do?
  6. Do you know if these strategies have a benefit on student attainment as well as other benefits?
  7. To what extent is it practical to prioritise other benefits (e.g. improving students' social skills) over student attainment?
- 
8. Coming back to the classification of your school, what would be your idealistic type of school?

---

**High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

**Person-centred**

“Committed to wider human purposes”

Focus on student achievement

9. If this is different to the earlier classification of your school, can you explain why it is different?
10. Does your message of the type of school you lead change depending on the audience?

If so, can you show where you would place your school for each audience you speak to?

---

**High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

**Person-centred**

“Committed to wider human purposes”

Focus on student achievement

11. What advice would you give to head teachers who are trying to find the balance between leading a ‘high-performance’ and ‘person-centred’ school?

**References:**

Fielding, M. (2006) *Leadership, personalisation and high performance schooling: naming the new totalitarianism*. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), pp. 347-369

**Appendix 3 – interview questions for third (last) interview**

Interview questions – Joe Williams dissertation

Michael Fielding (2006) categorised 2 contrasting types of school; the ‘high performance’ and ‘person-centred’ school. The aim of this research is to understand how head teachers are able to lead person-centred schools in a growing climate of accountability to meet external performance targets.

In other words, is it possible to champion student achievement (that is, students excelling in all areas of their development) rather than focussing just on student attainment (how well they do in their external examinations)?

**Questions:**

**What?**

Firstly, I have been told that your school values all aspects of a child's education rather than just focussing on their attainment (a person-centred as opposed to high-performance approach) but this is an outsider's perspective. To what extent do you agree with this opinion?

What does a person-centred approach look like in your school?

Does this approach have an effect on student attainment?

To what extent is it practical to prioritise other benefits (e.g. improving students' social skills) over student attainment?

### **How?**

How has the approach of the school changed since you have been head teacher?

---

#### **High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

#### **Person-centred**

"Committed to wider human purposes"

Focus on student achievement

Does the message of what approach you take as a school change depending on your audience? If so, how does it change?

---

#### **High-performance**

Focus is on outcomes, student attainment

#### **Person-centred**

"Committed to wider human purposes"

Focus on student achievement

How does the type of school you want to lead affect the type of staff you recruit?

How do you reconcile government policy that might have a negative impact on students? (e.g. the recent change to KS2 SATs)

**Why?**

What factors have influenced you to lead the direction of the school in the way you have?

Which factor has had the biggest influence? Why this factor?

Why do you think so many schools do just focus on attainment?

What advice would you give to head teachers who are trying to create a person-centred school?

Reference:

Fielding, M. (2006) *Leadership, personalisation and high performance schooling: naming the new totalitarianism*. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), pp. 347-369

#### **Appendix 4 – interview transcript A – Headteacher A**

Interview transcript – Headteacher A, from School A

**So, is this [pointing to the picture on a power point presentation] the old school?**

Yeah this is the old school. We are sat about a mile away from us [where the new school is] to the north-east. Very small site, so if you look at the field there an average year 9 can throw the javelin over the neighbour's garden. It was built for a grammar school for girls for 400 [students], when we left it in January 2012 we had a thousand students in it and the students, I suppose, at that time came largely from less affluent areas within the London borough of Sutton. Some came from the three main council estates, as it were, not saying that they are any better or worse than anyone else but that's where they came from. We had relatively high levels of deprivation (CHALLENGE). So, at the time, when I took over in 2005 we weren't the most popular, shall we say. On that road at the top of the school [pointing to the picture], just outside the gate, when I drove to school in the morning there were students stood in other uniforms looking to go elsewhere. And only 12 students came from the primary school at the top right of this picture [very close to the secondary school]. 12 out of 90 came to us even though we were 250m up the road. (CHALLENGE)

**So were they looking for the selective schools?**

They were partially looking for the selective schools, or other non-selective schools in Sutton. Sutton has got a bizarre system. It's got 5 grammars all of which appear in the top 30 nationally in attainment. You've got two faith schools, both accept boys and girls, they draw the next ability range. And you've got others that select from other criteria, some that select by performing arts, some by equal banding, some by paired primaries, tennis ability. So historically, [school A] was the secondary modern school. This is why we were the most deprived which is why we got the One School Pathfinder out of the 14 schools in Sutton.

**Ok, you were saying earlier that you just missed the cut [the school won the One School Pathfinder money just before the scheme was scrapped by government]...**

We just missed the cut, so at the end of my first year in 2006 in about July time we were told [school A] was going to be the One School Pathfinder and that I had to redesign a school (CHANGE). It had to be completely different, completely innovative, 21<sup>st</sup> Century, call it what you what you like. (CHANGE)

**And that [being innovative] was a stipulation?**

Yeah, that's right. To get your £38 million you weren't allowed to do the same and that was a sense of relief for me and a sense of relief for Sutton. You know, we were a basket case. Actually, it's all contextual, isn't it? Results were 15%, the behaviour was an issue, without being out of control but it certainly was an issue, it affected the teachers, affected their morale. It was a good excuse to do something different (CHANGE). When I was in my first year I approached it very differently; let's batten down the hatches, let's get the kids in uniform, let's get them lined up, let's get them in the classroom. (CHANGE). A real push on hammering down on the rules. I suppose, I felt that that only gets you so far, in my view and that actually at some point you will plateau, and this might be contextual and depend on the kids you've got but you get to a certain point and there's nothing more and you actually need to approach it in a different way to get to the next level and so for us we went to this place [shows a picture of a school in Copenhagen] which is [a] school in Copenhagen which you might have heard of... have you heard of [name of a school in California]?

50

## Yes, in California?

55 Yes, well [the school in Copenhagen] was the high tech high of the 2000s where loads of British educational tours went to and I walked into this place... Well firstly I walked in without anyone challenging me which is bizarre for us due to the safeguarding push and there was no receptionist as I could remember, there were shoes all over the place, there were kids running in socks. It was an all-through school from four to sixteen and I'd been in this school for 10 minutes and I hadn't met an adult which was really worrying in some ways and I just wandered about and I got to this point and as it turns out (there were no walls anywhere, it was like a warehouse) this is a classroom [headteacher A points to a picture] and I thought, my god, and this was a lesson and again I couldn't find the teacher, kids were doing different things. I actually went to another classroom which was a bit more structured and there were a few more walls, but as it turns out the kids were all working on a similar outcome but they were doing it in different ways so you had a group here who were doing it through art, a group doing it through drama, a group doing it through ICT and there was another group doing it sat on these chairs here. And these kids were about 10 years old and they just got up and left. So I thought 'I'm going to follow them'. I followed them and they went outside and I followed them a bit more and actually you can just about see them here [points to a picture]. This is next to a Copenhagen dock with a 15m drop into deep water. I ran back in because I was really worried but actually it was only when I reflected on that that actually the kids knew what they were doing, they knew the deadline of what they had to do, they were working in different ways to get to a certain outcome, they negotiated their breaks, they hadn't reacted on-masse to one particular instruction (TRUST) and so what came out of that whole thing for us was the absolute primacy of trusting relationships (VALUES/RELATIONSHIPS), it was spun throughout the entire system. Then I talked to the kids, these were ordinary kids, in an ordinary part of Denmark. They weren't selected, they weren't affluent, it was an ordinary part of Copenhagen and they were fluent in god knows how many languages, they were confident without being overly-confident, they presented themselves really well, they articulated themselves really well, they were knowledgeable, they were polite and you think, we've got to change something here because here's my lot who were in this really rigid system of being lined up, face the front, put your hand up to ask a question. You've all got the same work, here a bit of differentiation with a worksheet. Here was something completely different. So we knew we had to change our philosophy, our approach if we were going to get the longer term gains that we thought we wouldn't get if we just adopted that rigid approach (CHANGE).

90 So, we took our staff out there. Everyone who wanted to know. 70-80 staff. Cheapest professional development I've ever done. Flights, accommodation and meal, £200 a head. It's £400 up in London. I simply said to staff, "this is going to blow your socks off", I didn't give a long speech just said it will blow your mind. I said there are things you'll like and things you won't like; all I want you to do to is to think about that. When we came back we went through all the things we liked and things that would work if we tweaked them.

95 We then took 30 kids out, a real mix, and put them in for a week to see what they thought (LISTENING). So we put all that together under the central banner of 'relationships', about how you design a school that emphasises relationships totally (RELATIONSHIPS). We don't do things here if it solely produces results (VALUES). We do things because it improves relationships, because if we do that, the achievement and attainment tends to look after itself.

100 **Did you believe in the idea that it was all about relationships before you went to Denmark?**

No, not at all. I had only been a head a year then. I was still firefighting, learning on the job and I hadn't had a minute to sit down and think a philosophy of how to run a school (TIME).  
105 If I hadn't had the opportunity to go [visit the school in Denmark] I'd probably still be doing the same things I did in my first year because that's the way it is done. Everyone does it and everyone has to do it better, harder, longer. So no I hadn't, it was literally that moment when I saw the kids walking out and seeing the interactions between students, staff and parents I thought "yeah this is the crux of it". After that I came into contact with Human Scale  
110 Education.

**It seems like it's all comes from One School Pathfinder. Do you think it would have happened without that?**

115 I'd like to claim I would have come up with a fantastic idea myself but if I'm totally honest I would doubt it very much because I would have been institutionalised, country-ised, system-ised and you would have been driven with the obsession with the way we do things here and the need to do things better here (VALUES), so I have been very lucky, as were the other pathfinders. Initially being given opportunities to think about it differently (TIME), having  
120 thought about it differently the second intention was to act as a role model. It was a bit like banging your head against a brick wall at times, due to the pressure that heads are under improve results, meet Ofsted criteria, improve league table positions (CHALLENGE).

**So was "One School Pathfinder" a government policy?**

125 Yeah, it was thrown in the very last minute. We didn't think we were getting a new school in Sutton until 2019 and suddenly came the One School Pathfinder and there were 18 authorities that were going to get them and literally we heard in March 2006 and Sutton had a beauty contest, or un-beauty contest, of who was the most deprived and disadvantaged and  
130 obviously, it was going to be us and then July that was it. So in 5 months we went from knowing nothing to being given £38 million to build a new school (CHANGE).

**That's quite a change...**

135 (CHANGE) Total change and a real challenge. But it provided the impetus for us to do things differently.

[Headteacher A gives a brief timeline of the building of the school until it opened in January 2012]

140

**So what was happening in the mean time in the old school?**

145 First of all, in the old school, having come back from Copenhagen, we realised there was no point in waiting (CHANGE/ADVICE). I think that was possibly where the other schools might have suffered, in that they thought they could move to a new school and everything changed when they got there. We made the conscious decision of, despite the confines of the old building, we are going to put some of the practices and structure in place in the current school so that we could develop. We couldn't do the four mini-schools, and that's the main structure for building relationships, but one of the things that we did do was around the EF

150 curriculum which is a competency or skills-based curriculum in years 7 and 8 and that was  
taught by teams of teachers (CURRICULUM). We tried to cobble together large rooms by  
knocking down walls in the old building. That started in 2008 so we had four years running  
before it got to the new environment to up the ante to make it better. We also created  
vocational spaces in the old school. In as much as we can here, learning has parity of esteem  
155 so our car mechanics is just as important as mathematics.

A lot of the curriculum structures and a lot of the early stages of the pedagogy started there  
rather than having a new building and thinking 'oh god we've got to do all this' (CHANGE).

160 **How did the students change with the changes you were making?**

The kids do notice the changes over time and we have given them much more responsibility  
(TRUST). So looking at behaviour first of all we were very structured "do this, don't do  
that".

165 [phone call on interviewer's phone interrupts the interview]

In year 7 and year 8 there's a real trusting relationship so the kids are given to do things,  
they're trusted to do them, they're allowed to go out of the classroom, they're allowed to go  
170 to the break-out rooms to do it [an activity] so there isn't a teacher sat there controlling the  
whole lot (TRUST). That's paid dividends in terms of how much they've come on. We've  
got a strong emphasis on self and peer assessment and on children validating their own work  
and expressing their validation to parents in student-led conferences. We don't have parents'  
evenings, we have student-led conferences (RELATIONSHIPS). We hope it is giving them  
175 some of the confidence and some of the characteristics of the children I described earlier in  
Copenhagen.

