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Abstract

Dutch Reformed secondary school leaders’ personal and professional values have rarely been studied. This study investigates their values in leading their schools, both espoused and lived out, comparing their own perspective and the perspectives of staff and pupils, in relation to their Christian faith. A three-stage backward design was adopted. Document analysis and exploratory interviews facilitated developing two corresponding questionnaire surveys, for headteachers and staff respectively, available in Dutch and English. Subsequently, two case studies were conducted with headteachers representing substantial variation within this relatively homogeneous group. Three in-depth interviews were conducted with the head, interspersed with focus groups interviews with team leaders, teachers and pupils. The respondents entertain mainstream ideas on school leadership. The questionnaire data suggest that heads as a group and teachers as a group agree to a large extent. However, this conceals underlying individual differences between the heads, as emerged from the case studies. The degree to which staff agree with their heads on his values varies. Furthermore, heads differ significantly in the extent to which they formulate a direct link between their values and their faith. In the questionnaires approximately 25% of the answers given by both groups on open questions on values contain explicitly Christian elements. Analysis of the interview data suggested four mediating variables on the perceptions followers have of their leaders’ values. These include whether the headteacher has a focussed set of values; the extent of integration of his worldview, values and actions; the nature of the content of his values; and the extent to which a head’s vision is clear, coherent and convincing. Some characteristics of a head’s ongoing professional development appear to moderate these four variables. An integrated conceptual framework of perceptions of a head’s values and actions, sources and contexts was developed beforehand and refined afterwards to include these newly-found variables.
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Chapter one. Introduction

Introduction

This study aims to contribute to the knowledge about values of heads of Dutch Reformed secondary schools. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 provides a rationale which leads up to the purpose of the study and the central research questions which underpin the study (section 1.3). Then the relevant characteristics of the Dutch educational system are mapped out in section 1.4, with a particular focus on the orthodox Protestant Christian (i.e. Reformed) identity of the schools and school leaders, also in an international perspective. The chapter concludes in section 1.5 with an outline of the thesis.

1.1 Educational leadership and values.

Good leadership in schools facilitates good teaching and influences, mostly indirectly, the learning outcomes of pupils (Day et al., 2000, p. 74; Day et al., 2011; Hallinger, 2005; Hallinger & Heck, 2011; Leithwood, Anderson, Mascall & Strauss, 2010; Leithwood, Harris & Hopkins, 2008, p. 28; Leithwood & Louis, 2012; Leithwood, Patten & Jantzi, 2010; Marzano, 2005; Moursheed et al., 2010; Witzier, Bosker & Krüger, 2003). Although much is still unknown about the factors, actors, and relationships involved, as well as effects and effect sizes (Hallinger, 2011; Hallinger & Heck, 2011), it is widely recognised that how school leaders exert their leadership is to a considerable extent dependent on their personal and professional values (e.g. Begley, 2001; Bush et al., 2010; Hodgkinson, 1991). As Hallinger asserts, ‘Values define both the ends towards which leaders aspire as well as the desirable means by which they will work to achieve them’ (2011, p.128). Their values also influence how they perceive and use their room for manoeuvre in the many different contexts they work in (e.g. Hallinger, 2005, p. 234; Leithwood, 2005, p. 623; cf. Johansson, 2003).
The relation between values and leadership in schools is theoretically complicated and also needs more empirical research. Different models and theories on educational leadership conceptualise this relation differently (cf. Begley, 2001; Hodgkinson, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 2013) and sometimes use different terminology for, apparently, the same construct (cf. Bryk & Schneider, 2002, 2003; Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009; Rokeach, 1973). In addition to the conceptual confusion, there is a paucity of empirical data on the values of school leaders, although some research has been done which was explicitly aimed at elucidating the values of school leaders.

Two examples may be helpful. Branson (2004) explored values-led principalship amongst a group of five Catholic Australian secondary school leaders. Baig (2010) investigated the place of personal values in the leadership of two religious headteachers in Pakistan. These studies both address the intangible concept of values by studying a small sample of individuals. Whilst this yielded valuable information on the perception of headteachers in two different countries and cultures, both studies predominantly rely on information emanating from the heads themselves. The views of e.g. the teachers on the values of their heads is not taken into account. In order to obtain a richer perspective on the values of school leaders, eliciting the perceptions of others, such as their teachers and pupils, would be a valuable addition. Another aspect which has hardly been researched in studies done so far is the relation between the values heads espouse and what they actually do. There might well be a gap (e.g. Begley, 1999a, p. 4; 1999b, p. 238; 2010, p. 40), not dissimilar to what Argyris and Schön conceptualised as ‘espoused theory’ and ‘theory-in-use’ (1974), or McLaughlin as the intended and aspirational ethos versus the experienced ethos (2005, p. 312).

The situation in The Netherlands is not different from the one briefly sketched above, as I am not aware of studies which investigated both school leaders’, and teachers’ and team leaders’ perception on the head’s values. By extension, this is also not the case for the small segment of the Dutch secondary schools whose leaders are the subject of this study, i.e.
heads in one of the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools. The next section explains why these schools and these heads were selected.

1.2 The rationale for the research

I take a strong personal interest in this study for more than one reason. Being head of secondary teacher education in a Dutch Reformed Christian University I meet school leaders, teachers in secondary schools, teacher educators with strong roots in secondary schools, as well as our own students, being prospective teachers in secondary education or further vocational education, as well as colleagues from other universities. Because of this I hear the perceptions each of these groups have, on average, of the other groups. I was a teacher and team leader at one of the Dutch Reformed secondary schools before 2004, when I took up my current position at the university which provides them with a large number of their teachers. Even then I realised how glaring a gap sometimes exists between school management and teachers in all kinds of schools, including Reformed schools. Both groups were at times seemingly unable to see the perspective of the other party, let alone the value or truth elements in it. This is something that I felt and feel is detrimental to well-being and quality, of all involved, not in the least the pupils. It also made me begin to theorise to what extent my perception was warranted and more than just my own lens on school life, and if so, what aspects were vital in this, how this gap comes about, and eventually what can be done to diminish it.

Furthermore, and beyond that, I take the view that values are important in how people (and by implication heads, staff and pupils) perceive reality and how they deal with it. Certainly within the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools, to which I am a relative insider, I think it is important to be aware of the values we adhere to and that these should be entirely in line with essential Biblical thinking and truths, such as the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the fruit of the Holy Spirit (Galatians chapter 5). At the same time, it seems to me that often the daily grind prevents leaders and schools from reflecting on issues and dilemmas from the point of view of
their values, and how they relate to the Bible. Effectively, the default position of the prevailing practices within the wider Dutch school system may then be taken (Murre, 2011, 2015). This position is, of course, the secular, neoliberal thinking which pervades society. I feel committed to the same religious beliefs and values the schools officially adhere to. This also makes me wonder to what extent there is a relation between the religious beliefs school leaders have and what values they find important in their leadership. My educated guess is that the views on this relation are somewhat divergent; from a rather close relation to a more detached view, where religious beliefs and personal faith in Christ are not seen as directly influencing leadership practices.

Another point that is worth stating here, is that schools want this study done. The boards of the schools have been informed of the broad aims of this study in the early stages of it, as I had to ascertain whether it would at all be possible to carry out a study on leadership values in these seven schools. They have expressed their willingness, and even eagerness, to cooperate (pending, of course, formal approval of the project by the University of Leeds and more detailed information as to be given in the information sheets).

These schools have to, and are willing to demonstrate a capacity to be learning organisations. This study is intended to help them because it scrutinises a major area in the school, and it may help leaders reflect on the what, why and how of their leadership by being asked questions. By cooperating in this study this may help them learn without the potential burden or ‘threat’ of formal assessment of e.g. the Dutch ‘Ofsted’. As these schools are part of a select number of academic research schools, cooperating in this study may also help them to achieve their aims and aspirations in that respect.

Finally, carrying out this study under the supervision of an English university instead of a Dutch one would probably lead to more awareness of cultural aspects and bringing to light hidden assumptions in my approach. This could contribute to the validity of the study, as well as to my own learning trajectory.
In sum, Dutch Reformed school leaders’ personal and professional values have rarely been studied. More particularly, the relation between espoused and lived values has not yet been explored. Neither have the perceptions been explored of the so-called ‘followers’ or ‘led’ (e.g. Evans, 2014; Gronn, 2010; Middlewood, 2010, cf. chapter 2.2.5), denoting team leaders and teachers here. Nor has any research been found on how pupils perceive their headmaster’s values. From another angle, the influence of the heads’ Christian faith on their values has not yet been explored either. My emic perspective, i.e. that of an insider to the group or phenomenon that is studied, contributes to the depth of the probing and the quality of the study (see also chapter 3.8.3). At the same time, as ‘pursuing a doctoral education in a “foreign” context tends to increase the demands of this intellectual venture’ (Elliot, Baumfield & Reid, 2016, p. 1180), the distance created by doing this study abroad may help prevent near-sightedness.

1.3 Purpose and central questions

This mixed-methods study first aims to contribute to knowledge about the leadership values of heads in Dutch Reformed secondary schools in a sociocultural perspective. This is primarily seen in terms of comparing the perspectives of heads themselves with those of the staff and pupils. It also takes into account the embeddedness of heads in their schools with its concomitant social fabric. Secondly, the study intends to inform the leadership of these heads with regard to their values, so that heads’ espoused values coincide with their lived values in the perceptions of heads and teachers alike. The third aim of the study is to promote leadership in these Dutch Reformed secondary schools in which both heads’ espoused and lived values align well with their worldview and their Reformed Christian faith. At this stage values are defined as personal and professional ideals and standards for behaviour in leading their school.

The research questions guiding the study are as follows:
1. What perceptions do school leaders have of their own values in leading their schools?
2. How do they live out these values?
3. How, if at all, do they relate values to their Reformed Christian faith?
4. What are the perceptions of their team leaders, teachers and pupils of their head in this respect?

A more precise formulation and elaboration is provided in chapter 3.2, after the literature review. Three assumptions underpin the aims and the research questions:

1. Values are one key factor in how leadership is exerted in schools in actual practice;
2. Values are related to and can be rooted in a person’s worldview;
3. Heads and teachers often seem to have rather different perspectives on school matters, including values, practices and relative importance of elements in mission statements. Ideally these differences should be kept to a minimum.

1.4 The Dutch context

1.4.1 The Dutch education system and secondary schools

Some background knowledge about the Dutch education system, the prevailing context, and the religious identity of the secondary schools involved is essential to understand and interpret this study. In the Netherlands, pupils aged 4 to 12 attend primary school. Pupils aged 13 to 16-18 years old attend secondary school. Secondary education is divided in three major types, each offering various options within their curriculum. University preparatory education (VWO) takes six years, senior general secondary education (HAVO) takes five years and preparatory vocational education (VMBO) takes four years. After secondary education VMBO-pupils can go on to further vocational education, HAVO-pupils can also go to a university for applied sciences (HBO) and VWO students can also opt for a research-intensive university (see appendix A for a visual representation of the Dutch education system). Secondary schools vary in size and in the
types of education they offer. Many schools in The Netherlands are comprehensive schools, having several thousands of pupils.

The organogram of comprehensive schools generally comprises several layers (figure 1). The executive board, often consisting of one to three full-time employed people, is vested with the final authority and strategic responsibility of the comprehensive school or schools. Often, pupils of one track (of the various types of education within one comprehensive school) spend most of their time within their ‘own’ building. A head or location leader is responsible for the daily running of this part of the comprehensive school. In this thesis ‘ principals’, ‘heads’ and ‘school leaders’ are used as synonyms. Both men and women may hold these positions, but for the sake of simplicity ‘he’ and ‘him’ are used in this thesis. Heads tend to have

Figure 1. An organogram of a typical Dutch comprehensive school. The number of heads and team leaders varies from school to school.
comparable responsibilities and authority, whereas this may vary significantly in the third and lower layer of team leaders. Principals know all their teachers and see them regularly. Their teachers know them relatively well, which is not the case for executive boards. Principals are also often quite visible to pupils within their location and all pupils tend to know them. They often had a career as teacher before they became formal leaders. Principals generally lead two to five team leaders in the third layer. Team leaders are in charge of daily affairs within their team as far as their pupils (generally some 150-250) and teachers (approximately 25) are concerned. In private schools (see 1.4.3), there generally is a board of trustees which appoints the members of the executive board.

1.4.2 Political context
In the 1980s and 1990s a new government educational policy came in vogue in The Netherlands. Power was transferred from government to the schools, in an attempt towards deregulation and increasing autonomy (Teelken, 2001). However,

contrary to the goals of deregulation and school autonomy policies, over the last 20 years the central government has decreased the autonomy within schools with respect to educational content (and to learning and teaching objectives) by issuing more regulations (Honingh and Karstanje, 2007). (Honingh & Hooge, 2014, p. 77).

To this can be added a prevailing neoliberal climate with a concomitant economic agenda (Meijer, 2013a), an ever-increasing number of high stakes national tests across the age range, an emphasis on international comparative tables such as Pisa, OECD rankings and university league tables (Onderwijsraad, 2013), and several nation-wide rankings published annually by newspapers and magazines. Performativity therefore has been an issue in The Netherlands (Meijer, 2013b) as well as elsewhere (Ball, 2003; Biesta, 2010). There has been a national central exam at the end of almost all kinds of secondary education for decades. There is, however, no national curriculum in the Netherlands, in the English sense of the word, as the ‘freedom of education’, discussed further in section 1.4.3, allows for discretionary powers of the schools in this respect.
Government educational policy has been a matter of critical debate for a long time. In 2007 and 2008 this led to an exceptional and critical parliamentary investigation (Dijsselbloem, 2008). The major points of criticism were the perceived far-reaching interference of the Department of Education with professionals, the perceived prescriptiveness of its policy and regulations, and lack of evidence for changes promoted by the Department of Education. Concerns are still being raised by e.g. the Educational Council (Onderwijsraad, 2014). The inspectorate is criticised on a regular basis in the Dutch parliament for infringing too much in actual classroom practices and therefore in school vision and autonomy (Refdag, 2013, 2015; Verus, 2014). However, there seems to be less prescription from the side of the government and the inspectorate in the Netherlands than from similar institutions in England.

With the proviso of the inherent boundaries this context implicitly or explicitly generates, executive boards are free to act. The room for manoeuvre for heads and team leaders is dependent on the way the school is run by the executive board. Sometimes it is said that the detailed policy measures and regulations that used to come from the government are now issued by the executive boards (Büthker, 2005; Obbink, 2005).

1.4.3 Freedom of education and public funding.

The education system in The Netherlands is in some respects and to some extent unique (Dijkstra & Dronkers, 2001, p. 63), for ‘central to the Dutch arrangement are two constitutional rights: the right of freedom of education and the right of public and private institutions to equal public funding’ (Dijkstra, Dronkers & Karsten, 2004, p. 67; cf. Flynn, 2007, p. 8). These two constitutional rights, freedom of education and equal public funding, were established in 1917. The possibilities this offered gave rise to a richly varied and pluralistic educational landscape. After 1917, effectively, society as a whole, including hospitals, clubs, libraries, became organised along denominational or ideological lines. In Dutch, this process is referred to as ‘pillarization’. This also included the schools, the majority of which were
firmly rooted in their own ‘religion and ideology (Catholic, Protestant, social-democrat, neutral)’ (Dijkstra, Dronkers & Karsten, 2004, p. 88). Today, Roman Catholic schools and Protestant Christian school each count for roughly one third of primary and secondary schools. So-called public schools, allegedly neutral or secular, also account for roughly one third. The remainder consists of small numbers of Muslim schools, Jewish, and Hindustani schools, as well as ‘Gereformeerdvrijgemaakte’ schools (a particular protestant denomination) and Reformed schools. Up till now and notwithstanding ongoing secularisation and dwindling ‘pillarization’, a very high percentage of Dutch pupils attend religiously affiliated secondary schools; as mentioned above approximately 60 % in 2013 (DUO, 2014). This is primarily because of the perceived better quality of these schools as compared to public state schools. This does not mean that these formally religiously affiliated schools are as distinct from public schools as they used to be some decades ago. Precisely this led to the further establishment of Reformed secondary schools, which now account for 1% of the total number of secondary schools.

1.4.4 The religious identity of Dutch Reformed secondary schools in an insider perspective

Dutch Reformed schools, as the secondary schools included in this study, are a distinct group of religiously affiliated schools, officially recognised as a denomination by the government. This section first highlights what ‘Reformed’ stands for in this context and closes with some additional numerical data. The term ‘Reformed schools’ is a literal translation of what these schools are called in Dutch (‘reformatorische scholen’), and they are known as such to their international partners. The name ‘reformed’ refers back to the Reformation and to the worldview of these schools, as formulated by, amongst others, John Calvin (1509-1564). In their mission statements and official documents the schools refer to the Bible and the so-called ‘Three Forms of Unity’, i.e. the Belgian Confession (1561), the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) and the Canons of Dordt (1619). The schools came into being approximately 40 years ago. A significant number of Protestant-Christian schools had effectively secularised (Van den
Back in the early 1970s secularisation already worried groups of parents, orthodox churches and their opinion leaders, who saw it as paramount that children would grow up in a uniform climate, in which school, church and family promoted the same Reformed set of beliefs and values (Burggraaf, 1981, p. 11; Moerkerken, 1981, p. 93; Vergunst, 1981, p. 17; cf. Walford, 2002). The constitutional right to establish their own publicly funded independent schools was therefore invoked (Bregman 1981, p. 89; Burggraaf, 1981, p. 11). These schools should ideally employ teachers who are themselves converted Christians (Burggraaf, 1981, p. 15; Pieper, 1981, p. 35; Vergunst, 1981, p. 21), ‘converted’ meaning born again and believing in Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Teachers should also be members of particular churches. They have a strict admission policy as well as appointments policy. The Vereniging voor Gereformeerd Schoolonderwijs (VGS; the national union of reformed school boards), which was instrumental to the establishment of many reformed secondary schools (Rouwendal, 1996), described these schools as follows (Verhage, 1987, p. 226):

This is a conglomerate of schools, boards, parents, pupils and teachers, attending various church denominations, who want to take heed to the Word of God and the confession of the church founded on this Word and formulated in the Three Forms of Unity.

The necessity of regeneration (being born again) and salvation from sin and eternal perdition by learning to know Jesus Christ as your personal Saviour by faith as free and gracious gifts of the Holy Spirit are emphasised.

Belonging to this ‘conglomerate’ also entails some easily noticeable behaviours as going to church twice on Sunday, saying grace before and after meals, reading the Bible after most meals in the family. The life-style is generally socially conservative (Baars-Blom, 2006; De Muynck, 2008, p. 93f; Janse, 1985, p. 69). Examples are that women mostly wear skirts, because it is felt that the habit of women wearing trousers started decades
ago to negate and oppose differences between males and females which were created by God. Money is spent more on quality consumer goods than entertainment. Families tend to be larger than the Dutch average. The desire to avoid secularisation underpins many of these, although there also is the more psychologically based conformity to group norms. Owning a television, nationally almost 100%, tends to be frowned upon and seen as giving in to secularisation. However, the percentage owning a television was some 30% in 2011 and some 67% watch television via internet (Reformatorisch Dagblad, 2011). Modern media are widely used and younger generations tend to be more lenient towards contemporary society and the mainstream lifestyle (Reformatorisch Dagblad, 2016).

A general aim of the reformed secondary schools was to help pupils to become critical of theories incompatible with Calvinist beliefs; more specifically to make pupils aware of presuppositions behind theories and of the aims and results of scientific work (Burggraaf, 1981, p. 14). Teachers of the first reformed secondary school, the Guido de Bres comprehensive school in Rotterdam, founded in 1970, elaborated on their educational and formational aims, for which they see a Biblical basis in, amongst others, Psalm 34 verse 11: ‘Come, ye children, hearken unto me: I will teach you the fear of the LORD’ (Bregman, 1981, p. 91). This elaboration can be seen as an early specimen of the aims and objectives of reformed schools, when they were established as a separate set of schools in the Dutch educational system. These Rotterdam teachers claim that pupils are formed in reformed secondary schools to accept their calling as an adult member of society. The aim is for pupils to participate in society in a critical and constructive way, and that they can discern between good and evil, justice and injustice. Pupils should learn from the Bible, the Word of God, not to conform automatically to the existing way of life in society. Instead, they should be educated by their school to become responsible citizens. Schools should never be misused to renew society in a political sense, as dominant political parties seemed to advocate at the time. By doing that, the school as ‘pedagogical room’ is compromised (Bregman 1981, p. 89). Golverdingen, who chaired the VGS from 1981 to 2003, formulated a similar and encompassing aim for reformed schools, which has been widely accepted in these schools ever since. Teaching should be aimed at
Opinions are divided on the question whether the schools have been successful in arranging school life and delivering the curriculum accordingly. Daily devotions where the Bible is read and a message is derived, applied and discussed and where psalms are sung are an important part of how schools understand their duty to be Christian. Textbooks are to a large extent secular, although for some subjects Reformed textbooks have been in use for years. The didactic approach seems to be as varied as in the Dutch schools generally. Over the last decade, a combined effort has been made by the seven schools in conjunction with the VGS and Driestar Christian University (which offers teacher education for primary and secondary education) to study and improve Christian teaching (De Muynck, 2004). Unfortunately, no public data comparable to the work of Francis et al. on several kinds of Christian schools in the United Kingdom (e.g. Ap Siôn, Francis & Baker, 2007) are available on how graduates experienced their school career in this respect, although as a relative insider I know that internal studies carried out by the schools amongst their alumni suggest the picture is mixed.

The number of pupils in these schools increased from 1,793 pupils in 1970 to 17,605 in 1995 (Vereniging voor Gereformeerd Schoolonderwijs, 1996, p. 306) to 22,471 in 2013 (DUO, 2014), the total number of secondary pupils in The Netherlands being almost one million. The pupils attending these schools all come from Reformed Christian families. The seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools are comprehensive schools, with 26 locations and 39 school leaders. They have different locations, often in different places, in order to provide education relatively close by where the pupils live. Also, in some schools, locations are designated for particular streams of pupils, e.g. ‘grammar school’ like pupils, or vocational streams.
Still, being comprehensive schools, they offer all kinds of secondary education and relatively smooth transitions are possible when a pupil moves from stream to another. The comprehensive schools typically have some 2500-4000 pupils (comparable to the Dutch average) except one smaller one of approximately 1800 pupils. Together, as mentioned above, they make up one percent of the Dutch secondary schools (cf. DUO, 2014). They are spread across the ‘Bible belt’, a diagonal line from South-West to North-East, where most orthodox Calvinist Reformed Christians live. Two of these schools have a different organogram, which entails that there effectually is no layer of headteachers present with comparable discretionary powers as in the other schools. These schools are not included in the study.

The seven secondary schools cooperate in two alliances as ‘academic research schools’, of which there are only 18 in The Netherlands. There is no official league table of schools in The Netherlands, published by the government or inspectorate. There are, however, unofficial, commercial ranking studies, such as the authoritative ‘Keuzegids middelbare scholen 2015’ [Selection guide secondary schools, 2015] and comparable publications in newspapers and magazines. These publications are based on data such as average student attainment, inspectorate findings and pupil and parent satisfaction surveys (Steenkamp et al., 2015; Elsevier, 2016). Relatively often, the schools score high in these lists.

1.4.5 Dutch (Reformed) secondary schools in an international perspective

In order to put the Dutch Reformed secondary schools into a broader perspective this section first provides some statistical information. This is followed by a comparison with a group of Christian schools in England, then by comparing the concept of guided confrontation with the concept of critical openness promoted in North America, international contacts of the schools, and the level of government interference.

In the OECD’s PISA rankings 2012, where student attainment of 15-year old students on mathematics, reading and science is measured, the Netherlands came out as number 10; the United Kingdom as number 26. As for the 4th
grade attainment for reading and literacy according to PIRLS 2011, England was number 11 on the list and the Netherlands number 13. For 4th grade mathematics, as measured by TIMSS, England was 9th and the Netherlands 12th. Government spending on education is roughly on a par with the UK, with 4.1% and 4.8% of GDP respectively (OECD, 2013, p. 191)

There are some similarities and differences between Dutch Reformed schools and the schools of the English ‘Christian Schools Trust’ (CST). CST schools, which are much smaller and privately funded, are probably the kind of schools in the UK which are most closely related to the Dutch reformed schools from an educational and religious point of view. Comparative research carried out by Pike (2010a) in two schools, one CST school and one Dutch Reformed secondary school, that ‘consider themselves to be ‘strong’ identity school’ (2010a, p. 182) brought to light both similarities and differences. The CST schools were founded, amongst others, because of ‘the feeling on the part of Christian parents that state education had become too secular’ (Pike, 2004, p. 159); secularisation seen as a danger by both CTS and Dutch Reformed schools. Some Dutch schools cooperate with some CST schools, a study trip was organised by Dutch school leaders to some of these schools in 2011, and some CST leaders visited conferences organised by their Dutch counterparts.

CST-schools claim that

*Education is more than just the transfer of knowledge; we believe education is to prepare children for life. God’s truth is found in all knowledge (Science, Maths, English, History, Art, P.E., R.S. etc) so our schools seek to provide an excellent academic environment coupled with a Christ-centred curriculum. We also believe that schools should be an extension of the home and that children should experience the same values and beliefs at school as at home. We want to provide an environment where our children can be nurtured, to grow in their faith and where they choose, to make Jesus the centre of their lives in every aspect.* (Christian Schools Trust, 2016)

In comparison with Golverdingen’s formulation (see 1.4.4) the schools are similar in emphasising that education is more than just the transfer of knowledge, that God’s truth is found in all disciplines, and that home and
school should nurture the same values. There are at least three differences; the first being the curriculum. In the Dutch Reformed schools, as mentioned in 1.4.4, this can be quite comparable or even identical with that of secular Dutch schools, except when there are dedicated versions of coursebooks. Conversely, in CST-schools this receives more attention generally. A second difference is the spiritual climate. Reformed schools do not start with the aim of preparing children ‘for life’ (cf. the above quote), let alone for ‘autonomy’ (cf. Hand, 2006). Preparing them for eternity comes first: ‘who serves God’ and ‘for the creature’s salvation’ (Golverdingen, 1995, p. 82). Also, children are not seen so much as young people who already have faith and who can choose ‘to make Jesus the centre of their lives’. Instead, the reformed schools emphasise the necessity of being born again in the course of their lives, and the vital role of God’s grace in that process (cf. Pike, 2010a, p. 187). A third difference is the make-up of the population of pupils. In the Netherlands this is homogeneous, all children come from Reformed families, while in CST-schools this can be quite heterogeneous and include as many as ‘25% of students [who come] from non-Christian homes’ (Pike, 2010a, p. 187) in one particular school although this will probably vary from school to school.

Therefore, while there is much that Reformed and CST schools have in common, there are also relevant differences which shape the spiritual climate within the schools. Differences between Dutch Reformed secondary schools and for instance English Christian ethos schools of the Emmanuel Schools Foundation (ESF) are bigger, in terms of funding (public versus both public and private), heterogeneity of the school population (all Christian students versus 95% non-Christian), and school aims (explicitly Christian, versus a Christian ethos) (Pike, 2004, 2010a, 2011). Differences between Dutch Reformed secondary schools and Church of England schools include that these Dutch schools are much homogeneous in terms of student, parent and teacher population, and that the formal relation with churches (which come in at least six denominations) is different. The schools have a board of trustees, which stands at a certain distance from the school. In these boards often some or all of the seats are designated to be fulfilled by representatives of various denominations.
In their mission statements the Dutch Reformed Secondary schools reflect the preparation for life that Christian School Trust schools mention as well. The aim that pupils can participate in society in a critical and constructive way, as stated by the Rotterdam teachers mentioned above (section 1.4.4), also ties in with what Thiessen in the North-American context calls ‘teaching for commitment and critical openness’ (Thiessen, 1993, 2001). The Dutch Reformed Secondary schools generally seem to be somewhat more inclined towards commitment than critical openness. This can amongst others be inferred from their stance towards secular society (cf. Janse, 1985) and how they prepare their pupils for membership in society later on. The term which is often used is ‘guided confrontation’, confrontation referring to the gap between a predominantly secular society and the Christian values entertained in these schools. ‘Guided’ refers to the cautious way by which the pupils are gradually brought in closer contact with deviant views. ‘Guided confrontation’ thus emphasises the critical attitude more than the openness Thiessen refers to.

The Dutch Reformed Secondary schools entertain international contacts with Christian schools akin to theirs, in e.g. Canada, the UK and Germany. These are generally private and non-funded or only partially funded schools. The Dutch Reformed Secondary schools do this primarily for study trips with pupils, to help their bilingual departments and to explore common interests or dilemmas on the level of school leaders. These schools are often not entirely similar in doctrine or in life-style, but still they are recognised as Christian schools that seriously engage with the message of the Bible in the current age and society.

Finally, even though all Dutch Reformed Secondary schools receive full public funding, the level of government control is significantly lower in most aspects than in e.g. England and the UK (Walford 2001, p. 369, 375).

1.5 Summary and outline of the thesis
Values are one important ingredient of educational leadership. This study investigates the values of heads of Dutch Reformed secondary schools, both espoused and lived out, from both their own and their followers’ perspective, in relation to their Christian faith.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on values and on educational leadership, as well as the intersection of those two. Chapter 3 presents the research questions, discusses my epistemic orientation and outlines the research design. Chapter 4, 5, and 6 discuss the findings of the exploratory phase and the questionnaires (chapter 4), case study one (chapter 5) and case study two (chapter 6) respectively. In chapter 7, the findings are synthesized and analysed. In the final chapter then, conclusions are drawn, and limitations and recommendations indicated.
Chapter two. Literature review

Covering the enormous amount of literature on leadership in schools is close to ‘impossible’ (Bush & Glover, 2003, p. 3). A similar statement can be made about the field of values. Therefore, the objective of this literature review is more modest, and as the central research question (chapter 1.3) deals with leadership and with values, the intersection of these two concepts is most relevant. The concept of values is discussed first (section 2.1) as it to some extent informs the review of some key theories in the evolution of educational leadership (section 2.2). These sections provide elements for a conceptual framework (section 2.3). In section 2.4 then, some important gaps in the knowledge base are identified, which at the same time connect the literature review with the research questions and research design in chapter 3.

2.1 Values

2.1.1 Values as an elusive concept

The concept of values is used in a wide array of disciplines. Reference could be made to handbooks on behavioural economics (Altman, 2015), organizations (March, 2013), and culture and psychology (Valsiner, 2012). It has also been a widely used concept in research in educational leadership, for a long time (Begley, 1999b, p. 237; Willower, 1999, p. 124). Recently, handbooks have been published on ethical educational leadership (Branson & Gross, 2014) and on education, religion and values (Arthur & Lovat, 2013), in which authors use the concept of ‘values’.

It is, however, by no means self-evident what this concept stands for. An almost endemic remark made by researchers and scholars in the field of education, or values research more generally, is that the concept lacks ‘clarity, coherence and relevance’ (Begley, 1996, p. 404; cf. Leonard, 1999; Mueller, 2013; Richmon, 2003; Stefkovich & Begley, 2007). ‘The term by itself is vacuous’ (Marsden, 2005, p. 105) and ‘there continues to be a
conspicuous lack of agreement on what values are’ (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998, p. 351). It is even referred to as ‘The Grand Delusion’ (Green, 1999, in Richmon, 2003, p. 34).

Definitions are not always provided. If and when they are given, this does not in any way imply that they coincide, as values have been defined in many different ways (Parkes & Thomas, 2007, p. 207). In 1969 already, Rescher (as quoted in Richmon, 2003, p. 34; cf. Richmon, 2004) ‘compiled a non-exhaustive list of nearly a dozen distinct, and at times contradictory, descriptions of values.’ The values universe has not become any less inhabited since, as seminal works on general values research of Rokeach (1973) and on educational leadership of Hodgkinson (e.g. 1991, 1996) illustrate, each providing the reader with their own definition.

The concept of values is also related to, overlaps with, or is taken to be synonymous with other concepts or terms. Many attempts have been undertaken to delineate it with respect to these related concepts and terminology. Related concepts include morals (cf. Leonard, 1999), ethics (cf. Leonard, 1999; Stefkovich & Begley, 2007), ideal (Willower, 1999), virtue (Carr, 2013; Haydon, 2007; Willower, 1999), disposition, attitude (Begley, 2003; Raths et al., 1966, p. 28 as quoted in Halstead & Pike, 2006, p. 24), motivations and needs (Richmon, 2004) and beliefs and convictions (Halstead & Pike, 2006). Not only are these concepts related, Begley (2003, p. 4) even asserts that words 'like moral, values, quality and ethics are often used interchangeably in school leadership literature’, thus exacerbating the opacity (italics in original). ‘Values’ is also used as a constituent part of superordinate concepts (cf. Department of Education & Training, 2005) pertaining to education, schools and educational leadership, for which a similar confusion exists; such as worldview (Klaassen, 2009; Van der Kooij et al., 2013), culture and climate (Glover & Coleman, 2005; Peterson & Deal, 1998; Richmon, 2004; Van Houtte & Van Maele, 2011; cf. Haydon, 2007), and ethos (McLaughlin, 2005). Some aspects of these superordinate terms also have a bearing on ‘values’, including the distinction between the intended and aspirational ethos versus the experienced ethos (McLaughlin, 2005, p. 312), reminiscent of ‘espoused theory’ and ‘theory-in-use’ (Argyris & Schön, 1974), which can be applied
equally to intended, espoused or claimed values, versus lived values, values-in-use or values-in-action (see further section 2.1.7). It appears therefore that the concept of values suffers from several problems: lack of defining what it stands for altogether, a wide variety in definitions when provided and the concomitant divergence in the way values are understood, and confusion where and how it should have a place in the semantic network of related concepts and terminology.

Scholars have tried to create more clarity in different ways, but a common thread through these approaches is that they often use a combination of strategies. They start with a review of existing definitions of which they try to find the common denominator, which is often followed by an empirical part in which they endeavour to tease out a set of values which cover the field, while being mutually exclusive. Examples are Schwartz and Bilsky who have done so in the field of psychology (1987; cf. Schwartz, 1992), and Cheng and Fleischmann, who cover a ‘wide range of fields including psychology, sociology, anthropology, science and technology studies, and information science’ (2010, p. 1). In the field of school leadership, Leithwood and Steinbach (1991) developed a values framework by this procedure. Richmon (2003) assessed a selection of five approaches in the area of values and educational administration (including the Leithwood & Steinbach framework) against a new conceptual framework.

The cardinal question is whether these attempts to clarify the concept of values have been successful. On the positive side there is some value in collecting and clarifying definitions (Cheng & Fleischmann, 2010; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987), providing categories and limited lists of values (Cheng & Fleischmann, 2010; Leithwood & Steinbach, 1991) or how to approach values research as such (Richmon, 2003). Conversely, to-date none of these attempts has been successful in that a widely adopted approach to values research has been attained. Neither did these attempts produce an agreed-on universal definition of values (Parkes & Thomas, 2007). There are not even undisputed lists of values, possibly precisely because of the lack of agreement and the conceptual vagueness. A Dutch study found more than 1300 values which are prevalent in the Dutch population; these could be summarised in 160 values (Oppenhuisen, 2000). Clearly, the
attempts to clarify the concept and unite the field have failed thus far (Ergen, 2015).

In spite of this the literature distinguishes between many kinds of values. Some of these refer to where they reside, as personal values and organisational values. Some what they are about, such as end values or terminal values, which refer to ideals, while instrumental values refer to how end values can be reached. Claimed or espoused values are seen as opposed to lived values or values in action (see further 2.1.7).

Hodgkinson distinguishes between transrational, rational and subrational values and orders these hierarchically (1991, p. 97, see table 1, adapted from Haydon, 2007, p. 11). This brings to light to what extent values can be rated in order of importance and whether idiosyncratic preferences (i.e. subrational values) should be seen as value statements at all (cf. Haydon, 2007). Hodgkinson’s model also raises the issue of the possibility, desirability or necessity (the three depending on one’s perspective) of justification of all kinds of values to others. Indeed, transrational values, often ‘codified in religious systems’ that can be ‘quite atheistic as in Communism or some forms of Buddhism’ (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 100), are metaphysical and thus beyond rational justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>No rational basis (transrational): Fundamental principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Rational basis: values based in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>No rational basis (subrational): Values based on personal preference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implicit in all these categories is some idea of a definition what values are about. It is highly conceivable for instance that a discourse on the why and what-for of schools primarily uses values in terms of ideals (i.e. terminal values), while consideration of educational processes may use values
primarily in terms of technical standards that should be upheld (i.e. instrumental values that meet professional criteria).

In sum, even though values have been discussed ‘almost ad nauseam’ (Mueller, 2013, p. 2), the concept seems to remain intrinsically vague. It defies capturing in a universally valid and accepted definition. Nevertheless, the widespread and long-standing use also suggests that it continues to exert a certain appeal. While terms such as ideal, end-state, standard, principle, conviction, and trait all seem to cover one part of the semantic field which values in its intuitive and everyday meaning evokes, for that very reason they fall short of being an attractive alternative. The concept of virtues may be seen as a candidate, which requires a broader discussion in the next subsection.

2.1.2 Values and virtues

Virtues is also a broad-ranging concept, which has a connotation of being linked both to someone’s behaviour and to what guides this behaviour. Values and virtues are sometimes used in (almost) the same sense (Carr, 2006, 2011). They are also used as a kind of fixed collocation, ‘values and virtues’, without any clear distinction or complementary meaning (Lickona, 1991, 2004). When compared with one another, specific virtues mentioned by some (e.g. Carr, 2006, 2007; Wilson, 2014) coincide to a large extent with values mentioned by others (e.g. Begley, 2001; Day et al., 2000). Consequently, the issue whether virtues is a better candidate than values for the purpose of this study requires a broader discussion.

Carr attempts to clarify the relation between values and virtues (2011). Values can be understood first of all as principled preferences. Carr does not mention Hodgkinson, but in Hodgkinson’s analytic model (see table 1) a simple preference would amount to a type III, subrational, value. Carr seems to add the adjective ‘principled’ to indicate some kind of justification, thereby making it more like a type II, rational value in Hodgkinson’s conceptualisation. As principled preferences may not necessarily lead to actions, Carr’s second description is of values as principled commitments.
The intention should be there to act in accordance with the principled preference. In Hodgkinson’s model commitment to act does not seem to be a matter of reflection so much as that it is presupposed. In order for a value to be a virtue, Carr adds a third element to the definition, values as principled disposition; a disposition being a natural tendency to do something. The dyad ‘principled disposition’ however does not necessarily imply anything good or desirable (Hodgkinson, 1991) or of merit (Carr, 2013); so that element seems to be lost in the brevity of the definition. From this brief exposition it is clear that values appear to be broader than virtues, and that values lack the strong connotation virtues have of always being objectively good (Lickona, 2013). As many have said before, Hitler and Stalin certainly had values, but not many people would consider them to be virtuous. And Kim Jong-un, the leader of North Korea, might well have a disposition to get rid of uncooperative members of his government which to him seems perfectly justifiable and principled, but to most others perverted instead of virtuous. In education, values underpinning a neoliberal policy lack the stamp of necessarily being ethically good and virtuous (cf. e.g. Ball, 2003; Bottery, 2004; Biesta, 2010). Therefore, albeit the concepts are obviously closely related, there are differences as well. The list of differences is indeed considerable. First, virtues in their Aristotelian sense are about finding an appropriate middle ground between two extremes (Aristotle, 1996; Van Tongeren, 2003), whereas values do not have such a connotation. Some examples given of values, such as ‘work’ and ‘happiness’ (Begley, 2001) therefore cannot easily come under the heading of virtues. Second, ‘virtue’ has a connotation of normally actually acting upon something and not just valuing it. In Lickona’s words, ‘a value becomes a virtue only to the extent that it is acted upon’ (2013, p. 5). Someone may value courage, but he will only be called courageous if he acts bravely in the face of danger or risk. In other words, while there may be a difference between espoused values and values-in-use, virtues cannot be severed from actions which prove it. Third, this also points to habits and character. A one-off example does not make someone virtuous. As Patton says, ‘Virtues are like habits; that is, once acquired, they become characteristic of a person’ (2008, p. 3; Willower, 1999, p. 131). Character (Berkowitz, 2002, p. 6) and character education are therefore more related
to a virtue-ethical approach than values as such, which again points to a
difference (Arthur, 2010; Berkowitz & Bier, 2004, 2005; Carr, 2005, 2006,
2007; Halstead & Pike, 2006; Lickona, 1991, 2004; Pike, 2010b, 2013,
Pike, Lickona & Nesfield, 2015). Fourth, values can be positive or negative
in the eyes of others, whereas virtues are more generally recognised and
received as being good for all. In other words, values lack the intrinsic
ethical justification and appeal which characterises virtues (cf. also section
2.2.6). Finally, the list of virtues seems to be more limited than the endless
lists of values, and, possibly because of the middle position between two
extremes, they tend to go together.

In sum, there are considerable differences between both concepts.
Considering these, and because it is not known in advance whether the
espoused values are indeed enacted or whether the espoused (or lived)
values are perceived to be benign, perhaps bordering on or even being
identical with some virtues, with regard to the purpose of this study the
concept of values is more applicable than virtues. Values is also a more
common term and concept for the group of respondents. This study
therefore sticks to the term ‘values’. Consequently, a justifiable definition of
values has to be adopted, which is even more urgent given the widespread
confusion (section 2.1.1). That is the topic of the next subsection.

2.1.3 Values: a definition

The definition of values which is adopted in the current study for the
reasons explained below is formulated by Halstead and Pike (2006, p. 4):

‘Values are principles and fundamental convictions which act as
justifications for activity in the public domain and general guides to
private behaviour; they are enduring beliefs about what is
worthwhile, ideals for which people strive and broad standards by
which particular practices are judged to be good, right, desirable or
worthy of respect.’

The definition subsumes the important elements mentioned in the literature
as discussed above. It consists of several elements, which should be taken
together. The concept of values resembles a diamond and each element can be understood as one facet.

The first facet is that values are ‘principles’. A principle is a ‘basic idea or rule that explains or controls how something happens or works’ (Cambridge dictionary online, 2013). It conveys notions of profundity, sustainability, steadfastness and immutability. The next facet, ‘fundamental conviction’, draws attention to the personal character values have. Values are principles as well, suggesting an authority that goes beyond an individual, but at the same time they are different from mechanistic and impersonal rules, as they are convictions. These convictions are ‘fundamental’, corresponding with the ‘basic’ in the definition of principles as provided by the dictionary. Combined, this part of the definition ‘occupies the middle ground in the debate about whether values are subjective or objective’ (Halstead & Pike, 2006, p. 25).

Another facet is ‘enduring beliefs’. The ‘enduring’ corresponds with the same notions as mentioned above (sustainability, steadfastness and immutability). ‘A belief is a conviction or an opinion that one holds to be true, based on limited evidence or proof’ (Branson, 2004, p. 51). Evidence for the rightness of a person’s beliefs will always be limited, sometimes anecdotal, sometimes possibly confined to mere illustrations. Even so, it is a conviction hold to be true, and as such an element in the definition which again points to the subject. The same holds for ‘ideals’. Rokeach refers to this as an end-state (1973, p. 5).

‘Broad standards’ are an objective, or at least intersubjective, facet in Halstead and Pike’s definition. As they are broad, this leaves room for interpretation as well as for choice, albeit limited, in actions or activities. There is no one-on-one correspondence between values (seen as broad standards) and behaviour. Values cannot be applied in a casuistic way. Broad, however, is not to be construed as unlimited. It is and adjective to standards, implying specific norms. ‘Standards’ are reminiscent of the notion of ‘basic rules’ in ‘principles’.
Halstead and Pike’s definition also incorporates both private life and public domain. Their definition suggests that someone’s behaviour in these two areas is, from the point of view of values, not only interconnected, but basically underpinned by identical principles and convictions. The difference is that in the public domain a person’s actions in principle call for some form of justification, whereas this is not demanded in private life. For private behaviour values act as trusted guides, which lead the way ‘in general’; the ‘general’ corresponding with the ‘broad’ in ‘broad standards’. To the extent that schools as organisations within the educational domain are public, this part of their definition suggests alignment between a leader’s personal, professional and organisational values (cf. e.g. Begley 2001, p. 5), reminiscent of the ethics of authenticity put forward by others (e.g. Begley & Stefkovich, 2007; cf. Bishop, 2013; Ford & Harding, 2011).

A final facet worth accentuating is that this definition unpacks the notion of the desirable (cf. Hodgkinson, 1991; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). The terms worthwhile, good, right, desirable, and worthy of respect, are used. Thus it evokes the basic notions of value, which is derived from the French ‘valoir’, meaning ‘to be worth’ (cf. Parkes & Thomas, 2007, p. 207).

The characteristics of the definition make it possible to use it within the Dutch scope of this study, even though it was designed for use in a book on citizenship and moral education. First, and most importantly, this multidimensional definition corresponds with the broad usage of the Dutch equivalent (waarden). Second, values itself is a concept that pertains to many areas in life, and therefore to leadership research too. There is nothing in the definition which explicitly limits its use to teachers or pupils. Third, it encapsulates many relevant remarks and analyses made in the history of discussing the concept, thus acknowledging previous philosophical and empirical work. Fourth, the elements incorporated in the definition represent a broad and encompassing picture of values when taken together, and can also be used as lens or sensitising concept as they underline specific elements for inquiry when taken separately, thus providing clues for analysis. Finally, this definition is internally consistent. It also balances subjective and objective elements as well as private and public elements. For these reasons this definition is adopted for the current study.
2.1.4 Values and personality traits

Since labels such as resilience and determination are used to capture particular values as well as certain personality traits, this evokes the question whether and to what extent values can be justifiably distinguished from personality traits.