180 **I noticed you had a set of 9 values on your website and they seem to be around trusting  
relationships and person-centred based; how did you come up with those? Did they  
come after the trip to Denmark?**

Yeah I think we did. We obviously sat down with a group of teachers and students after the  
visits we had [including USA and Iceland as well as Denmark]. We thought about what skills  
students needed to be successful in the future and at no point did we think [about attainment]  
185 (VALUES). Ours aren't attainment driven at all, they are skills we think children need to  
have happy and successful lives, to have careers that they are passionate about and they get  
paid for and ones that they contribute positively to the community (VALUES).

In our EF curriculum, [the values] are our assessment objectives  
190 (CURRICULUM/VALUES). The kids learn about the values in the first term, they learn  
about how we assess and they learn about the wide range of option [subjects].

Each year 7 class produces one of these [a book about what happens at the school, including  
values]. They get it published at the end of the seven weeks and then sell it to their parents  
195 and the year 6s at the end of the year. So it's a real drive to emphasise the values we have  
rather than the results (VALUES).

**But I noticed that the results did improve as well...**

200 Well, if you take the core measures we've gone from 15% to 60% in ten years [progress  
made in each year except for one] (CHANGE/TIME). By and large that's not been about  
chasing results. Yes, we do interventions but we don't hammer the life out of them  
(RESULTS). If you chase these [values] objectives in year 7, 8, 9 and if you enthuse and  
engage the kids then that's the thing that will improve the results (BALANCE). The one dip  
205 we had was in 2012 when they knackered us on grade boundaries for GCSE English. If they  
hadn't changed the grade boundaries we would have been on 49% but we tumbled to 35%  
and I'm still very bitter about that (CHALLENGE).

**I noticed that in 2013 you got Requires Improvement for student achievement...**

210 What happened was in 2012 Ofsted came round after the results, we knew they were going to  
come in, and the inspector came expecting a nut house and he struggled because he had the  
rubric (CHALLENGE) and DfE in his ear on the one hand but he couldn't tally it. He said,  
"I'm knackered, the system is against me, they're not going to let me do any more for you, I  
215 know your results are going to be 55% next year but I'm going to have to put you in RI  
because of your results".

**Why was the system against you?**

220 Because, at the time, if you were below floor target, 40%, you couldn't get anything below  
RI (CHALLENGE)

**Was that a country-wide policy?**

225 Yeah, absolutely. We were slaughtered. And English is our best department. If you look at  
the results, always doing fantastic.

**Can you tell me a bit about your leadership through those times? Because it must have  
been a challenge to keep doing what you were doing despite getting RI.**

230 It did affect me very very badly because we had worked so hard to get from 15% of what  
were white, working class students. We dragged it to 42% which took some doing to get  
there and we had year on year improvements. But when it happened I knew damn well Ofsted  
were going to knock on my door. When they came they were lovely. They made you feel  
235 alright but you knew what was coming (CHALLENGE)

There was a point when I thought 'I give up' (CHALLENGE) but you have to show a bit of  
resilience, you keep doing what you're doing, keep believing what you're doing (VALUES),  
not reverting to type and sure enough the results were up to 55% the following year and our  
240 results were among the most improved in the country.

So I went through a period of self-doubt but in fairness, on reflection, it's made us a better  
school and it's made me a better leader because you need to go through something like that to  
come out of it stronger. We are better for it (CHALLENGE).

245 **Were there any organisations or people in particular who were pressuring you to move  
back to type as a school?**

250 The [Local Education Authority] have been thoroughly supportive all the way. They could have said, you're not the right man for the job, you're doing it wrong, but they didn't. The governors have been totally supportive (TRUST). In fairness, Ofsted, when they came in, were really supportive. There were those in government who had a vested interest in education who weren't supportive of our approach (CHALLENGE).

255 **That's interesting, because it was the DfE who gave you the One School Pathfinder so 8 years on its role reversal.**

260 Yeah this is the irony of it all. We've been given permission to be innovative but actually you want us to be innovative in your way which actually isn't innovative. But I'm not sure we can use [pathfinder] anymore because if I say, 'you've given me permission to do this' they'll say, 'sod off'.

265 **That brings me onto a question about your audiences. Do you change your message to the different audiences you speak to or not?**

270 I try not to because I actually think that everyone appreciates honesty and transparency so I've always tried to say it how it is, so if we've messed up, which we have, we say so (HONESTY). I think that's particularly important of the parents. Teachers are important too - if you take them out on a limb, which I have done, and they've supported you then they've been fantastic. The kids have responded magnificently to our way of working and the governors are supportive too. But if you take one group of people it would have to be the parents. You're trusting your child in something that's unproven, that they're not familiar with and there is a real risk that it is going to go wrong and that it will affect their child for the rest of their lives (TRUST). But the parents here have been incredibly supportive over time, very accepting of the changes [no levels up to year 9, only formative comments, and other changes mentioned earlier] and they've trusted us. Yes, they've seen improving results but equally we say it's not just about the results so they've got to see a value beyond the results. Now they are incredible advocates of the school; if there is ever a criticism of the school on social media, particularly about some of our innovative stuff, [the parents] will pile in and defend our school. The parents will defend student-led conferences over parents evening.

285 **In terms of their opinions of what made a good school, did that change as they saw the development of the school?**

290 Back in the day, I suppose they realised the school was in difficulty so they were very willing to support change (CHANGE). They were told that we were changing to the EF curriculum, they come in at the end of each term, they come in for the book launch, for the poetry evening. So it feels like they came along for the journey with the school and that they're involved (CHANGE). They read the blog, I write a blog every Monday about education that goes out to parents. It talks about any research that supports the way we do things, and it just reinforces what we do and why we do it. It's about keeping them fully informed and fully involved.

295 **What do parents think of your honest approach?**

Yeah they often call me up on things and that's fair cop. So I think as long as you're honest and open with them, by and large, they'll go with you (HONESTY). It's when they don't know, when they're uninformed, they'll go against you.

300

**I read somewhere that you're now oversubscribed for year 7 places. Why do you think that is?**

305

I'd like to think it's not the [new] building. I make it clear at open evening, don't pick [the school] because of the building, choose it for its values and practices (VALUES). It is going to be about results, we tell them about the results but we don't go banging on about it (RESULTS). It will be the fact that results have gone up and that gives them confidence, undoubtedly.

310

I think there's a degree of giving parents what they like. I think there is a real parental voice of "we've had enough of these exam targets, league tables, of the EBacc". There's a degree to which they like the fact [the school] has made a stand and not been compliant, ruffled a few feathers, but we are doing it for the kids (VALUES). And if we mess up on results, we apologise but they know we do it for the kids, they know everything we do here we do it for the kids (HONESTY). There's no gimmicks here, we don't force them to do EBacc, we put the kids in for qualifications for them but not for the school, for example BTEC car mechanics, BTEC horticulture, the kids get GCSE equivalent, we don't. We don't pursue buckets, we haven't got a clue what buckets we're in. We don't do things like the European driving licence which gives extra points. There's absolutely no gimmicks here at all (CURRICULUM).

315

320

**That's really interesting. I did notice you had fewer students than national average entering for the EBacc. Is that a conscious decision?**

325

No, if the child wants to do the EBacc we fully support that. If you want to do it, do it. If you are fully passionate about it, fantastic. If our weakest child is passionate about rivers and that drives them to do geography, fantastic. What we don't do is "you're bright, you have to do geography and history and a language" ((FUTURE) CHALLENGE). We don't do that at all, we allow kids to follow their passions. We have no fixed blocks at all, they do the compulsory subjects. Outside of that there are 4 option blocks. There are 28 subjects to choose from. It is entirely up to them, we don't get anywhere near EBacc or filling the buckets. To add to that I've got a 91-student ASD unit, who will get nowhere near EBacc.

330

**Everything you do seems student-focussed. How do you justify to Ofsted inspectors not jumping through their hoops, when in normal schools such as my school, if we didn't know about buckets we would get torn to shreds?**

335

Well Ofsted are supportive of everything you do as long as it ticks their boxes. If I didn't tick their box in terms of attainment going the right way. Our attainment for progress 8 is -0.05 which considering we don't focus on buckets or EBacc, and have qualifications that don't count for the school, and I have 13 autistic kids each year who get nowhere near 8 subjects. Actually that's a bloody good score.

340

So I think Ofsted actually appreciate it, particularly if you get a team of head teachers (CONFIDENCE). Last time, we had 3 of 5 in the team as current head teachers who value what we are doing. As long as your headline figures are ok. It comes back to the fundamental

345

argument, get relationships right, engage and enthuse the kids, results will look after themselves (BALANCE/VALUES).

350 **Would that be your advice for head teachers trying to do that?**

Yes that would be my advice with the one proviso that the people above them have to give them time (TIME). This is not a quick fix. If you want quick fixes, go down the PiXL route. Which works incredibly well, gets results up very quickly. Damages the average and affects schools that don't do it but that's the quick fix. If you want to do it the values-driven way you've got to give it time. It's a human process. There will be peaks and troughs, it's not linear (TIME/CHANGE). Then there will suddenly be exponential development, that's happened to us in the last year. It's about what happens now.

360 **I was about to ask, what next for [your school]?**

What happens now, we've decided at no point should we attempt to be compliant. We can't afford to take on others at the game they play, we will simply lose. We won't be as good as other schools, we have to continue being innovative, non-compliant.

365 **In term of what?**

Exam results, self-esteem of the school, staff morale, parental interest, community interest. The whole thing. We've got to keep innovating, if we are going to continue developing.

370 **How does that innovation happen? Is that the point of [the school's innovation unit]?**

Yeah, for us now, we're looking at all sorts of things. [Points to a whiteboard with a list of school things e.g. marking]. These are things we are really concerned about. For example, we're concerned about meetings and how they operate, we're done with those. Performance management is the next thing. Lesson observations.

Why do we do lesson observations? I can sit in here now and I know my teachers are doing well (TRUST).

380 **You trust your teachers?**

Yeah, I walk around, I know what's going on. I don't need half an hour for a set lesson plan (TRUST). We're thinking about doing INSET days differently, and taking 10 minutes off each lesson to give teachers more time. We're looking at, 'why do we do a five-day week? Why don't we do 5 days one week, 4 days the next week? Will parents buy-in to this? Do we put training on the fifth day?'. Reporting is about to go on-masse, except for year 11 where we'll give them a detailed passport. Year 7,8,9,10 - what's the point of doing reports?

390 Those are the sorts of things I think will take us onto the next level, not going along the harder, faster, longer approach.

395 **\*So if you need more time to go down the person-centred route, does it feel like a systematic problem?**

400 \*If you're going to do the compliant approach, you get results quicker than if you go down the personal approach where you give kids more freedom. It's like sheep herding, in the first approach you've got more sheepdogs than sheep, in the second one you've got a load of individual sheep and fewer dogs. So it takes a lot longer. One or two sheep run off now and again, or go into another field! It does take a lot longer. But I strongly believe the benefits in the long run for everyone involved.

### **So it's about being brave?**

405 Well, 'brave' gets thrown around a lot. I can't claim to be brave because I was given the opportunity. If I did it myself, then I would be brave. You have to be resilient. Resilience and perseverance are probably more important than bravery (RESILIENCE/CHALLENGE).

We've got to find more schools that are doing something different.

410

**Absolutely. The fact that I'm struggling to find any schools that are going down the person-centred approach, that are balancing that with good attainment, is really worrying.**

415 Yeah, schools, will claim they're doing it but they're not. This isn't a criticism because I feel the same pressures they do.

420 **\*It really strikes me that surely no one went into teaching because they wanted to focus just on GCSE and A level results. It really shocked me coming into this profession that it was so heavily focussed on attainment.**

425 \*And it's got worse. It's got tighter. It's become a game, government has made it tighter, profession tries to find a way around it, then government find another way to make things tighter. It's become a game, a competition. There's no collaboration between the two; central government and teachers. It's very toxic.

### **Is that a national or international problem?**

430 Well Denmark in 2006 was a lot freer. The trouble is that governments are chasing PISA results, as we are. And so Denmark are increasing teacher hours, making them clock in and out. Looks at the Scots at the moment. But also look at the high-flying countries at the moment, South Korea, they want to change. They're very nervous, they want to change. They see the pitfalls of what they are doing. They need to increase their personalisation.

### **It sounds like the grass is greener on the other side?**

Yeah, that's why independent schools are colonising China, because they have got the person-centred approach.

440 [Headteacher A shows me a map of all the people who have visited the school – more international high-profile visitors than from the UK]

445 [Headteacher A shows me an example of a project where the mini-school will do a play. They will have to apply for jobs in the theatre, interview for it and if they get the job they will work on it for the whole project until the play itself (e.g. acting, playwriting, set design). I

then have a short tour of the school. The head teacher justifies project-based learning by saying that usually content is taught at KS3 then the same at KS4. With projects, they won't study all the content at KS3 but they will have all the skills to succeed at KS4 and they'll be excited to learn new content rather than going over again].

450

End

of

interview

**Appendix 5 – interview transcript B – Headteacher B**

Interview transcript – Headteacher B, school B

[interviewer starts recording the interview late]

Shall I just go back and say this is a false dichotomy, it's not an either/or. Just because you're person-centred doesn't mean you don't care passionately about children's attainment, the two go together, we are in a learning business (BALANCE). We want the children to be the very best they can be, and that's in their results and in their relationships. The two really go together because you can't be a great learner without also being good at relationships. Learning is about a passionate interest in the outside world, and that would involve relating to others and mining their wisdom and their experience. So the two go together (BALANCE).

**Some schools are using attainment as the end goal whereas I think what you're saying is that attainment is the means by which you can show how good a learner you are. How do you feel about the former type of school?**

That attainment doesn't belong to the school, it belongs to the pupil and they're the ones who have to be committed to getting better, to learning more, to challenging themselves, to feel safe about taking risks. And to feel that their teachers are there to facilitate that journey.

**\*The problem in my school is that the results are the end product and it doesn't feel like it is a reflection of their learning, it feels more like it's becoming a factory to produce results...**

\*Yes, and factories are places where people feel dehumanised, a factory-model is very much an assembly-line model and an assembly-line model is episodic and staccato and you don't get that feeling of satisfaction of getting a completed, finished product.

**So are you saying that being a person-centred school is first and then the results look after themselves?**

No, I'm not saying that. When I took over this school it was a 100% person-centred school, to the extent that 'oh it doesn't matter if they learn to read, doesn't matter about their handwriting, let's not bother about hand-writing, that's just getting in the way of their other passions'. It was a child-centred school and the only thing that mattered was the interests of the child, and following their interest. If they didn't want to do maths that day then that was fine because they were following their interest by looking at the tadpoles, or hammering away on the woodwork tables. So I have experience of a completely different model. And yes, it is still a very warm-hearted school where the children's interests are respected. However, I describe learning in a school like this is having tea at the Ritz. First of all you have to have your sandwiches. You have to have your bread and butter. And that involves learning how to read, learning how to write, learning how to spell and to punctuate. Have your sandwiches, then come the cream cakes (CURRICULUM). So we do something called the international primary curriculum, which is a topic-based curriculum where the children follow their own inquiries and their own interests and go out on field trips and do experiments and generally have a marvellous time (CURRICULUM). But it's a very dichotomised curriculum.

**How does that look in terms of the school day?**

Morning – basic skills. Afternoon – IPC. And then I say, the champagne are the teachers. You add the fizz, you add the sparkle to both sides of the curriculum (CURRICULUM).

**Is that one of the first steps you changed when you took over?**

Oh yes, I took over 20 years ago when Ofsted were on the march and the national curriculum had been brought in and the school had completely ignored the accountabilities of both and would have very much been on the wrong side of an Ofsted inspection. But step by step, I hopefully kept the warm beating heart of the school but around it built rationales to give the children the very best in terms of being literate and numerate and creative (CHANGE).

55

**Your results are so far above national average in an area of such deprivation, what would you primarily put this down to?**

60

Firstly, we are deprivation-blind, we don't think about it. It's not part of the conversation. It used to be part of the conversation 'these are Bengali, EAL speakers, what can you expect the boys aren't going to learn to read until seven or eight years old' or 'the girls never speak' or the cultural or class expectations were overlaying how the teachers saw the children. And I still hear a little bit of it and I always challenge it. These are learners, and they come with great passion and we just have to build on that (PHASES). It doesn't matter if you come from a council house or one of the posh, gentrified houses [near the school]. We treat you exactly the same (VALUES). No excuses. Again, that's something perhaps you need to overlay, in terms of how the children are seen.

65

70

**That's really interesting. I feel that my school can learn a lot from that viewpoint. So, the international primary curriculum, when did you introduce that?**

15 years ago. We were one of the original schools in London to introduce it. I came across it purely by accident. I live in Greenwich, and there was a conference in Greenwich University. I was just walking through and I thought 'I'll just gate-crash the conference' and there I heard music to my ears: primary school practice which was creative and inspirational and hands-on and enquiry-based and experiential (CURRICULUM). All the good things from a child-centred approach that was starting to disappear from the national curriculum. It was all there in one document. So I gate-crashed and sat at the back. We were the first primary school to take it up, now there are hundreds more across the country.

75

80

**When you introduced that, did you do it to purely inspire the learners or did you do it to improve attainment as well?**

85

I think attainment was improving anyway with what we were doing in the mornings. You can see what children were doing by the age of five and it was very pleasing. But the national curriculum was taking the joy out of art and science and the humanities, and it felt like a really good idea to bring the joy and inspiration back and of course because the teachers here had already touched based with that kind of learning, they were very keen to take it up.

90

**\*And because obviously, you engaged and enthused your students with the IPC, do you feel that had an impact on the morning sessions?**

95

\*Yes

**\*So there's more engagement with the basic skills?**

100

\*More engagement, total engagement, yes. But remember these children are younger, and primary-aged children tend to be very engaged and motivated unless there's something very

badly wrong with the culture of the school. You're dealing with teenagers who need to be sold more, who need to bring them to a place of learning (PHASES). And you're in Chatham as well, which perhaps have a different set of cultural expectations around learning.

105 **So you changed the school so that there was some degree of focus on attainment which was necessary. Do you feel now that you have found the right balance?**

110 I think we are in the same place, I think in terms of attainment we are always looking for ways to get better. I think what we can do now is guarantee a consistency of a journey. A child joining us at aged 3 or 4 will leave us with a very high probability of exceeding national expectations. At least of meeting them but a high probability of exceeding them. We have cohorts of 45 children and there will be 2 or 3 children who have severe special educational needs who won't, obviously for many reasons, be able to meet or exceed. But for children without special needs, we do get them there. So no change, but always on the lookout for  
115 'how can we do this better?'. At the moment, we are very interested in children speaking. How can we engage the children so that their spoken word forms their thought processes so that we have a more nuanced, complex dialogue with them? Sometimes, the interchange can be quite simplistic and closed. So what we are looking at is to open that dialogue, and create a nuanced conversation where the children are thinking more deeply. So looking at  
120 developing programme and protocols that will lead the children there (CHANGE).

**\*And where did that focus come from? Was it from speaking to the children?**

125 \*A lot of our children are from south-Asian heritage and, culturally there's a quietness to the children. What we would like them to do is not to be really noisy but to develop their voice. What they say is extended. When I went to college there was a gentleman called Basil Bernstein who studied the way east London people spoke to each other and then went to posher parts of London. He divided language into a restricted code which he felt was spoken here, and an extended code which he felt were spoken by more middle class families, and he  
130 felt that that extended code gave the children a ticket to higher education and eventually to more successful jobs. And I feel that some of our children are in a restricted code and we can give them a more extended way to talking.

**\*And is the aim of that to give them the best career possible?**

135 \*Yes, I think so. Giving them the words...

**\*For them to express themselves?**

140 \*Yes, after all we have Canary Wharf on our doorstep. They should be able to get to an interview and be up in that boardroom. Run whatever they want to run. And I think word, language and facility to use language is the key.

145 **\*I imagine that will also have a good effect on English attainment. Is that another reason as to why you're focussing on speaking?**

\*Yes, yes, of course. The demands on primary aged children are very high at the moment in terms of literacy and their understanding of quite complicated reading. They're given a text that years ago wouldn't have been given to them until they were around 13 or 14 years old.

150 So what we are trying to do is to accelerate perhaps exposure to a more complex way of using language.

**That brings me onto this question: to what extent would you prioritise other benefits over student attainment? Would you ever do something that you felt was important but that might have a negative effect on student attainment?**  
155

I'm trying to think what that might be.

**For example, there are some studies that say project-based learning does not increase student-attainment. Other studies say that it is beneficial but overall it is inconclusive. Obviously it has other benefits...**  
160

Well we do project-based learning, IPC is 100% project-based learning. I think it can fall flat on its face if you don't get teacher buy-in. I tell you what a lot of schools do here which we don't do here, which I think is entirely person-centred but which I'm not committed to and that's circle time. It's very popular in primary schools. Everybody sits down after lunch time in a circle and passes round a teddy or a shell and says something. If there's 30 children around the class and they each take 2 minutes, that could be an hour or listening to somebody say something which can get very tedious. So yes, although it's person-centred, or it's meant to be person-centred, I think some of these circle time protocols can become very tedious and non-productive (VALUES).  
165  
170

And I don't encourage something called golden time which is a complete waste of a Friday afternoon. Friday afternoon becomes wet playtime where all the games and comics come out and you can do what you like on the computer. And I think 'no, actually, we are a 5 day week, we're not a 4 and a half day week. But that's a waste of time, circle time and golden time.  
175

**The message of what your school is like, does that ever change depending on who you're speaking to?**  
180

It doesn't really (HONESTY), I think if we were to capture the school in one sentence I would say we hit the sweet spot of warm relationships and high attainment. It is a sweet spot, and you have to keep working at it. As the leader of the school, it's a very intricate, intertwining of great relationships, great systems, great expectations (BALANCE). So we keep an eye on our systems as well. For parents, children and staff we do something called Kiazen which is the Japanese quality circles (LISTENING). A quality circle is when you get people together to talk about what's working, what's not working and what needs tweaking. So it can be anything to do with the school, any system or routine. That's why we did a radical change of lunchtimes. No queuing up, no dinner ladies. Children sit on tables and help themselves.  
185  
190

**And that came from Kiazen?**

Yes, quality circles. The children chose their menus (LISTENING). Very interestingly, children do not want choice. We have a 5-day menu, that's all. Children love it, they know what to expect. They have fruit and bread as well and it's a beautiful experience. It comes from looking at a system that didn't work, queuing and regimentation and cross dinner ladies.

200 **Going back to the factory model...**

It's back to the factory! That's when you start becoming person-centred.

205 So yes, we always look at the system. Incremental degradation; even good systems will degrade with time. Keep an eye on how the children are being organised. And talk to the users of the system, the parents, the children, the teachers. It's system, expectations and relationships. And it's a really intricate intertwining of the three and that's where you get the sweet spot (BALANCE).

210 And we need to be immediate. Immediacy is really important. If something needs to be done, do it now (ADVICE). Don't make a to do list, do it now. Immediacy and accessibility, doors are always open. People can go in and out of rooms and talk to each other and sort things out. So the deputy and me, same room, the conversation is immediate. There are all kind of things that go on to make it a dynamic and organic organisation.

215 **And you're a national leader of education, is that right?**

Yes, a NLE.

220 **And you said you worked in Chatham?**

Yes

225 **So how does the idea of relationships, systems and expectations fit into your work as a NLE?**

A lot of the schools we work with are very warm in their relationships and very low in their attainment. One of the things we are doing is sharing our tips and tricks to bring the children to a better place.

230 **\*This is anecdotal but it feels like there is a difference between primary schools and secondary schools. It seems, from what you're saying, primary schools focus too much on person-centred approach**

235 \*They do

**\*Where as secondary schools feel more and more like they are factories pumping out results.**

240 \*Primaries are going this as well, the big academy chains, the big federations. Cookie-cutting model, All the teachers have to comply.

245 **I've seen as well that you worked with parliament. The all-party education committee on accountability...**

Oh yes, a while ago now. Every now and again they call on primary heads with experience. I think now I'm too maverick, they don't want to hear me anymore. They haven't asked me for a while, I'm out of favour.

250 **So your message of your school didn't change for parliament either?**

No, no. We are as we are, and I'm proud of it (HONESTY).

255 **Key stage 2 SATS last year were very controversial. I read an article that said putting students through it was almost child cruelty. How do you deal with government policy that you have to enact but could have negative effects on your students?**

260 Well I think you have to do a little bit of horizon scanning, before it comes (ADVICE). So I knew this was coming about two years before it happened. [Headteacher + deputy] read very widely, we go to a lot of conferences, we knew about the new expectations so we put preparations in early on so that the cohort coming through were prepared. And I think that's the only way we can do it. So rather than wait for the year 6 to come in and think "Oh S\*\*t!". You can't wait until they are in year 6. You have to start in year 2 or 3. It's a whole school journey for them.