In the field of psychology much conceptual and empirical work has been done on personality traits (e.g. John, Naumann & Soto, 2008). Personality traits are ‘descriptions of people in terms of relatively stable patterns of behaviour, thoughts and emotions’ (Parks-Leduc, Feldman & Bardi, 2015, p. 3; cf. Olver & Mooradian, 2003, p. 110). Values ‘include an evaluative component lacking from personality (Parks & Guay, 2009, p. 677) and can conflict with one another, which does not happen for personality traits (2009, p. 677).

Since the 1990s the predominant model to describe personality traits is a five factor model (e.g. McCrae & Costa, 1997, p. 509), often referred to as the Big Five, which is ‘a relatively parsimonious taxonomy for grouping and classifying specific traits’ (Parks & Guay, 2009, p. 675). It consists of five broad categories: conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience. In a first meta-analysis of research on values versus traits, Parks-Leduc, Feldman and Bardi (2015) compared the quantitative measurement of the Five-Factor model to the quantitative measurement of values originating in the theoretical value structure developed by Schwartz (e.g. 1992, 1994). Schwartz’ underlying concept of values (e.g. Schwartz, 1992, 1994) is to a large extent encapsulated in the definition of values used in this study (2.1.3). They conclude that the viewpoint that traits and values are different ways of measuring the same thing ‘is inaccurate’ (Parks-Leduc et al., 2015, p. 23) and that ‘the two constructs are distinct’ (2015, p. 24). Therefore, the findings in the Parks-Leduc meta-analysis support a distinction between values and personality traits.
In conclusion, as the constructs have different definitions and empirical research suggests that values and personality traits are distinct indeed, in this study they will be treated as such.

### 2.1.5 Values and its sources

Sources of a person’s values include religion or worldview (Van der Kooi, De Ruyter & Miedema, 2013), culture, and upbringing and socialisation. According to Klaassen ‘(…) worldview and religion are the traditional sources of inspiration for the formation of moral values and acting upon moral values. This also holds for values which are relevant to leadership’ (2009, p. 24; Begley, 2003; Fry, 2003; cf. Law, Walker & Dimmock, 2003). While ‘defining “religion” is notoriously difficult’ (Clouser, 2005, p. 9), all worldviews and religions have beliefs in something having unconditionally non-dependent reality (Clouser, 2005, pp. 23, 35f). Therefore, in this study I use worldview and religion or faith as near synonyms. Beliefs also influence someone’s values (Clouser, 1999), as Francis and Penny found as well, when they reviewed empirical research on the relation between religion and values (2013). They subdivide religion in dimensions: ‘self-assigned religious affiliation, religious belief, religious practice, attitude toward religion and religious orientation’ (2013, p. 199) and found that ‘self-assigned religious affiliation is a socially significant predictor of individual differences in values’ (2013, p. 207). They also draw attention to the importance of church attendance as an influence on values.

Some might assert that values are neutral between different worldviews (Norman, 2012, p. 517). That, however, seems to imply the imposition of a meta-worldview in which worldviews can be assessed against each other, or the (implicit) claim that one’s own worldview warrants (and is capable of) making neutrality claims across the board (Clouser, 2005; Cooling, 2010). Moreover, the term ‘neutral’ neglects the relevance of how values are embedded in a value system, which is informed by one’s own worldview.

Van den Belt and Moret studied the effects of worldview on managing, human resource management and leadership style amongst Dutch leaders.
of businesses and organisations, apparently not of schools. They subdivided worldview in orthodox-protestant, modern-protestant, Roman Catholic and secular, and found ‘no significant difference between Christian and non-Christian managers’ (T. Van den Belt & Moret, 2010b, p. 4). For orthodox-protestant managers they interpreted this as a deviation from their worldview which was legitimised with the doctrine of common grace (T. Van den Belt & Moret, 2010a: 203, 210, 221-223). The doctrinal term ‘common grace’ includes the notion that every person has God-given talents and gifts, and not just Christians. In other words, in this view Christians are not necessarily unique in their values or practices, though for them they should be in accordance with the accepted range of interpretations of Reformed Christian ethics. Within the group of Dutch Reformed secondary schools and the set of beliefs they represent it is often felt that ‘leadership belongs to the terrain of common grace’ (H. Van den Belt, 2015; cf. T. Van den Belt & Moret, 222f). While I concede that this doctrine is generally invoked to underpin the use of models with a non-Christian origin and that its importance may be underestimated even by those who officially adhere to it, I maintain that, seen from within this doctrinal position, words like deviation and legitimisation, as used by T. Van den Belt and Moret (2010a: 203, 210, 221-223), presuppose a divide which is not there.

There are another two relevant sources of values in addition to worldview. The general culture one lives in also influences someone’s values (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Rokeach, 1973; cf. Hodgkinson, 1991; Law, Walker & Dimmock, 2003). As Hoy and Miskel maintain, values ‘are reflections of the underlying assumptions of culture’ (2013, p. 182). The GLOBE project on leadership and culture in 62 countries found that, even while many values were appreciated everywhere, how they are ‘expressed and enacted may still be noticeably different from society to society’ (Center for Creative Leadership, 2012, p. 7). Since culture is a rather wide-ranging concept, both geographically and content-wise, when focusing on its influence on values it seems to make sense to pay attention to the micro or meso culture as well. This includes the local customs and prevailing attitudes. While there may be characteristics of e.g. the Dutch culture which are generally true, there are also differences according to region and local history.
As ‘many values are formatively accumulated’ (Begley, 2003, p. 2), a third source of values is someone’s biography (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 95). By definition this includes education. Moreover, it also includes the family someone grew up in and his parental upbringing. In his study of the spirituality of Reformed teachers in the Netherlands, De Muynck found that personal values and convictions are often deeply rooted in a person’s biography (2008).

2.1.6 Values and context

Values are not lived out in a vacuum but in a context, which facilitates, encourages or discourages the expression in acts of certain values. Values will therefore work out differently in different contexts (cf. Hallinger, 2005; Leithwood, 2005), sometimes called ‘arenas’ (Johansson, 2003, p. 201). The idea of an ‘arena’ evokes competition and struggle, and captures effectively the tensions that may arise between what is possible and what is desirable, both from the head’s perspective. Arenas denote the multiple domains in which a school leader operates in order to do his job.

Several arenas can be discerned. Johansson (2003) mentions among others the law, political, the effectiveness, the democratic, the implementation, the loyalty, and the professional arena. Although this proliferation of arenas may be helpful in highlighting particular domains, the number seems to obscure more than to help clarify the context of heads’ jobs. Moreover, they are not mutually exclusive.
Begley’s conceptualisation of five contexts, is more parsimonious. He distinguishes between group (e.g. family and peers), profession, organisation (i.e. the school), wider community (e.g. parents, churches), and culture respectively. He presents this as an onion model with the individual himself in the core (see figure 2, Begley, 2001, 2003). An onion model conveys the idea that some contexts exert a more direct influence than others and as such it seems to make sense. However, it also suggests that the layers on the outside exert their influence on the individual through the layers that are closer to the core, which seems to be problematic. It is contestable that, for instance, culture only influences a person by mediation via community, organisation, profession and group. Furthermore, it is hard to distinguish clearly and effectively between group (which includes peers), profession, and organisation. Undoubtedly, the school as an organisation employs a considerable number of peers and professionals. Therefore, the onion model could have been even less complicated by taking these together. Finally, Begley adds another ring or outer area, representing the transcendental: ‘God, faith, spirituality’ (Begley, 2003, p. 10). This area acknowledges their influence on the values and the expression of values of the individual. Again it should not be construed as a seventh ring, as a transcendental dimension may exert its influence directly and throughout all the layers, without necessarily being mediated by the other layers.
Bottery et al. (2013) discern five levels of context in a comparative study of English and Hong Kong headteachers: the individual, local, legislative, cultural, and global context. This seems to be a conflation between two kinds of contexts. One is according to mental dimensions: legislative and culture. The second according to geographical distance or geographical unities, i.e. from individual, to local, to global. There seems to be a twofold problem here, as the national context is absent, and the legislative is confined to educational policy. A more coherent hierarchy of contexts could use the national context, which then includes the legislative framework and dominant ideologies, but also more volatile politics and rhetoric, demographics, finance, teaching qualification systems, and expectations. All of these also exert some influence on a national level and thus on heads’ room for manoeuvre.

Unless the purpose is to focus explicitly on one particular (sub)context, a simpler model to visualise the contexts headteachers work may be possible. This model consists of three elements: the self or the person, the profession, and the wider external world, which should not necessarily be seen as three rings of an onion model. The three elements can each be analysed further. The conceptualisation of the ‘self’ for instance includes the relation between personal values and behaviour (see 2.1.7). The ‘profession’ deals with professional values and accepted practice, as well as the peers in one’s school organisation or national teacher or leadership societies. The ‘wider external world’ includes educational policies and the dominant cultural values, both nationally and globally.

The relevance of these contexts or arenas is, of course, that they influence how values work out. There may be tensions as differing arenas with their differing constraints and demands may hamper equal, similar or at least coherent expression of someone’s value orientation. Different arenas may involve competing or even incompatible values (Begley, 2003, p. 9). A well-known example is the performativity agenda (e.g. Ball, 2003; Biesta, 2010) in the national arena versus professional values in the professional arena. Arenas can also try to impose particular values on the players within that arena that may be at odds with their personal or professional values (Bottery, 2004, p. 199; cf. Biesta, 2010; Grace, 1995; Gold et al., 2003;
Wright, 2003). An example in the Dutch context may be the tendency towards more nation-wide testing at a university level for prospective teachers, which is accepted within a considerable part of the organisational arena involved, and contrary to individual values about freedom of education.

The degree of agency that is possible for heads who operate within a particular arena may therefore be large or small and vary from arena to arena (Archer, 2003). Still, the room for manoeuvre is hardly ever zero, as there often remains an element of choice and freedom how to (re)act. As Bottery et al. assert, ‘even context is not decisive: similar contexts can generate very different reactions due to very different personalities’ (2013, p. 49). Day et al., point to the importance of values over context for at least some heads, as they found that ‘values, more than the power of context, dictated the leadership approach adopted by school leaders in the study’ (2001, p. 55; cf. Branson, 2007b; Campbell, Gold & Lunt, 2003). In the local context it is probably realistic to see context and the expression of values as mutually influencing each other (Barnett & McCormick, 2003, p. 67; Hallinger & Heck, 2011, p. 150), while in the wider arena there will be less room for the materialisation and expression of an individual’s values and by doing that influencing the arena itself.

2.1.7 Values and behaviour: interrelation and attributions

As someone’s values cannot be observed directly, they are inferred from the observable behaviour (which includes utterances) and subsequently attributed to a person. The relation, however, between values and the outwardly visible ‘skin’ (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 96) of someone’s conduct is problematic on several accounts.

First, this relation can be conceptualised in several ways. In Begley’s values syntax (figure 3) for instance it is seen as mediated by attitudes, where attitudes ‘can be formally defined as the predisposition to act specifically as a result of values or value system acquired previously and elsewhere’ (Begley, 2003, p. 6, cf. 2001, p. 9; Hodgkinson 1991, p. 94).
Values themselves, in this concept, rest on more fundamental understandings and motives. It seems to be difficult to verify this empirically and in that case it is essentially an assumption. Furthermore, values may provide a motive for doing certain things, effectively reversing the order (see 2.1.1 and 2.1.3). The value of mercy, for instance, may be a motive for allowing a teacher to go home early to care for a sick child, even when he is not entitled to get leave. Finally, in Branson’s model of the Self (2004, p. 69; 2005, p. 19; 2007a, p. 230; 2007b, p. 477) the interstitial layer between values and behaviour is the layer of beliefs, which is rather different from a layer of attitudes in Begley’s model. There obviously is no consensus on models of the self. However, it is clear that behaviour is unanimously seen as the outwardly visible ‘outer self’ (Branson, 2007a, p. 230), and as an expression of values that lay more close to the core of the self of a person, which can be mediated by another variable.

That leads, however, to a second problematic point, which is how attributions of values take place. From the perspective of a person himself, his natural inclination will be to enact his values. This does not mean that he is by definition aware of his values. The extent to which this is the case depends on self-knowledge and reflection (e.g. Branson, 2007a, 2007b; Begley, 2010), which implies that he may not be able to accurately give
words to what his values are (Branson, 2007a, p. 226; Erickson, 1986, p. 123; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998, p. 360). Thus, learning someone’s values cannot solely rely on what he says. Furthermore, from the point of view of outsiders, they normally make value attributions on the basis of someone’s behaviour and not merely his words. Attributions will be subject to a degree of uncertainty, for various reasons. Observers should take into account the possibility that more than one set of values matches a certain posture, as well as taking stock of the interference of mediating variables. The uncertainty about which values underpin which behaviour is, of course, exacerbated by the existence of mediating, interstitial layers in the personality of the observed, as mentioned before. Furthermore, the context also influences the availability and choice of action alternatives (see 2.1.6), thus adding another mediating variable. In other words, the line from values to behaviour and vice versa is not necessarily straightforward. In sum, the extent to which someone’s behaviour reflects his core values may vary.

Third, not only are attributions of values of one individual made by one other individual; in a school community, as in any community, interpretations tend to be exchanged among the members of the community. Interpretations are traditionally studied in the discipline of arts and literature and possibly cross-disciplinary borrowing might open up new perspectives here. A theory which explores the meaning of a text and the interpretive process in the context of a community is Reader Response Theory (RRT), which stems from the 1970’s. RRT addresses questions such as whether a text carries an inherent, immanent, meaning, and where and how the reader comes into the equation. Although it is difficult to describe premises, methodology, shared perspectives, techniques and beliefs of reader response approaches (Harding, 2014, p. 69), it can be said that the ‘text contains meaning only insofar as a reader engages with the text to interpret its meaning’ (Harding, 2014, p. 69). If the reader with his individual background is pivotal to the extent this quote suggests, this evokes the question how different readers with different biographies can apparently have the same interpretation of a text and find an identical meaning. In order to address this issue RRT uses the concept of the ‘interpretive community’. In the words of Stanley Fish, the founding father
of RRT, ‘the fact of agreement, rather than being a proof of the stability of objects, is a testimony to the power of an interpretive community to constitute the objects upon which its members (also and simultaneously constituted) can then agree.’ (Fish, 1980, p. 338). While leaving aside the alleged radically constructivist ontology of RRT (Cooling 2013; cf. however Gioia & Gwynn, 2006, pp. 897f), or necessarily accepting the presuppositions of reader response approaches, the concept of the ‘interpretive community’ may be borrowed and applied to the extent of agreement between groups of respondents on value attributions of heads, as that will appear in the case studies.

Fourth, there is yet another factor which complicates the relation between values and behaviour as there may well exist a disparity between espoused values and values which are in use (Begley 1999a, p. 4; 1999b, p. 238; Lickona, 2013, p. 5; MeGlino & Ravlin, 1998, p. 356; cf. Argyris & Schön, 1974; McLaughlin, 2005, p. 310). Hoy and Miskel summarise research findings by stating that ‘only a slight relationship exists between how leaders say they should behave and subordinates describe that they do behave’ (2013, p. 435). This may happen unintentionally, but also, as Carr asserts, that ‘the values that people often profess may be notional positions to which they may also pay little more than lip service’ (Carr, 2011, p. 172; cf. Begley, 2010, p. 40). Therefore, apart from the lack of awareness, and the mediating variables between values and behaviour mentioned in the previous paragraph, the potential gap between claimed values and ‘values in action’ (Lickona, 2013, p. 5) hamper straightforward attribution of value positions. This has obvious methodological implications concerning validity and reliability, which necessitate triangulation, for instance by using more sources of information or observing actual behaviour (Campbell, Gold & Lunt, 2003, pp. 207, 218).

2.2 Values and educational leadership
2.2.1 Elusive and divergent

While discussing the concept of values in the previous sections, some attention has been paid already to its relevance to leadership and leadership conceptualisations. Leadership is a multifaceted phenomenon which has drawn attention since at least Aristotle (Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 428). According to Northouse it has been researched for more than a hundred years (2013). However, encountering a precise definition of the construct of leadership in books and articles is still not a matter of fact (Rost, 2008, p. 98; Stewart, 2006, p. 3). Those authors who define the concept all use their own formulations and therefore the number of definitions is numerous (Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 427; Northouse, 2013, p. 5). Barker maintains that ‘Rost (1991) analysed a total of 587 works that referred to leadership in their titles and found that fully 366 of them did not specify any definition of leadership’ (1997, p. 344).

In a brief overview of leadership definitions, seventeen years on, Rost (2008) enumerates more than 10 different and diverging definitions, all published in the last two decades. Not only does an ‘agreed upon definition of leadership (...) not exist’ (Stewart, 2006, p. 4), there is no single classification of various perspectives on leadership. Crum (2013, p. 23) quotes Fleishman and Hunt (1973) as maintaining that in 60 years there have been 65 different classifications of leadership. They wrote this 40 years ago. There even is no scholarly consensus on how to investigate the phenomenon. A long and concerted project was undertaken by scholars of many fields to synthesise the acquired body of knowledge on leadership in a quest for a general theory of leadership. However, this unprecedented attempt failed to yield a workable taxonomy. Nor did it produce clear directions (Goethals & Sorenson, 2006). Leadership still is a rather elusive phenomenon. As the field is too wide to be exhaustive within the scope of this thesis, if ever (cf. Marturano & Gosling, 2008; Weijers, 2011, pp. 64, 65), this section only explores the evolution of the most pertinent theories in some more detail, as interpreted from the point of view of values and ethical implications.
2.2.2 A broad overview

In the evolution of leadership theory several directions have been taken. Great man theories came first, which assumed in a rather deterministic way (cf. Kruger, 2009, p. 111) that leaders are born and not made and that they exhibit certain traits. These trait theories tried to capture personality and motivational traits (Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 430) typical of those special people who were seen as good leaders. However, it appeared to be impossible to establish a conclusive list of personality characteristics associated with leadership (Northouse, 2013, p. 30). There also remained ‘methodological doubts [...] about attribution errors, suggesting that many of these traits are observed in leaders because they are leaders’ (Levine, 2008, p. 165). Hardly any attention was paid to moral aspects of leadership. Later on skills approaches gained currency, researching the capabilities of leaders rather than their personalities. These approaches do not seem to have much predictive value (Northouse, 2013, p. 59).

Subsequent style theories, concentrating on leaders’ behaviour, equally failed to identify universal behaviours that consistently result in effective leadership (Northouse, 2013, pp. 85, 96). The well-known managerial grid by Blake and Mouton is an example. Both skills approaches and style theories did not pay much attention to the ethical component in leadership. This also holds for the next generation of theories, situational leadership, which was primarily developed by Hersey and Blanchard (e.g. 1969).

Andersen claims that ‘After more than 35 years of research – indeed intensive research – into situational leadership, we cannot claim that this research has given convincing or consistent answers as to what behavioural patterns or managerial types are effective in particular situations’ (2008, p. 159). Apart from the lack of empirical support, these four stages in the evolution of leadership theory lacked a distinct moral perspective, which seems to be a glaring omission.

Sometimes theories are adorned with an adjective which epitomises its main thrust. As Leithwood and Louis say

Research on leadership in non-school contexts is frequently driven by theories described by one of our colleagues as "adjectival leadership models." A recent review of such theories identified twenty-one
leadership approaches that have been objects of considerable theoretical and empirical development. (2012, p. 5)

In education too, ‘adjectival leadership models’ proliferated. Descriptors are used such as transactional leadership and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978), servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1998), visionary leadership (Barnett & McCormick 2003), authentic leadership (Begley, 2003), participative leadership (Bogler, 2001), distributed (Harris, 2008, 2010; Spillane, 2006), layered and shared leadership (Hallinger, 2011), effective leadership (Sergiovanni, 1984) and professional leadership (Department of Education & Training, 2005), inspiring, ethical, inquiry-based leadership (Krüger, 2009), instructional leadership (Hallinger, 2005).

Contrary to what the one descriptive adjective per theory may suggest, these theories are not by definition mutually exclusive, let alone in all aspects. Otherwise disparate approaches can sometimes be complementary on the level of actual leadership practices, or partially overlapping (cf. Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Macbeath, 2003; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008). Apparently, using an adjective is not necessarily helpful in distinguishing clearly between the theories they refer to. Taken together, they strongly suggest that one aspect cannot adequately cover the complexity of the concept of leadership (cf. Leithwood et al., 2004, p. 20). The failure to find adequate categories also substantiates the point made by Goethals and Sorenson (2006), that a workable taxonomy could not be established.

More importantly, even though it should be acknowledged that in comparison with older theories more attention is paid to ethical aspects in this more recent array of ‘adjectival’ theories, just one of these is explicitly ‘ethical’. The choice of the adjective indicates that other aspects than the moral one are seen as defining leadership. Furthermore, albeit some theories incorporate ethical notions, others do not pay attention to values at all (Barker, 1997; Northouse, 2013). The widely used Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) of Kouzes and Posner is just one illustration that sometimes values remain almost entirely implicit (2013, p. 5).
However, as Willower says (as quoted in Begley, 2001, p. 2; 2003, p. 3), ‘because a significant portion of the practice in educational administration requires rejecting some courses of action in favour of a preferred one, values are generally acknowledged to be central to the field. (1992, p 369)’. Admittedly, general acknowledgement overstates the matter as in some cases it at best amounts to tacit acknowledgement of the mere existence of values, without making this a central element in leadership theory, praxis or practice. Even so, it seems to be hard to refute Klaassen’s statement, who asserted in the Dutch context that ‘personal, professional and religious values and worldview probably exert a considerable influence on thinking and weighing-up processes’ (2009, p. 5). How this ‘considerable influence’ is conceptualised in the various educational leadership theories varies greatly. This can be illustrated in the evolution of the most relevant of these over the last decades: transformational leadership, instructional leadership, distributed leadership, and values-based approaches to leadership (sections 2.2.3 – 2.2.6).

2.2.3 Transformational leadership and values

Transformational leadership (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999; Barnett & McCormick, 2003; Bass, 1985, 1999; Burns, 1978; Downton, 1973; Gill, 1998; Price, 2008; Stewart, 2006) has also been applied to educational organizations (Hoy & Miskel; 2013, p. 453; Leithwood, 1992). Although the literature on educational leadership does not ‘offer a unitary concept of transformational leadership’ (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000, p. 113), according to Leithwood and Sun

_Transformational leadership theory argues that, given adequate support, organizational members become highly engaged and motivated by goals that are inspirational because those goals are associated with values in which they strongly believe—or are persuaded to strongly believe._ (2012, p. 388)

While ‘transformational leadership theory emphasizes emotions and values’ (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005, p. 178) it has primarily been researched with a view to student attainment (Barnett, McCormick & Conners, 2001; Barnett & McCormick 2003; Black et al, 2003; Day, 2000; Day et al., 2000:74;
For all its merits, transformational leadership also falls short for at least three other reasons, that are intertwined. It is a look-alike of the former great man theories, with the burden this places on the individual leader and the consequences thereof (cf. Bottery, 2004, pp. 16-18). It tends to diminish the agency of the followers, and the valuable expertise of these professionals by giving it short shrift, if it does not entirely disregard it. And finally, while transformational leadership exudes the aura of being both benign and effective, it does not make clear where the values and mission come from, and whether and why these are benign and worth pursuing. As such, from a moral perspective transformational leadership is essentially rudderless. Even Hitler might be called a transformational leader. In an incisive review whether transformational leadership is democratic or demonic, Allix even suggests, amongst others, that the implication ‘is that leaders have some sort of monopoly on moral truth, knowledge and wisdom, which they exploit to draw followers up to their own perceived ethical standards’ (2000, p. 15). Attempts to connect ethics and authentic transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeyer, 1999), and by doing that to distinguish between ‘truly’ transformational leaders and pseudo ones, confront the moral aspects more fundamentally but do seem to be unconvincing in several respects. The point of the origin and justification of
values is taken forward in chapter 2.2.6, on values-informed approaches to leadership.

2.2.4 Instructional leadership and values.

Instructional leadership came in use in the 1980s and 1990s in the USA (Leithwood, 1992, p. 8) and later on in the UK as well (Frost & Harris, 2003, p. 484). In the Netherlands it is known as ‘onderwijskundig leiderschap’ (also known as pedagogical leadership); an official competence for primary and secondary headteachers (Andersen & Krüger, 2013; Krüger & Andersen, 2014). As clear ‘consensus on what instructional leadership actually is’ (Horng & Loeb, 2010, p. 66) is lacking, conceptualisations vary (Macbeath, 2003 (quoted by Frost & Harris, 2003, p. 484), Hallinger, 2005; Wahlstrom, 2012). Nevertheless, all of these broadly interpret it ‘as the principal’s orientation towards the primary processes in the school’ (Kruger, Witzier, Sleegers, 2007, p. 3), implying attention for leading the teaching and the learning.

As in transformational leadership, research on instructional leadership has focused primarily on school effectiveness (e.g. Hallinger, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe 2008). Instructional leadership potentially neglects other important elements of school leadership (e.g. Horng, Klasik & Loeb, 2010, p. 520) and school improvement (Fullan, 2002, p. 17), as its strong point is the focus on teaching and learning. Therefore, it seems to be fruitful to complement instructional leadership with transformational leadership (Hallinger, 2011; Kruger, Witzier, Sleegers, 2007; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Leithwood & Sun, 2012; Marks & Printy, 2003; Robinson, Hohepa, & Lloyd, 2009; Stewart, 2006). This may be relatively easy, as instructional leadership shares a somewhat top-down character from the expert head to the less expert teachers (cf. Frost & Harris, 2003, p. 483) with transformational leadership. There is indeed ‘an increasing convergence’ (Robinson et al., 2008, p. 666) towards a concept that has been called ‘shared instructional leadership’ (e.g. Hallinger, 2005, p. 233), ‘learning-focused leadership’ (Rhodes & Brundrett, 2010, p. 157;
From the point of view of values, in instructional leadership these pervade the concepts, but hardly ever surface. They are mentioned explicitly in statements as 'Finally, the principal must model values and practices that create a climate and support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning' (Hallinger, 2005, p. 227). Even then, it seems to be taken for granted and self-evident which values and why these. Possibly, this is because particular values implicitly underlie the elements of instructional leadership. For instance, when Wahlstrom talks about ‘instructional ethos’ as setting ‘a tone or culture in the building that supports continual professional learning’ (2012, p. 68), it is clear that ongoing professionalisation, development and learning are the underlying values a head tries to instil and promote. When Macbeath says that 'the concept [of instructional leadership] implies overseeing, monitoring and evaluation of teaching by senior managers’ (2003, quoted by Frost & Harris, 2003, p. 484), this, in turn, implies values consistent with a controlling and checking frame of reference, and does not evoke values of e.g. trust. Instructional leadership, therefore, is filled with values, mostly implicitly, which heads should model. Notwithstanding this, research in this area does not emphasise scrutiny of the values themselves, let alone the concept as such.

2.2.5 Distributed leadership and values

More recently, distributed leadership has been gaining currency in the UK and America and some conceptual and empirical work has been published (Anderson, 2012; Bush & Glover, 2014; Gronn, 2008; Harris, 2008, 2010; Spillane, 2006; Timperley, 2005). It has also drawn some attention in the Netherlands (Imants, 2010; Kessels, 2012; Klaassen, 2009). ‘Central to the idea of distributed leadership is the view that leadership is not the sole preserve of the individual at the top, but that it may be exercised by anybody within the organisation’ (Frost & Harris, 2003, p. 480). As such, it is not so much contradictory to representatives of school effectiveness research, including transformational and instructional leadership theories as
discussed above, as it does not deny the results with regard to academic achievement and leadership in these. It focuses on another dimension to the leadership discourse, in drawing attention to the issue where leadership resides in schools. In that sense it also purports to be not only a more accurate description of leadership in schools, but distributed leadership, if promoted, leads to a redistribution of power, a better use of talents and expertise and a spread of the workload (Bottery, 2004; Frost & Harris, 2003; Harris, 2008; Harris & Chapman, 2002; Spillane, 2006).

The most important merit of the concept is that it puts on the agenda the relationships between leadership, formal leaders and those who have been called the followers (e.g. Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Gold et al., 2003; Gronn, 2010) or the led (e.g. Evans, 2014; Hodgkinson 1991; Middlewood, 2010). This is an important triad that often remains more implicit in other leadership theories. Some points are worth considering.

First, leadership cannot be binary, with only an on and off position. In that sense, distributed leadership moves away from a dichotomy between leaders and led and conceptualises leadership as a continuum from almost zero influence to high amounts of influence, irrespective of who exerts the influence. Leadership is not only exerted by the principal and senior management, but is and should be within the agency of teachers as well. It needs to be said that heads can only be ‘perceived as a leader’ (Lord & Maher, 1993, p. 11) if the followers ‘consent to be led’ (Greenfield, 1982, p. 75; cf. Brailsford, 2001; Greenfield, 1995; Klaassen 2009). This properly reflects the agency of teachers. The individuality and being a subject of so-called followers should be acknowledged. In this thesis the terms ‘follower’ or even ‘led’ are therefore used only in a technical sense, for lack of a widely recognised short alternative. Conversely, even in situations where leadership has been shifted towards teachers, principals remain vitally important and essentially in charge (e.g. Anderson 2012, p. 42; Berkowitz & Bier 2004, p. 77; Bottery, 2004; Chenoweth & Theokas 2013, p. 57; Department of Education & Training, 2005; Gronn, 2010; Leithwood et al., 2006; Leithwood & Louis, 2012; Moursheed et al., 2010).
Second, taking together these considerations strongly suggests that 'leadership must be conceptualized as a mutual influence process, rather than as a one-way process in which leaders influence others’ (Hallinger, 2005, p. 234, italics in original; cf. Hallinger & Heck, 2011). This ‘mutual influence’ points therefore to an important issue which seems not to have been given much attention within literature on distributed leadership. This is the dynamic, ‘entwined’ (Cunliffe & Eriksen, 2011, p. 1434), interactive and relational character of leadership (Uhl-Bien, 2006), where each of the actors both exerts influence on others and is influenced by others. This issue goes beyond the question of distribution of power in a social situation (Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2001). It also ties in with similar insights discussed in section 2.1.6, where values, both espoused and lived out, are influenced by the context, which includes, by definition, the social and organisational context. Therefore, the distribution of power seems to be just one aspect of a broader and possibly much more fundamental approach to leadership. In this approach mutual relationships and interaction between all actors and factors are seen as constituent elements and units of analysis (Uhl-Bien, 2006), in addition to the agency and individual perceptions and contributions of each of the people involved; irrespective of whether they are traditionally indicated as ‘leaders’ or as ‘led’.

This also leads to another issue. From the point of view of values, distributed leadership seems to be rather one-sided in its reflections, as it predominantly highlights power issues. There seems to be a pervasive assumption that power should be distributed in equal portions over all involved. A convincing justification for that assumption is hard to find in the literature. Furthermore, while power, in the shape of the amount of influence that one wields, can be distributed, the concomitant responsibility for how influence is exerted is a fundamentally moral question that can never be uncoupled from the accountability and responsibility of an individual (cf. Pike, 2013, p. 140). It is striking that in a recent issue ‘Management in Education’, specially dedicated to Distributed Leadership, power and authority receive considerable attention, whereas the moral responsibility of individuals, as distinct from judicial or legal, is given scant attention, if at all (e.g. Harris & DeFlaminis, 2016; Diamond & Spillane, 2016; Woods, 2016). As responsibility is a moral question, it involves the
values of all of those involved. Issues as individual versus collective responsibility, with the added complicating dimension of differences in formal power, deserve proper reflection, more than fits within the scope of this thesis. Paying attention to relational aspects of leadership, as done above, cannot lead to negating individual moral responsibility (and the values involved) that comes with individual agency. They should go hand in hand.

2.2.6 Values based theories

In recent years, values-informed or values-based approaches have been gaining more attention. These concepts of leadership are not directly related to school effectiveness research and academic achievement of students (cf. however Day et al., 2011), and therefore different from transformational and instructional leadership. Given that these value-based approaches are relatively recent, the lack of a substantial empirical knowledge-base is not surprising (Kruger, Witzier & Sleegers, 2007; Langlois et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2008; cf. Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Value-based approaches come under various terms, as moral, ethical, authentic, or spiritual leadership (Begley & Johansson, 2003; Branson & Gross, 2014; Bush & Glover, 2014; Duignan, 2014; Ford & Harding, 2011; Johansson, 2003; Kruger, Witziers & Sleeger, 2007; Stefkovich & Begley, 2007). The relationships between those terms is vague (cf. Kruger, Witzier & Sleegers, 2007, p. 116; see also 2.2.1) and clear definitions of ethical leadership (Langlois et al., 2014, p. 312) and authentic leadership (Duignan, 2014, p. 52; Smith et al., 2008, p. 6), the most common denominators, have proved to be elusive. Authenticity, for example, to Hodgkinson ‘is the submission to the discipline of ‘whatever morality exists within”’ (1991, p. 130). To Bishop it ‘is comprised of much more than being true to oneself. Authenticity involves integrity, ethics, morals, values, self, relationships, and learning’ (2013, p. 5; cf. Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Begley asserts that ‘authentic leadership may be thought of as a metaphor for professionally effective, ethically sound, and consciously reflective practices in educational administration. This is
leadership that is knowledge-based, values informed, and skilfully executed’ (2003, p. 1). It ‘is the outcome of self-knowledge, sensitivity to the orientations of others, and a technical sophistication that leads to a synergy of leadership action’ (Begley & Stefkovich, 2007, p. 403; cf. Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 133). Clearly, rather different definitions are given under the one heading of authentic leadership.

The strong point of value-based approaches is the fact that they recognise the profound influence values have in leadership and the decisions that are made. As such they draw attention to a much needed and thus far less developed element in leadership theory. There are, however, some problematic aspects.

The first of these bears on the terms itself: if authenticity means so many different things to different people and is so broad in scope as to encompass almost anything, is it still a useful concept? Additionally, authenticity has positive moral overtones, at least in Dutch. It could therefore be argued that the term has been hijacked because of its intuitive appeal as a ‘non-objectionable’ (borrowing a term from Biesta, 2015, p. 58). In other words, who would not want to be authentic?

A second problematic aspect is that within values-based approaches various options have been proffered to guide the decision-making processes involved in leadership. These include proposing ethical frameworks of justice, care and critique (Starrat, 1994). A fourth ethic of the profession was added by Stefkovich and Shapiro (2003, p. 92; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005, p. 27) to which Branson added a fifth and, judging from the visual representation, overarching ethics of personal moral integrity (2010, p. 2). Apparently finding ‘established ethical standards’ (Bishop, 2013, p. 3) which are both convincing and encompassing is difficult.

A third aspect, which seems to have been given hardly any attention, is that ‘not all individuals encountered in organisational settings act in ethical ways’ (Begley, 2010, p. 36). The very fact however, that that ‘hardly needs to be said’ (Begley, 2010, p. 36), suggests that it is not warranted to only mention the positive values often associated with authentic or ethical
leadership. It seems as if authentic leadership ‘refuses to acknowledge the rounded subject as someone full of contradictions’ (Ford & Harding, 2011, p. 467). Effectively, ‘there is no room, in this model, for self-knowledge to reveal anything that is not positive. The individual is not allowed a dark side’ (Ford & Harding, 2011, p. 476). Although this dark side of leaders does neither need to be as evil as Hitler’s or Stalin’s conceptions, nor positively toxic (Pelletier, 2010), this seems to be unrealistic.

The fourth and final problematic aspect in values-based or values-informed approaches is the justification of values. Values mentioned in ethical and authentic leadership, include honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, respect, integrity, care (e.g. Brown, 2007 in Kruger, Witzier & Sleegers, 2007, p. 116; Bush & Glover, 2014, p.7; Rintoul & Goulais, 2010, p. 1). Values in these theories are essentially based on considerations of individuals, as it is often said or implied that they should ‘either be individually or socially constructed’ (Richmon, 2003, p. 43). They are a matter of ‘philosophical’ consideration (Hodgkinson, 1991, p. 116), involving ‘socially justifiable applications of ethics to situations’ (Begley, 2010, p. 47). This, however, presents some serious problems.

First, social construction, let alone individual construction, ultimately lacks compelling reasons for others to finally adopt the values of others, or the majority of others, if an individual persists in having a different opinion. Second, social construction of values on its own cannot justify why e.g. Hitler was wrong. Within a constructivist paradigm, in which Hitler cum suis socially constructed their (in mine eyes absolutely perverted) values, it is hard to see why they are wrong. While this is, of course, an extreme example, the point as such is also valid for education, where certain values, e.g. neoliberal values, might be socially agreed on in certain circles, which as such does not make them right or wrong. Put in a different way, values cannot be justified or determined to be right or wrong just because of a majority vote. Thirdly, a related problem is that the premise why some values are apparently or purportedly better than others is hardly discussed, let alone resolved (cf. Haydon, 2007, p. 16), fundamentally for lack of ‘an external yardstick’ (Notman, 2014, p. 181). Therefore, a more radical approach seems necessary, by taking recourse to values which are
independent of individual esteem. This has been advocated throughout the ages, belief systems and civilisations, and more recently such an approach was offered by C.S. Lewis. ‘Lewis has recourse to Natural Law’ (Pike, 2013, p. 18), which he calls the Tao. This Chinese and purposely non-Christian term indicates positive values that are almost universally recognised - recognised as opposed to constructed. Lewis illustrates it by drawing examples from many civilisations, but does not want to prove this, as ‘its validity cannot be deduced. For those who do not perceive its rationality, even universal consent could not prove it’ (Lewis, 2001, p. 83). If these positive values are universal, admittedly this evokes the question how to account for the existence of evil value systems, but discussing this is beyond the scope of this thesis. Notwithstanding this, Lewis’ approach does to some extent liberate widely recognised positive values from the constraints of founding them in social construction. As such, it would enrich ethical and authentic leadership theories.

2.2.7 Salient points

Summing up, the theories discussed in the previous subsections all highlight particular aspects which are supported, to some extent, by empirical evidence. If anything, the evolution of educational leadership theories makes clear that many elements play a role and should be taken into account. Moral aspects and values have been given more attention over the last few decades, although several issues highlighted in the discussion point to areas which need further exploration and empirical research. It also seems that research on educational leadership and values could benefit from including the multidimensionality of the values concept, as reflected in the definition adopted in section 2.1.3. Research could focus on any of the dimensions, such as which ‘justifications’ are given, or which ‘fundamental convictions’ play a role, or which ‘ideals’ leaders strive for, or which ‘broad standards’ are invoked, or what is considered to be ‘desirable or worthy of respect’. Both as separate elements and taken together this may generate a more detailed understanding of leadership.
This study does not focus on arbitrating between various conflicting definitions of leadership, but on values school leaders espouse and live out. Therefore, it does not offer a new definition (cf. Barker, 1997, p. 344). Even so, the brief overview of approaches to educational leadership offered in this and the previous subsections brings to light many relevant aspects. First, leading a school involves a social process in which influence is exerted intentionally over others (Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 427; cf. Rost, 2008, p. 94). The relationship between heads with followers features many aspects, including (differences in) hierarchy, power, agency, expertise, and perspective. Second, it should be recognised that leaders have certain values, that these values influence their actions, and that much more attention needs to be paid to these values than is usually done. Third, a school leader can choose from many routes and focal points, such as transactional versus transformational perspectives, the improvement of instructional quality, the (in)equality of influence of each of the followers, moral aspects in making decisions and reaching agreement. Each of these aspects has some face validity and backing from a theory, and sometimes some empirical support, as highlighted above. Each of these also exhibits weaker spots, also shown above. This is probably a major reason why leading and leadership is often seen as challenging. Fourth, the room for manoeuvre for a head is not unlimited, and furthermore, within this room his course of action may be contested by significant others. Finally, the mutuality of the relationship between a headteacher and his teachers implies that he may be, and in many cases will be, influenced in potentially profound ways by his social and professional context as well as the wider external arena (section 2.1.6).

2.3 Conceptual framework

Drawing from the discussion of the literature on values in educational leadership relayed above, the main points are recapitulated in this section. Together they map out the conceptual framework that underpins the study. This framework is visualised in the model in figure 4.
From the point of view of values research, ‘values’ itself form the first major element of the model. The definition of the construct of values provided by Halstead and Pike (2006, p. 24) is used for the reasons discussed in chapter 2.1.3:

Values are principles and fundamental convictions which act as justifications for activity in the public domain and general guides to private behaviour; they are enduring beliefs about what is worthwhile, ideals for which people strive and broad standards by which particular practices are judged to be good, right, desirable or worthy of respect.

The second main element are the actions. Someone’s espoused values are not necessarily recognisably or consistently lived out in his actions (section 2.1.7). The third element is the perspective someone has of his own actions, which he will tend to consider to be in accordance with his espoused values. However, they do not necessarily coincide (section 2.1.7). The fourth element of the model are the attributions made by others, by inferring someone’s values from his actions (section 2.1.7). These elements regard the complex relationship between observable actions and non-observable values. A particularly salient issue here is a potential discrepancy between the perceptions of leaders and the followers. A fifth element comprises the influences on someone’s values (section 2.1.5). In keeping with my broadly critical realist philosophical orientation (chapter 3.3), which ties in with the Christian worldview I adhere to (chapters 1 and 3), I agree that decisions are never neutral (Hantrais, 2009, p. 70). The relation with a school leader’s worldview and his faith, in this case the Christian faith which is integral to the school leaders and teachers this study focusses on, is therefore incorporated in the conceptual framework. Other influences on or sources of someone’s values include upbringing and family, and the wider culture. Actions are also influenced by a couple of factors. Therefore, the sixth element is the arenas someone works in (2.1.6) and the seventh other personality characteristics, including aptitude, knowledge and skills, and personality traits (2.1.4). A potential immediate influence of arenas and personality characteristics on values themselves is excluded as it seems to be too indirect for the purpose of this study.
From the point of view of leadership a few additional or coinciding elements contribute to the framework. Leadership in schools is exerted, among others, by heads who wield formal power and influence, though the teachers and the led in general are not without agency (2.1.6 and 2.2.5). The followers also have their own almost literal point of view. Their perspectives therefore might be dissimilar from their leaders’ perceptions. Values underpin the actions of leaders. This is irrespective of whether they try to influence academic results of students by primarily focusing on instructional quality (2.2.4) or focus on transforming the teachers towards a shared mission and goals (2.2.3), or concentrate on other issues. Values-based or informed theories (2.2.6) have rightfully drawn attention to the fundamentally axiological character of leadership, even if they fall short with regard to a convincing justification of the values involved.

These elements, when integrated, form a conceptual framework or multidimensional space (see the model in figure 4). The elements taken together shape the space for this study. Taken separately, they act as sensitising concepts for collecting and analysing data. The interrelation between various elements also offers important dimensions for analysis.
Figure 4. Model of the conceptual framework.
2.4 Gaps

This section identifies a number of gaps in the existing knowledge, from four different lines of thought. It draws from the previous sections and adds some hitherto unmentioned elements primarily pertaining to the Dutch situation and group of schools that are the subject of this study.

First, much international research has been done on educational leadership. One underexplored area is about a school leader’s personal and professional values, especially the relation between espoused and lived values. The perceptions of teachers and pupils, the followers, of their heads’ values have rarely been studied. Given that in many studies on other aspects there seems to be a disparity between the self-report of heads and the perception of their teachers (e.g. Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 435; Hunter-Boykin & Evans, 1995, p. 2), this seems to be a relevant gap in knowledge.

Second, researchers remark that most leadership theory originates from the United States (Bottery, 2004, p. 18; Walumbwa et al., 2008; cf. Smith et al., 2008; Wilson, 2014) or the English-speaking world (Den Hartog, 2002, pp. 2, 23; cf. Usoro, 2013, pp. 39, 40). This begs the question what that means for the rest of the world. At any rate, more studies conducted in other countries and cultures may add to the existing picture (cf. e.g. Bottery et al., 2013; Law, Walker & Dimmock, 2003), maybe even more so when carried out by cultural insiders (Hantrais, 2009). As I am a Dutch head of secondary teacher education, a Dutch perspective on Dutch school leaders could contribute to the knowledge base.

Third, little is known empirically about Dutch school leaders’ ‘personal and professional values’ (Klaassen, 2009, p. 9; cf. Klaassen & van der Linden, 2002; Sleegers, Denessen, Leeferink & Klaassen, 2001). Since then, some research has been done on somewhat related issues among Dutch secondary school leaders. Ten Bruggencate (2009) investigated to what extent educational leadership, directly or indirectly, influences student achievement. In her study she measured the perceptions of school leaders, teachers and pupils. She used the competing values framework developed
The word ‘values’ here is used in an organisational sense, and it therefore does not directly refer to the personal and professional values of the school leader as such. Schmidt (2009) also uses the Quinn and Rohrbaugh framework. She conducted research on how secondary school leaders steer educational processes and to what extent personal characteristics, among others, play a role. Somewhat surprisingly, her study does not take into account the personal and professional values of school leaders at all. De Wit (2012) used the concept of loyalty to study whether secondary heads perceive themselves to feel emotionally attached and committed to their teachers. He found that they indeed do (2012, p. 315). However, the views of the teachers have not been explored in his study. The concept of values, which could have been used to clarify the central question of commitment to teachers, is not used in his study. Verschuren (2013) studied seven successful and innovative Dutch secondary school leaders. She found that the ‘person’ of the school leader is a crucial factor in the explanation of successful innovations (2013, p. 167). This includes his values. She concludes that courage, in four distinct areas, is the value which is the common denominator. Her study is confined to purportedly successful school leaders in a small purposive sample. It would have been interesting to include ordinary, average school leaders, to assess whether their personality characteristics (including their values) are in fact different from the findings on successful school leaders. It appears therefore that no research has been found on personal and professional values with regard to leadership where both the perception of Dutch secondary school leaders and staff have been taken into account.

Fourth and final, as discussed in section 2.1.5, a person’s values are influenced by several factors, among which worldview or religion. It is unknown to what extent worldview and the orthodox protestant Christian faith, influences the values of Dutch Reformed school leaders. Taken together, these gaps provide ample reason for further research in several directions.
2.5 Summary

In this chapter the concept of values and its cross-section with educational leadership was explored from the literature and discussed. It appears to be multi-faceted. Its sources, how it relates to virtues and personality traits and character, the context or arena in which someone operates, the relation with someone’s behaviour and how this is perceived by others all impinge on the construct of values. Though this makes it somewhat elusive, an encompassing definition could be adopted for the current study. Leadership is a vast and vague concept as well, also in education. Some of the more pertinent theories or approaches (transformational, instructional, distributive leadership, and ethical and authentic leadership) were reviewed. The review demonstrated that the role of values, though acknowledged, has not received much attention, except in the values-based approaches. Moreover, few empirical studies were found. A conceptual framework could be derived from the insights gathered from the literature review, which is visualised in a model. Finally, important gaps in knowledge were identified or made explicit, including the lack of studies that compare headteachers’ espoused and self-declared values with how staff perceives these values, and the relation, if any, between a head’s values and his religion, more specifically, for the population studied here (Dutch Reformed secondary heads), the Reformed Christian faith.
Chapter three. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The chapter starts with presenting the research questions (3.2). Then my epistemic orientation is explained as this gives an initial sense of direction (3.3). The next sections discuss the 3-phase mixed-methods research design (3.4), sampling issues (3.5), data collection methods used (3.6), and approaches to data analysis (3.7). The chapter ends by discussing the trustworthiness of the research (3.8), as well as the ethical considerations (3.9).

3.2 Research questions

The theoretical framework and the insights emerging from the literature review (chapter 2) make it possible to fine-tune the central research questions that were formulated in chapter 1.2. Two research questions guided the study, together contributing to a comparative perspective:

1. What perceptions do school leaders of Dutch Reformed secondary schools have of their own values in leading their schools and do they relate these to their Reformed Christian faith?

This question explores the espoused and lived values of the heads in their leadership of a school. Heads denote the positional leaders in the layer between the executive board and the team leaders of these comprehensive schools. It seeks to elicit illustrative examples of actions and of the values that influence those actions. It also investigates the extent to which heads report a relation between their values and their worldview, which in this case, given the appointment policy of the boards of the schools, is related to the Reformed
Christian faith.

2. What are the perceptions team leaders, teachers and pupils have of their head’s values and actions, and the relation with his Reformed Christian faith?

This question corresponds with the first one, as it explores the perceptions the team leaders, teachers (so-called ‘followers’, cf. section 2.2.5) and pupils have of the issues which are addressed by the first question. It seeks to elicit illustrative examples of actions by the head and of the values that followers attribute to their heads. It also investigates the extent to which followers report a relation between their heads’ values and worldview.

3.3 Epistemic orientation

The anglophone literature, in striking contrast with Dutch textbooks on research methodology, discusses a wide array of worldviews, which helps to articulate my epistemic orientation and relate it to extant epistemologies (e.g., Baarda, De Goede & Teunissen, 2005; Baarda & De Goede, 2006; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Verhoeven, 2007). Constructivism, (post)positivism and pragmatism are the three which are mentioned most (Creswell, 2014b, p. 6; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 22). For several reasons, my own epistemic orientation is not covered by the three mentioned, but is a Christian interpretation of critical realism (Cooling, 2010; Wright, 2013; cf. Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009), for reasons which are explained below. Table 2 summarises the various positions.

Table 2. Summary of my interpretation of four key philosophical orientations on ontology, epistemology and methodology, based on Creswell and Plano Clark, (2011) and Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Ontological position</th>
<th>Epistemological position</th>
<th>Methodological position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to ontology, I believe that reality exists ‘out there’, that it has some stability and that is to some extent knowable; ultimately, and beyond the arguments given below, because I believe that it is somehow made and sustained by God. So, first, in a position reminiscent of (post)positivism, I believe that reality exists out there, independent of subjects who experience it. If that were not the case, my interpretations and constructions, including my perception of myself, would fail to have any firm basis and end in an ontological quagmire. Even philosophies as constructivism and pragmatism cannot totally avoid presupposing a reality independent of a subject that experiences it, if only because otherwise there would be little left to experience and it would not make sense to relay experiences to non-existent others. This impacts on my research in that I believe that it does not deal with something which is purely or merely construction, and a figment of imagination.

Second, I believe reality is not ephemeral, but tends to have a certain stability and, hence, predictability. This holds true for natural phenomena,
so-called ‘intransitive’ objects of knowledge (Wright, 2013, p. 11); but even in social science concepts such as attitude, habit, and personality traits, and even laws, can only be used meaningfully by assuming a certain amount of consistency over time. By extension, this also holds true for methodological concepts as traceability, which presupposes the possibility to mentally go back and visualise a trail, i.e. a pattern of connected events as distinguishable from other events. This impacts on my research in that I believe that after I have done the research, the results will still be valid for a while, within the limitations of the research design.

Thirdly, I believe that reality somehow unveils itself and is to some extent knowable. I believe that that is ultimately the case because, as the Dutch educational philosopher and theologian Herman Bavinck (1854-1921) formulated it, God both made the objective world (i.e. the world outside us) and human beings as knowing subjects (Murre, 2012). Ontology and epistemology are therefore closely related and to some extent intertwined, and at the same time distinct (cf. Wright, 2013, p. 10ff). This impacts my research in that I believe that it is intellectually appropriate to identify sometimes difficult ontological and epistemological questions, address these to the extent that they influence the research design, and, by making them explicit, open up positions for critical scrutiny by others.

Epistemologically then, I grant that absolute knowledge, attained in an empirically verifiable way beyond anyone’s capacity to cast aspersions on it, is impossible. I believe it should be acknowledged that our knowledge is limited, situated, subject to change and falsification (a term from Popper), and therefore provisional, as Bottery says (2004, p. 129). Knowledge of reality is also a mixture which includes an immediate manifestation of reality towards the subject, as well as an (individual and social) construction on the basis of impressions which have been received without prior reflection. Therefore, I believe that individuals need others to critically interrogate and check their truth claims. We also often need others to help find meaning in what we experience; finding meaning in reality as opposed to constructing knowledge out of a non-existent reality. Purely constructivist approaches at best lead to the assumption of co-existing but volatile and fundamentally incommensurable subjective universes, though eventually
even that assumes the existence of other beings. Therefore, I do not agree with Maxwell, who asserts that knowledge is ‘inevitably a construction from our own perspectives and standpoint’ (2012, p. 5; cf. Cooling, 2010, p. 32), because it often is more than that. I also believe that the critical realist position on knowledge, in this interpretation (as opposed to Marxist connotations, Alvesson, 2009, p. 44), reflects a humility and honesty that aligns well with basic Christian beliefs I subscribe to.

My epistemic orientation, in the sense described above, influences the research design in several practical ways. As table 2 suggests, in a practical sense critical realism allows for the use of whatever method, as long as it sheds light on the research questions.

First, because of the situatedness of the researcher, the perspectives of relevant others should be taken into account, irrespective of the fact that I am to a considerable extent an insider (see chapter 1 and section 3.8.1). The views of other insiders potentially enrich the perspective on school leaders’ values in leading their schools.

Second, a critical realist orientation assumes that the part of the reality of school life which is investigated, i.e. the perception of school leaders’ values in leading their schools can partly be captured in words and partly in numbers (cf. Hammersley, 1996, pp. 164-167; Pring, 2004). In words, as e.g. the items in a questionnaire are verbal items. In numbers, as these represent the conglomerated chunks of information, generated by descriptive or inferential statistics. A mixed methods sequential multiphase design as used in this study, consisting of a qualitative, a quantitative and again a qualitative phase, therefore is in complete agreement with the basic tenets of a critical realist orientation, and not the prerogative of a pragmatist paradigm (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, p. 14,15; Creswell, 2014b, pp. 7-11; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011: 40,41; Denscombe, 2008:273; Merriam, 2009, p. 18; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 713, as quoted in Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2009, p. 7; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 22).
Third, a variety of research methods tends to generate a more complete and intrinsically balanced picture. The combination of analysis of on-line documentation, interviews (whether these are exploratory, semi-structured, and conducted with an individual or with focus groups), on-line questionnaires for school leaders and for their teachers, allow for comparing and contrasting the emergent findings.

Fourth and final, the process of interpreting and finding meaning in the data ends when it does not lead to new insights anymore and saturation has apparently occurred. In terms of critical realism, reality has been approached by then as closely and completely as possible, within the constraints and limitations of the study.

3.4 Research design

3.4.1 Outline of the design.

The research questions call for an investigation of both the perceptions of leaders and those of teachers and pupils. As perceptions are intrapersonal beliefs on how things seem to be (cf. Longman, 2009, s.v.), these will have to be elicited from these groups of respondents themselves. Therefore, open-ended invitations to disclose information, as used in qualitative methods, are a necessary part of the design. The research questions also call for a quantitative approach, as they ask to what extent relations between two variables are reported. Therefore, a mixed methods design was adopted to address the research questions. In accordance with my epistemic orientation (section 3.3) both qualitative and quantitative methods can (and often should) be used. Furthermore, the research design comprises three phases, for reasons discussed below. The three phases each have specific aims pertaining to the trustworthiness of the research (section 3.8), data collecting instruments (section 3.6), specific sampling issues (section 3.5), and approaches to data analysis (section 3.7). Table 3 outlines the design.
Table 3. Outline of the research design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Main orientation</th>
<th>Aim(s)</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Qualitative      | 1. Exploration  
2. Semi-structured interviews with experts |
| 2     | Quantitative     | 1. Selection of cases  
2. Identification of areas of interest | 1. Questionnaire heads  
2. Questionnaire teachers |
| 3     | Qualitative      | In-depth investigation of cases | Several interviews with  
- heads,  
- teachers,  
- pupils |

This type of design is technically a multiphase design (Creswell & Plano Clark 2011, p. 100; Creswell 2014a, p. 577; Creswell 2014b, p. 228), though that may connote more extensive and complicated phases, carried out by a group of researchers. In the terminology of Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009, p. 151) it is a sequential multistrand design, with three phases; qual → QUAN → QUAL. The arrows indicate that the strands are not concurrent but sequential, while lower case letters indicate a less dominant aspect (2009, p. 142; Creswell, 2014b, p. 229). The third phase was the most important one in terms of depth of insights and evidence collected, but as official nomenclature for this is lacking it has been indicated by underscoring the second QUAL.
3.4.2 Phase one: Exploration

The aims of the first, exploratory phase were twofold: to find partial and preliminary directions for answers to the research questions, and to facilitate the development of two questionnaires. This was necessary because the literature review (chapter 2) revealed, amongst others, the confusion connected with the concept of values and the complicated relation between religious beliefs, values and actions in different contexts. There is no reason to expect that respondents in the schools will have any clearer views or have more focused definitions operating in their minds when they answer questions. In order to avoid misunderstandings of items in the questionnaires of the second phase, it is paramount to gauge the breadth of potential ideas and views. This is even more the necessary as no research has been done before on the leaders, staff and schools involved, with regard to these issues. Therefore, in the first phase an exploration was carried out by analysing published mission statements and core values, as well as consulting three insider experts.

3.4.3 Phase two: Questionnaire survey

In the second phase two corresponding questionnaires were distributed, one for school leaders and one for teachers, each containing both closed and open questions. Research on perceptions of teachers of their leaders, leaders’ behaviour, attributes and qualities, has often been carried out by using quantitative questionnaires, which gave an initial sense of the potential usefulness in the current study (Brailsford, 2001; Crum, 2013; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1997; Musera, Achoka & Mugasia, 2012; Sharma, 2011; Sharma, Sun & Kannan, 2012; Williams, 2000). This initial trust is reinforced because corresponding questionnaires have been used before to obtain both the views of teachers and school leaders (Swanepoel, 2008), while Barnett, Marsh and Craven (2005) used a quantitative survey to help select schools to conduct semi-structured interviews, which tallies with the research design employed here. The most important aim of this second phase was to select two heads for case study research in the third phase (see 3.5.3). Another aim was to identify possible areas of interest, as
guided by the research questions, which could be pursued in these case studies.

3.4.4 Phase three: Case studies

In the third phase two case studies were conducted. ‘Case study research comprises two parts: a subject and an analytical frame or object’ (Thomas, 2011, p. 14, cf. pp. 11-16). Here the subject is the head of a particular school, and the analytical frame are his values and actions in leading the school and the extent to which he reports a relation with his faith. Several instruments and sources of data can be used, in this case primarily interviews of the head and focus group interviews with the followers. The two selected cases represented substantial variation, in terms of the difference in perceptions between the head and his followers. In the first case study this difference was generally small, while in the second case study it was relatively big. The case studies were conducted consecutively, both to diminish the work load and to keep them separated.

3.5 Sampling

Sampling was necessary in all three phases of the research, with its concomitant issues. In this section the choices made are discussed and justified.

3.5.1 Sampling in phase 1: Criteria for selection of experts

In the first phase exploratory interviews were conducted with three insider experts. They were selected to accommodate the following criteria:

1. An insider with many years of experience in reformed education, of which a substantial number of years in a leading position equal or similar to the layer of school leaders who were the target respondents for phase 2 and 3.

2. A reformed school leader coming from a non-educational setting who relatively recently made a career change. This will provide both inside
knowledge and a fresh perspective on Dutch secondary education in
general and reformed secondary schools in particular.

3. In addition to these two criteria, these reformed school leaders
preferably took up their current position less than two years ago. This
may make them talk more freely, as they will not have to participate
in the second or third phase of the study. Secondly, they may be less
encapsulated by or self-identify with their current job and be able to
offer expert knowledge while taking some distance in adopting a
certain perspective.

4. Someone who is not employed by one of the seven schools, but
frequently visits schools and school leaders, e.g. as a consultant.
Three experts were found who met the criteria and were willing to be
interviewed. Expert A met criteria 1 and 3 (experienced school leader),
expert B criteria 2 and 3 (school leader who made a career change) and
expert C criterion 4 (consultant) each of them adding something to the
expertise and views of the other experts.

3.5.2 Sampling in phase 2: Questionnaire survey

The target respondents are the school leaders of the seven Dutch reformed
secondary schools and their teachers. The total population of eligible school
leaders is 25. The characteristics of this group were described in chapter 1.
In the smallest school the layer of principals as used in this study is absent.
In another school the organogram is different from the rest, as this school
effectively does without principals with similar discretionary powers as in
the other schools. These two schools were excluded from the study. In the
remaining five schools there were some vacancies and one person had been
ill and absent for a very long time (more than a year). Some leaders
changed their jobs during the months in which the survey was conducted.
Excluded from the survey were those school leaders who had had their
position shorter than two years (cf. Leech, Smith & Green, n.d., p. 4). This
was to ascertain that they themselves had firmly settled in their jobs, had
been able to come across enough situations which called for value-laden
decisions and to make sure that their personnel and pupils had had enough
time as well to get acquainted with the school leader. The total number of
potential school leader respondents was thus reduced to 17 school leaders.

Each school leader leads a team which comprises 26-130 people. The email addresses for 15 school teams (so for all school leaders save two) were given to the researcher. The two other school leaders preferred to have the questionnaire for teachers forwarded by their secretary. This list of known email addresses contained 1002 email addresses, averaging 67 per school leader. Teachers who have worked for less than two years with the school leader were excluded from the analysis for similar reasons as stated in the previous paragraph.

3.5.3 Sampling in phase 3: Substantial variation in selecting two cases.

Compared to the other 99% of the Dutch secondary schools, these Reformed secondary schools are to some extent homogeneous (see chapter 1). Even so the schools within this group differ on various dimensions. Some of these dimensions are common sources of variation with respect to all secondary schools, as size, urban or rural location and catchment area, the way the school organisation is set up, i.e. its organisation chart.

Additionally, there are also subtler differences in the way reformed secondary schools perceive their own religious identity in relation to the other six schools within this group (as, e.g., Bible translation, dress code, strictness of policy concerning church attendance and the use of mass media). Not only are these Reformed secondary schools not homogeneous, but the school leaders also differ in various respects, as the amount of educational and leadership experience, background, age, gender, and the size and composition of the teams of teachers they lead. A highly relevant dimension which directly pertains to the research questions, and on which differences may occur, is how the perceptions of the leader and his teachers relate on his leadership and leadership values. These may vary from very similar to rather disparate. This is the reason to select two cases; i.e. one of each end of the scale.

From the wide array of sampling strategies that is available (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, pp. 155-163; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 172;
Merriam 2009, pp. 55-80; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, pp. 168-196), this clearly calls for non-probability sampling, as ‘purposeful samples are selected to maximize variation of meaning’ (Morse, 2013, p. 36; cf. Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, p. 158). Criterion-based sampling (LeCompte & Preissle 1993, p. 69 as quoted in Merriam, 2009, p. 77) helps to ensure that as many different relevant dimensions as possible were reflected in the selection of the cases.

The concept of maximum variation sampling is an appropriate non-probability sampling strategy, as it aims to capture as much of the variation present in the population within the cases which are selected. In my study a more appropriate indication, however, is substantial variation, as ‘maximum’ seems to be too far-fetched a label for two reasons. First, the population is quite small; i.e. 17 effectively (section 3.5.2). Even though the population is not homogeneous, as mentioned before, it still is a particular and recognisable slice of the population of Dutch secondary school leaders. It can therefore hardly be assumed to be as diverse, and consequently ‘maximum’ seems to be an overstatement. Second, weighing up the different dimensions on which variation occurs, in order to select two cases, is not a straightforward and almost mathematical procedure. It will to some extent inevitably be arbitrary, and have some element of convenience sampling. Therefore, the procedure is called sampling for substantial variation.

Other forms of purposive sampling, as typical sampling or extreme case were not possible in this case. Typical and extreme case sampling assume criteria as to what may be considered typical or, conversely, extreme. It was not very well possible to select representative (i.e. typical) cases, as criteria and dimensions for representativeness had not yet been established. Typical case sampling would only have been possible if an exploration had been carried out before. This, however, is the first study on the perception of leadership values of Dutch reformed secondary school leaders (see section 3.5.2).
3.5.4 Sampling in phase 3: Selecting respondents within the cases.

In each of the case studies one focus group interview with team leaders, two with teachers and two with pupils were conducted. As the number of team leaders is 3 or 4, all team leaders were invited. The number of teachers is, of course, considerably higher. Teachers were invited by team leaders to participate in one of the focus group interviews, and they were selected to accommodate the following criteria: variation in number of years of experience as a teacher (ranging from at least two years to an advanced career spanning decades), across the age range, a diversity in subjects taught, and the inclusion of both male and female teachers. Per focus group approximately six people were asked to participate, as this number was thought to help generate a certain informality as well as a willingness to open up (Patton, 2002, p. 385). In total, two focus groups (totalling 10-12 teachers) amounts to approximately 15-20% of all the teachers.

For pupils, a similar procedure was followed. Team leaders asked five to eight pupils to participate in one of the two focus groups. They represented various classes, both boys and girls were present and they had at least one year (and preferably two) of experience with the head of their school.

3.6 Data collection methods

The research questions are mainly about constructs which cannot be observed directly. They call for eliciting information from respondents in an open way: what is ‘reported’, ‘perceived’ or ‘mentioned’. Therefore, open questions and interviews in various formats are most appropriate, whereas the potential of documentary research is limited. Observation is not capable of measuring perceptions, though it could eventually lead to finding illustrative examples of particular values. This is, however, a time-consuming and inefficient means of collecting these data. It is also prone to researcher bias, unless the purported illustrative examples are recognised by teachers and leaders themselves. Therefore, only the following data collection methods are used: analysis of relevant passages of school websites, exploratory interviews with experts, questionnaires, in-depth
interviews with head, and focus group interviews with team leaders, teachers and pupils, separately.

3.6.1 Online texts analysis (phase 1)

School leaders are expected, by virtue of their job, to live out the core values of their schools, or even be exemplars, while they aim to achieve its mission. Therefore, the exploration started with an analysis of the core values and the mission statements of the schools involved. The core values of the seven schools, as published on their websites, were collected. In some cases, apart from a brief list of values, schools add some explanation or elaboration of these values. The mission statements were collected as well. As these reflect the reasons for the existence of an organisation and may exude some of their values, they were incorporated in the analysis. The analysis was followed by a synthesis of the core values in one integrative version for the questionnaires (phase two).

Other official school documents as plans, reports and minutes will to some extent reflect values as well. It requires considerable interpretation though to relate the content unambiguously to values pertaining to leadership. Furthermore, these documents are rarely traceable to the influence of precisely and only the school leader who is being studied. This kind of documents therefore provide at best indirect evidence of the perceptions school leaders and teachers have themselves, and therefore it was decided not to include these in the data collection.

Personal or personalised documents, as (dedicated) diaries and autobiographies, elicit information from leaders or teachers. As such they could have been be part of the case study, if the right prompts are given to respondents. The time investment for the respondents for writing this kind of documentary material would have been considerable though, and much more than needed for granting interviews. Thus, both official and personal documents had serious shortcomings or disadvantages with regard to the research questions and the feasibility of the study and were therefore excluded from the data collection.
3.6.2 Exploratory interviews (phase 1)
In exploratory interviews some field-mapping can be done. Interviews with experts provided opportunities to check preliminary ideas and analyses, as well as relevant theoretical notions emerging from the literature review and the conceptual model (chapter 2.3). Ideas with regard to the concept of values and their views on the research questions were elicited. The experts were also asked to check the consistency and the perceived congruence with reality of the integrative version of the core values, as well as the perceived applicability to the seven Dutch reformed secondary school. This was important, as this integrative version was to be used in several questions in the questionnaires in the second phase.

A semi-structured interview of about one hour was conducted with each of the three experts. First expert C was interviewed and then A and B respectively (see 3.5.1); from the (relative) outsider to insiders. There was no need to adapt the list of questions in between these three interviews. The list of questions can be found in appendix B. During the interviews all questions were addressed but not always in the order given in the appendix.

3.6.3 Questionnaire survey: no existing instruments (phase 2)
The aims of the questionnaire survey in the second phase were twofold: selection of heads and identifying areas of interest (see 3.4.2). As it was necessary to be able to compare heads’ perceptions with teachers’ perceptions, two corresponding questionnaires either had to be found or to be developed. In this section an analysis is given why existing instruments are not suitable for the current study.

The key reason for not using existing questionnaires on leadership or values, wholly or partly, is that they lack a direct link with the research questions. Three examples may suffice to corroborate the point. Rokeach (1973) developed his widely used Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). The RVS is
not designed to measure leadership values. As it is about the general values people may have, it is too broad (cf. Begley 1996, p. 407). Some of the values in the RVS (e.g. mature love, family security, national security and salvation) are not readily applicable, neither in school leadership, nor in schools. Values are implicitly present in the 60 items in the widely used Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2013a) and could easily be made explicit, as they partly do themselves in their ‘ten commitments of exemplary leadership’ (2013b, p. 5). The LPI has the advantages of being brief and easy to complete. With regard to the current study however, it must be noticed that the LPI is not directly about values, thereby necessitating an interpretive step from practices to values. Francis has investigated value orientations of church leaders (e.g. Francis & Robbens, 2002). Francis and Stubbs developed a scale for measuring attitude to Christianity amongst youngsters and adults (1987), and also developed a closed-item survey for measuring values of Christian teenagers (Francis, 2001). Though this might indirectly address part of the issue of the Christian beliefs as mentioned in the research questions, it was not developed for the Dutch language and culture and it also skirts the issue of leadership values. Other instruments or approaches suffer from comparable drawbacks (e.g. Branson, 2004; Day et al., 2011; Hallinger, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1997, 2000).

There are additional reasons not to use existing instruments. As Oppenheim says, when existing questionnaires are used it should be ascertained that they work with our population (1992, p. 47). This requires thorough prior validation, which is a study on its own. Potential lack of validity is exacerbated when the target population comes from another culture or even another language. It should not be assumed that questionnaires work equally well in another country (Oppenheim, 1992, p. 47), let alone another language (1992, p. 48). Translation of questionnaires into another language is entering a series of minefields (1992, p. 48). Hantrais devotes a complete section of her book on international comparative research to discuss the difficulties in translating questionnaires (2009, p. 76 et pass.). Hofstede and Bond also warned of cultural differences which make it problematic to use a questionnaire which was designed, tested and used within one specific culture in another one (1984, p. 421). The worldwide GLOBE studies on
leadership made it clear that how values as trustworthiness, justice, honesty, decisiveness ‘are expressed and enacted may still be noticeably different from society to society’ (Center for Creative Leadership, 2012, p. 7). It seems that no current inventory of values assesses completely, directly and solely the issues raised by the research questions (cf. Francis, 2001, p. 14), while using parts of the existing instruments mentioned raises additional questions on internal consistency, reliability and construct validity. Therefore, a new instrument had to be developed.

3.6.4 Questionnaire survey: development (phase 2)

The design of the two corresponding questionnaires, for school leaders and teachers respectively, was guided by the research questions, the literature review, and the findings from the first phase. Both research questions were operationalised in a number of draft items, effectively yielding an item pool. The item pool was developed for the school leaders’ version; of which it was relatively straightforward to reformulate items for inclusion in the teachers’ version. The conceptual model (see chapter 2.3) yielded some sensitising concepts: elicitation of the naïve ideas respondents have on the concept of ‘values’, the relation between personal values and school values, the relation between values and actions and the possible constraints imposed on a school leader’s actions by the context in which he works. These also helped in formulating a few particular items. An analysis of the core values of the schools was used, as well as insights gained from the exploratory interviews. Finally, the dimensions relevant for substantial variation sampling of the cases (see chapter 3.5.3) were incorporated in the questionnaires as well.

The following additional criteria were applied:

1. It should be possible to complete the questionnaire in approximately 10 minutes. It was felt that a longer questionnaire would put off too many teachers and severely jeopardise the response rate. Evans, Homer and Rayner, working with university staff, state that ‘to secure a sufficiently large response we designed a questionnaire that we expected could be completed within 10 minutes.’ (2013, p. 677, cf.
Evans, 2014, p. 49). This does not preclude insertion of open-ended items, as long as the required time to fill in the questionnaire does not exceed 10 minutes.

As the questionnaire versions correspond, this implied that completion of the version for school leaders would also take approximately 10 minutes.

2. The questionnaire should be on-line, to be reached via a hyperlink. This is the common way of conducting questionnaires in schools in The Netherlands, was recommended by several school leaders and generates a database which is relatively straightforward to process. The questionnaire was built in the ‘Bristol Online Surveys’. The BOS-system is a secure surveying environment to which the University of Leeds subscribes.

3. It should be possible to build the questionnaire from more general to more specific questions. In this way both internal checks are possible between related items (e.g. Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, pp. 379, 403), while at the same time eliciting more information. The system used should therefore have the possibility of preventing respondents from going back to earlier questions and to correct their answers.

4. It should be possible to add open questions as a means of eliciting more information, e.g. after closed items.

These criteria led to the structure for the questionnaires which is described in table 4.

Table 4. The structure and main topics of the questionnaire survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Question numbers</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Describing the respondents (e.g. age, gender, subjects taught).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>Respondents’ intuitive ideas on leadership and values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relation between schools’ core values and a head’s own values

The perceived influence of contexts heads operate in

The depth of involvement of the head in school life

The potential relation between values and Christian faith

A final, invitational, open question

In appendix C this is shown in detail for question 8-26, while appendices D and E contain the complete and exact questionnaires for school leaders and teachers, both the English version and the Dutch version which was used for the respondents. For multiple choice questions on attitudes and perceptions a five-point scale was used, with answer possibilities which depended on the question (cf. Likert, 1932). The Likert scale answers to the closed items in the questionnaires were later converted to numbers 1 to 5, see table 5.

Table 5. Likert scale answers and their conversion to numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>Converted to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very great deal</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.5 Semi-structured interviews (phase 3)

Interviews, according to Merriam, for instance, are the ‘best technique to use when conducting intensive case studies of a few selected individuals’ (2009, p. 88). For several considerations in the two case studies two varieties of interviews were used: semi-structured interviews with the head, and semi-structured focus group interviews. Semi-structured interviews
provide both structure and flexibility. Structure, with a list of issues to be addressed; and flexibility by following an order in when to ask which question which feels as natural as possible in how the interview runs. Flexibility also in the necessary room to ask follow-up questions, e.g. to clarify or elaborate (Thomas, 2011, p. 163), or following emerging interesting trails, which is obviously not possible in the questionnaire survey. Flexibility thus allows for deeper exploration of issues; ‘exploring’ being a more appropriate word than ‘probing’, with its connotations of a sharp, pressing instrument used in a relation qualified by a power imbalance (Seidman, 2013, p. 86).

The use of different kinds of questions is key to the acquisition of rich data. Merriam (2009, p. 114) sums up six different kinds of questions, derived from Patton (2002, p. 348ff), of which asking for experiences, opinions, feelings, and knowledge are relevant with regard to the research questions. Questions can also be categorised as hypothetical, devil’s advocate, ideal position and interpretative (Merriam, 2009, p. 114), of which the last category in particular is appropriate as the research is mainly about perceptions.

In the interviews I tried to establish rapport and a natural balance between informality and formality, between empathy and distance (Evers, 2007, p. 88f; Seidman, 2013, p. 98f), even to the extent of wearing clothes which, in the particular school, would generally be seen to keep the middle ground between those two. Furthermore, the formulation of the questions was aimed at conveying a sense of neutrality (Merriam, 2009, p. 106; Patton, 2002, p. 366). Because I already knew the heads because of my job, as well as some of the teachers, it was relatively easy to achieve rapport.

Three interviews with the heads, spaced out over time, were conducted (Seidman, 2013, p. 21f). The first interview focused on the biography and context of the head. The second asked for details pertinent to the research questions and was informed by the focus group interviews. The last interview was used to check a vignette of the head written after analysis of the first part of the case study; a vignette being ‘a profile (…) of a participant’s experience’, used to ‘opening up one’s interview material to
analysis and interpretation’ (Seidman, 2012, p. 122). The final interview was also used to ask any remaining questions, to wrap up any other loose ends and formally end the case study. The focus group interviews with followers were conducted between the first and second interview with the head. The schedule for the case studies is presented in table 6.

Table 6. Schedule for the interviews in both case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>First interview with the head (90 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Focus group interview with team leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First focus group interview with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second focus group interview with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First focus group interview with pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second focus group interview with pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Second interview with the head (90 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Write a one page vignette of the head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Final interview with the head (60 minutes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Approaches to data analysis

3.7.1 Analysis of core values

The exploration started with an analysis of the core values and the mission statements of the schools involved. Of the seven sets of values, all values were first tabulated. With a view to the aim of facilitating the development of questionnaire items, they were then clustered in semantically related groups. The clusters that emerged were given one label. Then they were checked against the original sets of values of each of the seven schools to see whether there was indeed, as intended, considerable semantic overlap and that nothing inadvertently had been left out. Semantic overlap means that the terminology may be different, but that on the whole, taking all textual clues together, including the mission statements of the schools, there is close similarity in meaning.
3.7.2 Qualitative analysis of interviews and open questions

The case studies were analysed independent of the other. First, the interviews were transcribed in plain text, including repetition and interjections such as ‘erm’. Long thinking pauses and clear laughter were also indicated in the transcript. The analysis started already during transcription and ideas that occasionally emerged were collected in a document. The constant comparative method was used to analyse the interviews (Merriam, 2009, p. 30f; Patton, 2002, p. 489f; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 75; Thomas, 2011, p. 170f). To immerse myself in the data, after transcription the text was read several times, and then coded analytically, manually. The coding consisted of labels that were close to the text (Patton, 2002, p. 490), sometimes literally words, or a summarising code. Coding was done with a view to the research questions per se as the main focus, but also having an open mind for what might emerge from unexpected or new angles that could be related to the research questions. Then the large number of codes were collected and reduced into a much smaller number of categories, generally between 10 and 20. The categories were compared with the original text of the interviews and, if necessary, adapted. This cycle was repeated if necessary, until all codes could be assigned to categories and no further adaptation occurred, and saturation was achieved in this inductive approach (Yin, 2014, p. 138). The analysis was completed before the next interview was scheduled.

This procedure was used for the interviews with the heads. For the focus group interviews it was used as well, with the added lens of looking for signs of general agreement or diversity between the respondents that participated. For the interviews with the experts in the exploratory phase, the process was somewhat less elaborate, to suit the aim of these interviews. After transcribing and reading, here the labelling was aimed at expanding and fine-tuning my insider perspective, and identifying important areas. Both facilitated later stages without the need to reduce the number of codes into more abstract and encompassing categories. The qualitative
analyses helped to relay the findings themselves in thick description (Geertz, 1973; cf. Merriam, 2009).

3.7.3 Analysis of questionnaire data.
The analysis of the questionnaire data consisted of three stages: checking and cleaning the raw data, analysing closed questions, and analysing open questions. So, first the questionnaires of all respondents were checked for missing answers, accuracy and obvious errors, as, e.g. only extreme ‘left’ or only extreme ‘right’ answers (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, p. 407; Oppenheim, 1992, p. 279). Then the Likert scale answers to the closed items in the questionnaires were converted to numbers 1 to 5, see table 5. This effectively amounts to a conversion from ordinal to interval variables. Opinions among statisticians vary whether this is allowed. Harrington asserts that

*It may be possible to treat the variables (on a Likert-type category) as continuous/interval when there are at least five response categories, the sample size is sufficiently large, and the data are approximately normally distributed (i.e. not extreme skewness or kurtosis).* (2008, p. 45).

Though this is often done (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, p. 390) it at least implies that caution should be exerted in interpreting descriptive statistics. This is even more the case in inferential statistics, if tests are based on parametric data (Mayers, 2013, p. 109), the more so, if other assumptions are not or hardly met.

Then the data of the closed questions were analysed statistically with the help of SPSS. First descriptive statistics were calculated, including means and standard deviations of the total of school leaders, as well as for the total of teachers. The same was done per school leader and his or her teachers. The results were checked with appropriate tests to ascertain that the assumptions (i.e. that data are parametric and normally distributed) for carrying out inferential statistics such as t-tests and ANOVAs were not violated. If they were, non-parametric tests had to be used. Then paired questions were analysed. Finally, the differences between a head and his
teachers were tabulated, leading to selection of two heads to be asked for doing a case study (cf. Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011, p. 162).

The open questions in the questionnaire survey were analysed in the same way as the interviews with the heads. The answers to the open questions were totalised per group of respondents (all school leaders and all teachers). Then they were read, tabulated, coded, and subsequently categorised by using the constant comparative method. Apart from the answers to the questions as taken on their own, coding was done with a view to assessing whether the data complemented, corroborated or nuanced the findings of the statistical analyses, as well as to help select cases, and to find interesting themes which could be pursued in the case studies.

3.8 Trustworthiness of the research

A number of factors influence the trustworthiness of the research, in terms of validity and reliability. These include the quality of the research design, which comprises triangulation and translating and piloting instruments, as well as the perspective of the researcher. This section covers these topics, as well as limitations and threats to the trustworthiness of the research.

3.8.1 Quality of the research design

In addition to the overarching reason to choose a specific design is (i.e. its potential to answer the research questions; section 3.4), a number of more specific considerations underpins the choice of the mixed methods design (cf. Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 61).

Oppenheim asserts that 'by running backwards through the survey stages we can try to ensure logic-tightness, so that nothing is left out and we shall have measured everything that needs to be measured’ (1992, p. 10). This is related to the concept of concatenation (Stebbins, 2001), in which the elements of a design are linked together as in a chain, each contributing to
its strength; thereby enhancing validity. In keeping with these ideas the research design was developed in a backward design procedure. The third (i.e. final) phase was chosen first, leading to criteria for the second phase, which in turn informed the specific design of the first phase.

Four specific considerations linked together the phases, sampling, data collection instruments, and approaches to data analysis: triangulation, completeness, facilitating instrument development and facilitating sampling. These are chosen as most applicable from the five mentioned by Greene, Caracelli and Graham (1989, as quoted by Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 62), three as discussed by Hammersley (1996), and 16 as found by Bryman in his review of 232 studies which used mixed-methods designs (2006, pp. 105-107).

The first consideration in adopting a mixed methods design is complementarity. The research questions cannot be fully answered by only using qualitative or only quantitative methods. Complementarity also includes using multiple data sources. The two (methods and data sources) are combined in phase two; the two questionnaire surveys, for two groups of respondents, containing both closed and open questions. The exploratory interviews also complemented (and triangulated) my insider knowledge. In sum, the findings of the three consecutive phases were complementary to the extent that they did not overlap or were contradictory (cf. Hantrais, 2009, p. 116).

Triangulation was the second consideration. Complementarity and triangulation complement each other: complementarity adds, whereas triangulation checks. Parkes and Thomas concisely emphasise its importance:

In the social sciences, the use of triangulation can be traced to Campbell and Friske (1959) who argued that the use of more than one method should be used to confirm that the variance reflected is that of the phenomenon being tested and not that of the method being utilised. (2007, p. 214)

The findings of the exploratory interviews, the results from questionnaires and the findings of the interviews in the case studies were triangulated
against one another to gauge whether they converged, corroborated each other, corresponded or contrasted with one another (cf. Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 62). The possibility to triangulate between focus groups was the reason to organise two groups instead of one; thereby also minimising the risk of one or two people having disproportionate influence (Patton, 2002, p. 385). Within the focus groups, if members came up with outspoken negative (or positive) information, it was checked by asking whether the other members concurred, or could give counter examples. Thus, both data source triangulation and methodological triangulation were employed in this study (e.g. Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 75).

A selection of the codes generated in the analytical stage was triangulated as well. The inter-rater reliability (Cohen’s kappa, κ) was measured for one focus group interview, assuming that its values would be similar for the other interviews. Mayers (2013, p. 563) gives the formula for Cohen’s kappa, κ = (P_r – P_e)/(1-P_e).

The vignette, written towards the end of the case study, was ‘member checked’ (Seidman, 2013, p. 100); respondent validation (its synonym, Merriam, 2009, p. 217) also being an example of triangulating a researcher’s interpretation against that of the interviewee (cf. Seidman, 2013, p. 13). In order to protect the anonymity of the headteachers the vignettes are not included in the thesis.

The third key consideration was facilitation of instrument development. The exploratory interviews with insider experts in phase one facilitated development of more dedicated and focussed questionnaires in phase two. ‘An exploratory qualitative study is often used to inform a quantitative study’ (Hantrais, 2009, p. 111). As Bryman says (2006, p. 106), ‘qualitative research is employed to develop questionnaire and scale items – for example, so that better wording or more comprehensive closed answers can be generated’. Furthermore, the questionnaires in the second phase on their turn facilitated the formulation of questions and the selection of themes in the next phase. As Jones did, in his study on teachers' perceptions of African American principals' leadership in urban schools. He first distributed
a questionnaire, which he used to acquire preliminary impressions; which helped him to develop questions for interviews (2002, p. 11).

The fourth reason in the rationale for this mixed methods design was to facilitate the sampling of the cases for the third phase. As Yin asserts, that ‘the first stage should consist of collecting quantitative data about the entire pool’ (2014, p. 95), when there are more than 12 potential candidates. This has also been done before by e.g. Barnett, Marsh and Craven (2005), who used a quantitative survey to help select schools in which they wanted to conduct semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire results helped in the identification of ‘respondents with the required characteristics for in-depth interviewing’ (Hantrais, 2009, p. 112); characteristics which in this design provided substantial variation (see 3.5.3). As Denscombe says ‘mixed methods approaches have often been used as an aid to sampling with, for example, questionnaires being used to screen potential participants for inclusion in an interview program’ (2008, p. 272, cf. Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011, p. 22).

In sum, incorporating considerations on triangulation, completeness, facilitating instrument development and facilitating sampling, in the backward design, contributed to concatenation, thereby enhancing the trustworthiness of the study.

3.8.2 Piloting

When there is a relatively small number of participants a piloting procedure does not need to be ‘overly extensive to be useful’ (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 204). Therefore, I chose to invite others to reflect on the nascent questionnaire in all the stages of its design; but not in any great number, as quality trumps quantity. First, a draft version of the school leaders’ questionnaire (in English) was made with a selection of items from the item pool which I made after the first phase. Two colleagues checked this version for clarity and meaning, both on the level of items and the entire questionnaire. Some items were reformulated, left out or added. The draft questionnaire was put into the BOS (Bristol Online Survey) application, for
online piloting. Another PhD student checked the questionnaire, as well as the supervisors of this study. This led to the reformulation of one item, which was too open. This version was used to formulate the corresponding teachers’ questionnaire. Both questionnaires were subsequently translated into Dutch (see 3.8.1), put into the BOS system and piloted among a reasonably representative sample of the final group of respondents. Two school leaders (non-participants) tested the school leaders’ version. Five teachers from four different schools tested the teachers’ version: three male and two female teachers, of different ages (56, 56, 47, 32, 26), teaching different subjects (history, maths, English, English and German) and having different formal teaching qualifications (two have bachelor degrees, three have a master degree). Pilot respondents were asked four questions:

1. How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire?
2. Are the questions formulated clearly? Which ones are not clear?
3. Do you understand which of the managers in your school the questionnaire is about?
4. Do you have any comments or suggestions?

Completion took them on average some 10 minutes, which is the time span it was designed for. The majority of questions seemed to be clear, though the piloting also led to slight reformulation of a few items and the insertion of a brief definition of values after question 13. It was clear which of the managers in school the questionnaire referred to. This is obviously an important issue, but not self-evident as in Dutch schools the terminology is not consistent and not uniform nation-wide. The final versions of the questionnaires were then put into the BOS system and made ready for use by the intended respondents. Both school leaders and teachers were sent an email with a hyperlink to the online questionnaire. Two reminders were sent, after two weeks and three weeks respectively.

3.8.3 Emic perspective

In qualitative and mixed-methods research, attention is often paid to the perspective of the researcher. In keeping with my critical realist orientation, and the arguments mentioned in chapter 1, the importance of his perspective is not confined to those two methodologies, but should also be
extended to quantitative research. As Hantrais argues, ‘decisions taken designing the research are never neutral’ but (...) drawn up and implemented by human beings with their own personalities, cultures, ideologies and agendas’ (2009, p. 70).

A researcher’s perspective can be positioned on a bipolar continuum from insider to outsider (T Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 288). An emic perspective is that of a relative insider, whereas an etic perspective is that of a relative outsider (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, pp. 221, 222; Hantrais, 2009, pp. 78, 79; Merriam, 2009, p. 29; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, pp. 105, 288). While ‘there are very few cases (...) in which someone can be characterized as a complete insider or a complete outsider’ (Kerstetter, 2012, p. 101), in this study I am a relative insider on various dimensions.

I am a professing member of one the denominations which are represented in these schools. I worked as a teacher and team leader in one of the reformed secondary schools for 10 years in the beginning of my career, up till 2004. During that time, I also chaired the board of two Reformed primary schools in the city where I lived. In my subsequent job (from 2004 up till now) I have been working as a head of secondary teacher education of the University for Teacher Education which provides these schools with an important part of their teachers. Many colleagues in my faculty also work as a teacher in one of the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools. In this constellation, cooperation is a given. Therefore, I know most of these schools and school leaders relatively well, at least in comparison with the other Dutch secondary schools. Because of my job I often speak with both leaders and teachers. This makes me acutely aware that teachers may have quite different perceptions of their leaders than the leaders themselves, and vice versa. Although this discrepancy is not confined to Dutch Reformed secondary schools, for schools which are seemingly homogeneous it is remarkable. Identifying myself both with leaders and with teachers or teacher educators, to me garnering the views of the followers was not only a matter of validity, but also of doing justice to their perspective.
My emic perspective contributed to the study in various ways. Because of my insider knowledge (as a former teacher and team leader, as a head and as a fellow-Christian) I was be able to ask more exploring follow-up questions and pursue answers to levels only hinted at, which are difficult to discern to outsiders. My knowledge of the teachers helped explore their answers to some more depth. Obviously, a risk attached to an emic perspective is lack of distance. In this case there was an additional risk because I will have to work with these school leaders and teachers in future because of my job. This could have hampered me in touching sensitive areas, and it might also have prevented them from opening up to me. The risks were diminished by being clear about confidentiality. Moreover, all school leaders gave their permission, while being fully aware of the fact that in future we will continue to entertain professional relationships.

3.8.4 Threats and inherent limitations

Although triangulation, completeness, facilitating instrument development and facilitating sampling have been given ample attention in designing the study, this does not mean that the design is perfect. As Oppenheim asserts, writing about surveys, ‘any research design also suffers from error’ (1992, p. 22), while Patton, writing about qualitative research, maintains that ‘there are no perfect research designs. There are always trade-offs’ (2002, p. 223, cf. however Hantrais, 2009, p. 69). As said before, from my epistemic orientation, there is no such thing as unassailable knowledge (section 3.3). This does not imply, as seems to be the case in strong post-modernism, that research ultimately is ‘a completely pointless activity’ (Gorard & Taylor, 2004, p. 161, in Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 77). There are, however, threats and limitations.

A potential threat is the fact that two languages and cultures are involved, which are never fully equivalent. As the questionnaire was developed in English, the final version had to be translated into Dutch, the native language of the intended respondents. Dutch is my mother tongue and I am also reasonably proficient in English. As Hantrais argues:
The aim in translating survey instruments is to express questions in such a way that the stimulus has an equivalent meaning and purpose, and provokes an equivalent reaction in different societies. Good practice in translation therefore requires attention to be paid to conceptual equivalence rather than lexical comparability based on close scrutiny of the context within which language is used and develops. (Hantrais, 2009, p. 80).