265

**So do you think that was part of the issue with the new SATS?**

270 I think so, I think a lot of schools, a lot of leadership perhaps is policy-blind. They didn't actually recognise that things are changing around them or they are not quick enough in their response. They know that things are changing but they are not quick enough to respond to changes. So you have to be quite nimble in this environment. To know that changes are on the way, and lay down plans for those changes and it will change again.

275 **Why do you feel that it did change?**

A new education secretary will bring a whole new set of expectations. Michael Gove, he didn't make any secret of it. We knew that grammar would be on the cards in year 6 so we introduced it earlier in the school.

280 We do spelling bees, maths time table championships etcetera to introduce it early to students.

285 **So you are celebrating attainment. Do you ever celebrate things that are not going to be tested?**

I suppose we do, in assemblies the awards are for all kinds of soft skills. We are a 'you can do it' school which is again about the softer skills: confidence, persistence, cooperation. You get a 'you can do it' medal, all the children get that.

290 **You spoke about looking on the horizon. Ofsted haven't been on the horizon for a very long time. I was just wondering, why do you think that is?**

295 I think they are too busy, our results are so good it's hardly worth throwing money and time and resources at us. They'll come when there's a change; in leadership or a dip in results. As long as that doesn't happen it's very unlikely they will waste time and money on a school like us.

**\*The advice you're giving to schools as a NLE: is it that you need to raise attainment almost to get Ofsted off your back?**

300

\*Yes, and then you can breathe easily and bring in the things that you really love doing.

**Finally, why did you come into education and what drove you to become a head teacher?**

305

I never wanted to be a head teacher. I only wanted to be a classroom teacher. But there are always pressures on you to do more. 'Why don't you become literacy coordinator?' Then there was an emergency deputy head teacher secondment. And then this school came up, and I really didn't want a school that was totally child-centred. I thought it would be impossible to turn it around but when I came and visited I liked the people and I thought 'I can work with you'.

310

**End**

**of**

**interview**

**Appendix 6 – interview transcript C – Headteacher C**

Interview transcript – School C

Interviewer speaking – **bold text**

Headteacher C speaking – normal text

Deputy Headteacher C speaking – *italics text*

**I am looking at how head teachers balance being a ‘person-centred’ school and a ‘high performance’ school. How do you go about this at your school?**

5 I feel that if we didn’t build those relationships, we wouldn’t be able to have such good results (BALANCE) because when I first started here, and [the Deputy Headteacher] will be able to talk about it as well because we started the same year, there wasn’t a person-centred approach or high results and part of it was that the children didn’t feel valued. There was a high staff turnover because people weren’t investing in the children, and what we’ve done in the years leading up until now is increase our inclusion team to meet the needs of the children. We went from one SENCo and myself as the inclusion leader, to having a SENCo on each site, we’ve got an inclusion leader who’s the deputy, we’ve got bereavement councillors, domestic violence councillors, educational and clinical psychologists and we’ve built this package up of learning mentors, behaviour mentors, all highly trained to get to know our children (CHANGE/RELATIONSHIPS). Our social service and safeguarding involvement is a lot higher as well. A knock-on effect is the behaviour, it’s absolutely lovely here.

*And the grades started to go up once we put all these things in as well.*

20 **I’ve spoken to two headteachers so far. One said they focussed on relationships first, the other said they had to improve results first, then only when they felt safe could they improve the relationships. Where do you stand on this?**

25 I don’t know how you can focus on grades first (BALANCE). The children here wouldn’t have bought into us pushing for results. I think it comes from children trusting us (TRUST) and they certainly didn’t before. The year we started teaching, 75% of year 5 and 6 were below national expectations [SATs], then over the course of two years only 2% didn’t pass, that’s one child, and that’s just by valuing those children. We gave each student a plan to get them through and the results followed. And the children were enjoying school as well. At that time, we also expanded to 1.5 form entry to 4 form entry, which is on two sites. So we had to value the children to make sure those results kept themselves because the amount of children going through here, you need to have those systems in place where children can go to people, can trust people, for there then to be the knock on effect (TRUST).

35 **When did you start here?**

2011

40 **What was the approach like before you arrived?**

*It was results-driven. Previous leadership were very focussed on data and results. Some of the softer skills like making sure children are secure of themselves and have good self-esteem, and even feeling safe here was almost secondary and it wasn’t the top priority.*

45 **What was the catalyst for that change?**

Leadership leaving. Then we had a chance for the people who stayed here to do what we knew would be a good ethos for the school, to make the school work.

50 **How long did that take to build that?**

We started in 2011. By 2013 things were starting to change but we had 77 children on a register who were at risk from themselves or others for different reasons. By the time Ofsted came in at 2014, systems were in place by then (TIME). But I would say now there is an even bigger shift (CHANGE/TIME); now there are children and parents who have travelled through who trust us (TRUST). Whereas when Ofsted came in three years ago it was the early days of trusting. Even now I've got a CP [child protection] thing with a parent. Five years ago they would have been shouting and screaming at me, now he says "I understand [headteacher C], you've got to do this" (TRUST). So that whole ethos that parents know we do it because we have to do it because we care for the children – it's a very different reaction you get to before (CHANGE).

### **What was the Ofsted inspection like prior to 2014?**

I wasn't here then. It was a "Good". I don't know, I couldn't comment. I only know from reading the report that it was an OK school with things doing well.

I do believe that the Ofsted that we got a reflection of the value of the staff and what they place into children because you could go into any school and find flaw I'm sure. But our results are good, the other day we got a letter saying we were in the top 3% of schools for progress (RESULTS). And that's more important for us that students make progress and we have had a few accolades for disadvantaged children and how well they have done.

*It's all about people respecting children's starting points. So nobody looks at their class and looks at them as one clump of children. Everybody here is an individual and you respect their individual needs and their right to make that progress. It's about everybody working towards that.*

And that's one thing we did back in 2013, we wiped all results internally and said 'let's start again' (CHANGE). Because the previous approach was results-led but probably wasn't reflective, we started afresh, so it meant that the teaching and learning the children were getting was more specific to them. It wasn't just a pie in the sky type teaching – 'let's get everybody teaching and learning the same thing'.

### **In terms of your person-centred approach, what do your celebrations look like?**

Some schools do that listening ear approach where you can go and speak to someone who will listen to you. The approach we started with was that everyone was respected and that it is not a hierarchical school, children don't go "Head teacher! Year six teacher!" [in a shocked way]. In my old school, year's back, when I was a year 1 teacher, it was like "you're a year 1 teacher" [and therefore has less respect than other teachers]. We wiped all that dictator-type leadership style (VALUES) and went back to square one of everybody respecting everybody, everybody just saying thank you as they go along, even staff modelling that thank you to each other, holding doors open to each other and things.

Now, our rewards for children reduce as they go into year 6. So you start off with the younger years taking a teddy bear over the weekend, 'ask me why I'm a star' sticker (star of the week certificate), but when then get into older school it's about saying I'm really proud of my work and we're proud of you because when you get to secondary school you're not going to have all of that cotton wool put around you. The other things that we started to introduce

were real life awards, tangible ones such as thirty students across a year group can go out each month on a rewards trip and they can have a really good learning experience to say thank you for following our school values. We've got 22 values and thank you for following them all the way. When we first started, I remember we had 8 students across the whole year group, we couldn't find thirty children to say 'well done'. And we've kept it like that, if you slip even slightly you are off the month's trip. You can earn other things so they're not left completely in a puddle of doom. But we have gradually built up and I remember after the first year of doing it we had to draw out of a hat because we had over 30 [children] and I think that giving those children those experiences and again listening to them; what they want and what they don't want.

**So is student voice quite a big thing here?**

Yes we have 16 leadership teams which means every child from year 1 to year 6 is in a leadership team of some form. Be it they are in a junior leadership team which is like school council, or they are eco-ambassadors or they are travel-ambassadors or they are premises [ambassadors] or whatever they do, so that they have a voice and they contribute to what we do here. It's not just them saying 'we would like to do this' and we say 'lovely' and ignore it, we do it (LISTENING). So things like our building, we extended over at the other site, they [students] planed it, they went out and measured it, they gave us what we wanted and we put it in the plans and gave it to the architects. We've got solar panels on the roofs over there because children in year 5 and 6 did a project discussing the value of it so we've got it up on the building now. We make sure we don't ignore it, we put it into practice (LISTENING).

**Do you ever change the message you give to people about your school, depending on the audience? For example, parents compared to Ofsted inspectors.**

No I would always say we value the children here, that's number one (HONESTY). The results are incidental, the results are great and they keep people off our backs but actually what's of more value to us is that we can send the children off to secondary school with a good start and we can say to them 'we've done well by you'. A good accolade that came back this year was one of our children that went off to a newly established secondary school, their head teacher called the parent and said 'what school did they go to before? Because how she approaches work, how she sets out her work, how she listens, she's got good training and it stands out from the other children'. That to me is great, she has gone with that independence and the skills that she can apply.

We are also a school that receives a lot of fair access panel children which is those that have been managed moved from other schools and they do very well here. We've had a couple of children who have needed to go onto specialist provisions, but those are extreme children.

*It goes back to our ethos again, about our attitude to children. If you do get a fair access child, you don't say 'oh my goodness this child is going to be so much trouble', we're more likely to say 'what's their need? What's their background? What are their triggers? What can we put in here to make the first couple of weeks smooth and then we can break some of those habits. It's really about what we can do as a school as teams of people to support the child and I think in some schools (RELATIONSHIPS), as a class teacher people would be put in a room, they would be given thirty kids, door shut and you are left to it. Here, because it is not hierarchical, you have leaders saying 'how can I help?'. We don't talk about it explicitly but there is a real servant leadership approach here. All of the leadership team are*

155 *Outstanding practitioners in the classroom. We will jump in and help with planning or teaching. I'm still teaching a class, everybody still teaches. Everybody is an Outstanding practitioner and that is one of the things that gives you that credibility and it means you are more able to support teachers to give them what children need. You're not looking at it as 'my job is about data'. You're looking at it as 'my job is about making sure that everybody has got the tools that they need to do the best job for [the children]'.*

**\*And the data follows?**

160 *\*The data follows, if that child is happy and can access the learning and cares about the learning, and teachers are planning fun, engaging, challenging things for children to do. If that child is calm and happy and engaged and has bought into what we do and they know that you care about them, they'll do it and they'll make progress. It's getting that child in an emotional place where they can access the learning. There's no point planning an amazing lesson when they have got really low self-esteem because they are not going to be able to access it anyway, it's got to be both things together.*

**It sounds like staff are all on board with what you're doing, is that something you consciously had to change?**

170 In the beginning, yes, because there were a lot of staff who were hurt by previous leadership. But they were really willing to do it and I think we've never had to convince anyone. When we employ here we don't employ on 'this is the best teacher I've ever seen' we employ on the basis of 'they are a nice person and they seem like they like children'. We can teach them to teach.

175 *They want to get better, there is a desire to improve. Because there are always going to be changes here, things will always change. It's not a school where you come in and you know exactly what your day is going to be like. Things will change and it's about being flexible and about being willing to learn.*

180 And I think being a big school you've got to accept that as well. In some schools you have your PPA same time every week, here it will never be the same two weeks in a row. It just isn't and you get used to that quite quickly. And you can see quite quickly the people who aren't good at adapting. You've just got to adapt all the time with new children coming in. Also, with the amount of safeguarding and child protection files that we've got, it's a big part of the school here to keep those children safe and you've got to have a lot of energy here.

**So how to you cope? It sounds like a very energy intensive job...**

190 I cope because I absolutely love the children here, I love the staff here, I love what we've built here. I was here in the harder days, I love what we have done here [since then] and the difference we have made for a lot of children, a lot of families as well. I've often talked to [deputy headteacher C] about it, I've got no intention of going to another school. If I leave this school it's because I'm leaving education. I've got no intention of leaving anywhere else. I support and help out a lot of schools, but this just feels like home when you come back here. It's purely from the first face you see, they smile at you and say "Hi [headteacher C], can I help you with anything?". You don't get that everywhere else. It would be nice to spread the love but it took us a long time, about 4 year plus (TIME).

200

205 *I think 14-15 was the first class I had where I thought “you’ve got it” (TIME), the values were embedded and they were behaving differently and they were proud to be part of here. When you see your children, particularly when you teach year 6, when you see them go up to secondary, knowing you’ve given them that amazing start. When you have that conversation with parent about how they are getting on, it’s impossible not to feel proud about what the school does for those children and thinking what could have happened if the provision was not as good. You have changed the course of their lives, and that is an amazing thing to take part in.*

210 Whereas, I do remember the first SATS here, and the year 6s going off, the feel was like ‘the year’s over’ [said in a relieved way]. But I also remember two of them graffitied their SATS papers. Nothing we can do about that, and one of them wrote “F\*\*\* you” on it. Got full marks all the way down to question number 7 and then wrote “F\*\*\* you SATS” on it. We obviously didn’t know because you bag them up and send them off, and the STA phoned me  
215 and said what the student had written. That’s how they felt at the time about life, so it’s about us changing how our children feel about life (CHANGE).