In accordance with this, I translated the questionnaire into Dutch. For most items this meant close lexical proximity in straightforward literal translation, whereas for some items conceptual meaning and appropriate register for the Dutch school culture called for adaptations in formulation (cf. Seidman, 2013, p. 106). The translation was checked by a bilingual colleague who teaches ‘translation’ in a teacher education curriculum and who is a teacher in one of the schools (cf. Hantrais, 2009, p. 81).

A second threat to the validity may be my personal involvement (see 3.8.2) and my values as the researcher; validity seen in terms of measuring what I set out to measure with regard to the research questions. Post positivists tend to see the values of the researcher as bias, which should be eliminated as much as possible (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, p. 42). However, as Merriam says, the required rigour derives from ‘the researcher’s presence, the nature of the interaction between researcher and participants, the triangulation of data, the interpretation of perceptions, and rich, thick description’ (2009, pp. 165, 166). By providing this in chapters 5 and 6 (on case study one and two respectively) traceability was enhanced. As to the ‘researcher’s presence’ and ‘the nature of the interaction’ (Merriam, 2009, p. 165) it can be added that I have conducted many interviews with students, (potential) staff, also on sensitive and potentially embarrassing topics, or topics on which perceptions were widely disparate. I have got research interview training myself and I have taught modules on methodology, including how to conduct interviews. Though this does not guarantee an adequate interview atmosphere, it certainly helped.

Third, as Bottery et al. note, a key issue with validity is ‘whether one can be confident that an individual’s response is an accurate reflection of what they actually believe’ (2013, p. 46). A few reasons indicate that this was the
The heads and other respondents knew about the strict anonymity which is to be maintained indefinitely. After the first few minutes, heads seemed to open up and be very willing to cooperate and make a success of the interviews. The heads also read and approved the vignettes, which summarised their own answers. The portraits painted were rather different, convincing in their complexity. Finally, the heads both repeatedly said something critical of themselves.

Finally, in terms of limitations rather than threats, in mixed-methods designs credibility, traceability and transferability seem to be more appropriate concepts than reliability and generalisability. Reliability, in terms of repeating the same measurement over time and ascertaining that the results are close to identical, cannot be ascertained, as this design is cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. Generalisability is limited. Within the population of the schools, the statistical generalisability depends on the number of respondents in relation to the total number in the population. In this case it was slightly too low (chapter 4). As this is a very specific group of heads and schools, results are certainly not generalisable to the Dutch population. They may, however, be transferable, from the point of view of readers, who decide to what extent the circumstances in the situation they perceive, are similar to those in this study (cf. Seidman, 2013; Yin, 2014). Bassey, reviewing several kinds of generalisation, borrows the term ‘naturalistic generalisation’ from Stake for this process (1998, no page numbers indicated).

3.9 Research ethics

As social research involves investigating other people, it is incumbent on the researcher to justify the intrusion in their lives. In a thesis, particularly one on values, ethical issues concerning the research, deserve some consideration. Informed consent to be given by respondents, entails addressing the purpose of the study, potential benefits or harm, anonymity, data management and storage, as well as where to get more information and the right to choose or to withdraw from the study later on (e.g.
Thomas, 2011, p. 69, 70). This should be done in terms understandable for potential participants (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 200). This section presents how respondents were approached, what information was given to them, to what extent anonymity was sought, the right of withdrawal and data storage.

At the very start of this study the executive boards of the seven Dutch reformed secondary schools were approached to ask for their permission to carry out research on the perception of leadership values amongst their personnel and pupils. This was wholeheartedly and almost by return of post given by all boards, with the proviso that the researcher was to ask all respondents for their permission.

Respondents were approached as follows:

- Experts (exploratory interviews): by phone and subsequently by email. The researcher knows these people relatively well, and speaks with them on a first-name basis (see also 3.8.3).
- School leaders (questionnaires): by personalised email. The researcher knows most of these people by (first) name or in person.
- School leaders (case studies): by personalised email, followed by a phone call
- Teachers (questionnaires, case studies): after the school leaders had given their consent: by email.
- Pupils and parents (case studies): by email or by letter, and if they wished so themselves also by phone. This letter was sent by the researcher with an explanatory non-coercive letter by the school.

Respondents could decide freely whether they wanted to participate. This is true for all groups of respondents, school leaders, teachers and pupils, even though executive boards were generally eager to participate. This is in keeping with general school culture in the Netherlands where teachers are to a great extent autonomous in choices on whether they want to participate in surveys and educational studies. Similarly, this is also true for parents and pupils, although both parents and pupils tend to go along with decisions made or directions chosen by the schools in this respect. To minimise perceived coercion, teachers and pupils were given time to reflect
and, in the case of pupils, to discuss their participation with parents or carers. Information sheets were issued to all potential respondents.

Information sheets in different versions were written for all the potential respondents in the three phases, to ask their informed consent to participate (see appendix F):

1. Phase one, exploratory interviews: The three experts.
2. Phase two, questionnaire survey: The school leaders and their teachers.
3. Phase three, case studies: four separate information sheets for principals, teachers, parents and carers, and pupils, respectively. The pupils, aged 12-16, were addressed in language suitable to their age and developmental level.

In the information sheets, the aims of the study or the respective phase were explained, why this particular (group of) respondent(s) was approached, what would happen if they cooperated, anonymity and confidentiality, benefits and risks, and what would happen with the results.

Measures to secure anonymity were different for different respondents in different phases. The three experts of phase one could be kept anonymous, as only the researcher has access to them and the transcripts of the interviews. Nobody else knows who these experts are. In phase two, the results of the questionnaire were rigorously anonymised. No tables or information on separate schools are published, neither in this study, nor in potential other publications. In phase 3, anonymity was somewhat more difficult to achieve. As the cases were selected to attain substantial variation, even if they were anonymised, insiders might deduce which school leaders may have been studied (cf. Merriam, 2009, p. 233). In order to protect the identity of respondents some details (such as gender, age, denomination) have been omitted or changed. This might be seen as a limitation but has only been done where it does not affect the findings. Before the drafts of the case studies (chapter 5 and 6) were sent to the supervisors, a colleague who knows most of the heads rather well was asked to read it. He was not able to guess the real identity of either head.
Interviews, in which teachers and pupils may utter critical remarks about their boss and principal respectively, may be threatening. Therefore, ensuring strict anonymity of the teachers and the pupils was paramount. This was attained by several measures: first, the school leader was not involved in the sampling procedure of teachers nor that of pupils. Information from teachers and pupils had to be used in the second and third interview with the school leader, without any traceable links to specific respondents. This was done in two ways: both by framing questions as hypotheses and by using multiple focus group interviews. By dividing teachers over more than one focus group (and the same holds for the pupils) it is virtually impossible to trace back any information to the person who provided this. Finally, in the consent form participants promised to keep confidential any information divulged by other participants, which was duly emphasised by the researcher at the start of the interview.

Embarrassment of respondents was sought to be avoided by establishing rapport, by an invitational and non-judgemental formulation of questions, and by broaching potentially stressful issues in an open-ended way. Withdrawal was possible at any time; as well as refusal to answer questions, for which respondents did not have to give a reason. Information that had been divulged and analysed before withdrawal would not be taken out of the study. None of the participants decided to withdraw.

Digital data and documents were stored on the networks of the University of Leeds or Driestar Educatief University (which employs the researcher), in the specific part which is only accessible to him. The interviews were audio recorded to ensure good transcription of the interview. The recordings will be deleted three years after publication of the findings in this thesis.

A favourable ethical opinion was sought and given by the responsible Ethical Committee, the ‘ESSL, Environment and LUBS (AREA) Faculty Research Ethics Committee University of Leeds’. This was confirmed in their letter of 24 March 2014 (see appendix G).
3.10 Summary

Two questions guided this study on the values which selected Dutch Reformed secondary headteachers espouse and live out, and how they relate this to their faith: how heads perceive this themselves and how staff and pupils perceive this. In order to compare these perceptions a three-stage backward design was developed to collect and analyse the empirical data. The first stage was exploratory and consists of document analysis and interviews with experts. This facilitated the design of two corresponding questionnaires in stage two, for heads and teachers respectively, which contain both open and closed questions. In the final stage, two cases were selected, with a view to substantial variation. Semi-structured interviews with the respective head were interspersed with focus group interviews with team leaders, staff and pupils. The quantitative data generated statistical information, while the interviews were analysed using the constant comparative method. The trustworthiness of the research and its limitations are discussed, as well as my insider perspective and ethical issues involved.
Chapter four. Exploration and questionnaires.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the exploratory phase and also presents and analyses the questionnaire data with regard to the research questions and to justify the selection of two cases. First, in section 4.2, the core values of the schools are analysed and integrated, and the salient points of the exploratory interviews with the three experts highlighted. Then, in 4.3, background data on the response and respondents are discussed, as these influence the interpretation of the other data in the subsequent sections. Section 4.4 then presents the analysis of the answers to the other questions. For closed questions only tentative explanations of the results are offered, as qualitative data (generated in the subsequent case studies) are necessary to provide more insight. To some extent this is also the case for open questions. Section 4.5 deals with the selection of two substantially varying cases for the third phase of the research. The chapter ends with a few conclusions (4.6).

4.2 Exploration

4.2.1 The schools’ core values.

The official core values of the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools were collected, analysed and clustered semantically as indicated in chapter 3.7.1. As expected there turned out to be considerable semantic overlap. Therefore, the values mentioned could be clustered into one set which seems applicable to all schools. That this is at all possible testifies to the relative homogeneity of the school. Furthermore, for those value areas for particular schools for which there is not explicit semantic overlap, it can be argued from public statements made elsewhere (e.g. mission statements) that the schools consider these values as important for their school as well.
The set appears to consist of six clusters, which can be arranged in two subsets, each comprising three clusters (table 7).

The core values are related to the school as an organisation; not to leadership within the school per se. As school leaders operate within these schools and are expected to be exemplars of what the school stands for, it is reasonable to assume that they adhere to these in their leadership. Nevertheless, no complete overlap between values which are expressed through the leadership in the schools and the general core values of the school is assumed. Heads may exhibit additional or other values than the school values per se. Furthermore, school values may be considered to be terminal or end values, to which values which come to the fore in leading the school are instrumental (Rokeach, 1973). This does, however, at the very least imply that the instrumental values do not directly contradict the end values, although it does not imply complete overlap. The set of instrumental values will be related to the set of end values but is expected to demonstrate its own characteristics.

Table 7. The integrated set of core values of the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values indicating commitment to</td>
<td>1. God, Bible, Christian identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Society as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The formation of pupils for the future and getting their diplomas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values connected with the school as a</td>
<td>4. Teachers and pupils, care for, love, respect, serve and trust one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Teachers are transparent, trustworthy, responsible and accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Teachers are dedicated, passionate, courageous and cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Exploratory interviews

The three experts found it rather difficult to describe the term values (‘waarden’ in Dutch), as it is such a ‘basic word’. Eventually they came up with components as ideals, principles, standards. This is within the semantic field of the adopted definition (chapter 2.1.3). Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that respondents to the questionnaires will have similar conceptions of the concept ‘waarden’, so it can be used in the items, and it is an explicit link between the literature review and the empirical part of the study. The three experts are somewhat cautious about the values they think school leaders demonstrate, as there is such a wide variety between the schools in general and heads in particular. Values mentioned vary widely and include care for others, integrity, respect, loving and serving the Lord, loving colleagues and pupils, a (hyper-) sensitivity to equal treatment, and conscientiousness. The three experts all confirm that the integrated set of core values of the school (table 7) accurately describe ‘what we would like it to be’. However, each of them also adds that actual school life often displays a different reality; and there are ‘things which are very hard to make them happen’.

The two internal experts also point out that there is more to leadership than values: the general management style, personality traits, character, and context all influence someone’s leadership. Some draw attention to the influence of the regional and national culture on someone’s values, next to and possibly beyond that of a head’s faith. Regional differences are sometimes outspoken, as ‘there is a big difference between schools in the Veluwe [a rural area in the north east of the Netherlands] and schools in the western [i.e. highly urbanised] part of the country’.

Another point the experts highlighted is that in daily practice heads regularly pay much more attention to the educational quality delivered by the school than how to prepare pupils to participate in society as Christians. It remains to be seen ‘whether these [Reformed secondary] schools are any different from [mainstream and often secularised (section 1.4.4)] Christian schools’, one expert asserts.
School leaders are certainly visible to their teachers, which is important as otherwise the questionnaires do not yield valid data. They think that in general heads will not be very visible to pupils, although there are opportunities for heads to interact with pupils.

4.3 Questionnaires: Preparing the ground

The questionnaire was piloted first (cf. chapter 3), which led to (very) slight reformulation of items 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 21, and the insertion of a brief definition of values after question 13. The web links for the questionnaires were sent to leaders and teachers in September and October 2014. I am not aware of any special situations in this period which would unduly influence the response rate or the answers given.

As a first step then, the data from both questionnaires were prepared for analysis. 269 respondents filled in the questionnaire for teachers. Answers of respondents who indicated that they (partly) filled in the questionnaire for someone who is not a location manager or sector manager were deleted. Answers of those respondents who indicated 0 or 1 year of experience with their principal were deleted as well. As one principal had not filled in the questionnaire, the answers of his teachers were left out too. This reduced the number of respondents to 233 teachers and 16 heads (see table 8). The maximum number of respondents is estimated at 1100, so the net response rate is 21.2%. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011, p.147) indicate that the total number of teacher respondents is somewhat too low (233 instead of 285) to generalise statistically to the whole population of all the teachers working with one of the heads. Moreover, the number of respondents per head is much too low to generalise to his teaching staff as a whole.

Table 8. Data on respondents to the questionnaires. N = number of respondents, M= male, F = female, RR= response rate, E-H = experience as head, E-T = experience in teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>RR (%)</th>
<th>Age range (Yrs)</th>
<th>E-H (yrs)</th>
<th>E-T (yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of heads which filled in the questionnaire is 16, out of 17; a net response rate of 94%. All heads minus one have 10 or more years of teaching experience in a range of subjects. Heads lead schools with on average 763 pupils and 63 teachers (table 9), but the bandwidth as indicated by the standard deviation is substantial. In smaller schools heads have better possibilities to interact with teachers and pupils, which facilitates a more adequate knowledge of their values and actions. The pupil/teacher ratio is 12,1; lower than the 2014 average of 15,6 in The Netherlands (Onderwijs in cijfers, 2016).

Table 9. Number of pupils and staff per head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>For how many pupils are you responsible in your school?</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>For how many teachers are you responsible in your school?</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All relevant subjects are present within the group of teacher respondents, and appear to be normally distributed, as tested by the Shapiro-Wilk test (Mayers, 2013, p. 51), W(17) = 0,952, p = 0,494. Teachers can have five different kinds of classes, from lower forms in vocational streams (pupils of about 13 years old) to higher forms in grammar school (pupils of 16-18 years old). This also appears to be normally distributed, W(5) = 0,962, p = 0,820. Therefore, there does not seem to be any bias in the data in these respects.

The questions 21 to 24 address the relation between head and staff, head and pupils and his knowledge about both. If the scores of teachers or leaders on these questions are low, it is somewhat difficult to defend that teachers or pupils may be able to sketch an accurate picture of their head. As table 10 shows, this does not appear to be the case; the five point Likert
scale (in increasing order; chapter 3.6.4) score indicating agreement here. Teachers credit their heads with a good knowledge of their opinions and entertain good working relations with their heads. They also think he knows the pupils in his school. Heads also score high on those questions (22 and 24). An independent t-test shows that female teachers perceive their leaders to have better knowledge of both pupils (p = 0.029) and staff (p = 0.014) than male teachers do. Teachers were asked two questions (21 and 23) to determine the character and intensity of their relation with their head. Although they do not speak with him frequently, they experience a good working relation with him.

Table 10. Heads’ relations with and knowledge of staff and pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21,</td>
<td>I have a good working relation with my school leader.</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,</td>
<td>I have a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in my school (think of e.g. opinions, needs, concerns, life-style of pupils)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,</td>
<td>My school leader has a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in his school (think of e.g. opinions, needs, concerns, life-style of pupils)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,</td>
<td>How often do you speak with your school leader? (More than just ‘saying hello’, but not necessarily long.)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Questions: results and discussion

The order in which the answers on the questionnaire questions are reported and discussed is guided by the internal logic of questions themselves, and not by the order in which they were asked. The latter is guided by considerations on questionnaire design (chapter 3.6.4). Therefore, open questions 8, 9 and 10 come first, followed by a number of closed questions (11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26), which are compared pair wise as well as with open question 15 which asked for further detail. Open questions 12, 17, 19, 20 and 27 come last.

4.4.1 Question 8: Ideas on leading schools

Question 8 addresses ideas respondents have about leadership: ‘Please mention 5 to 10 words which come to mind when you think of leading schools.’ The answers given by the heads collectively comprise 10 categories. Teacher data appeared to fall in the same categories. These are in broad agreement with established ideas on leadership and management in the literature (e.g. Bush, Bell & Middlewood, 2010; Hoy & Miskel, 2013):

1. Working from within a vision
2. Inspire
3. Interest in people
4. Create the right conditions
5. Distinguish between teachers
6. Use a range of styles
7. The leader himself
8. Promoting continuous learning by teachers
9. Entrepreneurship
10. Rest category. The items in this category (such as ‘change management’) were mentioned only once and did not fit in well in number 1-9.

This first question also tests whether Christian notions emerge spontaneously. Except one marginal note on the importance of personal faith no head comes up with elements which are distinctly Christian in character. Teachers mention explicitly Christian elements 14 times, out of more than 700 items (2%). This suggests that neither leaders nor teachers harbour a distinct Christian variety of leadership.

4.4.2 Question 9 and 10: The concept of values

Question 9 (‘What do you mean when you use the term ‘values’?) and question 10 (‘Please give a brief example’) together both test whether respondent’s use of the concept is compatible with the adopted definition and as a consequence can be used as valid data, and to what extent Christian notions emerge. Heads see values as ‘conviction’, ‘basic principles and notions’, ‘a compass’, ‘a source of your leadership’, ‘the core of education. The answers of teacher overlap to a large extent with words as ‘principles’, ‘what you find important or essential’, ‘foundational tenets’, ‘basic attitude’, ‘which direct your behaviour’, ‘what is worth striving for’, ‘ideals’, ‘rules’. Both heads’ and teachers’ conceptions of ‘values’ appear to be in broad agreement with the definition adopted.

Six out 16 answers given by leaders are directly related to the Christian faith. Examples given include ‘leadership as exemplified by Jesus’, ‘leading pupils to Christ’, ‘things which are founded on the NORM’ [i.e. the Bible].

Some examples given by teachers are neutral (‘respecting a colleague is a value. A compliment if something goes well is an example of matching behaviour’). No inferences can be made whether or not the respondent sees
it happen in practice and whether he is happy or not with the state of affairs as it is.

Some answers are negative: something is expected of the leader which he or she apparently does not live up to according to the respondent ('If the leader asserts that good communication is important but as a teacher you do not notice anything at all'). Conversely, some answers indicate a value which the head embodies well ('My boss can be trusted, is a person of integrity, does not have cronies, and is transparent.')

It appears that, without any priming, a quarter of the teachers (44 out of 170 respondents) who gave an example mentioned explicitly Christian values, such as loving your neighbour. Several respondents also provide a Christian underpinning for generally acknowledged values; primarily, it seems, other-regarding values and virtues (cf. Slote, 1997, p. 132). One teacher writes that ‘It is important for a leader to be transparent, not only because it helps for functioning well (a practical consideration), but also because honesty etcetera is a value which is derived from Biblical norms’. Another asserts that ‘you want to be trustworthy, so you try to do what you say. This is strengthened because the Lord asks you to do this’. And ‘We deal with each other respectfully. Are friendly and helpful were necessary. By and large other citizens will do so too, but for someone else the source of this is a different one than the Bible’.

It appears that questions containing the word ‘values’ generate many more answers with explicitly Christian elements, than a question on leadership. Values, of course, is a word which carries an ethical, moral connotation, whereas leadership may be a seen as a much more neutral, or technical term. Another factor may be that in the Netherlands there has been some national debate on values and norms some 5 years ago, and there is almost continuous attention for certain values in schools. These are generally seen as related to ethics, life-style and, in the Reformed schools, what the Bible purportedly says about that. Thirdly, furthermore, most schools adopted a set of core values over the last decade. Consciousness of values will therefore have grown in the minds of all involved.
4.4.3 Questions 11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26: Values, behaviour and Christian beliefs

The questions 11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26 address relations between values, behaviour and Christian beliefs. Tables 11 and 12 present the means, medians, modes and standard deviations on the answers, for heads and teachers respectively. The mean scores vary from 3.06 to 4.38 for the leaders and 3.27 to 4.07 for the teachers. The scores are all on the higher end of the scale, which suggests that heads’ values are relatively often visible, that they are perceived to be connected to his Christian beliefs, and also fit well within the core values of his school. Median and mode are strictly speaking more appropriate descriptors than means here, as the data appear to be non-parametric. Apart from the fact that the data are ordinal instead of interval, this was determined further by Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. KS-tests are used when the number of data is higher than 50 (Mayers, 2013, p. 49). The KS-test yielded p-values of 0.000 for the scores on all questions.

Table 11. Heads’ scores: Descriptive statistics for questions 11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,38</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The core values of the school overlap with my leadership values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,19</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My values are visible in how I lead the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,06</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I explicitly refer to values when I make a decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even in difficult circumstances I manage to stay true to the values I find important.

I see a relation between my visible behaviour as a leader and my personal religious beliefs.

I refer to my Christian beliefs in my leadership.

---

Table 12. Teachers’ scores: Descriptive statistics for questions 11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>The core values of the school overlap with the values concerning leadership of my school leader</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The core values of the school overlap with the values concerning leadership of my school leader</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3,77</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals. My school leader’s values are visible in how he leads the school.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals. My school leader’s values are visible in how he leads the school.</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3,89</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>He explicitly refers to values when he makes a decision.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>He explicitly refers to values when he makes a decision.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3,27</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Even in difficult circumstances my manager tries to stay true to the values he says to find important.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Even in difficult circumstances my manager tries to stay true to the values he says to find important.</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4,01</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>I see a relation between his visible behaviour as a leader</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I see a relation between his visible behaviour as a leader</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4,07</td>
<td>4,00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and his personal religious beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My school leader refers to his Christian beliefs in his leadership.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively large standard deviation on question 11 indicates that the teachers disagree on this issue, even though the score is reasonably high. Because the data appear to be non-parametric, a Mann-Whitney test was used to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between heads and teachers on any of these questions. For the questions discussed here (11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26) this did not appear to be the case, as no p-values were below 0.05. This suggests that there is no difference in perception between teachers and heads on these questions. This is remarkable, as other research on teacher perceptions of their leaders on a wide variety of leadership aspects often revealed such a difference (cf. Barnett, Leithwood & Jantzi, 1997; Brailsford, 2001; Crum, 2013; Kuhns, 2005; Marsh & Craven, 2005; Musera, Achoka & Mugasia, 2012; Sharma, 2011; Sharma, Sun & Kannan, 2012; Swanepoel, 2008; Williams, 2000).

Several factors will play a role. First, of course, the current study examines a different construct, and therefore there is no compelling reason why the findings of earlier studies should be replicated. Second, the population and the sample is different from other studies, in that it is Dutch, Reformed (i.e. Calvinist Protestant) and relatively homogeneous. Third, the absence of a difference in perceptions between teachers as a group versus heads as a group does not exclude noticeable differences on a more individual level. Because of statistical limitations this cannot be ascertained mathematically. A final consideration concerns the validity of the questionnaire items. Though the questionnaires were carefully constructed and needed only minor alterations after piloting, items may prove to be unsuitable to distinguish perceptions of teachers and heads well enough. This could be tested by using the questionnaires for a variety of large groups of respondents. More to the point, this corroborates the necessity of subsequent qualitative probing in the multi-stage design of this study, which is done in the case studies.
4.4.4 Paired questions: 16 and 26.

Questions 16 and 26 both deal with the extent to which heads refer to values and religious beliefs or faith respectively. As already mentioned, normality cannot be assumed, and therefore, to test the correlation between questions 16 and 26, Spearman’s correlation is used. The Spearman correlation is moderate (cf. Mayers, 2013, p.82), \( \rho_s(246) = 0.353, p=0.000 \), two-tailed. A Wilcoxon signed-rank test showed that both the teachers and the leaders score lower on question 16 (explicit reference to values) than on question 26 (make reference to Christian beliefs). For teachers \( W = 7173, z = -6.962, p = 0.000 \) and for heads \( W = 61, z = -2.653, p = 0.008 \).

A number of explanations can be thought of to account for this. Maybe respondents do not all see a referral to Christian beliefs as an expression of their values. Alternatively, they may think their leadership (question 26) is wider and vaguer than making a decision (question 16). The questions are, in other words, not exactly equivalent. A third option could be that within these schools and the community it is expected of these Christian heads to be explicit about their religious beliefs and to connect this to what they do. Therefore, they might be more aware of this connection (and answer correspondingly) than of a connection between their values and their decision-making. Furthermore, it may also be more socially desirable to score higher on question 26 (explicit on beliefs) than on question 16 (explicit on values). Thinking about leadership in terms of values is also relatively new. All the schools within this study formulated a set of values within approximately the last 5 years. Therefore, the exact core values may perhaps only be partly internalised by heads and teachers, although question 11 indicates that both heads and teachers perceive substantial overlap between a head’s values and the core values of the school.

4.4.5 Paired questions: 14 and 25.

Question 14 (‘My values are visible in how I lead the school’) and question 25 (‘I see a relation between my visible behaviour as a leader and my
personal religious beliefs’) both deal with visibility. The Spearman correlation is moderate for teachers, \(\rho_s(233) = 0.453, p=0.000\), two-tailed, and small but insignificant for heads, \(\rho_s(16) = 0.230, p=0.392\), two-tailed. A Wilcoxon signed-rank test showed that, although there was no difference between question 14 and 25 for heads, teachers perceive heads’ values to be significantly less visible in how he leads the school (question 14), than the relation between a head’s visible behaviour and his religious beliefs (question 25): \(W = 3490; z = -3.336, p = 0.001\). This matches with the scores on questions 16 and 26, discussed above, where heads are perceived to refer more often to Christian beliefs than to values. Questions 14 and 25 both score relatively high. It seems to be that teachers have examples in mind when answering these items. This is confirmed by the fact that all respondents were able to answer the next question (Q15), which asked to mention specific values they attribute to their heads.

4.4.6 Question 15: Visible values.

Question 15 asks leaders ‘Which of your value(s) is (are) most visible?’ The number of values mentioned varies between one and five. They can be subdivided in two groups. Most of these values regard other people. The first group comprises not explicitly or uniquely Christian values, including commitment, honesty, safety, service, high quality, presence, be an example, responsibility, friendliness, and trustworthiness. The second group consists of explicitly Christian values, mentioned by seven out of 16 heads, comparable to question 10 (4.4.2). These include respect people for who they are as Christians, desire to live from the Bible, being dependent on God, relation with God, love your neighbours, mission of the school, living Coram Deo (‘before God’s countenance’).

The teachers’ answers were counted and clustered semantically. Some respondents mentioned just one thing, others four or five. To the extent that approaching an open question quantitatively can be justified, some indication of the semantic fields is given in table 13. Interestingly, none of the not explicitly Christian values contradicts the other values.
Table 13. Question 15: Heads’ most visible values, according to teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value and number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Christian formulations</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily regarding the head himself (92)</td>
<td>Respect (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modesty (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthiness (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincerity (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passion (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily regarding teachers as</td>
<td>Giving freedom to act (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionals (27)</td>
<td>Quality (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty towards teachers (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obedience of teachers (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily regarding teachers as</td>
<td>Relational closeness (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persons (43)</td>
<td>Being interested (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.7 Paired questions: 14 and 16

Question 14 asks whether a head’s values are visible in how he leads the school, while question 16 explores to what extent heads make their underlying values explicit while leading the school. A Wilcoxon signed-rank test showed that with regard to their teachers’ perceptions, heads’ values are significantly more visible in how they lead the school than that they explicitly refer to these values: $W = 1241; z = -8.988, p = .000$. This is similar for heads themselves. A Wilcoxon signed-rank test showed that in heads’ perceptions their own values are significantly more visible in how they lead the school than that they explicitly refer to these: $W = 0.00; z = -2.994, p = .003$. This seems to make sense in that it would be unnatural to
explain why you do what you do every time you do something. The opposite, never explain why you do what you do, seems more conceivable. It is clear though that both heads and teachers think heads sometimes (the Likert scale score 3 stands for sometimes, cf. chapter 3) refer to their values, while they are often (score 4 stands for often) visible.

4.4.8 Paired questions: 25 and 26
Question 25 asks whether a head’s personal religious beliefs are visible in his behaviour as a school leader, while question 26 explores to what extent heads make their Christian beliefs explicit. A Wilcoxon signed-rank test showed that with regard to their teachers’ perceptions the relation between heads visible behaviour and their personal religious beliefs scores significantly higher than that he explicitly refers to his Christian beliefs: $W = 1828.50; z = -5.669, p = .000$. This is not the case for heads themselves, where a Wilcoxon signed-rank test showed that there is no significant difference: $W = 13.50; z = -.641, p = .521$. The medians of both teachers and heads for question 25 and 26 lie much more closely together (4.00 and 3.75) than for questions 14 and 16 (4.00 and 3.06). Combined with the small number of heads, this may account for the fact that there is a significant difference for teachers and not for the heads.

4.4.9 Question 12: Mission statements
Question 12 asks teachers and heads to rank statements which were derived from the mission statements of the schools from most true (1) to least true (5), table 14

Table 14 Question 12 and its answer alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please rank the following statements from most true for your school leader (1) to least true for your school leader (5). When my school leader spends time with or for his teachers, his focus is to assist them in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scores on question 12 indicate that respondents have sometimes used some numbers more than once. Alternatives 12a and 12b have been overused; 12a slightly, some 25% for 12b by both teachers and leaders. Alternatives 12c, 12d and 12e have been underused; 12e to a large extent, by teachers. Therefore, no absolute numbers but percentages are shown in table 15.

Table 15. Question 12, per sub item, for teachers (T) and leaders (L), in percentages of total number of answers given for that sub item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q12a</th>
<th>Q12a</th>
<th>Q12b</th>
<th>Q12c</th>
<th>Q12d</th>
<th>Q12d</th>
<th>Q12e</th>
<th>Q12e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>81,2</td>
<td>23,6</td>
<td>18,7</td>
<td>27,9</td>
<td>6,25</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>6,25</td>
<td>17,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,25</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>18,7</td>
<td>30,4</td>
<td>68,7</td>
<td>29,6</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>31,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,25</td>
<td>22,7</td>
<td>62,5</td>
<td>20,1</td>
<td>6,25</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>19,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,8</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>18,7</td>
<td>15,8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24,8</td>
<td>18,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>9,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,25</td>
<td>9,01</td>
<td>5,15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,73</td>
<td>18,7</td>
<td>6,44</td>
<td>56,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heads score generally rank 12a first and 12c as second. Statement 12a and 12c belong together and refer to explicitly Christian aims formulated in the mission statements of the schools. If the first and second ranks are taken together, it can be seen that while leaders score high on 12a and 12c, the
percentages suggest that their teachers perceive a different reality, as they score much lower on these statements. Heads may have answered as they think is socially expected of them. They may also be convinced that they do effectively spend their time in the way they indicate, and then the lower scores of their teachers suggest that teachers do not recognise their leaders’ efforts in doing so. Teachers’ scores tend to be more evenly distributed than those of the heads.

4.4.10 Question 17: School’s core values

Question 17 measures the perceptions of the teachers and the heads on 10 specific values, derived from the schools’ official core values and mission statements (see chapter 3.6.1 and chapter 4.2). In order to be able to compare the scores of the teachers to these values to the scores of the heads, a sum score was calculated. First a reliability analysis was carried out, yielding a very high Cronbach alpha, $\alpha = 0.917$. There were no negative correlations. The new sum variable appeared to be normally distributed, $D(249) = 1.309, p = 0.065$. Therefore, an independent $t$-test could be carried out, revealing a significant difference between teachers and heads, $t(25,933) = -3.335; p = 0.003$ (two-tailed).

Table 16. Question 17: The extent to which the schools’ values are reflected in heads’ values and actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Average sum score</th>
<th>group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notwithstanding the statistically significant difference, the mean score is high, as table 16 shows, and teachers credit their heads with the perception that he (almost) often lives out these values. In the eyes of the teachers,
heads tend to think somewhat too favourably about how they live out their values in their behaviour. This might cause occasional feelings of e.g. disappointment and estrangement on the side of their teachers.
As these values were derived from the schools’ core values and mission statements, question 17 can be compared with question 11 (4.4.3). There, the large standard deviation suggests that a considerable number of teachers think their head’s leadership only marginally overlaps with the official core values. Taken together, the scores on questions 11 and 17 suggest a gap in perception between heads and part of their teachers.

4.4.11 Question 19: Staying true to values
Six heads answered question 19, which asks to give an example where heads managed to stay true to their values. Heads may not always have been able to answer this question, or they may have been reluctant to answer it. Therefore, the answers provide just some indication. Two heads mention the process of firing a colleague where they managed ‘to deal with him respectfully and candidly’. Another head says he lets ‘team leaders grow to the detriment of yourself’. Yet another one gives the example of treatment of parents who complain.
50 teachers (out of 233) answered this question. After coding and clustering, seven categories were found to cover the data, a few items reflecting more than one category, see table 17.

Table 17. Question 19: Categories in which heads stayed true to their values according to teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with not properly functioning staff, including firing a teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care for pupils</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fostering development of the school, curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
issues related to the religious identity of the school  & 11  
difficult decisions (non-specified or not covered by the other categories)  & 4  
personal values (like reliability, modesty, transparency, honesty)  & 6  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most of these categories focus on other-regarding values. Explicitly Christian examples account for one fifth of the examples given. Two respondents (out of 233) answered that their leader was either egocentric in his leadership or it was totally unclear what he stood for. This does not seem to be a bad percentage, although it should be added that it is of course unknown why 180 teachers did not answer this question, and whether this would have had implications for interpreting the results. The length of the questionnaire and the fact that an open question as this one takes some time to reflect on and write about will probably have played a role.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.4.12 Question 20: Difficulty in staying true to values

Question 20 asks ‘Is there an example where staying true to the values you find important was difficult?’ Six out 16 heads answered this question. They came up with various issues, including ‘Addressing malfunctioning colleagues I have no good relation with’, ‘When you discover that someone has been dishonest and then stay respectful and meet him or her with an open and honest attitude’, ‘How the budgeting system at school is handled’ and ‘When someone is always blaming others’.

Of 233 teacher respondents, 46 answered this question. After coding and clustering, eight categories were found to cover the data, see table 18. In the four main categories, the ‘clothing rules’-category is related to the lifestyle advocated in these Christian schools, as they generally state that the Bible indicates that women and girls should wear skirts instead of trousers, as these are men’s clothing (see chapter 1.4.4). Dismissing teachers is an area which is also mentioned by one head himself. Communication with teachers is sometimes seen as lacking transparency and consistency. A
head’s position in the middle of parents and teachers, or teachers and executive board sometimes leads to value conflicts, according to some respondents. These issues have been used in the interviews in the case studies (chapter 5 and 6).

Table 18. Question 20: Categories where staying true to values was difficult for heads, according to teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relation and communication with teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissing teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing rules</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in between other actors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil’s results</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitting mistakes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being consistent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with question 19, three quarters of the respondents do not answer this question. Obviously they do not use this opportunity to vent negative feeling or frustrations. This probably is in line with the general trend that heads and teachers concur on many items asked in the questionnaires, and the majority of teachers therefore do not seem to be unhappy with their head and how he lives out his values.

4.4.13 Question 27: Final voluntary remarks

Just two heads use the opportunity to add anything they might want to add, in answering question 27. Both are driven by Christian values as they write: ‘I try to help create an atmosphere at school in which there is a prevalent desire that pupils are caught by the power of the gospel’, and ‘Faith (go for it), hope (pray the Lord for help in the needs and concerns of the school) and charity’.
44 teacher respondents answered this question, and they do so in very different ways. Some say they are ‘very happy with [my] head’, while others ‘find it incredible how incapable people find themselves in this position’. Some ‘miss a clear vision on education in general’, while others write something similar as the teacher who asserts that ‘our head does not appreciate his teachers. This leads to unsafe situations and it is with some trepidation that I fill in this questionnaire’. 12 respondents mention an explicitly Christian element in their reaction, varying from critical comments ‘that mentioning God can work as a threshold or barrier to mention difficulties or problems in your work’ to a few neutral or positive remarks, such as ‘he takes great interest in teachers and pupils and is deeply reverent to, and loves, God and His Word’. Of the 29 answers which voice an opinion, 18 are negative, 8 positive and 3 neutral. Although, again, 75% of the respondents did not answer this question, possibly because this was the final question in a lengthy enough questionnaire, this does suggest that there is a significant number of teachers who, to some extent, harbour negative perceptions of their heads. This may seem to be contradictory with many of the findings reported earlier in this chapter. These questions, however, are, of course, much more specific than this last open question. Teachers may not necessarily be able to pinpoint where negative feelings originate from or how these relate to a head’s values.

4.5 Selection of two cases

In order to select two cases several criteria were taken into account (chapter 3.5.3). The first criterion is the lowest versus the highest difference in perceptions between head and his teachers. For closed questions 11, 14, 16, 18, 25 and 26 the absolute difference between the mean score of the teachers of the particular head and the head himself was calculated. Two heads had the lowest difference between their scores and the means of their teachers’ scores (head 1 and head 2). One head clearly stood out as having the highest difference of all heads (head 3).
The second criterion is external: the kind of school involved and whether it is urban or rural. The third criterion is related to person of the head (background, age, gender). Applying these criteria led to the exclusion of head 2. Selecting heads 1 and 3 represent the desired substantial variation, even though in terms of teaching experience, age, number of pupils and teachers they are more or less similar. For reasons of anonymity the full set of characteristics of those two heads cannot be disclosed. They both agreed to cooperate with a case study and enable their teachers and pupils to do so.

4.6 Summary

The seven schools display enough similarity to integrate their core values into one set. It was acknowledged by three insider experts as an adequate description of the espoused values and could therefore be used in the questionnaires. The experts also made clear that they perceive a wide variety between schools and between leaders in the lived values, and that in actual fact often attention paid by heads to educational quality trumps preparing pupils to serve God and lead a life as a Christian within the current society. Furthermore, leadership entails more influencing factors than values, including culture, character and context. These findings facilitated the development of dedicated questionnaires (see chapter 3).

The first aim of the questionnaires was to facilitate selecting cases. Given the data and applying criteria for substantial variation head number 4 and head number 11 were selected. Both agreed to cooperate in subsequent case studies, together with their teams, teachers and pupils.

The second aim was to find clues to pursue as well as tentative answers to the research questions. The main conclusion is that heads and teachers agree on most questions with two major exceptions. Their views on leadership correspond with each other and reflect notions mentioned in the literature. The concept of values comprises the elements from the definition adopted for this study. There are no statistically significant differences
between heads and teachers on the scores on values, behaviour, their visibility, the extent to which they are made explicit, and whether heads stay true to their values in difficult circumstances. Heads’ values and religious beliefs tend to score higher in visibility than how often they explicitly refer to these. They also refer more to Christian beliefs than to values. Scores are generally high, approaching 4 on a five point Likert scale. Heads and teachers only very rarely spontaneously mention Christian elements when they describe leadership. In open questions on values, these amount to approximately 25% of the answers given.

Heads score significantly lower than their teachers on two issues, both related to the Christian character of their schools. First, teachers perceive them to pay considerably less attention to the two explicitly Christian aims (out of four) formulated in their school mission statements. Second, heads think that on a daily basis they live out the 10 school core values significantly more than their teachers recognise.
Chapter five. Case study one

5.1 Introduction.

This chapter presents and discusses the findings of the first case study, with a head codenamed James. James works in a secondary school with several thousands of pupils. The school is subdivided in a small number of relatively independent school parts, each with a senior management team (SMT), comprising a head (James is one of these) and some team leaders. Heads work together under the general guidance of the executive board. James’ school employs some 60 teachers who teach approximately 600 pupils, as is typical for this kind of schools. There is a senior management team of a small group of team leaders. In order to protect the identity of James some details had to be left out or made somewhat vague. The teachers in this case study apparently consist of a reasonably representative cross-section of Dutch teachers in this kind of education, with regard to teaching qualifications, subjects taught, demographics, male and female teachers, and full-time versus part-time employment, with the notable exception that they are all professing Reformed Christians. The pupils attending the school come from similar Reformed Christian families. In sum, the set-up of the school is well within the band-width of Dutch secondary schools in general (see chapter 1.4), except that the population profess the orthodox Protestant Christian faith.

Section 5.2 is dedicated to James’ perceptions. Section 5.3 describes the followers’ perceptions; the perceptions the team leaders (5.3.1), the teachers (5.3.2), and the pupils (5.3.3) respectively have of their head. These sections are based on the coding of the interview data (see appendices J and K for a sample of interview transcripts and a sample of categories respectively). The inter-rater reliability was calculated by using the formula for Cohen’s kappa \( \kappa = (P_r - P_e)/(1-P_e) \). (See chapter 3.8.1). \( P_r \) is the proportion agreed, in this case 0,90, which means that 90% of the values found by coding the interview are semantically identical between raters. \( P_e \) is the proportion that occurs by chance factors. \( P_e \) cannot be calculated and hardly be estimated or even guessed. It seems to be close to
zero, therefore an arbitrary value of 0.10 was used. This yields a Cohen’s kappa, $\kappa = 0.89$. It should be at least 0.70 (Mayers, 2013, p. 563). Section 5.4 discusses salient themes which emerged. As the current chapter is confined to just one case study, explanations given are tentative rather than definitive, and will therefore be taken further in chapter 7 when findings of all stages will be discussed.

5.2 The head’s perceptions

5.2.1 Leadership

James gradually climbed the ranks, from being a teacher, to a part-time coordinating job as a middle manager, to being a deputy head, to being a full-time head of a particular educational stream, all in the same school. When James started his teaching career, some 20 years ago, leadership was about ‘doings things and primarily keeping staff satisfied’. He ‘connected what the group wanted with follow-up actions’, and ‘when pupils were expelled from class I always tried to keep the teacher happy’. In hindsight, he ‘was guided very much by what they wanted’. He thinks that this may have been ‘rather invisible’. James’ convictions changed however over the course of some years, some 8-10 years ago. His focus changed, as he ‘learnt gradually that leadership is not about organising things, but much more about making deep contact with people, and knowing what makes them tick’. Now ‘leadership is not about keeping people satisfied, but about setting a course and committing staff to this course’. In the interaction between having a vision and setting a course on the one hand, and committing people to this course on the other hand, James mentions various elements that play a role. ‘To lead is to make progress’, and in order to make that happen he needs ‘to think about what I want, a mental picture or a vision (…). It does not need to be complete. I then share this with my team’. Goals need to be shared, ‘the organisation has chosen to appoint’ him to achieve this, and James wishes ‘to take people with me, to go somewhere together’. It is the interplay between setting a course, committing staff to it and recognising their input which constitutes his leadership. He and the senior management team
choose a direction and set a course. Teachers may think about it too and voice their opinions. We then choose the next step and they again are asked for their opinion. (...) It is more a process of going there together.

This does not happen automatically and James is keen to 'have the right people in the right place. People of whom I think that they, with their own expertise, with their own personality, complement one another'. Therefore, in James’ perception, eventually progress towards shared goals is promoted by positioning the right staff in the right place, setting a course, garnering the opinions of the teachers, listening to their views, and to interact with them.

5.2.2 Values

In the quotations given above some of James’ values already come through. He explicitly mentions ten values which are prevalent in his daily work (table 19).

Table 19. James’ values according to himself.

| 1.  | trust;                              |
| 2.  | development;                        |
| 3.  | congruence and that it matches;     |
| 4.  | resilience;                         |
| 5.  | transparency and openness;          |
| 6.  | vision;                             |
| 7.  | purposefulness;                     |
| 8.  | connectedness;                      |
| 9.  | freedom to think and act;           |
| 10. | do justice to differences between people. |

There are three points to consider with regard to these 10 values: how important these values are to James, the coincidence of personal, professional, and school values, and development as a key value. So, the first key point is that for eight of these James literally adds that he finds
them important or very important. For the other two (numbers 6 and 7) the importance is indicated by saying that he ‘always wants to work (…)’ and that he ‘like[s] to do things’ in a particular way’ (see appendix H for a complete list with quotes). Clearly, though James sometimes carefully considers what term to choose, there is no hesitation in what values he espouses; on the contrary, he emphasises their relevance to him.

The second key point is that James’ unequivocally confirms the strong impression that his personal values coincide to a very large extent with his professional values:

*Interviewer: ‘I want to check what I heard in your story so far, which is that your personal values coincide to a very large extent with your professional values. This is who you are.’*

*James: ‘Yes!’.*

*Interviewer: ‘Not only because you’re the head?’*

*James: ‘No, this is who I am indeed.’*

*Interviewer: ‘You always think this important, also when you go home at five?’*

*James: ‘Yes.’*

The executive board of James’ school also formulated a set of core values a couple of years ago. For reasons of anonymity these cannot be revealed here, but their content is covered by the summary of the core values of the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools provided in chapter 4. James, however, never thinks ‘of the core values of the school. For me it does not work like that. Somebody just came up with these words. While I wholeheartedly agree with it [i.e. the core values].’ Apparently he agrees with the official set without using the very words, which points to the relativity of finding exact words.

The third key point to consider is the pervasive role of development as one of the key values James mentions spontaneously. This is not only borne out by his career as such, in which he frequently embarked on new positions, inherently coming with new responsibilities and challenges. James also frequently refers to his wish to continue to learn and to develop over the whole course of his career. He completed several studies on (approximately) master’s level after the initial teacher qualification degree
(which itself amounts to a bachelor degree in the current system). He also chose to do several series of coaching sessions. To James, development comprises several elements. On the one hand it is ‘acquiring new insights, new knowledge. I think that’s important. To enlarge your own world and be knowledgeable about things that happen’, but, ‘to develop also means to reflect, on myself, on others in relation to myself’. Development, learning and reflection are part and parcel of working in schools, and intertwined, as working is ‘a continual process of reflection’ and ‘developing is also learning together’.

To James, ‘the most important development in my career was the moment that I got stuck with myself’. Several contributing factors took their toll: He wanted to bear all responsibility alone, his views on what leadership essentially amounts to (see 6.2.1, satisfying people versus setting course for all) and his outward appearance (not showing emotions) was often incongruent with his inner feelings. This experience of being stuck induced him to take up a study geared towards personal development combined with a series of coaching sessions. The fact that exactly this was his reaction to his feelings of being stuck also testifies to his resilience, one of his values (6.2.2). He discovered that ‘leadership has to do with yourself. (…) What I learned then and there has probably had the most fundamental influence to really remain capable of doing the job’. What he learned not only contributed to a changed perspective on what leadership essentially is. He now ‘dare[s] to ask much more probing questions, about what really drives people’. He not only finds ‘it important to make others reflect on themselves’, but his own development also made him mentally prepared ‘to dare to tell them what I think and find, also about their functioning. That they know where they stand, for better or for worse’, which implies taking leave of staff if he deems that necessary.

In sum, James mentions 10 values which describe his identity. His values are really important to him. There is no perceptible difference between his personal and professional values. Development, over the course of his career and partly triggered by getting stuck is a key thread throughout his leadership.
5.2.3 Perceived influence: Faith.

A key point which deserves a separate section is the Christian underpinnings of James’ values and actions. Although the terms he uses for his values are not uniquely Christian, there is a profound and all-encompassing influence of James’ faith on his values in leading his school. According to James, his faith is fully integrated in his personal identity. He perceives a direct relation between almost all his values and his faith as he says that ‘because of my values and norms, based on the Word of God, I deal with people in a particular way, that you trust them, integrity, closeness. Confrontation sometimes’. And pondering some of his values he adds ‘Trust, development [and] congruence too has much to do with our identity. Transparency [and] vision too: what’s our aim? Purposefulness is also really connected with our identity; we’ve been given an assignment’.

This quote shows that for some values James formulates a link between a particular value and the content of his faith. Congruence, for instance, has to do with honesty. God is honest and there is no discrepancy between what God says and does. As it is our calling to imitate or mirror what God is like, congruence as a value is seen to be directly connected with his faith in God. In James’ words: ‘Congruence – to me there should not be a hidden layer between what I think and what the others experience. That has to do with honesty.’ This points to the relation with others and it also evokes a concept as authenticity; a word James does not use. Congruence more strongly emphasises that things are aligned, not contradictory. Congruence also has, in James’ view a vertical component; a relation with God: ‘If I take the first commandment, honouring God above everything, why is congruence included in that? Because I think God is like that. It ultimately has to do with the image of God which we should exhibit’. Congruence is not the only value for which he comes up with such a profound underpinning; this ‘is also the case with trust and purposefulness’.

Another aspect where James’ Christian faith has a bearing on his values and actions is the Reformed identity of his school. He feels deeply committed to this identity, of which he sees the concern for the eternal destination and personal salvation of children as the most profound element. As ‘identity
exists by how it is defined’ (Saldana, 2013, p. 62 and passim for a broader discussion), in these schools it almost always specifically refers to the religious aspect of things. To James ‘identity means personality formation, character development, in close relation with the Word of God’. He thinks good educational quality is integral to taking the reformed identity of the school serious: ‘I think that, especially seen from [the goal of] equipping and forming pupils, from within our identity, we have a duty to realise the best we can in ourselves and our children’. He therefore does not see these as mutually exclusive or as things that belong to different realms, as ‘what you do for identity, for personality formation, can only reinforce quality. I don’t feel any contradiction between the two’. And sometimes the link is even seen as stronger: ‘Delivering good quality work is also ‘identity’ (…) Particularly as you focus on the personal development of a child, results will go up too – not automatically; you should work on that as well’.

These are not mere words but this attitude also led to some specific initiatives. James is ‘not someone who believes that faith should be visible in words first and foremost. To me, it is much more the link with what I do, that should be congruent with what I stand for’. He chose, for example, to invest more energy in the personal formation, learning, coaching and future Christian citizenship of pupils by their form teachers. James and his team ‘spend much time how to integrate identity in daily life, in the daily teaching’. That is why they ‘want to continue to build our tutoring programme and our programme for equipping and forming pupils, because to us it is important to invest time in helping children to personally be equipped [for society]’. This kind of initiatives was not commonplace in earlier periods. James recalls that when he ‘started as a teacher much less attention was paid to identity. Of course we had a daily devotion and the like, but the thinking about this was not as we do that nowadays’.

Conversely, while James promoted certain initiatives, he intervened in others. He criticised and removed parts of a lesson series which was developed by a teacher in his school. In his eyes it diverged too much from the religious identity of the school and would probably be criticised as too secular, too worldly.
Staff are appointed at school or quit. This aspect of the head’s job is not so much related to values. It is, however, related to his faith and religious identity, as he experiences God’s guidance and providence in the comings and goings of staff.

In short, James’ views on values, his perspective on the relation between the identity of the school and the quality, and some specific educational initiatives are in his own perception directly related to his Christian faith.

5.2.4 Perceived influence: Family

James acknowledges the family he grew up in as one of the sources of influence on his values. In general, they ‘had a family culture of working really hard, not much talking and not much sharing of feelings and emotions. A kind of survival strategy existed; if you just go on, you will make it in the end’. This already points to resilience and in fact James says that ‘resilience and freedom ha[ve] to do with my upbringing. Not giving up’. Another value he connects with his upbringing is that he has ‘a tendency to be independent’. James perceives his upbringing as ‘more influential than cultural aspects of the region where I come from’. At the same time his parental family is not always the strongest factor, as ‘there are also aspects which have to do with my character, traits with are passed on from generation to generation. I’m thinking of connecting with people, trust; resilience and grit too’.

James grew up in a Dutch Reformed family (see chapter 1.4.4). Although this particular family had a slightly more open-minded lifestyle than average, it was within the subculturally accepted band-width. Less directly visible, but more important matters concerning personal salvation and belief in God are hardly ever discussed in some families, as Zwemer (1992, 2001) and Baars-Blom assert (2006, p. 60). The latter discerns a subgroup of families within the population of a reformed school where lifestyle is orthodox and communication is ‘closed’. In the head’s family too, matters concerning personal salvation, personal belief in God and the Bible were not often openly discussed. This is reflected in the head’s habit to only rarely
divulge personal feelings, religious experiences or beliefs in public, even though his personal Christian faith is very important to him. As a child Bible stories appealed to him, as well as the service of God. In his teen years this was less visible outwardly, whereas he still felt engaged inwardly. During his studies he encountered opinions on the Bible which diverged from his budding personal convictions. This caused a lot of thinking, but after some time he was convinced that he still wanted to be a Christian. James now professes to ‘believe with my whole heart everything which is said in the Word of God, that He leads my life and that there is room for me too to be saved’.

While James acknowledges the influence of his upbringing as a source of his values, beyond this he points to God’s providence as a more fundamental factor. The following quote shows how he sees several aspects discussed above as related:

What I believe in is integrated in me, my identity. There is a relation with my gifts and capacities and how I was raised. That is where my values originate from somehow. The aspect of identity in that is [with a quote from the Heidelberg Catechism] ‘What do you believe of God’s providence?’ Well, that I was raised in a certain context and received talents and gifts of which I feel that I should use these to answer my goal in life. In the setting of a school: the coming of the Kingdom of God.

In sum, James sees the Christian family in which he grew up as a major but not the only source of his values. He consciously embraced the Christian faith himself late in adolescence and attributes his path through life ultimately to God’s providence.

5.2.5 Perceived influence: Professional context

The school and the wider context both exert some influence, in James’ perception, but he emphasises his need to feel free to think for himself (section 5.2.2). Within the school he experiences enough room to do the things he thinks important and to do these in his own way. He does ‘not feel
any impediment from the framework of broader school policy’, which refers to the policy of the executive board. This does not exclude other forms of influence. He says that he ‘work[s] at a reformed school amongst reformed people and I’m not supposed to say controversial things. But I’ve left that behind now’. Indirectly he also acknowledges a certain influence of the school on the process of his formation throughout his career to what he is now. There were a couple of much older colleagues ‘who induced me to learn and granted room for learning’.

James’ perception of the role of the inspectorate is somewhat ambiguous: necessary and right, preferably as critical friends; but also too committed to their own check lists, without a real focus on the school’s strong points. Because of fast-changing government policies he has ‘felt disappointed in the government at times, so my confidence is not really growing’. Government policy ‘is erratic! I really hate that. Also policies which do not do justice to reality’. A welcome government initiative which was discontinued after a short while ‘taught me to consider beforehand whether a particular government policy fits in with what we want. And if so, are we going to adopt it on a low or a high level?’

In summary, the head perceives government policy to be unreliable and the inspectorate not always to be fair and helpful. The general school policy leaves enough room to do the things he thinks important.

5.3 The followers’ perceptions

5.3.1 Team leaders

The focus group of team leaders comprised all of them except one. The interview data give rise to at least three findings: the team leaders attribute many positive qualities to their head, they perceive an ongoing development in James’ leadership, and, thirdly, they are to a very large extent unanimous in their views of him.
The values the team leaders attribute to James are manifold and couched in positive terms. Perceptions mentioned are drive, vision, a hard worker, clarity in expectations, developing continuously, perseverance, a perfectionist, demanding, interested in people, a good observer. James is perceived to be passionate, ambitious, purposeful, entrepreneurial, optimistic, trusting, honest, open-minded, well-structured, transparent, just, compassionate and merciful. To the team leaders James ‘is really committed to the values of the school, to what we want to convey’. He ‘certainly is authentic in that, not with many words though. I’d almost say: not by delivering sermons’. And there is more than authenticity; they ‘also sense depth (literally: draft) in that. Not: because that’s what’s expected, but it is his own self’. The team leaders give a few educational examples which cannot be relayed here because they would jeopardise the anonymity of the head and school, but the following quote illustrates a few of the values mentioned about the leadership of the head:

*We organise ‘vision days’. He really takes the time for the process, and yes, he’s got the framework clear, does it fit in with the course of the school? But he also gives ample room for all to take it in and to come along and to contribute.*

According to the team leaders, ‘there is a certain room for your own policy within your part of the school; to organise things your own way. Part of that has also been devolved to the teams’. Heads do therefore have a certain room for their own initiatives and can run their part of the school to some extent in their own way.

James has developed over the years and ‘he has become more transparent, about his own search’. This includes his own spiritual feelings. James ‘finds it troublesome when he cannot make real contact with colleagues. That has to do with his own search for openness, transparency and connectedness’. His development is more than mere maturation in the job; not a smooth process, but without the overtones of a crisis. And it is ongoing; a work in progress. Some team leaders have been working with James in the same school for a long time. They say that ‘when you’ve seen his whole development and how he fulfils his job I admire that. It took much energy, also to work on himself. Investing in himself, very much so’. By doing this
he showed ‘enormous grit, perseverance’. It also makes him pay attention to the development of his staff. ‘What he has gone through himself he would like others to enjoy that too’. The quotes, uttered by all three team leaders, are exemplary for the unanimity they exhibit in all subjects that were covered in the interview. They simply think that ‘this is the best head they know’.

To sum up, the team leaders unanimously attribute a large number of positive values to their head. They think he continues to develop as a leader and has done so for a long time. James exudes a clear commitment to the official values of the school.

5.3.2 Teachers

Two groups of teachers have been interviewed, 6 and 7 respectively. Both groups represented a range of subjects. The teachers varied in number of years of experience, with a minimum of two years to a maximum of about 20 years. Most participants were male; the second group also comprised two female teachers. The teachers attribute a large number of values to the head, which are listed in table 20.

Table 20. James’ values according to his teachers. Empty cells indicate that the value was not mentioned by the particular group of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers group 1</th>
<th>Teachers group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear vision</td>
<td>Clear vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-like</td>
<td>Business-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigorous, brisk, clear-cut, energetic</td>
<td>Direct, does not beat about the bush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved, engaged</td>
<td>Interested in teachers’ personal life and well-being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teachers agree on most of these values, both within and between groups. Additionally, they also recognise that James clearly is a Christian, although he tends to speak about his own innermost faith in one-on-one conversations only. They slightly disagree on accessibility, flexibility, openness of communication and ability to sympathise with others. One respondent was partly negative, in saying that he is prone to overreact, either positively or negatively.

Group one exudes a very positive attitude towards the head but does not explicitly say they highly appreciate him. Group two does express its appreciation, in no uncertain terms, and they do not want to exchange him with another head. At the end of the interview one teacher is the clearly the voice of the others as he asserts that ‘he is really awfully good’.

In a word, teachers mention many positive values on which they fully agree in and over the two groups. A small minority disagrees for some values.

5.3.3 Pupils

The most conspicuous result of the two focus groups with pupils is that, although they know who the head is, they hardly know how he is. Pupils do
not interact with the head regularly, let alone frequently. They refer to him on the basis of the very rare appearances of the head in assemblies and when they see him occasionally in school. Attributions of values and even actions of the head are primarily made because of what pupils think the job entails, not because they can give any examples at all with a more person-related character. As such they cannot be used to add to the emerging picture of James.

5.4 Discussion of salient themes

Section 5.4.1 starts with the exposition of the perceptions all respondents have of James’ values. In 5.4.2 some considerations are given that the attributes mentioned can indeed be interpreted as ‘values’. Then, in 5.4.3 the near unanimity, is discussed. This is a pre-eminent point, which influences the other issues in terms of validity and scope. Section 5.4.4 focuses on the relation between faith and values, while 5.4.5 discusses the school and wider context. A final point are the sources of James’ values. Faith is clearly one the factors, but not the only one, and it is debatable whether it is the predominant one.

5.4.1 Values: perceptions compared

Table 21 shows the values as mentioned by the head, the team leaders and the teachers. It was possible to arrange most of the values mentioned in more encompassing categories. These categories emerged from the coding and have been indicated in the table by the term ‘field’, as they cover a wider semantic area. The unanimity or lack of unanimity has been indicated in the final column.

Table 21. James’ values as reported by himself, team leaders and teachers. Unanimity (U) is indicated by Y (yes) or N (no), or a hyphen in the case of inconclusive evidence. Empty cells indicate that the value was not mentioned by the particular group of respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Team leaders</th>
<th>Teachers1</th>
<th>Teachers2</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>vision, passionate</td>
<td>clear vision</td>
<td>clear vision</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposefulness</td>
<td>purposeful</td>
<td>purposeful</td>
<td>purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>business-like</td>
<td>business-like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious</td>
<td>Vigorous, brisk, clear-cut</td>
<td>Direct, does not beat about the bush.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfectionist, demanding</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>Makes teachers accountable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>interested in people</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a good observer</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved, engaged</td>
<td>interested in teachers’ personal life and well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency, openness</td>
<td>transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarity in expectations</td>
<td>clear about limits and limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>honest</td>
<td>reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>developing continuously</td>
<td>continual development</td>
<td>promotes development</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect individuality</td>
<td>Do justice to differences</td>
<td>Just, open-minded</td>
<td>gives freedom and room for manoeuvre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to think, act</td>
<td>courageous, independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>a hard worker</td>
<td>tenacious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Optimistic well-structured</td>
<td>wants people to be proactive</td>
<td>competent and knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in table 21, the similarity in perceptions between James and his team leaders is even more evident than between James and his teachers, both in terminology they use to indicate values, and in terms of the number they agree on. Almost all the values the head mentioned to
espouse and live out were also mentioned by team leaders and teachers. In terms of unanimity, the team leaders mention all the values, while the teachers mention all but one. Only for one value mentioned by James (doing justice to differences) the data are not rich enough to warrant a claim whether or not staff agrees with the head. Any tentative explanation should be able to account for both the unanimity and the spread within this unanimity. This is discussed further in section 5.4.3.

5.4.2 Interpreting the attributes as values
Table 21 displays James’ perceptions, and those the team leaders and the teachers have of James’ values in their own words. They have not been given the definition of values as used in this study (see chapter 2.1.3), and therefore their perceptions and value attributions were guided by their own implicit ideas of what values are. The current section addresses whether the attributes do indeed fit this definition, and whether the attributions are not so much values, as personality traits (cf. chapter 2.1.4); thereby answering the question whether they can justifiably be used as valid data within the context of this study.

When considering the attributes listed in tables 19, 20 and 21, it appears that they can indeed be interpreted as values. The attributes embody principles, fundamental convictions, enduring beliefs, ideals or broad standards, as mentioned in the adopted definition of values (cf. chapter 2.1.3). This does not automatically exclude them from being personality traits as well. The predominant model to describe personality traits is the Big Five factor model (e.g. McCrae & Costa, 1997, p. 509), which consists of five broad categories: conscientiousness, emotional stability, extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience (cf. chapter 2.1.4). Admittedly, some of the head’s attributes have some relation with one of the Big Five categories. It can therefore not be fully excluded that they also belong to the domain of personality traits. Notwithstanding this, the attributes all incorporate elements of the values in the definition used, display an evaluative component (Parks & Guay, 2009, p. 677) and therefore they cannot be interpreted as personality traits only. James also explicitly
distinguishes between his values and other personal characteristics. All things considered, given that all the attributes mentioned comply with the definition of the concept of values used in this study, and the constructs of value and traits are related but distinct (cf chapter 2.1.4), they can justifiably be used as valid data within the context of this study.

5.4.3 The large extent of agreement

Given that in many studies (e.g. Hunter-Boykin & Evans, 1995, p. 2; Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 435) there seems to be a disparity between the self-report of heads and the perception of their teachers (see also chapter 2.1.7), it is striking that in this case study there appears to be unanimity on almost all the values the head reports both to espouse and to actually live out.

There are several potential explanations of unanimity, also in this case; some of which can be excluded with a view to the evidence. The first explanation rests on the reasonable assumption that all respondents belong to the same, and purportedly homogeneous, group of people who feel attracted to this kind of faith-based schools and who profess to be of the same faith. This can, however, only be a defensible explanation if there is a rather straightforward connection between the Reformed faith in the particular variety the respondents profess, and lived values in the school. Second, if this is the case, a comparable level of unanimity should be found in other case studies. The quantitative data on the perceptions of values by heads and their teachers, which led to the selection of the cases, reveal that there are noticeable differences between heads in this respect (chapter 4.5). Third, because of the fact that in this population the head, team leaders and teachers by definition share their religious background, this self-same point cannot account for the difference in perception between team leaders and teachers, nor the spread within the group of teachers. Therefore, even though a shared faith and worldview act as unifying factors (see chapter 1.4.4 and the discussion below in 5.4.4), there must be other factors that play a role.
Another possible explanation for the high degree of unanimity is related to the character of the perceived values themselves. If indeed the followers perceive the head to have a clear vision, and if the head not only exudes congruence between what he thinks, says and does, but, more explicitly, is transparent in his communication, while having good relations with his staff, this combination can hardly fail to lead to a large degree of overlap in views on the head’s values, irrespective of whether followers like these values or not. This would also account for the slightly more diverse perspective of the teachers. A small minority of the teachers is somewhat more reluctant to maintain that the head is accessible and transparent. If someone is not accessible and at the same time not perceived to be entirely transparent, a lack of overlap in perceptions of espoused or lived values is only to be expected. In this interpretation of the data, the perceived transparency is pivotal in accounting for the agreement between head and staff, or the lack of it. It does, however, not address how interpretations come about and how these come to be shared by such a great number of people.

Finally, as mentioned in chapter 2.1.7, a concept from Reader Response Theory (RRT) may be borrowed to explore how shared interpretations come about and apply it to values. RRT studies how texts acquire meaning. Stanley Fish, the founding father of RRT, asserted that ‘the fact of agreement, rather than being a proof of the stability of objects, is a testimony to the power of an interpretive community to constitute the objects upon which its members (also and simultaneously constituted) can then agree.’ (1980, p. 338). This quote would suggest that unanimity does not rest in the clarity with which the head espouses certain values, nor in the values as they are lived out, but in the ‘power of the interpretative community’ (Fish, 1980, p. 338). A school forms an interpretive community. As James has been working in this school for a long time, ample opportunities and time have been available to share interpretations of his actions and values. Teachers interact with other teachers, team leaders with each other, team leaders with teachers, and team leaders or teachers with the head; they all make up an interpretive community as soon as they encounter one another and interact. Premised upon the conditions that the visibility of the head is strong enough, that opportunities are indeed used by members of the school community to share
interpretations, and that membership is sufficiently stable, it is possible to arrive at very similar interpretations and thus unanimity.

If seen this way, this would also account for the small differences in certain perceptions amongst the teachers. Teachers tend to form micro communities, which possibly lead to shared interpretations of school life within these sub communities. Indeed, the data allow for this interpretation, as teachers mentioned that the head does not interact equally often and intensively with all the informal groups that constitute his entire team. As teachers tend to have less frequent and intensive meetings with the head than team leaders, this would account for the difference between those two groups in the extent of unanimity found.

It must be emphasised however, that the mere fact of the existence of an interpretive community does not in itself guarantee convergence of opinions or even agreement. It is indeed not a rare phenomenon that members of a group, team or what is loosely termed a community, differ in their views on topics that have been under discussion for a long time. In order to save the ‘power of the interpretative community’ (Fish, 1980, p. 338) on reaching agreement, it may well be necessary to diminish the size of the community itself by excluding those who disagree. The concept of an interpretive community therefore, as understood by Fish and other reader response critics (Harding, 2014), may be conducive to reaching agreement but fails to fully account for it. Other factors must play a role too.

Mono-causal explanations of social phenomena are by definition one-sided. While the interpretations of the unanimity as discussed above each seem to have some credibility and do not contradict each other, the data are indecisive as to the question which one has the strongest explanatory power. As such, this underlines the tentative character of explanations that can be generated by just one single case study. It should be noted however, that the condition of strong visibility of the head is presupposed in all three; a condition that has often emerged in research on school leadership (Hallinger, 2005, p. 226; Hardman, 2011, p. 52; Witzier, Bosker & Kruger, 2003, p. 405).
5.4.4 Faith and values

The picture which emerges on James’ faith and his values is consistent, and in that sense aligns well with the high extent of agreement on James values (5.4.3). He himself connects his values directly to his faith and Christian doctrines. His team and his teachers recognise that his values and his faith are integrated. James appears to be a head whose key actions are recognisably rooted in his faith, according to his followers. At the same time he appears to be reticent about his faith and religious feelings in his heart of hearts, although that has grown over the years.

5.4.5 Values in the school context and wider arena

The extent to which this head perceives his personal and professional values to be challenged (chapter 6.1.5) seems to be different for the arena of the school organisation and the system wide arena respectively. The system wide arena is much more challenging to the head’s personal and professional values (as discussed in 5.2.5.) than the more immediate context of his school organisation. Within the school organisation heads are subordinate to the executive board. James does ‘not feel any impediment from the framework of broader school policy’ to live out the values he finds important. Team leaders and teachers concur that heads have considerable room for manoeuvre.

It appears that over the course of his career James came to identify himself more with what he thinks the school stands for or expects. Ongoing reflection on identity related-issues in school ‘have influenced me very much’, he says. When he was younger his life-style was more non-conformist, ‘e.g. smoking, or [certain activities] in his leisure time’. As ‘the school’ as an organisation is ‘made up of people and their relationships with one another’ (Daft, 2013, p. 12; cf. Duignan, 2014, p. 156), this suggests growing alignment between the values of the head and the other members of the school as an organisation.
There are a number of aspects to take into account, when considering this apparent alignment. First, the extent of the alignment evolved over time. The head explicitly mentions a couple of things he does not do now anymore (such as smoking) and which are even contrary to his current personal values. This suggests that alignment of values is not so much a state, but that it is dynamic and processual. In this case the values of head and school were perceived to converge. As a head, by virtue of his position, is one of the most visible exponents of the school, it could be argued that too broad a margin between James’ personal values and the predominant values within his school community would have led to problems. The fact of a decades-long tenure suggests the opposite, namely the absence of prohibitive problems. Therefore, one cautious interpretation might be that a long tenure tends to promote value alignment in some way. This, of course, is a conjecture, which needs further research.

Second, it is not entirely clear whether this value alignment primarily came about because of changing values of James (James moving towards a school group norm of a set of value operationalisations), or vice versa, or both. Although socialisation and accommodation to group norms is a common phenomenon, James also emphasises the need to feel free to think for himself and act likewise (section 5.2.2). Conversely, his values of openness and having a shared vision may be conducive to convergence and alignment.

Third, the very idea of evolution towards alignment by adjustment of the value orientation of one person (i.e. James, in this case study) raises the issue of authenticity (cf. chapter 2.2.6). Does authenticity exclude the possibility of externally induced change? Even while leaving aside the contested positive moral extension of the concept of authenticity, and limiting its use to be ‘true to thine own self’ (e.g. Duignan, 2014), the data in this case study combined with philosophical considerations seem to challenge the concept even when taken in this narrow sense. The fact or perception of change within a person’s values, to the extent that it is induced, promoted or necessitated by his context or structure, in the words of Archer (2003), compromises this person’s authenticity. That is, unless it were already part of his self-image to be willing to be changed by external
factors. The willingness to be changed by others and not by one’s own volition does not seem to be a common feature of the self-concept of people. This makes it questionable whether the concept of authenticity can be used at all.

5.5 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the data that emerged from the first case study. This case was selected, primarily because the questionnaire surveys (cf. chapter 4) indicated a considerable extent of agreement between head and followers. Seven points summarise the findings.

1. James mentions 10 values which he perceives to guide him in his leadership. These are to a very large extent recognised by both team leaders and staff.
2. James sees a direct relation between his values and his Christian faith and provides examples of this for most of his values. This indicates coherence and as such some predictability.
3. Three potential explanations for the apparent agreement between James and his followers have been discussed, namely homogeneity, the character of the values and the concept of the interpretive community. While each has some value, they all fall short of fully accounting for the data. Even so, they all point to the visibility of the head as an underlying factor.
4. One case study is not enough to fully test explanations for and theoretical notions derived of the findings. More particularly, it is not always possible to exclude potential explanations on the basis of this single case study. A second one (or more) is needed.
5. Ongoing development comes through as one of James’ most important values. He followed full-fledged studies on a part-time basis and took care to do intensive reflection sessions over a longer period. This is recognised by those who have known him for a long time.
6. Although James directly links his values to his faith, he acknowledges that his innate personality and character, his upbringing, his school context and the local culture have all influenced his values. His perception is that his upbringing is the predominant factor. Within the scope of this thesis it is not possible to verify this more precisely, but this seems to underestimate the tacit and pervasive influence of the local culture, which itself is embedded in the wider culture.

7. The school context or arena is not perceived as imposing constraints, while the national arena is. National policy is seen as erratic and partly unhelpful. The growing alignment between James’ values and those of the school, over the course of his two decades long career, evokes some problematic points with regard to the concept of authenticity, as ‘authenticity’ seems to collide with changing because of external influence or pressure.
Chapter six. Case study two

6.1 Introduction

Simon is in charge of approximately 700 pupils and 60 teachers and three team leaders. He appointed the team leaders himself, as well as a sizeable (but unknown) portion of the teachers, guestimated at 25%. The teachers comprise a reasonably representative cross-section of Dutch teachers in this kind of education, with regard to teaching qualifications (about 60% having bachelor degrees and 40% having a master’s degree), subjects taught, demographics, male and female teachers, and full-time versus part-time employment, with the notable exception that they are all professing Reformed Christians, attending church twice on Sunday (cf. chapter 1). The pupils attending this school all come from similar Reformed Christian families.

Simon’s school is one part of a comprehensive school with several thousands of pupils. Such a comprehensive school is subdivided in a small number of relatively independent schools, each with a senior management team (SMT), comprising a head and some team leaders. Heads work together under the general guidance of the executive board. The set-up of the school is well within the band-width of Dutch secondary schools in general (cf. chapter 1).

6.2 The head’s perceptions

6.2.1 Leadership

Simon started his career in education as a teacher, while he was still studying for his degree. He was active in taking up new initiatives in which he cooperated closely with another colleague. After a few years he was invited to do (part-time) coordinating jobs. He gradually climbed the ranks
via, among others, team leader to eventually becoming full-time head in a secondary school, which job he has had for 5 years now. This is a common career path for Dutch heads of schools. Simon is 50 years old. He is married and has children.

Simon has grown in his leadership role in the twenty-odd years he has had managing and leading positions. Of earlier stages in his career he says ‘I was busy with myself’, instead of being directed towards his staff and thinking about their needs. He tended to do a lot of only loosely coupled projects, and ‘did not even realise that I worked with no or hardly any vision’. By doing so, he now thinks he did not keep sight of the question whether his teachers could still catch up with his initiatives, because ‘in the beginning I was way ahead of the troops and I hoped and thought they would come after me’. He used to delegate less than he currently does. If staff underperformed, as a starting leader he found it difficult to address this, as ‘you are too cautious if staff do not function well enough. You tend to think: ‘let it be, it will get better in due time’. Which of course never happens’.

Gradually Simon’s views on and practices in leadership changed, primarily, it seems, by maturing in the role, and by focusing on developing professionally, as ‘at a certain moment’ he ‘really started investing in: “Who am I as a leader?”.’ He is not able to pinpoint this moment nor any specific triggers. He thinks learning and developing is important for staff as well and therefore he also takes ‘care that my team leaders can grow as a person and as a leader’, so ‘that they may lead their teams better’.

Vision, delegating and addressing less competent staff are also important to Simon. He says he ‘[tries] to work from a certain vision. Why do you want this? And to discuss that with each other’. Focusing on just a few points is important, as he ‘discovered that we had so many points we should work on in our plans, that it drove us crazy. I said: ‘Let us focus on two or three main points”.’ When he saw that team leaders were capable of doing a good job, he started to delegate more: ‘By delegating, it is much better than when I did it myself. And I gained time to do more important things than organising and doing everything myself’. Simon thinks he has grown in
addressing less competent staff and to help them develop or, ultimately, to be made to leave the organisation. He is good at organisation and structure and spends about 60-70% of his time on this. The remainder is distributed between school-wide duties and staying in touch with the team leaders and teachers within his department because he ‘[tries] to be present very often. And I see that they appreciate it.’

In sum, in his perception Simon has grown in his leadership over the years, in that he works from a certain vision, selects a small number of key issues to focus on, is happy to delegate matters to his team leaders, while retaining a high visibility with staff. Some of Simon’s values are already perceptible in this description. The next subsection describes them in more detail.

6.2.2 Values

When asked explicitly about his values, it seems Simon mentally makes a list. Simon says ‘My first value is that I try to be recognisable as a Christian to my colleagues.’ As if sensing that this is abstract he adds that he wants to be present, that staff know that they may count on him and that he will help them. Spread across the interviews additional values are mentioned, apparently triggered by something in the natural flow of the interviews. Very often Simon introduces it in terms of ‘this is yet another value I think’ and then goes on. Altogether Simon mentions a large number of values, 23 (appendix I). Simon does neither distinguish between professional values and personal values nor between espoused and lived-out values. He clearly perceives his behaviour to a large extent to be congruent with his values. He does, however experience some occasional internal struggles, which are addressed below.

The 23 values are categorised, first, as values related to people, both other-regarding (viz., his staff and his pupils) and self-regarding (i.e., himself as a headteacher and a person) (Slote, 1997, p. 132). Second, values couched in distinctive Reformed Christian terms versus values not formulated in Christian terms. This yields a model of two axes and four categories (table
22); the axes corresponding with the research questions; on head and followers, and on the relation with his Christian faith respectively.

Table 22. Simon’s values according to himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Espoused values</th>
<th>Self-Regarding</th>
<th>Other-Regarding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is traceable to explicit commitment to the Reformed</td>
<td>Trusting God instead of applying extreme risk management</td>
<td>Teachers and pupils:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian faith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caring for pupils from a Christian world view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching pupils how to become a Christian citizen in this society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not exclusively traceable to distinctive</td>
<td>Working from a vision.</td>
<td>Teachers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformed Christian notions.</td>
<td>Openness.</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting professional growth (himself).</td>
<td>Helping one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust.</td>
<td>Doing ‘the job’ together (cooperation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviviality.</td>
<td>Loving one another by providing both care and correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attributing success to others, failure to oneself.</td>
<td>Addressing things that do not go well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguishing between behaviour and the person himself.</td>
<td>Celebrating achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complimenting staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking after your staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honouring one’s commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting professional growth (teachers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitating professional
dialogue amongst teachers
about lessons
Expecting responsibility and
ownership
Buffering staff from
distractions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers and pupils:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that there is a big difference in numbers in the four categories. Of the other-regarding values, 15 concern staff, and only three directly concern pupils. Eight values are self-regarding. The difference in numbers here suggests that Simon articulates his values with regard to staff in much more detail than those concerning pupils. As his job primarily entails working with teachers and only rarely directly with pupils, this may account for this difference. Conversely, as schools exist first and foremost to educate pupils, a rich value system extending beyond his immediate scope of the teachers, would not have been unexpected. This disparity suggests that further probing of the scope of his vision is warranted, which is done below.

The second way of categorising the large number of values is whether they are couched in or traceable to explicitly Christian terms (‘EC-values’) versus values not traceable to distinctively (cf. Cooling, 2010) Reformed Christian notions (‘NEC-values’). The latter appear to cover about 80%, whereas the EC-values amount to some 20%. This does not imply that NEC-values are necessarily contradictory to EC-values, and Simon obviously embraces both types. However, notwithstanding his assertion that his prime value is to be recognisably Christian, it is clear that this orthodox Reformed headteacher does not draw his values from a distinctively or even uniquely Christian pool of values. Moreover, this raises the point to what extent a sacred-secular divide is visible here. Furthermore, it sheds light on the extent to which
Simon has reflected on his own value system in this respect. The following excerpt illustrates the point:

_Interviewer:_ Non-Christians would possibly have a number of the values you mention. What exactly is the relation with what you believe in? With what you find most important, in your heart of hearts?

_Simon:_ [Thinks] Yes, that is a… [thinks]. That is a difficult...
[thinks].
We are all sinful and need grace [...] So, on the one hand clemency toward others. Making mistakes. If you only stand up again and go on.

This issue is discussed further in chapter 6.4, so that the perceptions of the followers can be taken into account.

As mentioned above, vision is another salient issue that seems to emerge from the data. Simon mentions that having a vision is part of his leadership. Working from a vision is also one of his values. Part of his vision is that ‘we have to care for our pupils [...] and that we do that from a Christian perspective on life’, that ‘pupils learn for life [...] which means that we teach our pupils to be Christian citizens in this life, but also that real learning occurs’. As further probing did not yield more concrete information, these assertions seem to be somewhat non-descript and holistic. Furthermore, when asked again to describe his own vision, he points to other people, whom he consults or whose ideas he embraces, as he says: ‘I discovered that there are a lot of people who have better ideas than I have, other good ideas’. The formulations, taken together, indicate a real possibility that the proper, socially expected, words for leaders are there (e.g. crediting staff for their contributions), but that his vision lacks substance underneath the words. In other words, could this be rhetoric more than reality? This point is discussed further in chapter 6.4, so that the views of the followers may be taken into account.

In sum, Simon mentions many values which describe his identity. Clustering these on the dimension of people involved, most concern his relation with his staff, some his self-perception and a few the pupils. While he says that his first value is to be recognisably Christian, for some 80% of his values
not explicitly Christian terms are used. Carr maintains that ‘one cannot observe a sharp division between professional and personal values in the case of good teachers’ (2006, p. 172). Whether or not Simon is a good leader has not been assessed. Nevertheless, for this leader his professional values coincide with personal values. No distinction is made between espoused and lived-out values either. There is a possibility that the words on vision do not match the perceptions of the followers as it appeared to be difficult to substantiate it by examples.

6.2.3 Perceived influence: Faith

Simon is open about his Christian faith. He frequently brings it up himself throughout the interviews. He is an active member of the same denomination as he was as a child, in the town he lives in nowadays. As a teenager, however, Simon did not experience a personal saving relation with God, though he was outwardly a Christian. This changed in his early twenties when he met several God-fearing people in the course of his studies and early career, because ‘in them I saw something of being a Christian in daily life. That made me realise that I missed that, and I hungered for it. Eventually that led to the change in my life’. This change was fundamental; it ‘[…:] has been my salvation, in that sense’. His faith, he asserts, influences some of his values as well as his perspective on pupils and what a school should be like.

The first value Simon mentions (see also 6.2.2) is that he wants to be recognisably Christian to his colleagues, which he explains by adding that he wants to be present, that staff know that they may count on him and that he will help them. Although these values certainly tie in with his faith, they are not exclusively Christian. He mentions other connections between his faith and his values as well. ‘One of the core words of the Bible is of course love, that you love your neighbour’, he says. He also thinks being of service to others and thus serving God is important, as he is ‘looking for what God wants in [his] life. How can I be of service?’. Sometimes the performance of staff members ‘is a struggle to me, especially when staff do not strive to do a 100% of what they are capable of’. He wants to display a
willingness to forgive, and to ‘[...] walk [...] in Jesus’ footsteps. Then I think: ‘I have still got to learn a lot.’. Another internal struggle is detectable when he is reticent about his own contribution because when ‘You get a compliment [...] then you start to think... [but:] No! It is not about me. But that is a struggle’. He struggles with an inclination to feel pride creeping in when things go well. ‘Where is gratitude and wonder? That is God’s grace [...] There is an internal source of unrighteousness in spite of outward appearance [...] which makes me mild towards others’. Though he is reluctant to speak about his own contribution, he often compliments his staff and wants to do justice to their accomplishments (cf. 6.2.2.). It seems Simon’s recognition of the risk of becoming proud when praised, because of sinful inclinations, does not lead to the logical conclusion not to compliment others in order not to make them proud. He trusts others, and an allusion to human depravity, that ‘we do not have a positive view on man’, is only mentioned as an aside. He seems to be milder towards others than towards himself. The point will be taken up in section 6.4.

Simon’s faith also influences his perspective on pupils and what a school should be like. Pupils ‘are on their way to meeting God’. The ‘formational aspect of learning’ is important as pupils should be prepared ‘to take their place as a Christian citizen’ in this society. What this entails in some more detail, or how the two are connected does not seem to be a matter of conscious deliberation. Simon directly connects preparation for society with the weekly and daily devotions. He often mentions these and clearly thinks they are important. Devotions are as a ‘river bed every pupil goes through. They may kick and chafe and grate, but they remain here till they leave’. Simon thinks ‘that we should, as it were, “open up windows into heaven” by our teaching’. He explicitly refers to a recent eponymous book (Mackay et al., 2014), initiated by Driestar University, in which some 20 real-life lessons are collected, which contain explicit links between subject matter and biblical views. No reference is made here to preparation for participating in society as a Christian.

Summing up, Simon’s self-report on the influence of his faith on his values covers both relations with his staff and the aims and means of education. He wants to be recognisably Christian in his job. Four key elements are
loving his staff, exerting mildness towards shortcomings, complimenting staff with their achievements, and struggling inwardly with pride when he is complimented himself. He emphasises the importance of devotional moments for pupils to engender Christian citizenship. Lessons should be good and offer a Christian perspective. The relation between Simon’s faith and values consists of a couple of elements, which seem to be both standing alone somewhat and short on detail. This adds some urgency to the discussion of the issue of vision, which emerged earlier in section 6.2.2, and which is taken up in section 6.4, after taking stock of the perceptions of the followers.

6.2.4 Perceived influence: Family.

Simon grew up in a traditional Dutch Reformed family (cf. chapter 1) as one of a number of children. His mother was at home, caring for the family. His dad had a day-time job, but was away often during evening times for meetings related to church and Christian politics. Both his parents felt available and present to him. He asked his father for advice on what profession to choose. Though Simon does ’not remember whether he explicitly said: “Pray for this.”’, he does ’know that meant exactly that, even if he did not mention it explicitly’. The personal Christian faith of his father was important to him, though it was sometimes more implicitly there, than explicitly. Friends were always welcome and often stayed at Simon’s parental home.

Some elements of his upbringing are reflected in Simon’s values. He appreciates the presence of others, he likes a warm and inviting atmosphere, and he wants to care for his staff. This mirrors that his ’mom found it important that others would be well provided for’. Another value in his parental home was to work hard because ’it is your normal duty to have your house in order’. You certainly should not to brag about what you had done, but ’just act normal, that’s already crazy enough’. This is a well-known Dutch adage which is ingrained in Dutch culture in general (cf. ‘normalcy-doe-normaal’, 2016). Simon vividly remembers he had to train himself in paying well-deserved compliments.
6.2.5 Perceived influence: Professional context

The internal and external school context potentially exert a third influence on Simon’s values. This immediate ‘arena’ (cf. Johansson, 2003) is the micro level of his own school. Simon experiences ample room to focus on what he thinks is important. He says: ‘A few times a year I have an official conversation with the executive board on the aims in my annual plan, which are related to our strategic plan’. His annual plan is not detailed, but concentrates on a small number of points (cf. 6.2.1). Only a small degree of direction emanates from the board. ‘I hardly ever hear something new’, he says, when talking about school visits paid by members of the executive board, ‘they just confirm my points’. This is in accordance with a slow but wider trend within a swathe of big secondary schools to devolve some power from executive boards to heads and from heads to team leaders. That Simon is ‘called to account only very rarely’ is not a generic trend as this varies between boards and board members. Simon sometimes feels critical of the board and also sometimes buffers his team leaders from work or initiatives issued by it. This does not mean that Simon is in any way critical of the core values of the school as such, as he asserts ‘I completely agree with these. Only, sometimes you use just a slightly different word’. Communication lines with churches and institutions outside the school are the responsibility of the board. Simon himself is hardly involved in these matters.

His general professional context is the ordinary matrix all Dutch schools are subject to, in terms of laws and regulations, inspections, finance, educational policy and accepted practice. To a large extent the external context seems to be taken for granted by Simon and apparently it is not a factor which consciously influences his room for manoeuvre. General culture and its potential impact on his values in any perceptible sense is not mentioned.

Thus, neither the internal nor the external context Simon operates in hamper, or even influence, his perceived room for manoeuvre in any
significant way. The vox populi in The Netherlands as well as school leaders and Dutch researchers seem to be much more critical of the influence of politics and externally induced or imposed educational change (e.g. Toes, 2015), the influence of the inspectorate (Refdag, 2013, 2015), and the general climate of performativity (cf. Ball, 2003; Biesta, 2010). This suggests that Simon hardly reflects on these issues, and therefore, unconsciously, acts as a subcontractor; ‘unthinking links in a chain leading from those who developed policy to those who received it’ (Day & Harris, 2015, p. 4; cf. Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001). This salient point is explored further in section 6.4.

6.3 The followers’ perceptions

This section explores the perceptions the team leaders (6.3.1), the teachers (6.3.2), and the pupils (6.3.3) have of Simon, and compares these with Simon’s own perceptions. Salient points are identified and taken up in section 6.4.

6.3.1 Team leaders

The three team leaders have a good knowledge of the comprehensive school organisation as a whole of which their school is a constituent. They have had their jobs as team leaders for at least five years and have known Simon considerably longer than that. The next paragraphs explore their perceptions of Simon in his leadership of a Christian school, his vision, the professional context and his values.

Simon ‘can be characterised as a person who is looking forward to everyone having a living relation with God through Jesus Christ’; meaning both pupils and staff by ‘everyone’. He ‘knows his shortcomings very well [...] that he is a sinner himself’. Towards others he is willing to forgive and ‘there always is the possibility to start again, to turn the page and to forgive’. These perceptions match Simon’s own.
Team leaders say Simon ‘not only sees you as an employee, but as a person. He is interested in you’. He acknowledges ‘achievements of staff, in whatever way’, and ‘celebrating success comes back regularly’ but he finds it difficult to do bad news conversations. They obviously concur with Simon’s own perceptions on these issues.

According to Simon’s senior management team he gives them ‘ample room to do certain things. Of course he holds us to account. He coaches us when we have questions; coaches us, more than commands’. When a team leader has a plan, Simon ‘probes my motives’, and there always ‘is a check’ somewhere in the process. He ‘keeps an eye on what we set out to do, as well as on the money’. They cannot remember that Simon ever rejected one of their initiatives, even when they ‘had some wild ideas [they] were given every chance to proceed’. In sum, ‘he lets you do many things by yourselves and gives much freedom and responsibility’. This perception tallies with Simon’s own, in that he delegates, coaches and appreciates novel ideas.

Team leaders agree that Simon spends a significant amount of his time on managerial duties. They think this is inherent in the job and ‘as for managerial versus leadership, percentage-wise it is 70-30 or 60-40’. This perception corresponds with Simon’s own. His managerial focus includes benchmarking statistics or quality indicators, and when for instance ‘a national test had been made. He plotted the results and historic trends. Actually, he figured out where we stand’. Some of Simon’s managerial time seems to be spent on more purely administrative issues, when team leaders mention, for example, that ‘for citizenship […] he made a neat table with themes versus subjects, which we could forward to teachers, to fill in when and what they did with these’.