One other problem we had here was that the parents weren’t behaving in the playground. So we brought in a parent code of conduct, that made a big difference (CHANGE/VALUES).  
220 Because the parents now know we will pull them up on it as well. As soon as they reach our school gates or exterior, because I go and walk around to see what they are doing outside, that they know that we don’t accept it.

### **What were they doing?**

225 Swearing, spitting...

*Shouting at teachers as well. If their child had an argument with another child, the parent would go and take umbridge with the other child in the playground.*

230 Arguments between parents

*Not very positive. But having that code of conduct has changed the relationships teachers can have with their children (RELATIONSHIPS). Because if you’ve got a parent not being very polite about a teacher or about the school, it’s then very difficult for that child to buy in. There’s that sense of disloyalty. So having a better, more respectful basis for parents and they understand that there is that expectation, you don’t have those problems to overcome with children (CHANGE/RELATIONSHIPS). The children know that it’s ok to like school, and they have that approval from their parents and they see their parents responding respectfully and appropriately and positively with school. It’s that modelling again for [the children].*

I do remember at the beginning a couple of parents saying ‘don’t bother listening to them, come on off we go’. And at the time the first lot of leadership left and the next one came in ,  
245 she was brilliant, our interim head, some of the parents used to say ‘she’s a woman, don’t listen to her’. We don’t have that anymore with parents. It’s very much that joint effort. I wouldn’t say it’s perfect with every family that arrives. But some of the families that come here, they just don’t like schools. So it’s about trying to break that cycle as well.

250 **And you’re never going to get through the child, if the parents are on board, are you?**

No, some of the children are actually doing very well from those families, it's just the parents and I think the parents don't like it because the children like it and are doing well and they want to be proved right.

255

**Have you always had the belief of a child-centred approach or has that been shaped as you moved up leadership?**

260

When I was a teacher, I just fell into teaching, and I just got by day-by-day hoping that I was doing alright by the children.

*It's hard at the start*

265

You're just glad when you're doing everything at the start. I would say, for me, I've always cared and been on the side of defending children but my first school was very different, the demographic was very different and the leadership was very different, it was all very secretive, you didn't know what was happening. I came here, and you felt you could place more value in these children, these children want to learn. The school I was in before, they felt it was their right to learn. And the whole 'wanting to learn' puts a different spin on the amount of effort you want to put in I think.

270

**These are the children?**

275

Yeah, they get really excited about things. We did a disco for the first time last term. One child said "thank you so much, this is the best night I've ever been to". It was just lovely, probably the first disco a lot of them had ever been to. They are just so grateful. At my old school: "don't they have a cleaner who can do the cleaning for us?" but here they're all up, rubber gloves on: "What can we do? Where can we help?". They want to help us.

280

**\*Because you're modelling it to them?**

\*Yes, it's all that sort of modelling. If I was doing that with my old school, they would watch me do it. But the children here respect, I think they know how much we put in for them and they've said it. I know external people come in and said how much we do for them.

285

**I noticed that on the Ofsted report**

And if you look at the website, the inclusion centre of excellence that we've got; that's got parent voice and pupil voice as well and governor voice as well. I think that is quite telling.

290

**The reason I am doing this research is because I believe my school is heading down the 'high performance' route of school improvement, by battering the student with exam papers etc. What would be your advice to head teachers trying to strike a balance?**

295

I think don't be fearful of, well are your Ofsted ratings good?

**It is "Good" but it is outdated and probably inflated.**

300

People do it out of fear. I've got to be honest, when it comes down to SATS week, we don't breeze through it. We have our moments behind closed doors... But my advice is focus on

the children (ADVICE). My friend works in a school over in Southwark and their results aren't amazing, they're alright and it's always been like that. But they've got "Outstanding" the last two times because of the value they place on the children and because of the work they do with the families. Oh actually they went "Outstanding", "Good", "Outstanding". And she said it's purely because they saw how much we do for our children and the results are better than they would be had we not been doing that. It's about seeing that value. There's probably a minority in the world who think children are data-producing creatures. It's fear. Do you know what? We are in an easy position, it would be easy for me to preach, we don't have anyone breathing down our necks or anything and we work hard to make sure that doesn't happen (CHALLENGE).

*I think we could very easily though. Particularly a change in curriculum. There's been a real shift in expectation, that was a point where people could have gone "reverse, reverse", let's just, like you say batter them with exam papers. But actually people didn't and they stuck with it and it's been fine (CONFIDENCE).*

And actually, if you read the latest Ofsted reports, schools are getting pulled up on just doing grammar, literacy, maths and not doing all the other subjects. But again we stuck with doing creative and musical things, we stuck with things that we value and said 'lets just keep going' (CHANGE)

**The KS2 SATS changed last year. I don't know a lot about it but I read up a bit and read an article saying it was 'almost child cruelty'.**

I'd agree.

**So how do you reconcile that with focussing on the children and what's best for the child.**

*I've been really honest. I lead the year 6 team, I still teach year 6. And they know that they need to do it and they know that it's something that will get passed onto their secondaries but for us, we say 'this doesn't tell you everything about you as a learner'. This doesn't define what you are like as a learner, we've got to do it, we've got to get through it and it's important for us as a school and as a piece of information about you that will get passed on and this is what you need to do to get through it. This is what you need to know. They know that's not the useful bit of grammar, the useful bit of grammar is them understanding how to construct a sentence how to persuade someone, how to entertain somebody or how to break rules for effect. They understand why, and they can use that grammar to explain it, but they know that being able to identify the subordinating clause in a sentence isn't the end of the world. So it's about being honest (HONESTY).*

And when they were in the SATS paper, I was in with the EAL children and the reason I was in with them was because they went in the morning last year with our old head teacher to learn with her. So she had her class basically. And one of them was saying "what does this mean?", they were reading "parched" but they were saying "what does parch-ed mean?". I said "I can't tell you but who cares?". And then in the maths one, one of them said "I know what they're saying but what are they asking?" and I said "Who cares?" and it was just that sort of thing, I didn't mean "who cares?", what I meant was I could see that that child was starting to waiver, to bubble a little bit, so I tried to get them to move on

350 (RELATIONSHIPS). When they heard that they felt comfortable for the next one. Otherwise there is that fear that they have to get every answer right.

How we coped with it here is knowing those children again (RELATIONSHIPS). Where we expanded, we had a lot of managed transfer children here that had come from a lot of schools, who might have been excluded elsewhere, looked after children, very vulnerable children, children who had parents with mental health issues etc. Because we know our children, we allocated adults to be at the back of their rooms who we knew they trusted. So for one of them it was his year 1 and 2 teacher, who he absolutely adored and loved and he would do anything for her. We just had her in the back of the room reading a book, but because she was in there he was happy. This chess board here [headteacher C points to a chess board on the table] is Jonathan's who is the head of [managing the] site. There was a boy who had been excluded 7 times before coming to us and they used to play chess every lunchtime. So when he was doing his [SATS papers], Jonathan was again in the back of the room because that was a person he trusted. It was that whole thing that the child had an adult in the room that they trusted, and that's valuable (TRUST/BALANCE).

**Yeah, trusting relationships is a big theme that has come out of the interviews from other head teachers as well.**

370 **[End of interview with head teacher. The next part is a conversation with the deputy head teacher.]**

*Its changed an awful lot it's amazing. It's all about leadership and attitude to the children. The children are so proud coming here. Coming to school isn't something that's bad, they want to learn.*

**That's it isn't it? Getting kids to feel like that...**

*Depends what you're giving them. Here it's thematic and topic based and whatever your planning, you need to think "will they care?". Yes, you've got to teach them these things but how can you do it in a way they care about because there's no point talking to them about climate change in a really dry way, why don't you look at all these different people's opinions of climate change.*

385 **The other primary head teacher I spoke to designed the day to be maths and English, what they will be tested on, in the morning and project-based learning in the afternoon. How does your school compare?**

*The teachers choose for themselves. It's up to however the classroom teacher wants to organise it. But the kids are quite good in that they know quality learning is non-negotiable here (VALUES). They respect that people have spent a long time getting this ready. They know when they come into the classroom, they need to be ready. Not being ready to learn is eyebrow-raising. There are classes where you might try and avoid to Maths and Literacy in the afternoon if you have a lively class but it's flexible and up to the teacher. If you get in and have a dreadful first hour and think, 'I'm going to do PE next', as long as there's space in the hall, that's your call as a teacher. It has to be 'what do they need?' because that's more important. Conversely, having a class with high ASD, constant change to the day aren't a good thing.*

400 **You mentioned earlier about servant-leadership. Is that something you explicitly discuss with staff?**

*Not really but that would be how I would describe the school. We don't talk specifically about that (VALUES). When we talk about our leadership style it's about being values-based. It sounds really cheesy but it's about living those values, not just the leadership team but the staff as well. Part of that is having accessible leadership, leadership that are happy to chip in, leadership that are happy to do your job. There is no job too little. If somebody is really struggling and I haven't got a class, I'll help with resources. Like today I covered someone class when they had to deal with something unexpected.*

410 **\*I think that must have a massive impact on staff because we had a head teacher last year who was barely around and so it was the opposite of what you have here.**

415 *\*I don't think it works. It wouldn't work here, because the time with the children is so intense. Lots of children get themselves up, dressed, and to school. Lots of teachers have breakfast bars in their drawers for specific children. We have breakfast club but it is always full on the waiting list. Those little things that you do to set children up to have a good day. People are very good at reading children when they come in. We have a behaviour support mentor who is here full-time and her only job is to support children emotionally. She'll do the rounds and will check in with particular children and see what kind of morning they have had. Are they settled? If not, she'll take them out to read for 5 minutes. It's about picking children up before there is that spiral, they're so needy teachers and TAs have to give absolutely everything. So as a leader you can't just say "Do this, do this, do this" because it is so exhausting.*

425 **I always think with really good primaries, do you ever want to set up your own secondary school to make it an all-through school.**

430 *I wouldn't because I think the data pressures are very different, particularly for progress 8. Now's not the time. It's not looking very attractive right now in secondary schools (PHASES).*

**That's interesting because I think the pressure for not-so-good secondary schools to become factories, pumping out results is huge at the moment.**

435 *Yeah, that's not sustainable.*

440 *One more thing I would say about our school is that no one is here to develop their career. Leadership here is really close and tight, not in a clique-y way there's just that trust because we all know we're going to be here in five years time (TRUST). The development has been there for people who want it and it's really supportive and it's positively challenging. People are growing here and you're seeing the change in the school. And it's that progress you're looking for, it's not a salary bump, or getting a better job title. People are happy here and proud to be here. All of those things stops that staff attrition which means the children trust you. When I first joined they were losing a ridiculous percentage every year which meant every year input and training and staff inset days were the same because they were training 60% new staff every year. There wasn't that same trust between parent, children and staff.*

450 *If you've got good systems in place, good expectations, people have got what they need and they know that they are respected and trusted then they'll do a good job (TRUST/RELATIONSHIPS). .*

**End of interview**



**Appendix 7 – Document analysis – Headteacher A, School A**

Categories Sources	Context	Relationships-focussed	Results-focussed	Curriculum
School website	<p>In 2006 we were designated a ‘One School Pathfinder’ by the London Borough of Sutton. This designation required us to design a new school that not only responded to the outcomes in our vision statement, but it also had to be innovative and forward thinking in order to prepare our students for life in the 21st Century.</p>	<p>It goes without saying that Human Beings are a social species. Learning is a social activity. We understand that life in the 21st Century will be strongly dependent on social interaction. Consequently, we believe that the ability to form excellent relationships will be critical to our students’ learning and success in the future. Consequently, everything we do is designed to maximise the chances of such relationships. Our ‘Four Schools within One’ concept is central to this</p>	<p>67% of students achieving five or more GCSEs at grades A*-C, and 62% securing A*-C in both English and Maths (2016)</p>	<p>Instead of studying several of separate subjects at KS3, [school A] students have twelve lessons of EF curriculum per week in year 7 and eight lessons in year 8. English, Maths, Science, PE, French and Music are separate lessons, but EFC encompasses the rest of the curriculum. The EFC teachers design projects which explore geography, history, business studies, drama, religious studies, ICT and many other subject areas.</p> <p>In EFC, students are taught through project based learning (PBL). They don’t just learn to pass tests, our students learn things to make the world better,</p>