According to the team leaders, Simon ‘quite simply finds that lesson quality should be good’. Teachers should be ‘learning from each other’ by ‘visiting each other’s lessons, not judging one another’. Simon also ‘thinks citizenship is important. […] I think he wants that to come back in lessons, citizenship’. To them, this implies that Simon means Christian citizenship, without further elaboration on its characteristics.
Simon likes new initiatives. Team leaders assert that ‘in his enthusiasm he runs the risk of forgetting to help his staff to come along, which they do not always do automatically’. He sometimes forgets to listen to their arguments, neither does he always support his ideas with adequate arguments. They add that ‘he has grown in his role as head. [...] in speeches [...] in listening to arguments of others’ over the years.

So far, team leaders seem to be happy with Simon as a Christian man, with a heart and an eye for his staff and his pupils, who is quite busy with his managerial duties. They are, however, somewhat critical about the depth of Simon’s conceptual ideas. Notwithstanding their assertions that Simon ‘very well knows what he wants with his part of the school [and t]hat is the course he steers as well’, they also think that he ‘does not always show the helicopter view that would be helpful to lead well’. Additionally, ‘undergirding his decisions well, that could be a bit stronger’. They also agree, however, that ‘he has grown in that’. One team leader asserts that ‘for this part of the school he has what it takes [...] but for a big organisation, cognitively, I might be a bit doubtful’. Another team leader thinks that if Simon takes up a full-fledged study, instead or on top of attending short courses and conferences as he does now, he will be able to grow and be able to chair the executive board too, if he wishes.

The team leaders formulate their opinions with care and are reticent in voicing criticisms themselves of their boss on this issue for several reasons. They are obviously aware that this research is going to be published, it is clear from other remarks that they appreciate Simon for other aspects, and they want to do justice to the several sides they perceive in their head teacher’s professional profile by painting a nuanced picture. Simon himself is convinced that ‘working from a certain vision’ is one of his values. As mentioned in 6.2.2, based on the analysis of his self-perception, there was possibility that his vision might lack somewhat in substance. The team leaders underline this point, notwithstanding their caution, and even the team leader who is least outspoken on this issue implicitly concurs by stipulating the desirability of a part-time study. The perceptions of the teachers can shed light on this issue too (6.3.2), and it is taken up in 6.4
Apart from giving their views on his leadership and vision, team leaders provide information on the professional context they see within their comprehensive school as a whole (of which their school is a part). Team leaders think that ‘We really are too organised as a school’; referring to, in their eyes, unnecessary bureaucracy. The organisation as a whole is in search of a good distribution of authority within the existing hierarchical structure. This also implies looking for a how to strike a proper balance between issues which are centrally decided and imposed by the executive board and which matters should be relegated to heads or devolved further to their team leaders. The team leaders ‘think that in our part of the school we ourselves are convinced that we should have autonomy, within our part of the school’.

Simon is perceived as a headteacher who within this entire organisation tries to carve out a relatively large area in which he can make decisions. They ‘regularly see in [their] head that he says: “Give us our own room to decide on this topic”’. Simon succeeds in obtaining this room for manoeuvre, they think. They could, for instance, reallocate hours from managerial tasks of the senior management team to extra time for coaching pupils, thus diverging from general school policy. Team leaders think Simon differs from the other heads they know, in that ‘he certainly speaks his mind when discussing matters with his fellow-heads, and says that he begs to differ’.

Their perceptions partly correspond with Simon’s, in that he perceives ample room to make plans and carry out ideas, and that he can be critical towards the board at times (cf. 6.2.5). There is a difference as well between the team leaders and Simon, as he does not mention the internal bureaucracy as being problematic. This may be accounted for by the fact that as a head Simon experiences both less interference from operational rules with his job and is in a better position to criticise or ward off potential threats to his room for manoeuvre. This issue will also be addressed further in chapter 6.4.

While speaking about Simon’s leadership, vision and professional context already reveals some of the values team leaders implicitly attribute to him.
They explicitly attribute the following values to Simon: purposefulness, drive, giving room and freedom to act, takes responsibility and expectation that staff will take responsibility too, passionate, assertiveness to those in similar or higher ranks, a people-person, wants people to develop (table 23). There are four explicitly Christian (‘EC’) values and 12 not explicitly Christian (‘NEC’) values which is about the same percentage (25%) as was derived of Simon’s self-report (20%). This issue is discussed further in chapter 7.4.

Table 23. Simon’s values according to his team leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values attributed to Simon</th>
<th>Regarding Simon himself</th>
<th>Regarding others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is traceable to explicit commitment to the Reformed Christian faith</td>
<td>Aware of his sinful shortcomings</td>
<td>Wants everyone to know Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is willing to forgive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wants school to prepare pupils for Christian citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not exclusively traceable to distinctive Reformed Christian notions.</td>
<td>Purposeful</td>
<td>Compliments staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passionate</td>
<td>Acknowledges and welcomes contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driven</td>
<td>Values being present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes responsibility</td>
<td>Values professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Values academically good quality lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values that people take responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wants people to develop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum, Simon is seen as a committed Christian, a purposeful leader who is interested in his staff, their well-being and professional growth in teaching well. He delegates many things to his team leaders, whom he coaches more than commands. He has what it takes to do the job, though there are some hints casting aspersions on his overview and argumentative strength.

6.3.2 Teachers

Three groups of teachers were interviewed, comprising five, two and five teachers respectively. Two groups of about six teachers each were planned, for the considerations mentioned in chapter 3.5.4. As for the second session only two (female) teachers showed up, I decided to add a third group. All groups represented a range of subjects. The teachers varied in number of years of experience, with a minimum of a year and a half for one teacher to a maximum of about 30 years. Seven participants were male.

Table 24 lists teachers’ perceptions of Simon’s values on which they agree. Most of the attributed values are ‘other-regarding’ (cf. Slote, 1997, p. 132), which corresponds with Simon’s own wish to ‘be of service’. Five out of 15 values are explicitly Christian, therefore the percentage of EC-values is 30%, slightly higher than Simon’s self-report and what the team leaders say. If the values on which teachers do not fully agree are taken into account, this percentage is lower.

Table 24. Simon’s values according to his teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values attributed to Simon</th>
<th>Regarding Simon himself</th>
<th>Regarding teachers and others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is traceable to explicit commitment to the Reformed Christian faith</td>
<td>Authentic Christian; words and deeds are consistent</td>
<td>Christian love Helpful* Developmental attitude* Wants to pass on the Christian faith to pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not exclusively traceable to distinctive Reformed Christian notions.</td>
<td>Driven Enthusiastic Values good organisation Sticks to rules</td>
<td>Accessibility Appreciation Warmth Care Values good organisation Sticks to rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers say that Simon ‘is very approachable. He often sits in the staff room and he also comes to us’. He shows appreciation, warmth and care, and exhibits ‘Christian values as loving you neighbour, being ready to help someone else, a developmental attitude. He very much exhibits those’. Teachers agree that he ‘is a real Christian. He walks the talk’, ‘is quite serious and very much wants to pass on the Christian faith to pupils’. He is driven and enthusiastic. Furthermore, ‘he wants it to be organised. (…) he is very much on rules, but maybe that’s necessary’. To a very large extent teachers agree on these attributes, which they see as positive. Their perceptions also correspond with Simon’s own, and the team leaders’s. They emphasise the rules slightly more than Simon does. This seems to be logical as teachers tend to be on the receiving end. Even so, they perceive this as necessary.

While Simon’s value of a desire for staff to grow professionally is mentioned by about half of the teachers, this is neither endorsed nor contradicted by the others. This may be accounted for by differences within the group of teachers. The teachers who chose to stay silent may not have experienced Simon’s involvement themselves, even more so as the official appraisals are done by the team leaders and not by Simon. Some of the teachers who mention Simon’s views on professional growth, study for a qualifying degree (teaching by unqualified starting teachers being a common phenomenon in the Netherlands) or have recently completed one. They experience that Simon ‘actively helps me think, which I like’. Others mention that ‘Simon
tries to stimulate teachers to grow in their job’. The perception of the teachers matches Simon’s self-perception.

Teachers’ perceptions are divided on two issues. The first one is that about five respondents are somewhat critical about his ability to think in conceptual terms. The perceptions of the teachers corroborate therefore what team leaders already hinted at. They think he does not always display a clear overview and is not particularly strong on vision nor on substantiating proposals with good arguments. In their view, their ‘head is not an ideologue (...) a conceptual thinker (...), thinking back a few steps, that I do not see very often’. They ‘sometimes [...] wonder what he adds to e.g. real educational level. I do not know either whether he studied [at a university]’. It seems that the critical teachers wish to be convinced of the rightness of decisions by what they deem to be compelling arguments, instead of accepting decisions because of other reasons, including the authority of the head or their trust in his judgement. They may also be critical because of decisions in the past, which they did not agree with. Some also appear to attribute more value to a formal certified level of study (i.e., a master’s degree) than the teachers who do not voice criticism about vision and conceptual thinking. This may be related to the level of their own qualifications, but this could not be consistently established. Alternative explanations for this difference among the teachers cannot be ruled out either. Clearly, the views of a substantial part of the respondents on this point correspond with the veiled doubts of the team leaders and contradict Simon’s self-perception. In chapter 6.4 this is discussed further.

The second issue teachers differ on, is that the same respondents think that Simon is sometimes somewhat rigid, while others appreciate that he makes decisions and is not erratic in the course chosen. He sticks to the rules. This issue seems to be related to the first one. If indeed arguments are not weighed up by Simon in the way the critical teachers think is appropriate, he might stick to a chosen course action which they think is not justified any more, and therefore he may seem to be somewhat rigid.

In sum, the evidence on teachers’ perceptions suggests that Simon is a devoted Christian, who is present, caring and helpful, and who pays
attention to professional growth of the teachers. The initial doubts whether Simon’s self-perception on his vision matches that of the followers are not merely confirmed but corroborated. However, teachers’ opinions differ on this issue and some emphasise that he does a proper job in his current position. After a passage in which several critical remarks were made a teacher clearly wants to give a more positive slant to the interview and seems to voice the feelings of the majority, when she says: ‘I think he is in the right seat. I do not want to say that it fits him like a T. But I do see him enjoying his job’.

6.3.3 Pupils

Some pupils in the two focus group interviews with six pupils each ‘barely know who he is’. They know Simon because of the weekly devotions and because he walks in the corridors during lesson breaks. Pupils do not interact with the head regularly, let alone frequently. Pupils appreciate his way of doing the devotions, as they ‘can listen very well’ when it is Simon’s turn. He ‘is geared towards teenagers […] uses our language [and] gives good examples’. Pupils say that during devotions ‘he is really serious [and] wants to recommend, indeed give’ the Christian faith to them. They also think he is well-organised, because he ‘writes out every word’. These perceptions correspond with both Simon’s own perceptions and those of the team leaders and the teachers, notwithstanding the much narrower scope of pupils’ value attributions.

6.4 Discussion of salient themes

6.4.1 Introduction.

Four key themes emerged from the data analysis in 6.2 and 6.3 worthy of further critical discussion. First, the extent to which the perceptions of Simon’s values of all categories of respondents correspond (6.4.2). Second, the diverging perceptions on Simon’s conceptual depth (6.4.3). Third, the extent to which explicitly Christian notions inform Simon’s values (6.4.4). Fourth, the varying views on Simon’s perceived room for manoeuvre in
relation to agency and structure (6.4.5). Section 6.4.6 is devoted to a fifth theme, viz., the relation between data and themes on the one hand and the analytic model, developed in chapter 2, on the other hand.

A prerequisite, however, is whether the attributes mentioned in this chapter as purported values can reasonably be interpreted as such. If this is not the case, the findings are hardly relevant for answering the research questions. For the sake of brevity, the considerations discussed in the first case study (5.4.2) are not repeated here, as they are identical and lead to the same conclusion. All things considered, the value attributions can justifiably be used as valid data within the context of this study.

6.4.2 The extent to which respondents agree

Simon and his team leaders and teachers agree on a number of values. They are less than unanimous on others, while still other values are mentioned by Simon only, or the team leaders, or the teachers. All respondents state that Simon is an authentic Christian who wants others to know Christ as well and who loves others. They also convey that he is visible, present and accessible, warm and convivial; that he shows appreciation and pays compliments.

Perceptions differ somewhat on whether and how Simon promotes professional development, the extent to which he inflexibly sticks to the rules, and how actively he promotes that teachers prepare pupils for Christian citizenship in their lessons. Teachers and team leaders entertain differing perceptions, though these issues are not highly contested. Some values are only mentioned by one category, i.e., either Simon, the team leaders or the teachers. Of the 23 values Simon mentions, many do not come up in the interviews with the followers. These include addressing things that do not go well, attributing success to others and failure to oneself, distinguishing between behaviour and the person himself, trusting God instead of applying extreme risk management, buffering staff from distractions.
Several factors seem to account for the differences. First, it seems to be a difficult undertaking to live out so many values equally well, let alone in equal proportions or even coherently. Thus, some values may be less visible than others, while still not being absent altogether.

Second, differing standpoints and value orientations of the respondents may lead to differences in the exact terms which respondents use, as well as how a certain value is looked upon in positive or negative terms, while the construct they refer to is still the same. For example, Simon asserts that ‘keeping agreements’ is one of his values. Team leaders and teachers refer to somewhat related attributes (‘staying the course’, ‘sticks to rules’), which suggests they recognise this value in an organisational sense, for some to the extent of approaching inflexibility. Put in a slightly different way, Simon’s value of ‘keeping agreements’ has a positive connotation. It is a virtue and not a vice. The perception that ‘rules are important’ is both narrower in meaning and slightly more negative, while ‘sticking to rules’ seems to convey a negative assessment of this value. So, formulations of value attributions are not necessarily neutral and factual, but may be couched in evaluative or even judgemental terms, as they seem to be influenced by someone’s own value orientation and standpoint.

A third factor that plays a role is that the nature of the value involved makes it less visible. One example is the head’s value of buffering staff from distractions. The very fact of doing so may makes the underlying value less perceptible to staff, unless, of course, the head chooses to explain his policy with respect to buffering and informing staff every now and then.

A fourth point to be taken into consideration is that the extent of agreement between Simon and his team leaders, his SMT, appears to be larger than between head and teachers. The number of teachers is, of course, much larger than the number of team leaders, which allows for more potential for disagreement. As all team leaders were handpicked by the head, while not all the teachers were, this will probably play a role. On the other hand, being appointed to the job by the head himself does not imply that team leaders automatically agree with their head, which they obviously do not.
The smaller group size of the team leaders, however, does not in itself guarantee a higher degree of unanimity.

A fifth and more important factor seems to be the degree of cooperation, which is obviously much higher for the SMT than for teachers, even though they acknowledge that Simon is present and visible to staff. Opportunities to interact with their head and adjust perceptions are less frequent for teachers. Still, the assumption that interacting frequently with a person will by definition lead to corresponding perceptions is contestable.

To summarise, the lack of agreement on a number of values can be accounted for by a combination of considerations, viz., the relative visibility of each of Simon’s values, differing formulations and evaluation of the same underlying construct, a difference in standpoint and, by consequence, perspective, a difference in relational closeness and frequency of interaction. However, there seems to be another source of disagreement, which is related to perceptions on conceptual thinking. This issue is discussed in the next section, 6.4.3.

6.4.3 Diverging perceptions on conceptual depth

Simon asserts that he values working from a good vision. The evidence suggests otherwise, however. Team leaders cautiously cast aspersions on his conceptual thinking, while almost half of the teachers are explicitly doubtful. Zooming out of the concrete to an overarching view is not often seen. Important ideas sometimes seem to come from others. Sometimes initiatives, if pursued at all, suffer from a lack of adequate arguments. Clearly, no detailed and holistic vision emerged from the data. Higher-order thinking (‘analysing, synthesising and evaluating’ (Krüger, 2009, p. 18)) has been asserted to be an ‘important characteristic of effective leadership’ (Krüger, 2009, p. 113, cf. Bryk & Schneider, 2003, p. 5; Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009, p. 180). This raises the issue to what extent followers’ opinions of Simon’s conceptual strength and their perceptions of Simon’s values interfere.
At least two effects are likely to play a role here. The first is that a limited visionary scope will curtail the materialisation and expression of Simon’s values. For example, the importance he attaches to educating pupils for Christian citizenship seems to be honest and well-meant, and aligns well with his widely recognised Christian identity. At the same time, it is hardly referred to by teachers, in fact only once, that ‘all of sudden he came up with a list to fill in what you do with it in subjects’. The second effect is that those who tend to be critical about Simon’s conceptual thinking, probably also perceive other issues in a more critical vein. The example (6.4.2) on meeting agreements (positive) versus sticking to rules (neutral to negative) can be interpreted as such. Moreover, even unanimity in terminology may be deceptive and conceal underlying differences, both in how values are perceived and how they are appreciated. For example, openness and open-mindedness to ideas are recognised by most respondents. On the face of it, both have positive connotations. But on closer scrutiny there is a caveat, because to some of the critically minded respondents this value also veils a paucity of original ideas.

In sum, this suggests that a leader’s clear conceptual thinking and a concomitant well-developed vision, or rather the perception of these by his followers, mediates the perceptions they have of his values and actions.

6.4.4 The extent to which Christian notions informed the head’s values

To all respondents, team leaders, teachers, and pupils, Simon as a person clearly is a devoted Reformed Christian. The research questions that guide this study, however, do not focus so much on the person of the head teacher as on the extent to which headteachers and their followers report a relation between values, leadership practices and their religious beliefs. In this case study Reformed Christian notions are to some extent pervasive and visible. Notwithstanding this, the available evidence appears to suggest that the influence of these notions is limited, in that some 75% of the values mentioned by Simon and endorsed by team leaders and teachers do not have an explicitly Christian flavour. On closer scrutiny however, the picture seems to be more nuanced in several ways.
First, this apparent sacred-secular divide can be interpreted with the doctrinal notion of ‘common grace’ (see also chapter 2.1.5). In this view Christians are not necessarily unique in their values or practices, though for them they should be in accordance with Reformed Christian ethics. And it is sometimes felt that ‘leadership belongs to the terrain of common grace’ (H. Van den Belt, 2015; cf. T. Van den Belt & Moret, 222f). Simon’s position however, is summarised better by ‘Christians leading’ than ‘Christian leadership’ (cf. Hull, 2003; H. Van den Belt, 2015), as neither he nor the other respondents mention the notion of common grace, even when prompted (cf. 6.2.2).

Second, the explicitly Christian values mentioned seem to focus primarily on three areas, viz., the ultimate aim of life of being saved by Christ, on how to interact with others as an expression of the second main commandment to ‘love thy neighbour’, and on how to deal with the negative effects of sin, primarily within Simon himself. The evidence suggests that much less attention is paid to e.g. what Christian citizenship entails in some concrete detail and what that means for education and the curriculum. Issues such as how subjects are treated, or if and how a Christian perspective should inform classroom pedagogy and didactic approach receive a limited amount of attention in terms of time, effort, and reflection. These are notions some other (foreign) Christian schools uphold more strongly (Murre, 2011; cf. chapter 1). In other words, explicitly Christian values cover particular parts of this headteacher’s job and are less conspicuous in others.

Third, tables 22, 23 and 24 demonstrate that most of the attributed values are ‘other-regarding’ (cf. Slote, 1997), which corresponds with Simon’s own wish to ‘be of service’. Here, two elements, mentioned under one and two respectively, seem to come together. In the other-regarding values Simon expresses his adherence to the ‘love thy neighbour’-commandment. This is operationalised in values which are not uniquely Christian, but that can still be derived from or be congruent with Christian notions. In other words, espousing and living out a larger set of other-regarding values than self-regarding is (within this group of schools) in accordance with accepted interpretations of Christian faith and doctrine. That Simon does not say so
himself may be attributed to his lack of reflection and his conceptual thinking (cf. 6.4.3).

6.4.5 Perceptions on structure and agency

Considering the dichotomy of structure versus agency (cf. chapter 2.1.6) it seems to be self-evident that expression of espoused values is facilitated most if the constraints generated by structure are least prominent. Therefore, the most remarkable point on the issue of the external influence on the professional arena and Simon’s concurrent agency probably is the relative absence of it in the interviews. Teachers do not mention it as an important factor. To Simon himself it apparently is not a factor to be reckoned with. Team leaders assert that Simon manages to ascertain a bigger than usual room for manoeuvre in his school, when compared with fellow heads in other parts of the school. The examples given however, do not seem to indicate an unusual amount of freedom, as compared to the bandwidth in Dutch schools in general.

Simon does not seem to consciously reflect on how his context influences the potential to live up to his values. This is not accompanied by a strong, compelling and encompassing vision and concomitant initiatives. Indeed, it is hard to see how lack of reflection can go together with a strong vision. Thus, it is difficult to see how a claim can be refuted by the available evidence that Simon frequently seems to act as a subcontractor of policies and ideas conceived elsewhere, whether inside or outside of his school. Such a position, resembling that of an ‘unthinking link [...] in a chain leading from those who developed policy to those who received it’ (Day & Harris, 2015, p. 4), is conducive to a lack of agreement in what Simon’s authentic values are (cf. 6.4.2). In sum, the lack of reflection on the structure versus agency dichotomy seems to interfere with the expression of values and the possibilities followers have of discerning values authentic to Simon from lived-out values and actions originating elsewhere.
6.4.6 Considerations on the conceptual model

Two issues discussed above necessitate a review of the conceptual model which was developed in chapter 2.3 by drawing from the literature (figure 4). Firstly, the perceptions of a leader’s conceptual thinking and vision by his followers mediate how they perceive his values (6.4.3). The model, however, assumes that values are directly inferred from actions. Hypothesising a direct link between actions and values conceals a number of presuppositions or conditions, that may not always be met. These include the assumption of a recognisable, well-developed and coherent value-system that covers the whole range of job-related issues. It also includes the assumption that actions match words and vice versa consistently over time in the particular part of a leader’s job that followers come to know of. If these assumptions are violated, almost inevitably a somewhat fragmented and shallow view of a leader’s values will be perceived. This in turn may lead to confusion about, and by consequence disagreement on, the real values of a leader. Therefore, the model should either be refined, or come with a proviso.

Secondly, as only a minority of Simon’s values were traceable to explicit commitment to the Reformed Christian faith, ‘worldview’ seems to be too coarse a label to be used in the conceptual framework (chapter 2.3) without further qualification, i.e. in the box with influencing factors (see also section 6.4.4). Instead of interpreting it as a monolithic concept, it seems to make more sense to allow for a composite with gradations in its influence and its expression in particular values. A continuum ranging between a unique, exclusive, and direct relation between certain values and a worldview on the one hand, and an incorporation of alien and contradictory values in a worldview on the other hand seems to be possible. As this issue needs to be informed by the first case study as well, it is taken up in chapter 7.

In sum, from the point of view of this case study, refining the diagram on the immediacy of the relation between values and actions, and on worldview as one of factors which influence values, seems warranted.
6.5 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the data that emerged from the second case study. This case was selected, primarily because there appeared to be a noticeable difference between the head’s perceptions and his teachers’ perceptions (cf. chapter 4). Seven points summarise the findings.

1. Simon mentions a large number of values, which are not all recognised by his team leaders and teachers. Simon’s professional values coincide with personal values (6.2.2).

2. Some 20 to 30% of the Simon’s values, as mentioned by all respondents, is directly traceable to distinctive Christian notions. The other values, which are well within the widely accepted professional domain, can have Christian underpinnings, but they are not recognised by the head as such. A ‘Christian leading’ seems to be a more adequate description than ‘Christian leadership’ (6.4.4).

3. Most of Simon’s values were perceived to be other-regarding, corresponding with his wish as a Christian to be of service, while a few were self-regarding.

4. The existing structures and the internal and external context of the school largely seem to be taken for granted by all respondents. They are not a matter of much reflection for Simon, nor does he weigh them up against his values; potentially leading to a subcontractor position (6.4.5).

5. Several considerations account for the lack of unanimity (6.4.2) on a number of Simon’s values. Followers’ perceptions of the scope of Simon’s vision and his conceptual thinking, sometimes critically evaluated, emerged to interfere with perceptions of Simon’s values (6.4.3). Value attributions from actions to perceived values therefore do not seem to be straightforward, but can be mediated by other factors including vision and conceptual power. This implies that the analytic model that was derived from the literature (chapter 2) needs to be refined. Another implication is that in studies on value
perceptions, perceptions of other factors should somehow be taken into account.

6. The relation between someone’s overarching worldview and his values can be seen as a continuum, ranging from a unique influence of the worldview on the value(s), to values which are contrary to the overarching worldview.

7. Methodologically, for reasons of triangulation and complementarity, and to enable a critical treatment of the data, it appears to be imperative to include perspectives of several groups of respondents. If only the head had been interviewed, for example, there had been no means of assessing whether initial doubts on conceptual thinking were warranted. The pupils in this school, however, being one such group of respondents, do not know their head well enough to come up with more than very general information. Apparently Simon’s visibility for pupils, as a head, is limited.
Chapter seven. Discussion

7.1 Introduction

The immediate purpose of conducting this mixed-methods study is to contribute to knowledge about headteachers’ values in five Dutch Reformed secondary schools in a comparative perspective of the leaders and the led (chapter 1.3). It takes into account the head’s sociocultural context (chapter 2.1.6 and 2.2.7). The study itself is guided by two research questions (chapter 3.2). Chapter 4 presented the findings from the analysis of the official school documents on the school’s core values and their mission, as well as the exploratory interviews with experts. It also presented the findings of the corresponding questionnaire surveys issued to heads and staff. Chapters 5 and 6 contained the case studies of the heads James and Simon respectively. These chapters all offered partial answers to the research questions, and tentative explanations of the results as well as emerging overarching themes.

The aim of this chapter is to extend this and provide an integrative approach. In order to structure the discussion, key themes which emerged have been identified. The first key theme, discussed in section 7.2 with its subsections, is the degree of agreement between head and teachers on the issues the research questions address. This degree varies between hardly any agreement to almost complete unanimity. The findings from chapter 4, 5 and 6 on leadership and on values respectively are first put together in order to sketch the bigger picture. Then five explanatory factors which possibly account for this difference in degree of agreement are identified and illustrated from the interview data. Section 7.3 is dedicated to a second key theme with a view to the research questions, viz. the relation between faith and values. In section 7.4 two other themes are briefly discussed, which also shed some light on heads’ values. These themes are the influence the wider context of a school has on the lived values of the heads in this study, and the confusing concept of values itself. Finally, the findings of this study in the sections 7.2 to 7.4 culminate in section 7.5 in a review
of the conceptual model (see chapter 2.3) which itself was derived from the review of the literature in chapter 2.

7.2 Key theme one: Differences in perceptions.

7.2.1 The bigger picture: leadership

The questionnaire findings on leadership strongly suggest that both the heads and the teachers of the selected Dutch Reformed secondary schools entertain mainstream operationalisations of the concept. The elements mentioned by both groups consist of 10 categories, which are in broad agreement with established ideas on leadership and management in the literature (e.g. Bush, Bell & Middlewood, 2010; Hoy & Miskel, 2013). These include working from within a vision, inspire staff, be interested in people, creating the right conditions within schools for teaching and learning, treating teachers as individuals with different competences, demonstrating entrepreneurship in doing new things, and promoting continual professional development of teachers.

The case studies of James and Simon added some depth to this. To James leadership is about setting a course and committing staff to it. Various elements play a role, including progress, vision, shared goals, garnering the opinions of the teachers and having the right people on the right place. By interacting with staff and listening to their views they will start to share the goals. Both team leaders and staff seem to concur, and moreover, to be happy with their head, as both groups say that ‘this is the best head they know’. Simon reports that he has grown in his leadership over the years, in that he works from a certain vision, selects a small number of key issues to focus on, is happy to delegate matters to his team leaders, while retaining a high visibility with staff. This is not in all respects recognised by team leaders and staff, who tend to be critical with regard to vision. This has further ramifications for their perceptions of what Simon’s focus on key issues really amounts to. His proclaimed visibility tends to be seen in terms of demonstrating interest in the well-being of staff. Therefore, the
agreement between heads and teachers on leadership which emerges from the questionnaire findings does not represent the full picture.

7.2.2 The bigger picture: values

The questionnaire scores on the items which measured whether heads’ values are visible, perceived to be connected to his Christian beliefs, and whether they fit well within the core values of his school are generally high, approaching 4 on a five point Likert scale. There are no statistically significant differences between heads and teachers on the scores on values, behaviour, the extent to which values are visible and to which they are made explicit, and whether heads stay true to their values in difficult circumstances. Heads’ values and religious beliefs are more often visible than explicitly referred to. Heads also refer more often to Christian beliefs than to values. While there is agreement on these issues, there is a statistically significant difference on the perceptions of whether heads live out the 10 school core values on a daily basis. Heads’ perceptions are significantly higher here than their teachers’ perceptions are.

Here again, the case studies of James and Simon added some depth to this. Both James and Simon think their personal values coincide with their professional values. However, major differences between James and Simon concerning values emerge as well. In James’ case, he mentions a relatively small number of values, which are to a very large extent recognised by team leaders and staff. These include the areas of goal-setting, interrelationships, integrity, learning, respecting individuality, freedom and resilience. Respondents are almost unanimous in their perceptions. In Simon’s case this is different. He mentions 23 values as being important and lived out, many of which are not mentioned by team leaders and staff.

7.2.3 Explanatory factors

It appears that both on leadership and on values the broad picture is that the questionnaire findings of all heads and all followers demonstrated a relatively high extent of agreement. In James’ case too, there is a high
degree of agreement on these issues between him and his followers, to the point of unanimity, while in Simon’s case perceptions vary significantly. Apparently, the questionnaire findings veil underlying profound differences.

There can be differences and similarities between the two heads, between the teachers and team leaders of James versus those of Simon, and between the respective heads and their staff. Explaining the variety in the findings excludes using commonalities or similarities, whether between the heads, between the staff members and between the respective heads and their staff.

Between the two heads the similarities are considerable, and include: their age, number of years of experience, their highly comparable career paths, key characteristics of their school (in terms of number of staff, pupils, complexity of decisions, and the amount of government influence). Both heads are committed Christians and profess a Reformed Christian faith. They also both have a subject background as a teacher albeit not the same subject. They both experienced a difficult period. They do not strike me as very different in terms of intellect per se. They are both well-informed about school matters. The self-reported religious atmosphere in the families they grew up in is roughly similar and both experienced a degree of freedom and stimulation in their upbringing. None of these factors therefore can be one of the causes of the differences in perceptions the followers have of their respective heads.

The similarities between respondents from James’ staff versus Simon’s also seem to be great and cover important elements. These include that there does not seem to be a difference in expectations between James’ and Simon’s staff of what it means to be head. Similarities also include the apparent composition of the focus groups (cf chapters 3, 5 and 6); their outlook on school life, faith, general political preferences. A difference in standpoint between head and followers, and by consequence a difference in perspective, may also lead to disagreement. However, this holds for James as well as for Simon, and it can therefore not account for the difference between them. There also is no a priori reason why there should be a difference between the two heads in this respect, as their schools are
similar in the relevant aspects (cf. chapter 3.5.3 and 4.4). Neither does the
degree to which staff buy into the vision and values of their head seem to
be different. If these do not appeal to them, they might be inclined to be
more critical and discern cracks in the extent their head manages to lead a
professionally integrated life. Again, the interview data did not suggest any
issue here. Simon’s team leaders and staff were not dissatisfied with the
vision or initiatives as such, or the general course of the school, though
some, obviously, did not think highly of the conceptual depth as displayed
by their head. In sum, neither the sampling procedure, nor my insider
knowledge, nor the interview data provided any clues to suggest
fundamental dissimilarities between the team leaders and teachers in either
case study, which could potentially account for the differences found when
comparing the perceptions of James and Simon with their respective team
leaders and teachers.

Having excluded then the commonalities and similarities briefly discussed
above, the difference in degree of agreement between James and his staff
versus Simon and his staff, calls for an integrative and coherent set of
explanatory notions which can account for both agreements and
disagreements between perceptions, beyond the tentative explanations that
were offered in the previous chapters; 4, 5 and 6. A small number of key
factors contribute to generate insight in the extent of agreement between
the perceptions of headteachers and followers in terms of the differences
between James and Simon. These include focus, extent of integration, the
content of the values, vision and conceptual clarity, and heads’ own
development. This is visualised in figure 5. The factors themselves and the
perception of a head’s values are interrelated and possibly interdependent.
For the sake of clarity and the scope of this thesis only the influence the
factors have on followers’ perceptions of their head’s values in leading the
school is considered.
7.2.4 Focus

James demonstrates a clear focus on a relatively small number of values and a small number of school development projects, which he initiates, endorses and implements. He mentions 10 values, all of which are recognised by his team and teachers, whereas Simon mentions 23. While it is not known how many values a person can reasonably espouse and live out, Rokeach assumes that a person normally ‘possesses a relatively small number of values’ (1973, p.3). Ten values seems to be a much more manageable number to keep in mind when weighing up alternatives and making decisions than 23. A smaller number of lived values tends to make it easier for others to recognise these, other things being equal.

Additionally, there seems to be a qualitative difference in the degree of certainty both heads exude when talking about their values. They both use ‘perhaps’ a number of times when talking about their values, which is understandable given the difficulty people may have in finding words for what they think (Branson, 2007a, p. 226; Erickson, 1986, p. 123; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998, p.360; cf. section 2.1.7). Simon for instance, says: ‘Perhaps this is also a key word (…)?’, ‘Perhaps a value is (…)?’, ‘Could not this also be a value (…)?’. In James’ case, however, the ‘perhaps’ does not so much indicate hesitation as a thoughtfulness in expressing himself: ‘Perhaps I cannot find the right words for this, but what I do find really important is (…)’. And: ‘When we are talking about a value, I just come to think of freedom! That is very, very important to me, to live and to function well’.

The addition of key clauses such as ‘this is really important’ indicates that it
is more a matter of finding an appropriate word for a value, than wondering whether the value as such is a real value or not. Focus, therefore, both in limitation of the number of values and the extent to which the value is of real importance to the head seems to be a first factor which bears upon followers’ perceptions of a head’s values.

7.2.5 Extent of integration

A second factor is the extent to which a head integrates the various elements which make up his public image, on which value attributions are based. The model which was derived from the literature (chapter 2.3) not only points to values, but also includes actions, worldview, aptitude, and arenas. Comparing James and Simon in this respect also suggests that the differences in the extent to which they manage to lead in a coherent, integrated and consistent way influences which values followers attribute to them.

This can be illustrated by what the heads mean with working from a vision (a value they both assert to have), which corresponding strategies they subsequently adopt, which actions they promote, and how all of these are aligned. This also ties in with the way they involve teachers in developments, which is another point both heads say they find important.

In James case these elements are interconnected, as this quote shows:

_In my case, it works like this, that I need to mull over what I want. A picture or direction. I collect that by reading, by talking, by trying to get all of it together. And to me, well, it is not necessary to be ready with that. And then my way is to go to the team and teachers to share ideas, to take them with me in where my thoughts lead me. And then, something starts growing. My way is, how to put it, I think I manage to create a kind of openness and safety so that people will come, so that one plus one makes three. From there, lines are set out further, within the school._

Clauses such as ‘trying to get all of it together’ point to a wish to be coherent and integrative. As is clear from the quote, James leads and takes
initiatives. At the same time, he says he involves his team leaders and staff at an early stage, before he himself has a well-polished idea of what it is that he wants. This is borne out by what his team leaders say:

*We organise 'vision days'. He really takes the time for the process, and yes, he’s got the framework clear, does it fit in with the course of the school? But he also gives ample room for all to take it in and to come along and to contribute.*

Staff recognise that ‘he gives ample room to be involved in the process’, and that he asks for input when new ideas for school development emerge. Some of them wonder whether he really does not have any preconceived ideas, so that floating an idea is merely tactical. They all recognise, however, that staff do get a real chance to be involved in major developments, particularly when someone is seen as an expert in the area involved. Still, James is also seen as someone who ‘when he has formulated a goal he sticks to it and clearly says that this is where we go to’. Taken together the perceived consistency and coherence are conducive to the large extent of agreement between team leaders and staff on James’ value of vision and involving people.

The extent of integration between vision, strategies adopted, actions taken, and involvement of teachers is different for Simon. Although the research did not focus on the extent of integration between these elements, the available evidence does not indicate alignment. Taken separately, followers do not all think Simon has or communicates a strong vision for his school. There is hardly any evidence in the interviews of consciously adopted strategies to realise the vision. Teachers are invited to come with ideas and suggestions themselves, but apparently they are only involved in new initiatives from the top in a later stage. Disagreement on the exact values of the head seems to be a natural consequence of the apparent lack of alignment.

7.2.6 The content of the values

A third factor which plays a role in the question whether agreement in perceptions of a head’s values occurs is the content or character of the
values themselves. This factor was already briefly discussed in chapter 5 and 6, but is taken up here in a broader perspective. A clear example is visibility. If a leader does not live out this value, followers hardly have the opportunity to know him. Any attribution of values can only arise from rare chance encounters and indirect information. It is therefore prone to reflect a one-sided or distorted view on someone’s values, without the possibility of correcting initial perceptions by having regular meetings with the head. In the cases of James and Simon the content of their values partly overlaps but it is also partly different as can be seen in table 25.

Table 25. A comparison of the values James and Simon mentioned. In bold the values they have in common.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Simon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
While there are a few values the two heads apparently have in common, there are at least three issues to consider. First, even the same terms can harbour different materialisations. As will be discussed below this seems to be the case for both ‘vision’ and ‘development’ (7.2.7).

Second, James’ values of congruence and connectedness are not mentioned in any form by Simon. To James ‘it is very important that something is congruent, that it adds up. What I say here I should also say there’. ‘There is no shielding layer between who I am and what impression others have’. Congruence therefore refers to the alignment of and consistency between (conglomerates of) ideas, actions and words. Connectedness means that ‘the other person has and feels the room to speak his mind, founded on who he is, without an immediate value judgment. And that I experience the same room’. It is not purely a matter of relationships, but ‘certainly it also contains content, definitely’. Congruence and connectedness together tie in with the extent of integration, discussed above (7.2.5). While Simon possibly will not disagree with this, to James it is an important value he explicitly refers to.

A third point about the differences in the values themselves is that a number of the values Simon mentions can be subsumed under some of

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15. **Trust**  
16. Buffering staff from distractions  
17. Being of service  
18. Caring for pupils from a Christian world view  
19. Teaching pupils how to become a Christian citizen in this society  
20. Trusting God instead of applying extreme risk management  
21. Conviviality  
22. Attributing success to others, failure to oneself  
23. Distinguishing between behaviour and the person himself |

While there are a few values the two heads apparently have in common, there are at least three issues to consider. First, even the same terms can harbour different materialisations. As will be discussed below this seems to be the case for both ‘vision’ and ‘development’ (7.2.7).
James’ values, for instance the values about the relations with staff. This suggests James has more of a helicopter view and may tend to think in higher order concepts (see also 7.2.7). This leads to more coherence, and by consequence to more recognition of particular values by more people, which becomes visible in the near (or at least a much higher degree of) unanimity. Thinking in higher order concepts also has a bearing on vision and conceptual clarity; the topic of the next section.

7.2.7 Vision and conceptual clarity

One striking difference between James and Simon concerns their vision and perceived conceptual strength. As discussed extensively in chapter 6.4.3, in Simon’s case, the perception of weak conceptual thinking and a concomitant vision by some of his followers mediates the perceptions they have of his values and actions. As one teacher says that ‘there was not a deeply-thought-through vision behind all this. Some staff quickly realised the emptiness of it’. In James’ case no such issue emerged. His followers agreed to a large extent that his vision is clear, and the issue of conceptual thinking or the lack of it was not raised at all. According to Begley (1994, in Bush & Glover, 2003, p. 7; the original internet source no longer being available) vision may operate on four levels; from basic to intermediate to advanced to expert, varying in degree of involvement of staff. Vision is ‘widely regarded as one hallmark of successful school leadership’ (Bush & Glover, 2003, p. 7), though the evidence is mixed. It seems to be the case that Simon operates on a lower level of involvement (intermediate) than James (advanced or expert).

The two heads do not seem to be different in terms of intellect per se. Their initial school career does not suggest that James had higher cognitive abilities than Simon. If anything, it is the other way round (giving details here would jeopardise the anonymity). Therefore, if there is a difference in the extent to which the heads demonstrate a capacity for clear conceptual thinking and developing a vision, and if it appears not to be directly related to initial school careers, the question is whether there are any other factors which account for this difference.
A factor which needs to be considered first is whether Simon’s followers possibly are more critical than James’s followers. In other words, can it be the case that Simon is evaluated more rigorously than James? While this possibility cannot be fully excluded, the evidence does not suggest that this is the case, as was my own impression. The composition of the two groups of followers did not seem to be different on a school-wide or nation-wide level, although it might be the case that in Simon’s case the percentage of teachers having a master’s degree (instead of bachelor’s) may be slightly higher than in James’ case. On the micro level of the focus groups, this potential effect does not seem to play a role, even more so because of the sampling procedure (that is, within the requirements provided, see chapter 3.5.4). Furthermore, the participants in the focus groups of both James and Simon did not strike me as being different in the level of criticality they demonstrated towards all kinds of aspects of school life.

If, therefore, there is no factor which suggests any bias in the characteristics of the two groups of followers which might have led to differences in perceptions between these two groups, and there neither seems to be an initial difference in cognitive abilities between the heads, it follows that another factor (or factors) plays a role. The evidence suggests that there is indeed such a factor: there is a difference between James and Simon in the further development over the course of their careers. As this has broader impact than only on vision and conceptual strength it is discussed separately in the next section.

7.2.8 Development

With regard to professional development the importance of differences in growth rate are often underestimated (Kotter, 2012, p. 189). Growth indicates better performance in one’s job, irrespective of how that can be measured. The speed with which this happens can vary from person to person. A difference in growth rate of a symbolic 1% per annum versus 6% for instance, amounts to roughly 300% difference in ‘performance quality’ in twenty years’ time, because of the compounded effect. James and Simon
are different in this respect, although they both have invested time and energy in their own development.

James’ professional development, as discussed at length in section 5.1.3, can be characterised as broad, deep, extended and integrated. It comprises completing several complete studies, intensive coaching trajectories, reflection in and on action, alone and together with others, and integrating learning with working. He says

‘To develop is, on the one hand acquiring new insights, new knowledge. I think that’s important. To enlarge your own world and be knowledgeable about things that happen. On the other hand, to develop also means to reflect, on myself, on others in relation to myself’.

His followers recognise this, as they say: ‘When you’ve seen his whole development and how he fulfils his job I admire that. It took much energy, also to work on himself. Investing in himself, very much so. Enormous grit, perseverance.’

Simon says that ‘at a certain moment’ he ‘really started investing in: “Who am I as a leader?”’ (cf. chapter 6.2.1). Even so, his professional development, apart from maturing in the job, consists of visiting or organising short one-off sessions, meetings or masterclasses. He says he ‘considered doing a real in-depth course in school leadership, but I get zillions of invitations for [one day or one half of a day] seminars, which I can benefit from’. Some of his followers think that if he ‘takes up a full-fledged study, instead of or on top of attending short courses and conferences as he does now, he will be able to grow’. Others ‘sometimes [...] wonder what he adds to e.g. real educational level. I do not know either whether he studied [at a university]’ (which he actually did as initial training). They underline the desirability of a part-time study; i.e. a master’s degree in leadership or management. As such, this aligns well with evidence in the literature, which clearly suggests that short courses, lasting one or two days or even afternoons, generally fail to produce measurable effects (Department of Education and Training, 2005, p. 4; Darling-Hammond, 2009, pp. 5, 6, 9; Van Veen et al., 2010, p. 25).
The differences between James and Simon in their professional development over the course of their career contribute to the perceived differences in values. This can be illustrated with two values: vision and involving staff. James, when talking about his own formal professional development, primarily refers to long-term studies. He ‘did that study and it helped me to gain a real insight in matters’. He also ‘did a master’s, which formed me in thinking and writing’. Both testify to James’ resilience; one of his values. He recognises that because of his development his convictions and actions changed: ‘Leadership is not about keeping people satisfied, but about setting a course and committing staff to this course’ (see chapter 6.1.1). As mentioned above, this is recognised by the followers.

For Simon no such link can be found in the interview data. Because the heads were similar at the start of their career (see above), this suggests that not development per se makes a difference, as they both worked on professional growth. What does seem to make a difference on the level of values and the extent of integration and recognisability is whether this ongoing development can be characterised as broad, deep (i.e. high level), extended and integrated. Professional development therefore is not so much a mediating variable which directly influences the perception of a heads values, as a moderating variable for at least some of the mediating variables as discussed above.

7.2.9 Additional factors which can be excluded
The explanatory notions as discussed above do not incorporate all of the tentative explanations which were offered in chapters 4, 5 and 6. Therefore, the question to what extent the empirical evidence justifies the exclusion of some other factors needs to be answered as well. Two issues warrant further discussion.

Reader Response Theory (RRT) is the first of these. In chapter 5 (James’ case study), the core concept borrowed from RRT is the interpretive community. When there is broad agreement within a community RRT does to some extent offer a theoretical explanation, in that interpretations come
about in social interaction within a community. It therefore also accounts for a lesser degree of agreement when the interaction between individuals is less intensive; when there is a difference in relational closeness and frequency of interaction. If there are too few opportunities to interact (as an individual with the head, or as a community of followers), shared interpretations can hardly come about. Additionally, one-sided or wrong perceptions can hardly be adjusted. No indications were found in the data that James’s followers were different from Simon’s followers in this respect. Moreover, even with the high degree of agreement evident in James’ case, RRT does not offer any form of guarantee that individuals come to interpret a phenomenon in the same way. Sharing interpretations of a phenomenon, in this case a head’s actions which lead to the value attributions by staff, might tend to lead to convergence. However, staff may still stick to their own interpretation of their head’s actions, even whilst acknowledging the interpretations of others. At any rate, in the case of lack of agreement, as in Simon’s case, RRT on its own seems to be unable to account for the data.