<p>Gov.uk – performance tables</p>	<p>School A was a mainstream comprehensive, but converted to an Academy in December 2016.</p> <p>Mixed, comprehensive admissions</p> <p>191 year 11 students on-roll as of 2016, 1215 in total</p> <p>8.6% EAL, 32.4% FSM (below and above national average respectively)</p> <p>Very low % of students entering for EBacc (16% compared to 55.8% in local authority and 36.8% England average)</p>		<p>Average according to attainment 8 (-0.06, confidence interval of -0.21 to +0.1)</p> <p>60% of students achieved C or better in English and maths (compared to 59.3% England average and 76.8% in Sutton). This is up from 53% and 55% in 2014 and 2015 respectively.</p>	
<p>Ofsted report, 2006</p>		<p>“Students’ behaviour is good and much improved in the past year”</p>		
<p>Ofsted report, 2009</p>		<p>“The harmonious and cohesive ethos of the school greatly enhances students’ own attitudes to learning”</p> <p>“[Students] displayed responsible cooperative</p>		

		relations with one another, which resulted in productive team working”		
Ofsted report, 2013		<p>“Most parents and carers agree that their child is making good progress”</p> <p>“Relationships were very strong and promoted a positive climate for learning”</p> <p>“Relationships are a real strength”</p>	<p>“The proportion of students gaining five A* to C grades at GCSE including English and mathematics in 2012 was well below national averages”</p> <p>“[leadership] have worked relentlessly to address the dip in the 2012 results, which had not been anticipated but has been explained”</p> <p>“The school’s tracking of students’ attainment and early entry results suggests that this will improve significantly in 2013”</p> <p>“School data, lesson observations and work samples suggest that progress in English and mathematics will meet and exceed national targets in 2013”</p> <p>“The school did not meet the government’s current floor</p>	

			<p>standards, which set the minimum expectations for students' attainment and progress at the end of Key Stage 4"</p> <p>"Raise students' achievement by ensuring that all groups of students... make progress which is at least good by consolidating improvements already made"</p>	
Ofsted report, 2015	<p>Overall effectiveness: RI  Achievement of pupils: RI  Quality of teaching: Good  Behaviour and safety of pupils: Good  Leadership and Management: Good</p>	<p>"Parents have much confidence in the school's unique approach to 21<sup>st</sup> century education"</p> <p>"Pupil's outstanding behaviour and relationships with each other and with teachers underpin their enthusiasm and willingness to learn"</p> <p>"Staff could not do more to nurture pupils' personal development, welfare and safety. Pupils feel safe and secure because their health and happiness is the school's key priority"</p> <p>"Practically all pupils respond</p>	<p>Pupils make at least good progress from well below average starting points in Year 7. Over half of them attained five A* to C GCSE grades including English and mathematics in 2015, almost matching the national average. In all years, the majority of current pupils are on course to meet their targets and achieve well</p> <p>Since the previous inspection, progress in English between Years 7 and 11 has been well above national expectations; it moved closer to these expectations in mathematics and science in 2015. Accurate</p>	<p>"Practically all pupils respond to the school's motto of 'igniting a passion for learning'. This is done by blending positive relationships in small classes with an exciting curriculum which 'empowers pupils with skills such as empathy'"</p> <p>"In years 7 and 8, pupils spend a significant proportion of their time with their form tutors studying an "EF Curriculum" which includes humanities, art and design, computing and personal development. In year 9 pupils study English, mathematics, science, religious education and physical education</p>

		<p>to the school's motto of 'igniting a passion for learning'. This is done by blending positive relationships in small classes with an exciting curriculum which 'empowers pupils with skills such as empathy'"</p> <p>"[Pupils] quickly learn the importance of respectful, positive relationships with staff and make friends in their mini-schools and with other pupils in their teaching groups"</p> <p>"The school is a lead school for 'Human Scale Education', a charitable organisation emphasising the fundamental importance of relationships in human scale environments. In year 7-11, pupils study in smaller than average classes within one of four small schools: Horizon, Trade, Performance and World"</p>	<p>school information suggests that progress in these subjects, and science, continues to improve in all years. However, lower-attaining pupils, particularly girls and pupils who fall behind, do not make the same good progress as others in mathematics. This is already a key priority in the school's action plan.</p> <p>[Leaders] have worked relentlessly to address the dip in the 2012 results, which had not been anticipated but has been explained</p>	<p>and sample 12 out of 26 'electives' (optional subjects). This helps them decide which ones to study in Years 10 and 11 to achieve GCSE and other qualifications. In Years 9 to 11, pupils are in vertical form groups"</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>The Management of Change: a Case Study (taken from a link on the school website)</p>	<p>“Historically there have been high levels of deprivation amongst our intake and attainment on entry has been well below the national average”</p> <p>Describing the One School Pathfinder programme...  “‘At its heart was the need for the school to develop a vision for education that offers real innovation and enables learning and teaching to be transformed.”</p> <p>“Confidence has increased in the local community and we are significantly oversubscribed in our lower years.”</p>	<p>“Most of all we valued the need for positive relationships, despite it being a time when there were strained relationships between the various stakeholders because of the range of issues the school faced.”</p> <p>“From this we drew the following conclusions about experiences within the school:  • Small is beautiful • Excellent relationships are essential • Learning and Teaching needed to be organised in flexible ways. We needed to question our assumptions about the environments in which learning takes place, whether that was in school, at home, online, or in the community • Co-operative and collaborative learning needed to be emphasised • Pastoral and academic roles needed to be integrated so that students were seen as whole people.”</p> <p>“Whilst smaller schools do provide the opportunity for</p>	<p>“Change has ensured that achievement and attainment have risen. Confidence has increased in the local community and we are significantly oversubscribed in our lower years”</p> <p>“Against many measures we can say that it has been a success. Attendance and punctuality have improved. Exclusions, both fixed term and permanent, have fallen drastically. Approval ratings from parents regarding the EFC are very high. The number of first choice applications from year 6 students in our feeder primary schools has increased by approximately 150%. We have also hit, as hoped, the external judgement markers relating to achievement and attainment”</p>	<p>These 12 core skills form our EF Curriculum (EFC) throughout years 7 and 8. The EFC forms 12 of the 29 weekly timetabled periods. Students learn the 12 core skills through a curriculum that has 12 Themes; each one is half a term in duration. Each Theme contains the key knowledge within one or two lead subject areas but this knowledge, although seen as an essential component of the learning, very much supports the learning of the skills.</p> <p>Core skills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a Team Member • Problem Solving • Managing Time • Showing Initiative • Taking Risks • Being Creative • Gathering and Managing Resources • Presenting Information • Understanding and Using ICT • Understanding and Using Skills for Writing • Financial Understanding and Numeracy • Social and Emotional Intelligence</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>more positive relationships, radical changes rather than a remedial reworking of existing actions needed to be undertaken within them. To us this meant that on a weekly basis teachers must be interacting with fewer students and students with fewer teachers. Critically we knew we needed this investment in our lower years. Effective relationships had to be created from the outset. The solution for us lay in an Integrated Curriculum. Not one that was lifted ‘off the shelf’, but one that was specifically designed to meet the needs of our students in our community”</p>		
<p>“GCSE Examination Results” news release after 2012 results – found on the school’s website</p>			<p>Particular concern was directed at English and students who sat the AQA Foundation Paper. In the January exam a student only required 164 marks to achieve a C but in June they needed 180. Consequently, a large number of students achieved a grade D when they should have achieved a grade C.</p>	

--	--	--	--	--

**Appendix 8 – Document Analysis – Headteacher B, School B**

Categories Sources	Context	Relationships-focussed (‘person-centred’ approach)	Results-focussed (‘high- performance’ approach)	Curriculum
School website			Our children are tested and progress tracked every half-term, and given personalised intervention if they are falling behind. Our SATs results are consistently above national expectations for attainment and progress.	We also believe children learn best through active engagement with the world around them. The <i>international primary curriculum</i> provides rich learning experiences through thematic topics, designed to inspire, engage and delight the children, and provoke high levels of enquiry.
Gov.uk – performance tables				
Ofsted report, 2008		Teaching and learning are outstanding because pupils' needs are at the heart of the	the school is dedicated to promoting high achievement, holding	The exciting, relevant and innovative curriculum ensures that

		<p>school's work.</p> <p>Pupils are cared for extremely well, have excellent oral and pastoral guidance and are supported and encouraged in all that they undertake</p> <p>This is a school where everyone is valued and cherished, and that generates high self-esteem through the satisfaction of high achievement in personal skills and across the curriculum.</p>	<p>several achievement awards</p> <p>Achievement is excellent. Many children start school with very little or no knowledge of the English language and limited pre-school experiences. By the end of Year 2, they attain average standards in reading and mathematics. In the 2007 national tests, standards in writing were above average although, because they have not had time to develop their language skills fully, few pupils in Year 2 attained the higher levels in all three subjects. By the end of Year 6, standards are above average in English and mathematics. Standards in science are high. In all subjects, more pupils than average attain the higher levels. I</p>	<p>pupils use and extend the basic skills acquired in the mornings to the International Primary Curriculum in the afternoons.</p>
Ofsted letter to pupils (2008) accessed on the		I am very impressed with your excellent behaviour and the way everyone in your		

school's website		school cares for each other. Your school is indeed a very happy place to be. It is no wonder that now everybody does their very best not to miss school.		
School B self-evaluation form (2016) – accessed on the school website	The school currently has: • 379 pupils on roll • 90% from ethnic minority groups • 77% with English as an Additional Language • 8% with Special Needs • 45% eligible for Free School Meals during past six years • 0.4 School Deprivation Indicator • 39% of children in Tower Hamlets live in income-deprived households	Weekly Achievement Assemblies celebrate the pride and commitment they have to their own successes and to the achievements of their peers. Respect, dignity and trust underpin the learning climate, with tolerance, courtesy and consideration underpinning behaviour at all times, both within the classroom and around the school	NB a picture of the table of KS2 SATs results for 2016 is below  We hold half termly progress meetings which keep teachers continuously accountable for the progress of all their pupils, with an uncompromising focus on disadvantaged pupils and those with special needs or disabilities	We deliver a thematic, creative, experiential curriculum promoting curiosity, enthusiasm and engagement (IPC)  The children are well-challenged by the whole curriculum, which creates a wealth of memorable experiences and rich opportunities for high quality learning, social and cultural development, and is an excellent preparation for their secondary education and future employability.

From the school's self-evaluation form – accessed via the school website.

2016 KS2 SATs results										
	Combined	Combined	Reading	Reading	Writing	Writing	Maths	Maths	SPaG	SPaG
	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding
<b>SWB</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>13%</b>	80%	22%	91%	27%	98%	31%	93%	33%
National Standard	53%	5%	66%	19%	74%	15%	70%	17%	72%	23%
(difference to SWB)	-23%	-8%	-14%	-3%	-17%	-12%	-28%	-14%	-21%	-10%
Local (Tower Hamlets)	60%	7%	70%	18%	81%	19%	78%	20%	80%	26%
(difference to SWB)	-16%	-6%	-10%	-4%	-10%	-8%	-20%	-11%	-13%	-7%
Converter Academies	57%	6%	70%		77%		73%		76%	
(difference to SWB)	-19%	-7%	-10%		-14%		-25%		-17%	
Converter Academies +5 years	61%									
(difference to SWB)	-15%									
<b>PROGRESS:</b>			Reading		Writing		Maths			
			3.21		4.27		6.33			
<b>AVERAGE SCALED SCORE:</b>		<b>School:</b>	104.4				107.9			
		<b>National:</b>	102.6				103			

**Appendix 9 – Document Analysis – Headteacher C, School C**

Categories Sources	Context	Relationships-focussed (‘person-centred’ approach)	Results-focussed (‘high- performance’ approach)	Curriculum
School website		<p>Pupils and staff are highly motivated and firmly believe in learning together, in partnership with families.</p> <p>In 2015 [school C] also achieved the Inclusion Quality Mark and was made a Centre of Excellence for inclusion.</p>	NB see table below for attainment data accessed via the school website	
Gov.uk – performance tables			<p>84% of pupils meet the expected standard in reading, writing and maths (compared to 64% in Local Authority and 53% in England)</p> <p>14% achieve higher standard in reading writing (compared to 10% in Local Authority and 6% in England)</p>	
Ofsted report, 2009		Excellent pastoral care and welfare develop pupils'		

		confidence and self-esteem and successfully raise pupils' expectations and aspirations		
Ofsted report, 2014	<p>This is a much larger-than-average-sized primary school and has recently expanded so that provision is now across two sites.</p> <p>A majority of pupils speak English as an additional language. Many are at the early stages of learning English.</p> <p>The number of pupils starting and leaving the school at other than at the usual times is above average.</p> <p>The proportion of pupils receiving support from the pupil premium funding, which is the extra government support for pupils known to be eligible for free school meals, looked after</p>	Every pupil's needs are addressed, either by the school or through close collaboration with other agencies, ensuring excellent equality of opportunity	<p>Pupils' achievement is outstanding. Pupils make rapid progress across the school so that by the end of Year 6, the large majority of pupils have made more than the expected progress in reading, writing and mathematics</p> <p>The school has been acknowledged by the Department of Education as being among the top 250 schools nationally in terms of the progress disadvantaged pupils make in Key Stage 2."</p>	

	<p>children and those from service families, is above average. In this school it relates to pupils who are eligible for free school meals and those in local authority care.</p> <p>The proportion of disabled pupils and those who have special educational needs supported at school action is above average. The proportion supported at school action plus, or who have a statement of special educational needs, is also high when compared to national figures.</p>			
Data dashboard (2015) – accessed via school website	753 students on roll in 2015, 57.7% EAL, 79.0% stability			

Letter from Nick Gibb, MP (Minister of State for School Standards) (2017)			Your school's results, as published on 15 December, show that your school is among the top 3% of schools in England in terms of the progress your pupils make between key stage 1 and the end of key stage 2 in English reading, writing and mathematics.	