In sum, although a high degree of agreement may be promoted by frequent interaction in (micro)communities, that is not necessarily the case; while a lack of agreement cannot be fully accounted for by using this element of RRT either. In other words, the presence of (micro)communities may, but does not necessarily, function as a generator of interpretations. It is therefore more like a condition sine qua non: a necessary (or at least desirable) but not sufficient condition.

A second potential explanatory factor which apparently can be excluded deals with the implicit understanding and appreciation of concepts or constructs used. There may be different formulations of the same underlying construct (such as rigid versus steadfast) and a concomitant difference whether this value is appreciated. Apart from the fact that this might have happened in James’ case as well as Simon’s, this has been accounted for in chapter 6 for those rare instances where it seemed to be the case. Additionally, it does not so much indicate disagreement on the value itself, as on the question whether the value somehow appeals to staff.
7.3 Key theme two: Faith and values

7.3.1 The bigger picture

In the relatively homogeneous set of Reformed schools which formed the backdrop of this study a clear relation between faith and values would not have been unexpected. However, there appears to be a considerable variety on this issue. Therefore, the relation between heads’ values and their Christian faith is a second key theme. Admittedly, this variety is related to the lack of agreement on heads’ values, which was discussed in section 7.2. However, the separate position these schools have within Dutch society, the reason why they were founded (i.e. the ongoing secularisation with its ramifications; see chapter 1.4.4), and the wider importance of the question how worldview impinges on values in leadership and on education (see chapter 2.1.5), warrant further elaboration in the current section.

The questionnaire findings display that heads and teachers only very rarely spontaneously mention Christian elements when they describe leadership. This is in accordance with the fact that they entertain mainstream opinions on what constitutes school leadership (section 7.2.1). In open questions on values, approximately 25% of the answers given by both groups contain explicitly Christian elements. Heads score significantly higher than their teachers on whether they pay attention to the two explicitly Christian aims (out of four) formulated in their school mission statements.

The two case studies add considerable depth to these findings. Both heads are recognised by their team and staff as real Christian people, i.e. not just nominally or sociologically Christian. The values mentioned by either James or Simon are well within the widely accepted professional domain. James, however, relates all his values to his Christian faith and sees them as ‘based on the Word of God’. That is why he deals ‘with people in a particular way, that you trust them, integrity, closeness. Confrontation sometimes’. For trust and integrity many heads and staff in the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools would be able to provide a link with Biblical insights. James is able to go the extra mile, as he adds that ‘congruence too has much to do with our identity’. He links congruence with honesty. God is
honest and there is no discrepancy between what God says and does. As it is our calling to imitate or mirror what God is like, ‘the image of God’, congruence as a value is seen to be directly connected with his faith in God. The same holds for vision and purposefulness: ‘Vision too: what’s our aim? Purposefulness is also really connected with our identity; we’ve been given an assignment’. Clearly, he is able to formulate a direct link between the relatively small number of values he mentions and the content of his faith and belief in God. James also ‘wholeheartedly agrees with’ the school’s official values. Both team leaders and teachers also see him as fully committed to these school values, which are partly couched in Christian terms.

For Simon, on the other hand, this is different. Some 20 to 30% of the Simon’s values, as mentioned by all respondents, is directly traceable to Christian notions. The other values can have Christian underpinnings, but they are not recognised as such by Simon. Most of Simon’s values are other-regarding, corresponding with his wish as a Christian to be of service, while a few are self-regarding. This is in accordance with accepted interpretations of the Reformed faith and doctrine. Simon does not mention the often invoked theological notion of common grace, even when prompted in the interviews.

7.3.2 The relation between worldview and values

As in the first key theme that emerged (section 7.2), here again differences are visible between the findings from the questionnaire, the case study of James and the case study of Simon. In the chapters dedicated to each of these some tentative explanations were offered for the findings of that particular part of the study. These will be taken up here and integrated to account for the findings of the entire study. Four elements were mentioned: the relation between worldview and values, the notion of common grace, the extent of integration, and the conceptual depth behind the words. Together they seem to explain the variety found within the empirical data.
The relation between worldview and values is not necessarily monodimensional, as seems to be the case in some literature discussed in chapter 2, where worldview and religion are seen as one of the sources of values (chapter 2.1.5; Begley, 2003; Fry, 2003; Klaassen, 2009; Van der Kooij et al., 2013). As mentioned in chapter 6.4.6, instead of interpreting worldview as a monolithic concept, it seems to make more sense to allow for a composite with gradations in its influence and its expression in particular values. Starting from the assumption that worldview implies some consistency and coherence, a continuum ranging between a unique, exclusive, and direct relation between certain values and a worldview on the one hand, and an incorporation of alien and contradictory values in a worldview on the other hand seems to make sense. Four potential relationships between worldview and values can be distinguished:

1. Values which are unique to that worldview. Two examples from this study are honouring God and loving your neighbour as being His creation and made in His image. Both James and Simon refer to values within this domain. It also makes their worldview Christian, at least partly, in that these values originate from their faith in the Bible.

2. Values can also belong to a worldview while they are not unique to that particular worldview. I label this as values which are distinct to that worldview (cf. Cooling, 2010, see also chapter 2.1.5). The value clearly belongs to that worldview, but the label of the value as such is also common to other worldviews. However, the motivation or underpinning is different as to why the value is important and how it is embedded in the worldview. Justice, for instance, is a value that may be upheld both within a Christian worldview and a humanist one. In the former it is linked to attributes of God, as a supremely just and righteous Being, which is obviously not the case in the latter one. Within the domain of visible conduct it may well lead to similar behaviour in a number of instances.

3. If a particular value is neither unique for nor distinct to a certain worldview (in the sense as used above), while still being upheld, it
seems that it is added to a person’s worldview while originating from somewhere else. By implication this ‘somewhere’ is another worldview, and values may well find their way to an individual via the other sources; i.e. his upbringing or the prevailing culture he lives in. This is not just an academic possibility. Humility, for instance, is not of Aristotelian descent. Even so, it could be added to a set of values originating from Aristotle’s work while not being contradictory to the basic tenets of the worldview into which it is incorporated.

4. A fourth position is that a value may come to be lived out, or even espoused, within a certain worldview from another worldview, while it is fundamentally alien to it and in contradiction with some of its constituent elements. An example from education may be the de facto reduction of pupils to their IQ by some teachers and leaders, whilst emphasising the unique value of each human being, irrespective of intellectual prowess. Another example is the current value of detailed forms of accountability, whilst underlining the desirability or even necessity of ample room for professionals to shape their way of teaching in accordance with accepted practice within the teaching profession. It seems self-evident that this fourth position can provoke all kinds of implicit tensions and cracks. All the same, it is a common position, certainly from a post-modern perspective, where this kind of ‘bricolage’ (which is metaphorically taking stones from whatever origin to build an idiosyncratic outlook on life) not only occurs, but is presupposed. From a coherentist position, which I adhere to, this is contradictory and unsatisfactory.

James and Simon are in different positions on this fourfold scale. James was able to give a direct link between each of his values and Biblical beliefs. Therefore, his position is either number one, for those values which are unique to his Christian worldview, or number two, for the remainder, which are distinctly Christian. Simon did not relay an explicit link with his Christian faith for some 70-80% of his values, even when asked. He did not consciously reflect on whether these values were integral to his beliefs or whether they originated elsewhere. That makes his position on the continuum for these values either the second, third or fourth. The fourth is
not applicable as all these values can be considered not to be alien to the Christian faith. How Simon acquired these values may be influenced by his Christian upbringing, making them belong to number two; the distinctly Christian values. Their origin might also be the culture he grew up in, making it number two or three again. As he did not consciously reflect on these 70-80% of his values, he at least runs the risk of adopting values that are at odds with basic beliefs.

Worldviews are different in how they account for the outward similarity in values that is inherent in the second position, or the seamless adoption of values originating elsewhere in the third. Within the reformed Christian faith, the doctrinal notion of common grace is often invoked (see chapter 2.1.5) to account for the fact that non-Christians seem to espouse the same values as Christians. However, neither Simon nor James refers to common grace. In James’ case this is logical. He does not have to give an account of how others may apparently espouse the same values as he himself thinks important, as he is able to connect all his values to his Christian beliefs (which amounts to position two). As for Simon, referring to common grace for those of his values which he did not link with his Christian beliefs would have been an accepted way of defending his position. That he did not do this points to the other factors which account for the difference between the two headteachers, section 7.3.3.

7.3.3 Other explanatory factors

The difference between James and Simon with regard to the relation between values and faith is not fully accounted for by different positions on the relation between worldview and values. Two related additional explanatory factors which have already been covered above (7.2.5 and 7.2.7) are relevant here as well. The first of these is the consistent and recognisable extent of integration of values, beliefs, and actions. For James, this integration is not confined to alignment of values, vision and actions, but it also includes the integration of basic doctrinal beliefs (i.e. Reformed views on what the Bible teaches) with his values-in-use and his espoused
values. His values are in other words founded on his faith and its doctrinal content. This way of integrating faith and values is not the case for Simon. The second additional explanatory factor is the conscious reflection on the origin, the content and the scope of one’s values, and the extent of conceptual processing. Both heads felt challenged by the interview questions, as Simon says that ‘in this conversation I continually have to think really really hard’. James is not different, as he says ‘Just let me think. [Pause] I never think about these questions so thoroughly’. In Simon’s case this is followed by intimating that conversations help him to make up his mind. James continues to focus on the content of the question I posed and comes up with a few remarks which have a bearing on the topic of the question. Therefore, while their initial position may apparently be similar, the interview data suggest that eventually James is better able to focus and to connect concepts, and thus demonstrates more of a helicopter view. This factor is obviously related to the extent of integration.

7.4 Other themes: The influence of the context and the concept of values

7.4.1 Theme three: The influence of the wider context.

James and Simon concur on the influence of the school context on their room for manoeuvre, particularly the policy of the executive board. James does ‘not feel any impediment from the framework of broader school policy’ (see also chapter 5.2.5). Simon too, experiences ample room and says that ‘a few times a year I have an official conversation with the executive board’, but he ‘hardly ever hear[s] something new’.

James and Simon differ on their perceptions about the influence of the external national context. James is critical of the government and its policy because ‘It’s erratic! I really hate that’, and so he has ‘felt disappointed in the government at times’. This taught him to ‘consider beforehand whether a particular government policy fits in with what we want’. To Simon, external influences are hardly a point of reflection, contrary to prevailing voices in the debate in the Netherlands (e.g. Biesta, 2012; Refdag, 2013,
There is no evidence that he weighs these external influences up against his values. This could easily lead to a subcontractor position (Day & Harris, 2015, p. 4; see also 6.4.5), although there is no evidence for this in the data. It does, however, corroborate the point made above (section 7.2.7) on vision and conceptual clarity.

7.4.2 Theme four: The concept of values

The literature review (chapter 2) discussed a long-lasting and broad confusion in scholarly circles on the concept of values. Eventually, an encompassing definition was adopted, formulated by Halstead and Pike (chapter 2.1.3). One of the key reasons was to retain a link between academic usage of the term and the everyday usage. The current section evaluates whether the empirical evidence warrants that choice.

The questionnaires (chapter 4) reveal that heads see values as ‘conviction’, ‘basic principles and notions’, ‘a compass’, ‘a source of your leadership’, ‘the core of education. The answers of teachers overlap to a large extent with words as ‘principles’, ‘what you find important or essential’, ‘foundational tenets’, ‘basic attitude’, ‘which direct your behaviour’, ‘what is worth striving for’, ‘ideals’, ‘rules’. Both heads’ and teachers’ conceptions of ‘values’ appear to be in broad agreement with definition adopted. During the case studies (chapter 5 and 6) the interview data were checked in order to ascertain whether what was presented as values falls within the scope of the definition. This turned out to be the case. Apparently, the usage of the Dutch equivalent of values (‘waarden’) is congruent with and reflects the breadth of the definition chosen.

This does, however, evoke the issue of the relevance of the discussion in scholarly circles on the elusive concept of values (see chapter 2.1.1). Some elements do not appear in the data, for instance what Hodgkinson calls type III, the subrational type of values which indicate mere personal preferences (1991). Ideals, standards, principles and convictions are words which indicate more accurately what respondents have in mind when talking about values. This suggests that, when examining values of at least people which
are similar to the respondents of this study, a broad and encompassing definition is adequate. If the aim is to focus more specifically on one of the constituent elements subsumed under ‘values’, it is probably more helpful to use more appropriate, i.e. narrower, terminology.

7.5 An evaluation of the conceptual framework.

In chapter 2.3 a conceptual framework on a leader’s values and actions was derived from the available literature (figure 4 in that chapter). It recognises worldview or faith, upbringing and parental family, and the wider culture as three sources of values which school leaders espouse. A head’s actions are influenced by his values, the arenas he operates in, and other factors including aptitude, knowledge, and personality traits. A direct link was assumed between values and actions. From the point of view of the head, generally speaking his actions are likely to reflect his values. From the perspective of the followers, value attributions are made on the basis of the visible behaviour of their head. The conceptual framework facilitated both the design of the empirical part of the study, as the coding and analysis of the data. The aim of the current section is to evaluate the adequacy of the conceptual framework itself with a view to the combined findings of the separate stages within this study and the analysis offered in this chapter thus far. It appears that the framework needs refining in three major respects.

First, the relation between the conceptual framework as a whole and the wider context in which it functions needs to be addressed explicitly. Concentrating only on the framework itself obscures a number of presuppositions, or conditions in other words, which should be met in order to make it valid. These include the assumption of a recognisable, well-developed and coherent value system that covers the whole range of job-related issues. It also includes the assumption that someone’s actions match words and vice versa consistently over time. This should at least be the case of the particular part of a leader’s job that followers come to know of. If these assumptions are violated, almost inevitably a somewhat fragmented and shallow view of a leader’s values will result. This in turn
may lead to confusion about, and by consequence disagreement on, the real values of a leader.

The current study shows that these necessary conditions are not automatically all met. The design has taken into account that heads should have had their position for at least two years and that followers should have known their head also for at least two years. The design of the study has also taken into account that the followers who participated in focus groups represent various walks of school life. However, the first two assumptions could not be taken into account beforehand: a recognisable, well-developed and coherent value-system that covers the whole range of job-related issues, and the assumption that someone’s actions match his words and vice versa consistently over time. These have to be assumed; and Simon’s case shows that this is not automatically warranted. Therefore, as holds for every model, this framework too should come with a proviso.

Second, concerning the framework itself, the relation between a head’s actions (i.e. his visible behaviour) and the values that followers attribute to him is not straightforward. The model, however, assumes that values are directly inferred from actions. The framework also implicitly assumes that all followers will attribute the same values when they experience their head’s actions in their daily professional lives. The data in this study suggest that the situation was more complicated. As section 8.4 demonstrates, four mediating variables can influence the perception followers have. The first is whether a head has a clear focus so that the number of his values is not too large. The second factor is the extent to which a head is able to integrate his worldview, values, and actions. The third is the exact content of his values, as some values are more prone to be recognised than others. The fourth factor takes into account whether a head exhibits a clear, coherent and conceptually convincing vision for his school. These factors in their turn are all moderated by the quality of a head’s professional development over the course of his career. Therefore, the model should incorporate these factors as mediating or moderating variables. It is no longer possible (if it ever was) to assume a direct relationship between actions and the values attributed on the basis of these actions. This also implies that in studies on value perceptions, perceptions
of at least the four factors mentioned above should somehow be taken into account.

The framework needs refining in a third respect which is the relation between worldview or faith and values. As discussed in section 8.3.2 ‘worldview’ seems to be too coarse a label to be used for the worldview-values continuum. If worldview is taken in its sense of a coherent set of beliefs about reality which cannot be entirely derived from other beliefs or empirical evidence (i.e. a faith), four different positions seem possible on how someone’s values relate to his faith or worldview. These range from unique, to distinct, to add-on, to alien to someone’s worldview (see 8.3.2). Though worldview still stands as one of the sources of someone’s values (alongside upbringing and culture), it should be qualified in accordance with this continuum. This means that the sources of someone’s values are much more an array of interrelated contributing factors than monodirectional and clearly identifiable entities.

In sum, essentially the conceptual framework, as derived from the literature (chapter 2.3.) seems to be a helpful model to explore values and actions. However, it needs to be qualified and adjusted. This yields a more complicated but also more accurate model, as shown in figure 6.
Figure 6. The adjusted model of the conceptual framework. Adjusted elements in bold and italics; explanation in the text
7.6 Summary

In this chapter all the findings are taken together and analysed. This can be summarised in the following points:

1. The bigger picture on leadership is that the respondents (heads and staff) agree and entertain mainstream ideas.

2. With regard to values there are differences between the heads, and also on the degree of agreement between him and his staff and amongst his staff. These perceptions seem to be mediated by the amount of focus (in breadth and depth) a head is able to convey, the extent of integration of what he says and does, the content of the espoused values, and the depth of his vision and conceptual clarity he exhibits. These four factors seem to be moderated themselves by differences in ongoing professional and personal development. Therefore, the conceptual framework, as derived from notions in the literature, has to be adjusted and refined.

3. While both heads are recognised to be real Christian people by their team and staff, one of them relates all his values to the Bible, while for the other headteacher only about one quarter of his values is directly traceable to Christian notions. This leads to some reflections on the relation between worldview, faith and values, for which four positions are distinguished, starting from the assumption that worldview implies some consistency and coherence.

4. Finally, the data on how the notion of values is used by respondents vindicates the broad definition that was adopted, while simultaneously casting aspersions on the practical relevance of the ongoing discussion on definition issues in scholarly circles.
Chapter eight. Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

This study explores the values of heads of Dutch Reformed secondary schools in leading their schools, as they perceive themselves and are perceived by their staff and pupils. In this final chapter the two research questions are answered first (section 8.2). As these answers are to some extent empirical rather than explanatory and theoretical, and confined to the group of heads and schools involved, section 8.3 is dedicated to the further contributions this study provides to theory and section 8.4 to methodology. The extensive discussion in chapter 7 of the topics covered by sections 8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 is not repeated. Section 8.5 outlines some additional limitations of the study, primarily covered already in chapter 3. In section 8.6, a number of recommendations are indicated, both for the heads and schools involved, and for future research. A brief recapitulation of the rationale for this study (chapter 1.2), the gaps in knowledge as identified in chapter 2.4, the research questions (chapter 3.2) and the research design (chapter 3) provides the backdrop for the conclusions, the contributions, the limitations, and the recommendations, set out below. Finally, 8.7 sums up the original contributions.

The rationale for this study comprises four elements. The first is the gulf, or chasm at times, between the perceptions teachers have and school management of educational issues concerning their own schools. Are heads’ espoused values also the recognised values-in-action? Research has been scant on this issue, also in the Netherlands. Can the often neglected perspective of the followers in research be taken into account, and they be given a voice? The second element is my personal view that the extent of integration between Christian faith, values, practical choices made within schools, leadership, and lessons should be high and can benefit from more insight in the mutual and interdependent relationships, reflection and subsequent actions. Does the Christian faith indeed have a significant influence on the leadership of the heads within the Dutch Reformed
secondary schools? A third element is that the schools involved want to grow in a mind-set in which different kinds of research come into play within their schools, which help improve their education and fulfil their missions. A fourth element is the international thread. Apart from the fact that much research and theory on leadership emanates from the USA (cf. chapter 2), both the schools and I are Dutch, and the study was carried out at an English university. This seemed to be a potent brew in that hidden assumptions and things that otherwise would have been taken for granted, including cultural aspects, had a better chance of coming to light.

The research was guided by two research questions. The two questions correspond, as both address the perceptions that exist of the values of heads (i.e. school leaders) of Dutch Reformed secondary school. ‘Heads’ denote the positional leaders in the layer between the executive board and the team leaders of these comprehensive schools. Together they provide a comparative perspective:

1. What perceptions do heads of Dutch Reformed secondary schools have of their own values in leading their schools and do they relate these to their Reformed Christian faith?
2. What are the perceptions team leaders, teachers and pupils have of their head’s values and actions, and the relation with his Reformed Christian faith?

The first question investigates heads’ own perceptions, whereas the second one examines the perceptions followers have of their heads’ values. As the population consists of Reformed Christian heads the research questions also study whether a link exists between heads’ faith and heads’ values.

A mixed-methods multistage backward design was used, in which earlier stages were designed to facilitate later stages. The first stage comprised document analysis of schools’ core values, and exploratory interviews with insider experts. In the second a survey was carried out using two corresponding questionnaires, for heads and followers respectively. The questionnaires contained both closed and open questions. They were designed to fulfil the dual aims of collecting data, and facilitating selection
of heads for doing case studies. The heads were selected with a view to substantial variation, primarily in the sense that differences in perception between them and their staff were either small (case study one) or big (case study two). During the case studies three interviews were conducted with the head, interspersed with focus group interviews of separate groups of followers: team leaders, teachers, and pupils.

8.2 Empirical contributions

The empirical findings with regard to the two research questions can be summarised in the following points. First, the heads and the teachers of the seven Dutch Reformed secondary schools entertain mainstream ideas on the concept of leadership. The elements mentioned by both groups consist of 10 categories, which are in broad agreement with established ideas on leadership and management in the literature (e.g. Bush, Bell & Middlewood, 2010; Hoy & Miskel, 2013). These include working from within a vision, inspire staff, be interested in people, creating the right conditions within schools for teaching and learning, treating teachers as individuals with different competences, demonstrating entrepreneurship in doing new things, and promoting continual professional development of teachers.

Second, with regard to heads’ values, the questionnaires reveal that the values seen as most visible can be subdivided in two groups. The first group comprises not uniquely Christian values, including commitment, honesty, integrity, safety, service, high quality, presence, responsibility, friendliness, and trustworthiness. The second group consists of explicitly Christian values. These include respecting people for who they are as Christians, desiring to live from the Bible, being dependent on God, relation with God, love your neighbours, the Christian mission of their school, living Coram Deo (‘before God’s countenance’). None of these contradicts the first group values. Most of these values regard other people.

There are no statistically significant differences between heads and teachers on the scores on values, behaviour, the extent to which values are visible
and to which they are made explicit, and whether heads stay true to their values in difficult circumstances. Heads’ values and religious beliefs are more often visible than explicitly referred to. Heads also refer more often to Christian beliefs than to values. The teachers recognise that their heads often live out the official school values care, respect, trust, service, responsibility, transparency, dedication, passion, courage, cooperation. The heads’ perception is slightly higher (4.18 versus 3.87 on a 5 point Likert scale), which is statistically significant.

The overall picture which emerges from the questionnaires conceals underlying differences between the heads. In the two cases that have been studied the first head mentions a relatively small number of values, 10, which are to a very large extent recognised by team leaders and staff. These include the areas of goal-setting, interrelationships, integrity, learning, respecting individuality, freedom and resilience. The other head mentions 23 values as being important and lived out, many of which are not mentioned by team leaders and staff.

Third, from the point of view of a relation between heads’ values and their professed Reformed Christian faith the picture is mixed. The questionnaire findings display that heads and teachers only very rarely spontaneously mention Christian elements when they describe leadership. This is accordance with the fact that they entertain mainstream opinions on what constitutes school leadership. In open questions on values, approximately 25% of the answers given by both groups contain explicitly Christian elements.

The schools’ mission statements contain four aims; two of which are explicitly Christian. There is a discrepancy between the perceptions of the heads as a group versus the teachers’ perceptions on the amount of time heads spend with or for his teachers in realising either of the four aims. When forced to choose (table 15, chapter 4), heads score three to four times higher on the two explicitly Christian aims than their teachers perceive them to do, namely helping pupils to learn to know God and preparing pupils to participate in society as Christians. Teachers think heads primarily spend their time on assisting teachers to achieve the two other
aims, namely teaching lessons of good quality and preparing pupils for exams or tests.

The two case studies add considerable depth to these findings. Both heads are recognised by their team and staff as real Christian people, i.e. not just nominally or sociologically Christian. The values mentioned by either James or Simon are well within the widely accepted professional domain. James, however, relates all of his values to his Christian faith and sees them as 'based on the Word of God'. He is able to formulate a direct link between the relatively small number of values he mentions and the content of his faith and belief in God. This is different for Simon. Some 20 to 30% of the Simon’s values, as mentioned by all respondents, is directly traceable to Christian notions. Most of his values are other-regarding, corresponding with his wish as a Christian to be of service, while a few are self-regarding. All his values can have Christian underpinnings, but this is not recognised as such by Simon, even when prompted.

Both leaders see no discrepancy between their personal values and their professional ones, nor even a distinction. Neither do their staff. The heads agree with their schools’ official values, even though they use other words.

Another minor but interesting conclusion is that the pupils in general did not know the heads well enough to attribute anything else to them than general stereotypes common to leadership positions. Even so, both the heads and their teachers are confident enough to assert that they have a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in their school in terms of opinions, needs, concerns and life-style (table 10). One of the underlying reasons to focus on heads within the schools was that they may be known to pupils, whereas board members with overall responsibility will not be known. For the heads of the schools within this study it can be concluded that they are relatively remote from pupils.

8.3 Analytical and theoretical contributions
This study also advances the body of knowledge on leadership and values on a more theoretical, analytic and holistic level. A first key contribution is an integrated conceptual framework of values and actions. This framework was first derived from a critical engagement with the literature on values, and adapted after interpreting the data (chapter 7.5). As the conceptual framework comprises many elements and internal relationships, it has been visualised in figure 7 (identical to figure 6 in chapter 7).

Figure 7. The final conceptual framework visualised.
The framework identifies and visualises sources of someone’s values in terms of worldview, culture and upbringing. These sources go beyond the person himself. The framework also recognises the distinction between values and actions, the former being a construct and the latter being directly accessible or visible to others. Actions are interpreted here as materialisations of someone’s values. These actions are not only influenced by values, but also by two other factors which are incorporated in the conceptual framework. The first of these two factors is the specific context or arena a person operates in; ‘arena’ evoking the struggle which may be there to live up to one’s values in circumstances that may not be conducive to this. The second of these two factors identifies intrapersonal factors including aptitude, personality traits, and knowledge. A key relationship in the framework is that between a person’s values and his actions. From the point of view of the person himself, actions are assumed to be materialisations of his values, though moulded by the arenas they are happening in. From the perspective of others, in this study the followers, i.e. team leaders and staff, attributions of values are made on the basis of their head’s visible actions.

The empirical part of the study does not question the broader structure of the conceptual framework. In that sense, the data are consistent with it and do not falsify it, to put it cautiously. However, the findings did necessitate a fine-tuning of the model in three respects, as discussed in chapter 7.5. The first is explicit addition of key assumptions, i.e. consistency and coherence of a person’s value orientation. The second adaptation is the identification of four mediating variables and one moderating variable on the perceptions followers have of their leaders’ values. The mediating variables include a focussed set of values; the extent of integration of worldview, values and actions; the content of the values; and the extent to which a head’s vision is clear, coherent and convincing. The quality of a head’s development is a moderating variable which appears to influence the four mediating variables. The revised conceptual framework (figure 7) is a good starting point for future research on values and actions of school leaders, the perceptions of leaders and followers, or even broader, a person versus others who know him.
Another key point concerns the importance of the quality of a head’s professional development. This proved to moderate the mediating factors that account for differences in perceptions the followers have of their heads’ values, and the extent of agreement amongst them. It is the quality of the development which counts here, in terms of depth and breadth, length, and integration; rather than the number of years of experience, and professional development on their own (chapter 7.2.8). Depth and breadth include the necessary analytical level when someone reads for a master’s degree, and also whether the professionalisation activities undertaken are challenging in that they lead to deep personal reflection. The duration of a study or coaching trajectory is a factor as well, which aligns with literature findings on effects of professional development (chapter 7.2.8). Integration, finally, refers to the extent to which a head’s professional development increases his ability to connect his actions (such as decision making, selling a vision as well as co-developing it with his team) with his faith and values. Although this point cannot be generalised statistically, it highlights once more the far-reaching importance and influence professional development can have.

A further key notion concerns terminology. Chapter 2 reviewed discussions on the definition of concept of ‘values’, and attempts to distinguish it from related constructs, whether they be broader, narrower, superordinate or subordinate, each bearing a fuzzy set of connotations. In the context of this study the term values (‘waarden’ in Dutch) as used by the participants in the study appears to carry the broad and encompassing meaning of the definition offered by Halstead and Pike (2006, p. 4; chapter 2.1.3). This implies that fine-grained discussions on how to define the concept of values have only limited implications for practical research.

From another angle terminology inevitably plays a role when schools formulate their set of core values. This study makes clear that the exact choice of terminology of school values is of limited influence and importance. A first indication for this is the fact that it was possible to collapse the seven different sets of core values into one set, which was recognised as valid by all participants involved. A second indication is that
the heads used their own words to indicate their values and did not use the terminology of their respective schools. Even so, both they and their followers explicitly stated that heads’ values were in agreement with the school values, which they indeed seemed to be when considering the set of core values of their schools as a whole. This indicates that the cluster as a whole, the wider semantic field which is evoked by the terms used when taken together, and what that means to individuals, is more important than the exact separate words used to indicate single values.

8.4 Methodological contributions

The mixed-methods research design was carefully crafted to attain several objectives at the same time (chapter 3). Complementarity of stages and instruments, triangulation, facilitation in developing research instruments, and facilitating sampling were key design criteria. This section highlights four contributions of the design to the realm of research methodology. The first one draws on the fact that the backward design indeed delivered what it was designed for, i.e. identifying interesting cases within a seemingly rather homogeneous group of schools and heads. (See, however, chapter 3.5.3 which alludes to the problematic and partially mythical character of the concept of homogeneity). Even though I, as an insider, knew these roughly 20 heads fairly well before I started doing this study, convenience sampling or hand-picking two heads which in my opinion are different, would not have led to the current selection of heads (James and Simon). Neither would it have been as justifiable a sample as it is now. The selection of these cases was facilitated by the data from the two corresponding questionnaires. In its turn, the exploratory interviews with insider experts helped to broaden my understanding of the theme of this study, the respondents involved, and facilitated designing the questionnaires. I conclude that emic perspectives can be enriched, crucially so, by harvesting the insights of others in the stages of sampling and of exploring the issues at stake.
The second conclusion is that the descriptive statistics on the closed questions in the questionnaires tended to obscure real differences within the group of respondents. Matching heads with their teachers by fine-tuning the analysis of the questionnaires revealed these differences and enabled selection of cases with a view to substantial variation. The subsequent case studies have demonstrated that the variety as suggested by the questionnaire findings does in fact exist. The dedicated questionnaires which were developed proved to be a useful tool to facilitate selecting cases, on top of the overall picture they generated.

The two corresponding questionnaires that have been developed are a third methodological contribution. They can be used for further research within the Dutch context in schools of other denominations and non-denominational schools. As the questionnaire is available in English as well (appendices D and E), it can also be used in English speaking countries for all types of (secondary) schools, if a future researcher deems it to be valid for the circumstances. If he does not, then the process of development, including the previous phases of document analysis, interviewing experts and piloting other versions, has to be followed again. The questionnaires could also be translated into other languages, provided it stays culturally equivalent, rather than an ‘exact’ translation. The same caution applies to the interpretation of data gathered in other cultures because of potential subtle or conspicuous cultural differences (see chapter 3.6.3).

A fourth contribution to the field is the concept of substantial variation, as a variant of maximum variation in purposive sampling. Maximum variation generally connotes larger groups than the one involved here. It also seems to suggest the widest possible difference between the cases. This evokes the question of which dimensions should be involved in identifying these differences and how to weigh up the different dimensions against each other. Using substantial variation as a denominator bypasses these problems and is therefore a better alternative. It was suggested to me when discussing the transfer document with internal examiners at the University of Leeds.
A final methodological point is that in this study triangulation, by including perspectives of different groups of respondents was crucial. Especially in the case of disagreement between the head and his followers it is impossible just to rely on the self-report of the head and what he wants to and is able to disclose. If only the head had been interviewed, there had been no means of assessing whether initial doubts on conceptual thinking were warranted.

8.5 Limitations

Chapter 3.8.4 already identified and discussed several threats to the validity of the study, namely the difficulties which arise from the necessity to translate the questionnaires and some of the data, my own involvement and values as an insider, and the question to what extent respondents’ utterances will reflect their real views. Furthermore, establishing reliability in terms of repeating measurements over time is not possible with the cross-sectional design used. Neither are findings statistically generalisable, both because of the limited number of participants and the intended purposive sampling because of the atypical kind of schools involved. Beyond what has already been discussed in 3.8.4, now that the study has been carried out four additional remarks need to be made.

First, the key thrust of the design involved exploring two substantially varying cases, considered to be extreme cases with a view to the biggest versus smallest gap in perceptions on leader’s values. A tacit assumption might then be that investigating the other heads would have led to positions that come somewhere in between. Though there are no indications to the contrary and the findings on the closed items in the questionnaires might be construed as supportive, this has not been tested.

Second, coming back to the issue of an emic versus an etic perspective (section 8.4), this study is a specimen of insider research. Chapter 3.8.3 outlines in detail how potential threats to the trustworthiness have been countered. While a supposedly detached, ‘objective’, outsider, who just
darts in and cannot know the wider features and long-term developments relevant to the case, brings its own problems, combining the two may prove fruitful.

The third remark here is about the relationships between culture, faith and values. As this study did not primarily focus on the sources of heads’ values, the intricate relationships have only been touched upon. Both heads, and their followers, hardly recognised cultural influences on their values; as they only pointed towards their faith and their parental family. They certainly did not demonstrate any conscious prior reflection on this issue. The intricate issue of the interrelation between a certain faith, with its content and rituals for instance, and the surrounding pervasive culture, with the heterogeneous make-up it consists of, has not been fully explored.

Finally, with regard to generalisability, in cases studies in general as well as in this thesis statistical inferences and claims only have very limited potential. My reason to conduct the case studies was not to generate blanket generalisations. It was to explore distinctive details, and to develop notions and claims on a conceptual level by building on the data. I claim that these have broader validity than just within the two cases. Generalisability of empirical findings, however, is left to the reader, who can assess to what extent similarities exist between his area of interest and the study done here (cf. chapter 3.8.4 and Seidman, 2013; Yin, 2014). These four issues are not to be seen as limitations only. They also open up new avenues, the topic of the next section.

8.6 Recommendations

The recommendations offered in this section are based on reviewing the rationale for the study and the gaps in knowledge which were identified (chapters 1.2 and 2.4 respectively), taken together with the contributions to the empirical knowledge base, to theory and to methodology, and the limitations, mentioned in this chapter so far. The section starts with some
practical suggestions for the heads and the schools involved and ends with recommendations for further research.

8.6.1 Schools and school leaders

Five suggestions are offered for consideration by the schools and heads involved in this study, primarily in the form of questions to reflect on. Opportunities then need to be provided to engage in critical dialogue within the school as well as with fellow principals.

First, the mission statements of the schools suggest the schools have set themselves four aims, of which two are explicitly Christian. The questionnaires strongly suggest a difference in perception between heads and teachers as to which of these aims they spend most of their time, attention and energy. Given the reason the schools were founded, this deserves broader attention and discussion, as senior management, together with staff, and with parents. It is possible to cast a wider net and involve churches, pupils, external stakeholders and the wider community. Schools could identify and discuss a cluster of questions here, including whether such a clear-cut distinction between the four aims can or should be made in practice, whether equal attention needs to be paid to all of these, consider what that means in practice, and act upon the outcome of such a discussion.

The second suggestion is to increase the extent to which staff can experience coherence and consistency in the leadership of schools. This study suggested clear differences between heads in the extent to which they integrate their values, vision for the school, strategies adopted, actions taken and involvement of teachers. Assuming that a large extent of integration is indeed desirable, how can heads and schools promote this?

Third, each of the schools adopted its own set of core values. This study demonstrated that people within the schools find their own words to indicate a head’s values, without any spontaneous reference to the official set. This may lead to further reflection on what you want as a school community with your particular set of core values. To what extent does the
terminology used express distinctive features not available in other terms or semantic fields, and what does that look like in practice? To what extent are these values a mere invention? What is the desired and actual position of your set of values in a room defined by dimensions as invention, adoption, implantation (possibly from elsewhere), and a description of life as actually lived in this particular school? Are there any elements in the definition used in this study that on reflection you find particularly important to the leadership of the school?

Fourth, this study highlighted perceptions of the followers in the school; the team leaders and teachers. It also found that their views can shed light on aspects of the school leadership. Moreover, that these views do not always align with honest opinions heads have on how they function as a professional. When (not) and on what topics can followers’ perceptions and opinions be harnessed and put to good use, especially with a view to how heads function? To what extent is the current situation satisfactory, and to whom?

Finally, one of the things schools often take pride in is continuing professional development, CPD. This comes in different shapes and forms and the study suggested that there are considerable differences in this respect between heads. While there may be good and understandable reasons for that, the findings suggest that investing in professional development which is broad, deep, extended and integrated (chapter 7.2.8) pays off. It should be cognitively challenging, open up new perspectives and lead to deep self-reflection, on one’s values, actions, attitudes. To what extent does this reflect development trajectories on the shop floor? Can teachers’ perceptions be used to engage in a critical dialogue on this issue?

8.6.2 Further research

Future research could branch out in several rather disparate directions, which may however be combined and offer new perspectives. I recommend three, each linked to a research principle: empirical, philosophical and theological, and methodological.
The first direction is further empirical research along the same lines as this study. The principle involved is replication of the research method, which eventually may lead to justifiable analytic generalisation. The population investigated in this study represents a small and non-representative sample of Dutch secondary schools, which leaves a wide field to explore further. An interesting option is to include Dutch secondary school heads of other denominations, or no denomination at all. As values (and related concepts) are regularly referred to in Dutch debates on schools, research on similar questions as used to guide this study would probably be welcome, fill a void and enlighten the debate on schools and their missions. Moreover, this would enrich the current knowledge on leadership in Dutch schools.

Research tends to focus on school effectiveness. While this is important, it is not the only possible vantage point and not in all respects unproblematic. The knowledge base tends to be fragmented and incomplete from the point of view of the influence of a head’s worldview and his ethical considerations. More insight in the relationships between worldview, values and actions of heads, both in their own perception as in that of their staff, can also be helpful in improving the leadership within schools. In sum, this kind of research would yield an overview of the Dutch situation with regard to values in school leadership.

A second possibility with regard to empirical research is to broaden the scope even further and include to other countries, languages and cultures; i.e. doing international comparative studies. This again could be done in several ways. If Christian school heads were selected from other countries, this would shed more light on the role of the Christian faith as well as on cultural differences. As the questionnaires are available in English a good starting point is available, bearing in mind the caveat that even in English-speaking cultures there may be unforeseen differences (cf. (Oppenheim, 1992, p. 48; Hantrais, 2009, p. 76 et pass.; Hofstede & Bond, 1984, p. 421, cf section 3.6.3).

The second recommendation is to broaden the methodology as used in this study. The research principle involved here is methodological triangulation. As mentioned above (sections 8.4 and 8.5) and in chapter 3, insider research definitely has its merits. Detached outsiders parachuted into cases
may well miss key components and undercurrents as they lack the long exposure to what constitutes the case, embedded in its natural and organic habitat. Even so, it might be rewarding to conduct future studies by cooperating pairs of both an insider and outsider, thus bringing both emic and etic perspectives to the cases. In that case, attention should be paid, amongst others, to the ‘power relationships among researchers’ (Kerstetter, 2012, p. 103). In the end, if the emic-etic dichotomy were dissected somewhat more, ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ probably would be more like artificial or ideal-typical extremes on either end of a more realistic perspectival continuum, than really existing possibilities.

The third and final recommendation concerns philosophical and theological aspects. The related research principle is that of theoretical triangulation, especially when different philosophical or theological underpinnings are brought to bear on the collection and interpretation of concepts and data. There is a cluster of issues here that could benefit from further study, both conceptual and empirical. A first intricate issue is how worldview, values, religion and culture relate and how that impinges on the field of educational leadership. This will partially depend on definitions which are adopted for each of these constructs (e.g. Van der Kooij, 2013, on worldview; and Hofstede, 1980, and many others on culture), Also, whether worldviews are inevitably ultimately religious (Clouser, 1999, 2005). Three sources of values were identified in the conceptual framework, on the basis of the extant literature: religion and worldview, culture, and upbringing. It might be possible to disentangle their relative influence and how they interrelate. In this study, as well as in others (e.g. T. van den Belt & Moret, 2010a, 2010b; H. van den Belt, 2015) the doctrinal point of ‘common grace’ emerged as one explanatory notion bearing on heads’ value orientations. Common grace, and the doctrinal notion of ‘the image of God’, believed to be borne by humans to some extent, are invoked to account for perceived commonalities or similarities in action patterns and value orientations with people who adhere to other religions and non-Christian worldviews. From a (Dutch) Reformed position, further reflection and clarification seems to be expedient. That might also help heads to determine or understand where they stand, promote coherence and consistency (also in the perception of
their staff), and give words and concepts to better discuss their axiological position.

### 8.7 Original contributions

This study examined the values headteachers of five Dutch Reformed secondary schools espouse and live out, and the relation with their professed Christian faith, in a comparative perspective of heads’ perceptions and the perceptions their team leaders, teachers and pupils have. The final section of this thesis briefly sums up the original contributions, discussed above, starting with the empirical contributions.

Both headteachers and their staff, i.e. team leaders and teachers, entertain mainstream ideas on the concept of leadership. The questionnaires reveal that there are two groups of values which are seen as most visible. The first group comprises not uniquely Christian values, while approximately 25% of the answers given by heads and staff on open questions on values in the questionnaires contain explicitly uniquely Christian elements. The questionnaire data suggest that heads as a group and teachers as a group agree to a large extent, except on the school’s mission, where heads score three to four times higher on advancing the two explicitly Christian aims than their teachers perceive them to do.

Case studies of two heads brought to light that, while they are similar in some respects, including the lack of a distinction between their professional and personal values, there are also significant differences. The degree to which staff agree with their heads on his values varies from near unanimity to partial outspoken disagreement. Furthermore, the two heads differ significantly in the extent to which they formulate a direct link between their values and their faith. The values they mentioned are well within the widely accepted professional domain.

Secondly, the study also contributed to theory generation. An integrated conceptual framework of perceptions of a head’s values and actions,
sources and contexts or arenas was derived from a critical engagement with the extant literature on values. Analysis of the data suggested that there are four mediating variables on the perceptions so-called followers have of their leaders’ values. These include whether the headteacher is perceived to exhibit a focussed set of values; the extent of integration of his worldview, values and actions; the content of his values; and the extent to which a head’s vision is clear, coherent and convincing in the perceptions of his team leaders and teachers. The quality of a head’s ongoing professional development proved to moderate the mediating factors that account for differences in perceptions the followers have of their heads’ values, and the extent of agreement amongst them. It is the quality of the development which counts here, in terms of depth and breadth, length, and integration; rather than the number of years of experience, and professional development on their own. The integrated conceptual framework developed from the literature was refined afterwards to include these newly-found variables.

A further theoretical contribution concerns terminology. The breadth in the adopted definition of values is also reflected in the term values (‘waarden’ in Dutch) as it was used by the participants in this study. This implies that fine-grained discussions on how to define the concept of values may have only limited implications for practical research. Terminology also inevitably plays a role when schools formulate their set of core values. For the schools in this study the exact choice of terminology of school values is of limited influence and importance. The wider semantic field which is evoked by the terms when used collectively, and what that means to individuals, appeared to be more important than the exact terms used to indicate single values.

Thirdly, the study also yields some methodological contributions. The three-stage backward design that was adopted delivered what it was designed for. Starting with an open and exploratory stage this design can be used to identify interesting cases within a seemingly rather homogeneous group of schools and heads. As such, it can be used in similar circumstances. The two corresponding questionnaires that have been developed are another methodological contribution. Matching heads with their teachers by fine-tuning the analysis of the questionnaires enabled selection of cases with a view to the apparently novel concept of substantial variation; a
variant of maximum variation in purposive sampling. The questionnaire surveys can be used for further research within the Dutch context in schools of other denominations and non-denominational schools. This can also be the case in an English-speaking context, or, provided they are translated in a (sub)culturally equivalent way, more internationally. If a future researcher deems them not to be valid for the circumstances then the process of development can be followed again.

In sum, this study contributed to the empirical knowledge and theoretical insights in the espoused and lived values of heads in selected Dutch Reformed secondary schools, as well as to methodological points. As such it serves the first purpose, formulated in the purpose statement: to contribute to knowledge about the leadership values of heads in Dutch Reformed secondary schools in a sociocultural perspective. It also promotes the second and third purpose: to inform the leadership of these heads with regard to their values, so that heads’ espoused values coincide with their lived values in the perceptions of heads and teachers alike; and to promote leadership in these schools in which both heads’ espoused and lived values align well with their worldview and their Reformed Christian faith.
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Appendix A: Diagram of the Dutch Education System

Diagram of the Dutch Education System

- **Postgraduate**
  - **MA / MSc / LLM degree**
    - 1-2-3 years (60-180 credits)
  - **Master's degree**
    - 1-2 years (50-120 credits)

- **Undergraduate**
  - **BA / BSc / LLB degree**
    - 3 years (180 credits)
  - **Bachelor's degree**
    - 4 years (240 credits)
  - **University Preparatory Education (VWO)**
    - 6 years
  - **Senior General Secondary Education (HAVO)**
    - 5 years
  - **Senior Secondary Vocational Education and Training (MBO)**
    - 1-4 years
  - **Preparatory Vocational Secondary Education (VMBO) (I-III)**
    - 4 years

- **Primary**
  - **Primary Education**
    - 8 years

Downloaded on 141205, from http://www-db.in.tum.de/teaching/ws1112/hsufg/Utrecht/requirements.htm
Appendix B: Questions for the exploratory interviews

**English version**

List of questions for the three exploratory interviews with experts.