Attainment data (2016) – accessed via the school website

Attainment Outcomes	% At expected standard or above		
	School	Greenwich Borough	National
Reading Test – expected standard or above (100+)	99%	73%	66%

Reading Test – higher standard (110+)	44%	22%	19%
Writing Teacher Assessment – expected standard or above	89%	83%	74%
Writing Teacher Assessment – greater depth	37%	26%	15%
Maths Test – expected standard or above (100+)	95%	78%	70%
Maths Test – higher standard (110+)	33%	23%	17%
Grammar Punctuation Spelling Test – expected standard or above (100+)	90%	78%	72%
Grammar Punctuation Spelling Test – higher standard (110+)	22%	28%	23%
Science Teacher Assessment – expected standard	90%	88%	81%

Average Scaled Scores	Average scaled scores		
	School	Greenwich Borough	National
Reading Test	110	104	103
Maths Test	107	105	103
Grammar Punctuation Spelling Test	106	105	104



## **Appendix 10 – Case study A - Headteacher A, School A**

### **Case Study: Headteacher and School A**

5 School A was a mainstream comprehensive in the London Borough of Sutton, but converted  
to an Academy in December 2016 (Gov.uk). It has a comprehensive admissions policy in an  
area that contains selective grammar schools as well as schools that select for non-academic  
traits (Appendix 4 – Interview transcript). As of 2016 there were 1215 students on-roll,  
32.4% of which have Free School Meals (this is slightly above the national average).  
10 Headteacher A took over the position in 2005 where students attaining 5+ A\*-C (including  
English and maths) was 15% (The Management of Change – a case study written by  
Headteacher A). As of 2016, this percentage was 67%, with 60% of students getting A\*-C in  
English and maths (Gov.uk), just above the national average.

15 Reflecting on when he started the job, Headteacher A states “historically there have been  
high levels of deprivation amongst our intake and attainment on entry has been well below  
the national average” (The Management of Change). Looking back to 2005 specifically, he  
states “behaviour was an issue... it affected teachers, affected their morale” (interview  
transcript). To improve behaviour, he “approached it very differently [to how he would  
20 approach it now]”. He describes this approach as “Let’s batten down the hatches, let’s get  
them lined up, let’s get kids in uniform, let’s get them in the classroom. A real push on  
hammering down the rules” (Appendix A). An Ofsted inspection in 2006 resulted in a  
“Satisfactory” grade 3 out of 4 (Ofsted has now changed the language they use, and a grade 3  
is now “Requires Improvement”). In the report, Headteacher A’s approach was praised:  
25 “Students’ behaviour is good and much improved in the past year” (Ofsted report, 2006).  
However, on reflection, Headteacher A felt the way he dealt with behaviour “only gets you so  
far and actually at some point you will plateau... you get to a certain point and there’s  
nothing more and you actually need to approach it in a different way to get to the next level”  
(Appendix A).

30 The real catalyst for change came from School A being awarded the One School Pathfinder  
for the borough of Sutton, as part of the Building Schools for the Future programme. In July  
2006, the school was awarded £38 million to build a new school. Headteacher A stated “at  
[the One School Pathfinder programme’s] heart was the need for the school to develop a  
35 vision for education that offers real innovation and enables learning and teaching to be  
transformed” (Management of Change). As research, Headteacher A took teachers and  
students on many trips to Iceland, USA and, most importantly, to Denmark. In a school in  
Copenhagen, Headteacher A describes a critical incident (Appendix 4) in which he  
discovered “the absolute primacy of trusting relationships”. He compared the “confident...  
40 articulate... knowledgeable... polite” students from Copenhagen, who were not academically  
selected or affluent, to his students in the UK who were “in this really rigid system of being  
lined up, face the front, put your hand up to ask a question... So we knew we had to change  
our philosophy if we were going to get longer term gains”. From the trips to innovative  
schools around the world, Headteacher A concluded the following:

- 45
- Small is beautiful
  - Excellent relationships are essential
  - Learning and Teaching needed to be organised in flexible ways. We needed to  
question our assumptions about the environments in which learning takes place,  
50 whether that was in school, at home, online, or in the community.

- Cooperative and collaborative learning needed to be emphasised
  - Pastoral and academic roles needed to be integrated so that students were seen as whole people
- (from The Management of Change)

55

As soon as they were back from Copenhagen, changes were made; as Headteacher A states “there was no point in waiting” (Appendix 4). “Critically we knew we needed investment in our lower years. Effective relationships had to be created from the outset” (The Management of Change). The school introduced the EF curriculum, a “competency or skills-based curriculum in years 7 and 8 that was taught by teams of teachers” (Appendix 4). The curriculum comprises of projects; each project has one core assessment objective, which is 1 of the 9 values of the school. Importantly, during these projects “the kids are given time to do things, trusted to do them, they’re allowed to go to the break-out rooms to do [an activity], there isn’t a teacher sat there controlling the whole lot.” This change was noted in the Ofsted report in 2009, in which it stated “[Students] displayed responsible cooperative relationships with one another, which resulted in productive team working”. Due to these changes and improving attainment, the school received an overall grade of “Good” in their 2009 Ofsted report.

60

65

70

They moved into the new building in January 2012. Developing the importance of positive relationships, the new school was designed with a “Schools within Schools approach” (The Management of Change). In each intake of year 7, the students are split equally between the first three schools or, in certain cases, they will be part of the fourth school that “provide[s] specialist experience for... students with a statement of Mild... or Moderate Autism” (The Management of Change). Having a system of smaller schools “provide[s] the opportunity for more positive relationships” (The Management of Change).

75

80

Up until 2012, the school had made year-on-year improvements on the percentage of students getting 5+ A\*-C (including English and maths) since Headteacher A had arrived in 2005. In 2012, however, the figure dipped to 35%. In a letter to parents that is on the school’s website, Headteacher A put this down to the examination board changing the grade boundaries for GCSE English. The following Ofsted inspection in 2013 noted “most parents and carers agree that their child is making good progress”, “relationships were very strong and promoted a positive climate for learning” and “school data, lesson observations and work samples suggest that progress in English and mathematics will meet and exceed national targets in 2013”. However, the report stated, “the proportion of students gaining five A\*-C grades at GCSE including English and mathematics in 2012 was well below national averages” and because “the school did not meet the government’s current floor standards” (at the time this was 40% of students getting 5+ A\*-C (including English and maths)), the school received “Requires Improvement” (grade 3). It should be noted that this dip in results the year the school moved building demonstrates that changes made prior to the new building, not the building itself, led to the year-on-year improvement in attainment.

85

90

95

Headteacher A described this experience as affecting him badly initially, but goes onto say “There was a point when I thought ‘I give up’ but you have to show a bit of resilience, you keep doing what you’re doing, keep believing what you’re doing, not reverting to type and sure enough the results were up to 55% the following year and our results were among the most improved in the country. I went through a period of self-doubt but in fairness, on reflection, it’s made us a better school and it’s made me a better leader because you need to go through something like that to come out of it stronger. We are better for it.”

100

105 The school continued to follow their maxim of developing relationships throughout the  
school, with the belief that improved attainment would follow. In 2014, 2015 and 2016 the  
percentage of students getting A\*-C in English and maths was 53%, 55% and 60%  
110 respectively. The Ofsted inspection in 2015 was “Good” overall with an “Outstanding” grade  
in the “Personal Development, Behaviour and Welfare” category. Of note, the report stated,  
“Pupil’s outstanding behaviour and relationships with each other and with teachers underpin  
their enthusiasm and willingness to learn”, “practically all pupils respond to the school’s  
motto of ‘igniting a passion for learning’. This is done by blending positive relationships in  
115 small classes with an exciting curriculum” and “[Pupils] quickly learn the importance of  
respectful, positive relationships with staff and make friends in their mini-schools and with  
other pupils in their teaching groups” (Ofsted report, 2015).

115 This is not, however, the end of the road for Headteacher and school A: “We have to continue  
being innovative... we’ve got to keep innovating if we are going to continue to develop”  
(Appendix A).

Evidence collected from:

- 120 • GOV.UK – compare school and college performance. School A
- The Management of Change. Becoming a Human Scale School: a Case Study
- 125 • School website
- Appendix A – Interview transcript with Headteacher A
- Ofsted report, 2006
- 130 • Ofsted report, 2009
- Ofsted report, 2013
- 135 • Ofsted report, 2015



## **Appendix 11 – Case study B - Headteacher B, School B**

### **Case Study B – School and Headteacher B**

5 School B is a primary school in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. For Headteacher B, school B “hit[s] the sweet spot of warm relationships and high attainment” (interview transcript). School B’s last Ofsted inspection report (2008) noted:

10 *Achievement is excellent. Many children start school with very little or no knowledge of the English language and limited pre-school experiences. By the end of Year 2, they attain average standards in reading and mathematics. In the 2007 national tests, standards in writing were above average although, because they have not had time to develop their language skills fully, few pupils in Year 2 attained the higher levels in all three subjects. By the end of Year 6, standards are above average in English and mathematics. Standards in*  
 15 *science are high. In all subjects, more pupils than average attain the higher levels.*

In the 2015/16 academic year, of the 379 pupils on roll at school B, 77.4% spoke English as an additional language (EAL) and 45.3% of students were eligible for free school meals at any time during the past six years, compared to national averages of 20% and 25.4%  
 20 (gov.uk). However, headteacher C stresses that the school is “deprivation-blind” (interview transcript) and that they have high expectations for all students, no matter their background. The school’s self-evaluation report (2016) states “we hold half termly progress meetings which keep teachers continuously accountable for the progress of all their pupils, with an uncompromising focus on disadvantaged pupils and those with special needs or disabilities”.  
 25 This focus on student progress is reflected by the school’s attainment results. Below is a table of 2016 KS2 SATs results for school B (school website):

	Reading		Writing		Maths		SPaG	
	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding	Expected	Exceeding
School C	80%	22%	91%	27%	98%	31%	93%	33%
National standard	66%	19%	74%	15%	70%	17%	72%	23%

NB. SPaG stands for Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar

30 Whilst the school receives consistently impressive examination results, the Ofsted report (2008) highlighted that “pupils are cared for extremely well, have excellent oral and pastoral guidance and are supported and encouraged in all that they undertake”. Additionally, the report said, “this is a school where everyone is valued and cherished, and that generates high  
 35 self-esteem through the satisfaction of high achievement in personal skills and across the curriculum”. Similarly, in a letter to the students, the Ofsted inspector said “I am very impressed with your excellent behaviour and the way everyone in your school cares for each other. Your school is indeed a very happy place to be”.

40 Headteacher B is passionate that the two, caring for children and producing excellent examination results, are not mutually exclusive. “We want the children to be the very best

they can be, and that's in their relationships and in their results...learning is about a passionate interest in the outside world, and that would involve relating to others and mining their wisdom and their experience" (interview transcript).

45

In order to achieve the balance, the school's curriculum is split into maths and English in the morning, and the International Primary Curriculum (IPC) in the afternoon. Headteacher B describes the morning as the "bread and butter... and that involves learning to read, learning to write, learning to spell and learning to punctuate" (interview transcript), while the school's website states the IPC "provides rich learning experiences through thematic topics, designed to inspire, engage and delight the children and provide high levels of enquiry". Together, the school believes "the children are well-challenged by the whole curriculum, which creates a wealth of memorable experiences and rich opportunities for high-quality learning, social and cultural development, and is an excellent preparation for their secondary education and future employability" (school B's self-evaluation form, 2016).

50

55

Evidence collected from:

60

- Interview transcript with headteacher B
- Ofsted report, 2008
- GOV.UK – compare school and college performance. School B.
- School website
- School B self-evaluation form (2016) – accessed on the school website

65



## **Appendix 10 – Case study C - Headteacher C, School C**

Case Study C – with Headteacher C and Deputy Headteacher C, at school C

5 School C is a primary school in the London Borough of Greenwich. In 2014, the school received “Outstanding” status from Ofsted, this is the highest grade a school can be awarded. The school is split across two sites and is much larger than an average primary school, having four forms in each year (Ofsted, 2014). Here are some statistics on the make-up of the school from 2015:

10

- 57.7% of students spoke English as an Additional Language, this is significantly higher than the national average (Data Dashboard).
- The stability rating of the school was 79.0%. This is the proportion of students entering and leaving the school at the normal times. This figure is slightly below national average (Data Dashboard).
- The proportion of students receiving support from pupil premium funding, the proportion of disabled students and the proportion of students with special educational needs was above the national average (Data Dashboard).

15

20 Despite these barriers to learning, the school boasts excellent external examination results. In 2016, 99% of Key Stage 2 students were at expected standard or above in the English reading test, compared to 66% of students nationally. 95% of Key Stage 2 students were at expected standard or above in the maths test, compared to 70% of students nationally. 90% of Key Stage 2 students were at expected standard or above in the Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling test, compared to 72% of students nationally (School Website). Additionally, more students at school C were at expected or above standard in the internally-assessed writing (89%) and science (90%) assessments compared to the national average (74% and 81% respectively).

25

30 The Ofsted report on school C in 2014 noted “pupils’ achievement is outstanding. Pupils make rapid progress across the school so that by the end of Year 6, the large majority of pupils have made more than the expected progress in reading, writing and mathematics”. The report highlights the school as in the top 250 primary schools for the progress they made with disadvantaged pupils in Key Stage 2. In 2016, the school received a letter from the Department for Education that praised school C for being in the top 3% of schools nationally in terms of progress made between Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 in reading, writing and mathematics.

35

40 For Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher C, the relationships between people in the school are paramount to this success. Headteacher C reflects “I feel that if we didn’t build those relationships [with the students], we wouldn’t be able to have such good results” (Interview transcript). Deputy Headteacher C agrees, “If a child is clam and happy and engaged and has bought into what we do and they know that you care about them, they’ll do it and they’ll make progress”. Leadership have increased the inclusion team in the school, so that they have “highly trained [people] to get to know our children”. As a result, the school achieved the Inclusion Quality Mark and was made a Centre of Excellence for inclusion in 2015.

45

50 Headteacher C admits “when it comes down to SATS week, we don’t breeze through it, we have our moments behind closed doors”. Despite this, the school’s emphasis on building positive relationships shines through in the week the students sit their SATS examinations.

Headteacher C says, “Because we know our children, we allocated adults to be at the back of their rooms who we knew they trusted” She described an example of this in which a boy, who had been excluded seven times before arriving at school C, played chess with the school’s site manager every lunchtime. When the boy was sitting his SATS examinations, the site manager was in the room as well, because the boy trusted him and therefore felt less nervous and anxious.

The focus on relationships before results doesn’t end with students and teachers. The school have worked hard to improve the relationships with parents. Headteacher C recalls “parents weren’t behaving in the playground... [parents would be] swearing, spitting”. Deputy Headteacher C remembers that parents would be “shouting at teachers as well. If their child had an argument with another child, the parent would go and take umbrage with the other child in the playground”. This posed a significant challenge to the school’s approach as it meant a barrier to the staff developing positive relationships with the students. Deputy Headteacher C says, “If you’ve got a parent not being very polite about a teacher or about the school, it’s then very difficult for that child to buy in. There’s that sense of disloyalty”. To fix this the school brought in a parent code of conduct. The school has very high expectations of how parents should behave when in and around the school. This has led to improvements in the behaviour and attitudes of the children. Deputy Headteacher C says, “[the children] have that approval from their parents and they see their parents responding respectfully and appropriately and positively with the school”.

Greater trust is developing between parents, students and teachers at school C. Headteacher C gives an example of having to deal with a child protection case. She says that five years ago the parents would be shouting at her but now they are being respectful because they know that the Headteacher C’s actions are because she has the child’s best interests at heart.

Although the school’s results are very impressive, they are “incidental” to Headteacher C. What is more important to her is knowing that the they have given the students a good start, and that they are prepared for secondary school (interview transcript). They focus on the children, build trust with them, and the results follow.

Evidence collected from:

- Ofsted report, 2014
- Data dashboard – accessed via the school website
- School website
- Letter from the Department for Education
- Interview transcript

### **Appendix 11 – codes for content analysis**

Code	Criteria for text labelled with the code
CHALLENGE	Any challenge that a headteacher faced during their leadership
CHANGE	Any changes that headteachers made or were affected by
TRUST	Any text regarding trust
VALUES	The values of the headteachers and how the values affect their leadership
RELATIONSHIP	Text concerned solely with relationships
RESULTS	Text concerned solely with student qualifications or results
BALANCE	Text that discusses how to balance relationships with results
LISTENING	Listening to the students
TIME	Any text regarding time
ADVICE	Advice headteachers would give to other headteachers
CURRICULUM	Any text concerning the school's curriculum
HONESTY	Any text regarding honesty of headteachers
CONFIDENCE	Any text regarding confidence
RESILLIENCE	Text regarding resilience to challenges
PHASES	Text that identify differences between secondary schools and primary schools.

## Appendix 12 – Ethics Review Form

# Education Faculty Research Ethics Review Application for full review

### 1. PROJECT DETAILS

MAIN RESEARCHER	Joe Williams
E-MAIL	<a href="mailto:Joewilliams582@gmail.com">Joewilliams582@gmail.com</a>
POSITION WITHIN CCCU	MA student
POSITION OUTSIDE CCCU	Teacher of Science
COURSE (students only)	Transformational Leadership MA (TeachFirst)
DEPARTMENT (staff only)	
PROJECT TITLE	Headteachers' perspectives on finding a balance between a 'person-centred' and a 'high-performance' school
TUTOR/SUPERVISOR: NAME	Dr Robin Precey
TUTOR/SUPERVISOR: E-MAIL	robin.precey@canterbury.ac.uk
DURATION OF PROJECT (start & end dates)	Start: 1/1/2017 End: 15/9/2017

OTHER RESEARCHERS	N/A
-------------------	-----

### 2. OUTLINE THE ETHICAL ISSUES THAT YOU THINK ARE INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

I will be interviewing head teachers and analysing documents about their school in order to create case studies of them. The major ethical issues are ensuring confidentiality (I will ask head teachers via e-mail to participate in the study on a voluntary basis), ensuring anonymity (no names of people or institutions will be disclosed in the study) and ensuring no emotional harm is caused by the findings of the study (the head teachers will have opportunities to look through the case studies and the final draft of the study before it is handed in – I will make changes if they feel that they have been misrepresented)

### 3. GIVE A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE PROJECT in no more than 100 words. (Include, for example, sample selection, recruitment procedures, data collection, data analysis and expected outcomes.) Please ensure that your description will be understood by the lay members of the Committee.

I will select 3-4 schools that have high attainment, but focus on trusting relationships (person-centred) as well. I will e-mail the head teachers of these schools to invite them for one semi-structured interview each. I will record the interviews, transcribe them and then delete the recordings. I will use this data and documents available on their websites (e.g. Ofsted reports) to make a short case study of each head teacher. I will then send the interview transcript and case study back to the head teacher so that they have an opportunity to disagree and edit my interpretation of their case. The research is for aspiring head teachers who would like to lead person-centred

schools, while also having high levels of attainment.

4. How many participants will be recruited?	3-4
5. Will you be recruiting STAFF or STUDENTS from another faculty?	NO .
6. Will participants include minors, people with learning difficulties or other vulnerable people?	NO

7. Potential risks for participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Emotional harm/hurt*</li> <li>- Physical harm/hurt</li> <li>- Risk of disclosure</li> <li>- Other (please specify)</li> </ul> <p>*Please note that this includes any sensitive areas, feelings etc., however mild they may seem.</p>	Please indicate all those that apply. YES NO NO
8. How are these risks to be addressed?	<p>I will lead the interview in a sensitive way – I will allow the interviewee to share their experiences and feelings of their journey but I will not probe any areas that may be sensitive to the interviewee.</p> <p>I will keep the question of the interview on a purely professional level. I will not ask any questions about the interviewees personal lives.</p>
9. Potential benefits for participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved services</li> <li>- Improved participant understanding</li> <li>- Opportunities for participants to have their views heard.</li> <li>- Other (please specify)</li> </ul>	Please indicate all those that apply. NO YES YES

10. How, when and by whom will participants be approached? Will they be recruited individually or en bloc?	Participants will be recruited individually via e-mail. They will be recruited as soon as I have had approval from the ethics committee.
11. Are participants likely to feel under pressure to consent / assent to participation?	No, I will stress that being part of the research is voluntary.

12. How will voluntary informed consent be obtained from individual participants or those with a right to consent for them? - Introductory letter - Phone call - Email - Other (please specify)	Please indicate all those that apply and add examples in an appendix.  NO YES NO
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

13. How will permission be sought from those responsible for institutions / organisations / Not a member of CCCU academic staff (only registered CCCU postgraduate student, what insurance arrangements are in place to meet liability Other (please specify)	Please indicate all those that apply and add examples in an appendix. Researcher – has had opportunities in previous assignments to conduct interviews NO NO YES (Participants will be head teachers who are responsible for their institutions) Supervisor – very experienced in guiding students through research
14. How will the privacy and confidentiality of participants be safeguarded? (Please give brief details).	No names of people or institutions will be disclosed in my dissertation (including case studies and transcripts)  All recordings will be deleted after I have transcribed them.
15. What steps will be taken to comply with the Data Protection Act? - Safe storage of data - Anonymisation of data - Destruction of data after 5 years - Other (please specify)	Please indicate all those that apply.  YES YES YES
16. How will participants be made aware of the results of the study?	I will e-mail a final draft to the participants before I hand it in.
17. What steps will be taken to allow participants to retain control over audio-visual records of them and over their creative products and items of a personal nature?	I will delete all recordings once I have written a transcript of the interview.

*Attach any:*

*Participant information sheets and letters*

*Consent forms*

*Data collection instruments*

*ents*

*Peer review comments*

DECLARATION

- I certify that the information in this form is accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief and I take full responsibility for it.
- I certify that a risk assessment for this study has been carried out in compliance with the University's Health and Safety policy.
- I certify that any required CRB/VBS check has been carried out.
- I undertake to carry out this project under the terms specified in the Canterbury Christ Church University Research Governance Handbook.
- I undertake to inform the relevant Faculty Research Ethics Committee of any significant change in the question, design or conduct of the study over the course of the study. I understand that such changes may require a new application for ethics approval.
- I undertake to inform the Research Governance Manager in the Graduate School and Research Office when the proposed study has been completed.
- I am aware of my responsibility to comply with the requirements of the law and appropriate University guidelines relating to the security and confidentiality of participant or other personal data.
- I understand that project records/data may be subject to inspection for audit purposes if required in future and that project records should be kept securely for five years or other specified period.
- I understand that the personal data about me contained in this application will be held by the Research Office and that this will be managed according to the principles established in the Data Protection Act.

**Researcher's Name:** Joe Williams

**Date:** 03/06/2017

**FOR STUDENT APPLICATION ONLY**

I have read the research proposal and application form, and support this submission to the FREC.

**Supervisor's Name:**

**Date:**

CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO APPROVAL BY THE COURSE RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

--

	NAME	DATE
Approved by Course Committee		
Checked by Faculty Committee		

CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO APPROVAL BY THE EDUCATION FACULTY RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

--

	NAME	DATE
Approved by Faculty Committee		