By ‘school leader’ I refer to the level of location leaders or sector leaders of the 7 Dutch Reformed secondary schools. This is the level between the executive board and the team leaders.

1. What do you mean by the term ‘values’?

2. Which values do you see in the daily practice of these school leaders? Do these 7 schools or school leaders differ much in this respect?

3. To what extent do you see a connection between their leadership values and the religious values of the schools? Do these 7 schools or school leaders differ much in this respect?

4. To what extent do you feel school leaders (of the level referred to above) are visible to their teachers? Do these 7 schools or school leaders differ much in this respect?

5. To what extent do you feel school leaders (of the level referred to above) are visible to their pupils? Do these 7 schools or school leaders differ much in this respect?

6. I have analysed and summarised the core values of the 7 Dutch Reformed secondary schools. These are the proclaimed core values as published on their websites. I found two clusters of three (sets of) values:
   
   **Commitment to**
   
   2. *Society as a whole.*
3. The formation of pupils and their qualification for the future.  

Community  
1. People aspect: care, compassion, love, respect, trust, service.  
2. Formal aspect: accountability, responsibility, transparancy, trustworthiness.  
3. Professional aspect: dedication, cooperation, passion, dynamism, courage.  

Do you feel the espoused values of the 7 Dutch Reformed secondary schools are adequately described by this summary?  
Should anything be adapted?

Dutch version

Vragenlijst voor de drie exploratieve interviews met experts.

Met ‘schoolleider’ bedoel ik de laag locatiedirecteuren of sectordirecteuren van de 7 Nederlandse scholen voor voortgezet onderwijs. Dit is de laag in de organisatie die tussen het college van bestuur en teamleiders in zit.

1. Hoe zou u het begrip ‘waarden’ omschrijven?

2. Welke waarden ziet u leiders op de 7 scholen vormgeven in de praktijk?  
   Zit er in dit opzicht veel verschil tussen de scholen of leidinggevenden?

3. In welke mate neemt u een verbinding waar tussen de leiderschapswaarden en de religieuze waarden van de school?  
   Zit er in dit opzicht veel verschil tussen de scholen of leidinggevenden?

4. In hoeverre denkt u dat schoolleiders (uit de bovengenoemde laag in de organisatie) in de dagelijkse praktijk zichtbaar zijn bij hun leerkrachten?
Zit er in dit opzicht veel verschil tussen de scholen of leidinggevenden?

5. In hoeverre denkt u dat schoolleiders (uit de bovengenoemde laag in de organisatie) in de dagelijkse praktijk zichtbaar zijn bij hun leerlingen?
   Zit er in dit opzicht veel verschil tussen de scholen of leidinggevenden?

6. Ik heb de kernwaarden van de 7 Nederlandse scholen voor voortgezet onderwijs geanalyseerd en samengevat. Dit zijn de beelden kernwaarden zoals ze gepubliceerd zijn op hun websites. Ik heb twee clusters gevonden van elk 3 (sets van) waarden.

   **Betrokkenheid op**
   1. God, christelijke identiteit, het worden van een christen
   2. op maatschappij als geheel
   3. Vorming, kwalificering

   **Gemeenschap**
   2. Formeel: verantwoordelijkheid, transparantie, betrouwbaarheid

Denkt u dat de beelden kernwaarden van de 7 Nederlandse scholen voor voortgezet onderwijs hiermee adequaat beschreven zijn? Zou er nog iets gewijzigd moeten worden?
Appendix C: Questionnaire items in relation to research questions

Table A: The connection between some aspects of the first research question, and items in the questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Research questions concerning principals</th>
<th>Research questions concerning teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Please mention 5 to 10 words which come to mind when you think of leading schools.</td>
<td>Mention 5-10 words which come to mind when you think of leading schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What do you mean when you use the term ‘values’?</td>
<td>What do you mean when you use the term ‘values’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Please give a brief example.</td>
<td>Please give a brief example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The core values of the school overlap with my leadership values.</td>
<td>The core values of the school overlap with the values concerning leadership of my school leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Please rank the following statements from most true for you (1) to least true for you (5): When I spend time with or for my teachers, my focus is to assist them in 1. helping pupils to learn to know God</td>
<td>Please rank the following statements from most true for your school leader (1) to least true for your school leader (5): When my school leader spends time with or for his teachers, his focus is to assist them in 1. helping pupils to learn to know God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As ‘values’ is a rather vague construct to the general public, it may be interpreted by different people in different ways. It is important to assess the level of difference in interpretation in order to be able to interpret the findings on subsequent questions.
2. teaching lessons of technically good quality
3. preparing pupils to participate in society as Christians
4. preparing pupils for exams or tests
5. doing other things than mentioned above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>What ‘other things’ would you think of?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What ‘other things’ (question 12e) would you think of?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 12 and 13 are derived from the integrative version of the core values of the seven schools (3.4.2).
In the exploratory interviews it was suggested that number 2 and 4 are in reality much more predominant than 1 or 3. In official statements nr 1 and 3 are nr 1 and 2. To avoid automatically awarding points the order in the questionnaire was jumbled.

14 ‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals.
My values are visible in how I lead the school.

14 ‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals.
My school leader’s values are visible in how he leads the school.

The pilot study suggested that at this point in the questionnaire some guidance on what the study understood by ‘values’ would have been helpful. Therefore a very brief definition was given, which captures the main points of the definition adopted for this study (see chapter 2.1.3)

15 Which of your value(s) is (are) most visible?

15 Which of his value(s) is (are) most visible?

16 I explicitly refer to values when I make a decision.

16 He explicitly refers to values when he makes a decision.
Table B. The connection between some aspects of both research questions and items in the questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Research questions concerning principals</th>
<th>Research questions concerning teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>What values do principals perceive to guide them in the daily execution of their role as school leader?</em></td>
<td><em>What do 'the led' perceive as the guiding values of their principals?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My teachers will recognise the following values in the daily execution of my job: 1. care, 2. respect, 3. trust, 4. service, 5. responsibility, 6. transparency, 7. dedication, 8. passion, 9. courage, 10. cooperation</td>
<td>I recognise the following values in my school leader’s daily execution of his job: 1. care, 2. respect, 3. trust, 4. service, 5. responsibility, 6. transparency, 7. dedication, 8. passion, 9. courage, 10. cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This list comes from the integrative version of the core values of the seven schools (see 3.4.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Even in difficult circumstances I manage to stay true to the values I find important.</td>
<td>Even in difficult circumstances my manager tries to stay true to the values he says to find important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Could you give an example where you managed to stay true to the values you find important?</td>
<td>Could you give an example where he managed to stay true to the values he says to find important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Is there an example where staying true to the values you find important was difficult?</td>
<td>Could you mention an example where it was difficult to stay true to the values he says to find important?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions 18-20: The literature review highlighted (a.o.) the influence of the context on the enactment of values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>For how many pupils are you responsible in your department? I have a good working relation with my school leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I have a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in my department (think of e.g. opinions, needs, concerns, lifestyle of pupils). My school leader has a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in his department (think of e.g. opinions, needs, concerns, lifestyle of pupils).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>For how many teachers are you responsible in your department? How often do you speak with your school leader? (More than just ‘saying hello’, but not necessarily long.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am content with the depth of my knowledge of the opinions of my teachers on school matters. My school leader knows the opinion of his teachers on school matters well enough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 21-24 indicate depth of involvement within school (as part of lived views on leadership) Check whether pupils can justifiably be asked for their views later on.

Table C. The connection between the aspects of faith, leadership and values (as included in the research questions) with items in the questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Research questions concerning principals</th>
<th>Research questions concerning teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do principals report a relation between leadership practices and their Calvinist beliefs?</td>
<td>To what extent do ‘the led’ report a relation between leadership practices and the Calvinist beliefs of their leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I see a relation between my visible behaviour as a leader and my personal religious beliefs</td>
<td>I see a relation between his visible behaviour as a leader and his personal religious beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refer to my Christian beliefs in my leadership.</td>
<td>My school leader refers to his Christian beliefs in his leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>There is a relation between questions 11, 14, 16, 25 and 26: from general to specific and from values to Christian beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: English and Dutch texts of the questionnaire for school leaders

This appendix contains the complete and exact questionnaires for school leaders, both the English version and the Dutch version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire for leaders</th>
<th>Vragenlijst voor schoolleiders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to this questionnaire!</td>
<td>Welkom bij deze vragenlijst!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questionnaire aims to ask your opinion on ‘school leadership and leadership values’. It consists of 27 questions. A number of these are optional. Some questions are open. Most are closed questions. If you do not know the answer, please tick the answer which comes closest. For ‘he’ and ‘his’, please read she and her if applicable. The pilot of this test revealed that filling in the test takes on average less than 10 minutes. Note that once you have clicked on the CONTINUE button your answers are submitted. You cannot return to change your answers.</td>
<td>Deze vragenlijst is bedoeld om uw mening te vragen over de waarden die in uw leidinggeven als locatie- of sectordirecteur naar voren komen. De lijst bestaat uit 27 vragen. Een aantal daarvan zijn keuzevragen. Bij het testen van de vragenlijst bleek dat het invullen zo’n 15 minuten in beslag nam. Dat is mede afhankelijk van de uitgebreidheid waarmee u op keuzevragen ingaat. Zodra u op de ‘CONTINUE’ (verder) knop hebt gedrukt worden uw antwoorden opgeslagen. U kunt niet terugkeren naar voorgaande vragen. Als u het antwoord niet weet, vink dan het antwoord aan dat voor uw gevoel het dichtste bij komt. Waar ‘hij’ en ‘hem’ staat kunt u ook ‘zij’ en ‘haar’ lezen indien van toepassing. Bij de laatste vraag hebt u de mogelijkheid aanvullende opmerkingen te maken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can stop and finish this questionnaire later on</td>
<td>Hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking. Dat wordt zeer gewaardeerd!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your cooperation. It is highly appreciated!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You and your profession</td>
<td>U en uw beroep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This page contains questions on your professional biography.</td>
<td>Deze bladzijde bevat vragen over uw beroepsloopbaan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 At which school do you work?</td>
<td>Op welke school werkt u?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In what year were you born?</td>
<td>Wat is uw geboortejaar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 What is your sex?</td>
<td>Male/female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 What is the total number of years of experience that you have as a school leader?</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You may have been a school leader in more than one school. This question is about the total number of years, irrespective of the number of schools you have led.</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 What is the total number of years in your current position as school leader?</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 What is the total number of years of experience you have in teaching?</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(In any school, and including any regular and frequent teaching you did as a school leader)

dat u misschien deed als directeur).

Teaching: as a teacher in primary or secondary school (or any other form of education). Also if you teach on a regular and frequent basis while you are a school leader.

NOTE Lesgeven: als docent in het basisonderwijs of voortgezet onderwijs (of een andere vorm van onderwijs). Maar ook als u regelmatig lesgeeft terwijl u directeur bent.


New page Nieuwe bladzijde

Leadership Leiderschap
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please mention 5 to 10 words which come to mind when you think of leading schools.</th>
<th>Open question</th>
<th>Wilt u 5 tot 10 woorden noemen waaraan u denkt als het gaat om het leiden van een school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five words is enough, please mention no more than ten.</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
<td>Vijf woorden is genoeg; svp niet meer dan 10 woorden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New page</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nieuwe bladzijde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values and your leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Waarden en uw leiderschap</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three pages will follow with questions on values and your leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Er volgen nu vier bladzijden met vragen over waarden en uw leiderschap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Values and your leadership (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What do you mean when you use the term ‘values’?</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Wat bedoelt u wanneer u de term ‘waarden’ gebruikt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Please give a brief example.</td>
<td>Open question</td>
<td>Geeft u alstublieft een kort voorbeeld</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11| The core values of the school overlap with my leadership values.                 | Very little  | De kernwaarden van de school overlappen met de waarden die ik heb over leidinggeven. | Nauwelijks
|   |                                                                                 | A little     |                                                                                   | Enigszins
|   |                                                                                 | Somewhat     |                                                                                   | In redelijke mate
|   |                                                                                 | A lot        |                                                                                   | Veel
<p>|   |                                                                                 | A very great |                                                                                   | Voor het overgrote deel |
| 12| Please rank the following statements from most true for you (1) to least true for you (5): | order        | Wilt u de onderstaande stellingen ordenen op volgorde van prioriteit, van hoogste prioriteit voor u (1) tot laagste (5)? Elk graag slechts 1 keer. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>When I spend time with or for my teachers, my focus is to assist them in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>helping pupils to learn to know God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>teaching lessons of good quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>preparing pupils to participate in society as Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>preparing pupils for exams or tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>doing other things than mentioned above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In de volgende vraag kunt u eventueel aangeven wat u bij e (‘andere dingen dan de hiervoor genoemde’) in gedachten hebt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanneer ik tijd besteed met of voor mijn docenten, dan ben ik er op gericht om hen te helpen om: (vul aan met a-e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. leerlingen beter te helpen hoe ze God kunnen leren kennen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. beter lessen te kunnen verzorgen van een goede kwaliteit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Leerlingen beter voor te bereiden om als christen te participeren in de maatschappij.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Leerlingen beter voor te bereiden op het afleggen van de examens en de toetsen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Andere dingen dan de hiervoor genoemde.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>What ‘other things’ would you think of?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aan welke ‘andere dingen’ (vraag 12e) zou u denken?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Values and leadership (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My values are visible in how I lead the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | ‘Waarden’ zijn ethische principes, overtuigingen, maatstaven en idealen.                                                    |
|   | Mijn waarden zijn zichtbaar in hoe ik de school leid.                                                                       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waarden en leiderschap (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>‘Waarden’ zijn ethische principes, overtuigingen, maatstaven en idealen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mijn waarden zijn zichtbaar in hoe ik de school leid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nooit</th>
<th>Bijna nooit</th>
<th>Soms</th>
<th>Vaak</th>
<th>Bijna altijd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Welke van uw waarde(n) is (zijn) het meest zichtbaar in uw leidinggeven?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>Which of your value(s) is (are) most visible?</td>
<td>Please mention no more than five.</td>
<td>Graag maximaal vijf noemen. Zet een '0' als u de vraag niet kunt beantwoorden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values and your leadership (3)</td>
<td>Waarden en uw leiderschap (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>I explicitly refer to values when I make a decision.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Ik verwijs expliciet naar waarden als ik een beslissing neem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Someti mes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 7</td>
<td>My teachers will recognise the following values in the daily execution of my job:</td>
<td>Please choose one of the options.</td>
<td>Mijn docenten zullen de volgende waarden herkennen in hoe ik mijn dagelijks werk uitvoer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Someti mes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Even in difficult circumstances I manage to stay true to the values I find important.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>Someti</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Could you give an example where you managed to stay true to the values you find important?</td>
<td>Kunt u een voorbeeld geven waar u erin geslaagd bent trouw te blijven aan de waarden die u belangrijk vindt?</td>
<td>Kunt u een voorbeeld geven waar u erin geslaagd bent trouw te blijven aan de waarden die u belangrijk vindt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is there an example where staying true to the values you find important was difficult?</td>
<td>Is er een voorbeeld waar het moeilijk was om trouw te blijven aan de waarden die u belangrijk vindt?</td>
<td>Is er een voorbeeld waar het moeilijk was om trouw te blijven aan de waarden die u belangrijk vindt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New page</td>
<td>Nieuwe bladzijde</td>
<td>Nieuwe bladzijde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Your department</td>
<td>Uw afdeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For how many pupils are you responsible in your department?</td>
<td>Voor hoeveel leerlingen bent u verantwoordelijk in uw deel van de school?</td>
<td>Voor hoeveel leerlingen bent u verantwoordelijk in uw deel van de school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Just give a rounded number please. The difference between e.g. 120 and 125 is not important, but the difference between 125 and 200 is.</td>
<td>Geef alstublieft een afgerond getal. Het verschil tussen bijvoorbeeld 120 en 125 is niet belangrijk, maar het verschil tussen 125 en 200 wel.</td>
<td>Geef alstublieft een afgerond getal. Het verschil tussen bijvoorbeeld 120 en 125 is niet belangrijk, maar het verschil tussen 125 en 200 wel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I have a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in my department (think of e.g. opinions, needs, concerns, life-style of pupils)</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somew</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A very great deal</td>
<td>Voor hoeveel docenten bent u verantwoordelijk in uw deel van de school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>For how many teachers are you responsible in your department?</td>
<td>For how many teachers are you responsible in your department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is about the number of persons, irrespective of how many days a week they work. Give a round number if necessary.</td>
<td>This is about the number of persons, irrespective of how many days a week they work. Give a round number if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am content with the depth of my knowledge on the opinions of my teachers in school matters.</td>
<td>I am content with the depth of my knowledge on the opinions of my teachers in school matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>I see a relation between my visible behaviour as a leader and my personal religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>I see a relation between my visible behaviour as a leader and my personal religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Values and your worldview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ziirnlly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mee eens</td>
<td>Zeer mee eens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onzeker</td>
<td>Zeer mee oneens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mee oneens</td>
<td>Zeer mee oneens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I refer to my Christian beliefs in my leadership.</td>
<td>Never Almost never Someti mes Often Almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ik verwijs in mijn leiderschap naar mijn christelijke geloofsovertuigingen.</td>
<td>Nooit Bijna nooit Soms Vaak Bijna altijd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the final question. Please use the space below to add further comment if you think that the questionnaire has overlooked any important points about leadership values or if you would like to elaborate on any of your answers.

As laatste nodigen we u graag uit om opmerkingen toe te voegen als u vindt dat belangrijke punten over waarden in uw leidinggeven niet in de vragenlijst genoemd staan, of als u anderszins uw antwoorden wilt toelichten.

New page

You have completed the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

You can now close this questionnaire by closing the window.

U bent klaar met de vragenlijst.

Hartelijk bedankt voor uw medewerking!

U kunt nu het venster sluiten en daarmee de vragenlijst afsluiten.
Appendix E: English and Dutch texts of questionnaire for teachers

This appendix contains the complete and exact questionnaires for teachers, both the English version and the Dutch version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire for teachers</th>
<th>Vragenlijst voor leraren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to this questionnaire!</td>
<td>Welkom bij deze vragenlijst!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The questionnaire aims to ask your opinion on your school leaders’ values in leading his schools. ‘School leader’ is taken as comprehensive term for location manager, sector manager etcetera. Your school leader has given permission to send you this questionnaire. Respondents will stay anonymous.</td>
<td>Deze vragenlijst is bedoeld om uw mening te vragen over de waarden die in het leidinggeven van uw locatie- of sectordirecteur naar voren komen. Uw directeur heeft toestemming gegeven deze vragenlijst uit te zetten. Het invullen gebeurt strikt anoniem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It consists of 27 questions. A number of these are optional. The pilot of this test revealed that filling in the test takes on average 10 to 15 minutes, depending on how extensive your answers are to the optional questions.</td>
<td>De lijst bestaat uit 27 vragen. Een aantal daarvan zijn keuzevragen. Bij het testen van de vragenlijst bleek dat het invullen 10-15 minuten in beslag nam. Dat is mede afhankelijk van de uitgebreidheid waarmee u op keuzevragen ingaat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that once you have clicked on the CONTINUE button your answers are submitted. You cannot return to change your answers. You can stop and finish this questionnaire later on.</td>
<td>Zodra u op de ‘Continue’ of ‘volgende’ knop hebt gedrukt worden uw antwoorden opgeslagen. U kunt niet terugkeren naar voorgaande vragen. Als u het antwoord niet weet, vink dan het antwoord aan dat voor uw gevoel het dichtste bij komt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bij de laatste vraag hebt u de mogelijkheid aanvullende opmerkingen te maken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you do not know the answer, please tick the answer which you think comes closest.

For ‘he’ and ‘his’, please read ‘she’ and ‘her’ if applicable.

The final question gives you the opportunity to add remarks.

Thank you for your cooperation. It is highly appreciated!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You and your profession</th>
<th>U en uw beroep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This page contains questions on your professional biography.</td>
<td>Deze bladzijde bevat vragen over uw beroepsloopbaan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 At which school do you work?</td>
<td>Op welke school werkt u? *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 In what year were you born?</td>
<td>Wat is uw geboortejaar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 What is your sex?</td>
<td>Wat is uw geslacht?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/female</td>
<td>Man Vrouw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 What is the total number of years of experience that you have with this school leader?</td>
<td>Hoeveel jaren ervaring hebt u in totaal met uw locatie- of sector directeur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>‘School leader’ refers to the manager of the location or the sector, which you indicated in question 1 (‘At which school do you work?’).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>In which sector and years do mostly work? Please choose no more than two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What is the total number of years of experience you have in teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What subject(s) do you teach? (three at most)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and/or chemistry Mathematics</td>
<td>Natuurkunde en/of scheikunde Wiskunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A creative or expressive subject (e.g. art, music, drawing)</td>
<td>Een creatief/expressief vak (zoals cvk, muziek, handvaardigheid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vocational subject (e.g. technical skills, care)</td>
<td>Een beroepsgericht vak (zoals techniek, verzorging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another language</td>
<td>Een andere taal dan reeds genoemd Anders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leadership**

8. Please mention 5 to 10 words which come to mind when you think of leading schools.

Open question: Wilt u 5 tot 10 woorden noemen waaraan u denkt als het gaat om het leiden van een school?

Five words is enough, please mention no more than ten.

NOTE: Vijf woorden is genoeg; svp niet meer dan 10 woorden.

New page

**Values and leadership**

Waarden en leiderschap
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four pages will follow with questions on values and your leadership.</th>
<th>Er volgen nu vier bladzijden met vragen over waarden en het leiderschap van uw directeur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values and your leadership (1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Waarden en leiderschap (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you mean when you use the term ‘values’?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Open question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Please give a brief example.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Open question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The core values of the school overlap with the values concerning leadership of my school leader** | **Very little**  
**A little**  
**Somewhat**  
**A lot**  
**A very great deal**  
**I don’t know** | **De kernwaarden van de school overlappen met de waarden die mijn directeur heeft over leidinggeven.**  
**Nauwelijks**  
**Enigszins**  
**In redelijke mate**  
**Veel**  
**Voor het overgrote deel**  
**Dat weet ik niet** |
| **1** |  |  |
| **Please rank the following statements from most true for your school leader (1) to least true for your school leader (5):**  
When my school leader spends time with or for his teachers, his focus is to assist them in  
- helping pupils to learn to know God  
- teaching lessons of good quality  
- preparing pupils to participate in society as Christians  
- preparing pupils for exams or tests | **Wilt u de onderstaande stellingen ordenen op volgorde van prioriteit, van hoogste prioriteit voor uw directeur (1) tot laagste (5)? Elk graag slechts 1 keer.**  
**In de volgende vraag kunt u eventueel aangeven wat u bij e (‘andere dingen dan de hiervoor genoemde’) in gedachten hebt.**  
**Wanneer mijn directeur tijd besteedt met of voor zijn docenten, dan is hij er op gericht om hen te helpen om: (vul aan met a-e)** |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. doing other things than mentioned above</td>
<td>a. leerlingen beter te helpen hoe ze God kunnen leren kennen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. beter lessen te kunnen verzorgen van een goede kwaliteit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Leerlingen beter voor te bereiden om als christen te participeren in de maatschappij.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Leerlingen beter voor te bereiden op het afleggen van de examens en de toetsen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Andere dingen dan de hiervoor genoemde.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 What 'other things' would you think of?

Aan welke 'andere dingen' (vraag 12e) zou u denken?

Values and leadership (2)

‘Values’ are ethical principles, convictions, standards and ideals.

My school leader’s values are visible in how he leads the school.

Never
Almost never
Sometimes
Often
Almost always

‘Waarden’ zijn ethische principes, overtuigingen, maatstaven en idealen.

De waarden van mijn directeur zijn zichtbaar in hoe hij de school leidt.

NOT

15 Which of his value(s) is (are) most visible?

Welke waarden zijn voor u zichtbaar aanwezig in zijn leidinggeven?

Please mention no more than five.

Graag maximaal vijf noemen. Zet een ‘0’ als u de vraag niet kunt beantwoorden.

Values and leadership (3)

Waarden en leiderschap (3)
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He explicitly refers to values when he makes a decision.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Hij verwijst expliciet naar waarden als hij een beslissing neemt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Nooit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>Bijna nooit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Soms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Vaak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Bijna altijd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I recognise the following values in my school leader’s daily execution of his job:</td>
<td>Please</td>
<td>Ik herken de volgende waarden in hoe mijn directeur zijn dagelijks werk uitvoert:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>choose one of the options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Nooit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Bijna nooit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>Soms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Vaak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Bijna altijd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and leadership (4)</td>
<td>Waarden en leiderschap (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Even in difficult circumstances my manager tries to stay true to the values he says to find important.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Zelfs in moeilijke omstandigheden probeert mijn directeur om trouw te blijven aan de waarden waarvan hij zegt dat hij die belangrijk vindt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Nooit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>Bijna nooit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Soms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Vaak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Bijna altijd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Could you give an example where he managed to stay true to the values he says to find important?</td>
<td>Kunt u een voorbeeld geven waar hij erin geslaagd is trouw te blijven aan de waarden die hij zegt belangrijk te vinden?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Could you mention an example where it was difficult to stay true</td>
<td>Kunt u een voorbeeld noemen waar het moeilijk was voor hem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your department</td>
<td>Uw afdeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 1 | I have a good working relation with my school leader. | \begin{itemize}
  \item Very good
  \item Good
  \item Reasonable
  \item Somewhat bad
  \item Bad
\end{itemize} |
| | Hoe is de werkrelatie met uw directeur? | \begin{itemize}
  \item Zeer goed
  \item Goed
  \item Redelijk
  \item Tamelijk slecht
  \item Slecht
\end{itemize} |
| 2 2 | My school leader has a comprehensive knowledge of the pupils in his department (think of e.g. opinions, needs, concerns, lifestyle of pupils). | \begin{itemize}
  \item Very little
  \item A little
  \item Somewhat
  \item A lot
  \item A very great deal
\end{itemize} |
| | Mijn directeur heeft een brede kennis van de leerlingen in zijn deel van de school (denk bijvoorbeeld aan opvattingen, behoeften, dingen die hen bezig houden, levensstijl). | \begin{itemize}
  \item Nauwelijks
  \item Enigszins
  \item In redelijke mate
  \item In vrij grote mate
  \item In zeer grote mate
\end{itemize} |
| 2 3 | How often do you speak with your school leader? (More than just ‘saying hello’, but not necessarily long.) | \begin{itemize}
  \item Hardly ever
  \item Less than once a week
  \item Once a week
  \item Several times a week
  \item Every day
\end{itemize} |
| | Hoe vaak spreekt u uw directeur? (Meer dan alleen een groet, maar niet perse langdurig.) | \begin{itemize}
  \item Bijna nooit
  \item Minder dan 1 keer per week
  \item 1 keer per week
  \item Enkele keren per week
  \item Iedere dag
\end{itemize} |
| 2 4 | My school leader knows the opinion of his teachers on school matters well enough. | \begin{itemize}
  \item Strongly agree
  \item Agree
  \item Uncertain
  \item Disagree
  \item Strongly disagree
\end{itemize} |
| | Mijn directeur kent de opvattingen van zijn docenten over schoolzaken goed genoeg. | \begin{itemize}
  \item Zeer mee eens
  \item Mee eens
  \item Onzeker
  \item Mee oneens
  \item Zeer mee oneens
\end{itemize} |
### Values and your worldview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 5 I see a relation between his visible behaviour as a leader and his personal religious beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Some final questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 6 My school leader refers to his Christian beliefs in his leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Final page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 7 This is the final question. Please use the space below to add further comment if you think that the questionnaire has overlooked any important points about leadership values or if you would like to elaborate on any of your answers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### You have completed the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your cooperation!
| You can now close this questionnaire by closing the window. | U kunt nu het venster sluiten en daarmee de vragenlijst afsluiten. |
Appendix F: Information sheets for participants

Information sheet questionnaires – principals and teachers

You are being invited to take part in a research project by filling in a brief questionnaire. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

What are the aims of the research project?
In exercising the leadership of their schools leaders live out values. In this PhD project I will examine what the views on leadership values are and how principals translate these values into daily life within their jobs.

Why am I approached?
This research project will be carried out in all seven Dutch reformed comprehensive secondary schools. All school boards have given their approval to approach individuals within their schools. That is why I approach you and ask for your cooperation.

What happens if I cooperate?
If you participate you are asked to fill in an on-line questionnaire. Both principals and their teachers will be asked to fill in this questionnaire. It has been tested and it takes less than x minutes to complete it.

What about anonymity?
The results of this questionnaire will be rigorously anonymised. They will be kept for further academic purposes for 3 years after publication of the results. Then they will be destroyed. You will not be able to be identified at any stage of the project, nor in any reports or publications.

Are there any benefits or risks?
Whilst there are no immediate benefits for the people who fill in the questionnaire, it is hoped that this work will help develop (future) principals in their leadership. There are no known risks.

**What will happen with the results?**

The results of the questionnaires will be used to identify areas of interest and give clues for subsequent qualitative research. The results will be published in a PhD thesis and scholarly papers. If you are interested in the final results, you may make this known by sending me an email at edpm@leeds.ac.uk.

**Any questions?**

This project has been subject to ethical review by the University of Leeds. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me at edpm@leeds.ac.uk or by phone (06-51927435). Or contact my supervisor dr. Mark Pike by email at m.pike@education.leeds.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information and taking part in this project.

Ir. P.M. (Piet) Murre
Information sheet exploratory interviews - experts

You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

What are the aims of the research project?
In exercising the leadership of their schools leaders live out values. In this PhD project I will examine what the views on leadership values are and how principals translate these values into daily life within their jobs.

Why am I approached?
This research project will be carried out in all seven Dutch reformed comprehensive secondary schools. All school boards have given their approval to approach individuals within their schools. The first stage of my research consists of asking 3 experts who know these schools or their own school, but who will not take part in subsequent stages. That is why I approach you and ask for your cooperation.

What happens if I cooperate?
I will conduct an interview with you. This will take no more than 1 hour. You will be asked a few open questions on leadership, values and the Dutch reformed secondary schools. We will also discuss a list of values. The interview will be audio recorded to ensure good transcription of the interview and will be deleted afterwards.
You can withdraw at any time. You may refuse to answer questions. You do not have to give a reason.

What about anonymity?
The results of this interview will be rigorously anonymised. They will be kept for further academic purposes for 3 years after publication of the results of the entire project. Then they will be destroyed. You will not be
able to be identified at any stage of the project, nor in any reports or publications.

**Are there any benefits or risks?**

Whilst there are no immediate benefits for the people who will be interviewed, it is hoped that this work will help develop (future) principals in their leadership. There are no known risks.

**What will happen with the results?**

The results of the interview will be used to design a questionnaire. The results of the questionnaires will be used to identify areas of interest and give clues for subsequent qualitative research. The results will be published in a PhD thesis and scholarly papers. If you are interested in the final results, you may make this known by sending me an email at edpm@leeds.ac.uk.

**Any questions?**

This project has been subject to ethical review by the University of Leeds. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me at edpm@leeds.ac.uk or by phone (06-51927435). Or contact my supervisor Dr. Mark Pike by email at m.pike@education.leeds.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information and taking part in this project.

Ir. P.M. (Piet) Murre
You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

**What are the aims of the research project?**
In exercising the leadership of their schools leaders live out values. In this PhD project I will examine what the views on leadership values are and how principals translate these values into daily life within their jobs.

**Why am I approached?**
This research project is carried out in the Dutch reformed comprehensive secondary schools. All school boards have given their approval to approach individuals within their schools. In the final stage of my research I carry out case studies. The cases are selected with the help of the questionnaires you cooperated with in an earlier stage. The cases account for maximum variation. Your school and leadership is one of the cases. That is why I approach you and ask for your cooperation.

**Who else will be approached?**
If you agree to participate I will also ask a selection of teachers and pupils for permission to be interviewed in focus groups on your leadership philosophy and how that is enacted in the day-to-day management of the school. This will be done by a sampling procedure in which they can voluntarily decide whether they want to participate and which safeguards their anonymity.

**What happens if I cooperate?**
I will conduct three interviews with you, spread out over time. Each interview will take 1 hour. You will be asked questions on your leadership, values and practices. The first interview will be general. The second interview will be in-depth and specific. The third interview is meant for final clarifying questions. You can withdraw at any time. You may refuse to
answer any question. You do not have to give a reason.
The interviews will be audio recorded to ensure good transcription of the
interview and will be deleted afterwards.

**What about anonymity?**
The results of the interviews will be rigorously anonymised. They will be
kept for further academic purposes for 3 years after publication of the
results of the entire project. Then they will be destroyed. You will not be
identified in any reports or publications.

**Are there any benefits or risks?**
A potential benefit for you as principal is getting more insight in your
leadership role. Furthermore, it is hoped that this work will help develop
future principals in their leadership. There are no known risks.

**What will happen with the results?**
The results will be published in a PhD thesis and scholarly papers. If you are
interested in the final results, you may make this known by sending me an
email at edpm@leeds.ac.uk.

**Any questions?**
This project has been subject to ethical review by the University of Leeds. If
you have any queries please feel free to contact me at edpm@leeds.ac.uk
or by phone (06-51927435). Or contact my supervisor dr. Mark Pike by
email at m.pike@education.leeds.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information and taking part in this project.

Ir. P.M. (Piet) Murre
Information sheet case studies: interviews - teachers

Leadership in schools is important to teachers and pupils. As you are a teacher you are being invited to take part in a research project on school leaders’ leadership values.

Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

What are the aims of the research project?
In exercising the leadership of their schools leaders live out values. In this PhD project I will examine what the views on leadership values are and how principals translate these values into daily life within their jobs.

Why is my school leader selected?
This research project is carried out in the Dutch reformed comprehensive secondary schools. All school boards have given their approval to approach individuals within their schools. In the final stage of my research I carry out case studies. The cases are selected with the help of the questionnaires your school cooperated with in an earlier stage. The cases account for maximum variation. The leadership within your school or location is one of the cases.

Why am I approached?
As leadership is experienced by ‘the led’ it is important that their perception is taken into account. That is why I approach you and ask for your cooperation.

Who else will be approached?
The principal has given his consent for talking with staff about his leadership. He does not know which staff members have been selected to be interviewed. This will also not be disclosed at a later stage. A sample of pupils will be asked for permission to be interviewed group-wise.

What happens if I cooperate?
I will conduct one or two interviews with small groups of teachers, spread out over time. Each interview will take 1 hour at most. You will be asked questions on your principal’s leadership, values and practices. A second interview may be helpful for final clarifying questions. You can withdraw at any time. You may refuse to answer any question. You do not have to give a reason. The interviews will be audio recorded to ensure good transcription of the interview and will be deleted afterwards.

**What about anonymity?**
The results of the interviews will be rigorously anonymised. They will be kept for further academic purposes for 3 years after publication of the results of the entire project. Then they will be destroyed. You will not be able to be identified at any stage of the project, nor in any reports or publications.

**Are there any benefits or risks?**
It is hoped that this work will help develop (future) principals in their leadership. There are no known risks.

**What will happen with the results?**
The results will be published in a PhD thesis and scholarly papers. If you are interested in the final results, you may make this known by sending me an email at edpm@leeds.ac.uk.

**Any questions?**
This project has been subject to ethical review by the University of Leeds. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me at edpm@leeds.ac.uk or by phone (06-51927435). Or contact my supervisor dr. Mark Pike by email at m.pike@education.leeds.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information and taking part in this project.

Ir. P.M. (Piet) Murre
Information sheet case studies: interviews – parents and carers

School leaders lead teachers who teach pupils. Both teachers and leaders are important to the well-being and academic results of your child. Your child is being invited to take part in a research project on school leaders’ leadership values.

Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

What are the aims of the research project?
In exercising the leadership of their schools leaders live out values. In this PhD project I will examine what the views on leadership values are and how principals translate these values into daily life within their jobs.

Why is this school leader selected?
This research project is carried out in the Dutch reformed comprehensive secondary schools. The school your child attends is one of these. All school boards have given their approval to approach individuals within their schools. In the final stage of my research I carry out case studies. The leadership within your school or location is one of the cases.

Why is my child approached?
As leadership is experienced by ‘the led’ it is important that their perception is taken into account. Pupils belong to those who are led. That is why I approach you and ask for your cooperation.

Who else will be approached?
The principal has given his consent for talking with pupils about his leadership. He does not know which pupils have been selected to be interviewed. This will also not be disclosed at a later stage. A sample of pupils are asked for permission to be interviewed group-wise.

What happens if I cooperate?
I will conduct one or two interviews with small groups of pupils, spread out over time. Each interview will take 30 minutes at most. They will be asked questions on how their principal leads the school. A second interview may be helpful for final clarifying questions. Your child can withdraw at any time. They may refuse to answer any question. They do not have to give a reason. The interviews will be audio recorded to ensure good transcription of the interview and will be deleted afterwards.

**What about anonymity?**
The results of the interviews will be rigorously anonymised. They will be kept for further academic purposes for 3 years after publication of the results of the entire project. Then they will be destroyed. Your child will not be able to be identified at any stage of the project, nor in any reports or publications.

**Are there any benefits or risks?**
It is hoped that this work will help develop (future) principals in their leadership. There are no known risks.

**What will happen with the results?**
The results will be published in a PhD thesis and scholarly papers. If you are interested in the final results, you may make this known by sending me an email at edpm@leeds.ac.uk.

**Any questions?**
This project has been subject to ethical review by the University of Leeds. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me at edpm@leeds.ac.uk or by phone (06-51927435). Or contact my supervisor dr. Mark Pike by email at m.pike@education.leeds.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information and taking part in this project.

Ir. P.M. (Piet) Murre
Information sheet interviews - pupils

In schools both teachers and principals are important to the well-being and academic results of pupils. You are being invited to take part in a research project in your school on the leadership values of your principal. You can guess what values people have in what you hear or see them do. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others, like your parents or carers, if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information.

What exactly are ‘leadership values’?
Values are about a couple of things. They are about what people think is important in life, what is really worth pursuing, and how you make sometimes difficult choices. Leadership values in schools are about how you lead the staff and the pupils. If, for example, a teacher is continually being late for class, you could wonder whether he thinks that is important. Maybe he values reliability less than listening to people who keep him busy even though he does not have any time left. So, what someone does, does show something of his values, but you can sometimes draw different conclusions from one example.

What are the aims of the research project?
So, in exercising the leadership of their schools leaders live out values. I am a researcher. In this project I will examine what your principal’s views on leadership values are and how (s)he translates these values into daily life within their jobs.

Why is this school leader selected?
This case study project is carried out in several reformed comprehensive secondary schools. The school you attend is one of these. All school boards have given their approval to approach individuals within their schools. Your principal and a couple of teachers also cooperate.

Why am I asked?
If we have leaders, we also have people who are led. School staff, like your teachers. Or you as a pupil. So it is important that what you think, hear and see is taken into account. That is why I approach you and ask for your cooperation.

**Who else will be approached?**
The principal has given his consent for talking with staff and pupils about his leadership. He does not know which pupils or staff have been selected to be interviewed. This will also not be disclosed at a later stage.

**What happens if I cooperate?**
I will do one or two interviews with small groups of pupils, spread out over time. Each interview will take 30 minutes at most. You will be asked questions on how your principal leads the school. A second interview may be helpful for final clarifying questions. You can withdraw at any time. You may refuse to answer any question. You do not have to give a reason. The interviews will be audio recorded.

**What about anonymity?**
Everything you say, or the other pupils say, will be rigorously anonymised. Neither the principal nor the teachers will be informed of who says what. I will keep the information of the interviews for further academic purposes for 3 years after publication of the results of the entire research project. Then they will be destroyed. You will not be able to be identified at any stage of the project, nor in any reports or publications.

**Are there any benefits or risks?**
It is hoped that this work will help develop (future) principals in their leadership. There are no known risks.

**What will happen with the results?**
The results will be published in a PhD thesis and scholarly papers. If you are interested in the final results, you may make this known by sending me an email at edpm@leeds.ac.uk.

**Any questions?**
The University of Leeds has checked this project. If you have any queries please feel free to contact me at edpm@leeds.ac.uk or by phone (06-51927435). Or contact my supervisor dr. M. Pike by email at m.pike@education.leeds.ac.uk.

Thank you for reading this information and taking part in this project.

Ir. P.M. Murre
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Appendix H: James’ values

List of James’ values, as mentioned by himself, with one supporting quote per value.

1. Trust (vertrouwen), ‘trust is an important value’;
2. Development (ontwikkeling), ‘development is an important value’;
3. Congruence and that it matches (congruentie, dat het klopt), ‘to me, it is very important that something is congruent, that it adds up’;
4. Resilience (veerkracht), ‘to me resilience is an important value for myself’;
5. Transparency and openness (transparantie en openheid), ‘that there is openness, within limits of course, is important to me’;
6. Vision (visie), ‘I always want to work from a certain frame, it shouldn’t be loose. Much rather a vision which has been thought through before or internalised’;
7. Purposefulness (doelgerichtheid), ‘I like to do things aiming at a certain purpose’ [...te doen op het doel af]
8. Connectedness (verbinding), ‘I want to relate with people’. ‘Feeling connected with people is important to me (...). The other person has and feels the room/freedom to speak his mind [zijn ding te zeggen], founded on who he is, without an immediate value judgment. And that I experience the same room.’;
9. Freedom to think and act (vrijheid), ‘I want to be able to think freely and to be independent of a group’. ‘Freedom is very important to me to be able to live and function properly’;
10. Do justice to differences between people (rechtdoen aan verschillen tussen mensen), ‘Yes, I consider doing justice to differences between people very important’. 
Appendix I: Simon’s values

List of Simon’s values as mentioned by himself.

1. Honesty: ‘Eventually honesty wins, it is in a deeper layer, as well as openness’;
2. Helping one another;
3. Doing ‘the job’ together: ‘I think honesty, being ready to help one another, getting the job done together, these are the somewhat deeper values’;
4. Working from a vision: ‘I try to work from a certain vision. Why do you want this?’;
5. Loving one another by providing both care and correction: ‘Love in a supportive sense.’ ‘Love can be also be sharp. I want to speak frankly with a colleague’;
6. Addressing things that do not go well: ‘Maybe that’s a value too. I am open and if there is something of which I do not think that it is OK, then I make that explicit’;
7. Openness: ‘I try to be open and honest. When I see something, I make it explicit. If it is good, but also if I see that it is not exactly allright’;
8. Celebrating achievements: ‘The value, not of things always being half empty, but: we have achieved this’;
9. Complimenting staff: ‘Another of my values is that I try to celebrate achievements together and give compliments’;
10. Looking after your staff: ‘I think: look after your staff very well!’;
11. Honouring one’s commitments / keeping agreements: ‘The love of: this is what we expect from each other, this what we agree on and you can count on that’;
12. Promoting professional growth (both himself and teachers): ‘That is a value too: I want to develop.’ ‘The value that we should learn, together’;
13. Facilitating professional dialogue amongst teachers about lessons: ‘I should facilitate that it is possible for teachers to discuss their lessons’;
14. Expecting responsibility and ownership: ‘People should take responsibility’;
15. Trust: ‘An important value is that I trust people’;
16. Buffering staff from distractions: ‘We should be a heat shield’;
17. Being of service: ‘I am looking for what God wants in my life. How can I be of service? Even though I find it terribly difficult, being of service’;
18. Caring for pupils from a Christian world view: ‘That we have to care for our pupils [...] and that we do that from a Christian perspective on life’;
19. Teaching pupils how to become a Christian citizen in this society: ‘What I envisage is [...] that we teach our pupils to be Christian citizens in this life, but also that real learning occurs’;
20. Trusting God instead of applying extreme risk management: ‘Is not this a value too, [...] that we then trust that things will go well. God is at the helm’;
21. Conviviality (‘gezelligheid’ in Dutch; there is no proper English equivalent): ‘That is a value too: I very much like a cosy atmosphere’;
22. Attributing success to others, failure to oneself: ‘One of my values, which I find hard sometimes, is to ‘look through the window’ when something is successful, and to say: ‘They have done a good job’. And if something does not go well, that I look in the mirror’;
23. Distinguishing between behaviour and the person himself: ‘This is also one of my values, that I want to distinguish between a person and his behaviour. The value that we are all fallible creatures’. 
Appendix J: A sample of the interviews

Interview 1 Headteacher 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Int | Starting at 8 minutes  
Could you just tell me something about yourself, from your childhood till now, the course of your life, some general information, your studies, and what about church, your upbringing, that kind of thing? |
<p>| Int | Yes, let's just go back to the beginning for a minute, to, say, just your family, your school years and so on, you just mentioned your socialization, could you elaborate on that please, on the things you remember? |
| HT1 | Well, how shall I put it? Like I said, my father worked a lot, so my mother raised the children on her own. And there was a culture of working hard, and, er, we didn't talk much and we didn't share our feelings and emotions. Which caused a kind of survival strategy: we'll just carry on, and if you carry on you will manage. |
| Int | In your family, you mean? |
| HT1 | Yes, exactly. And I think I adopted that part. What also played a role was the, well let me put it this way, looking back I think, in our family there was me and my brothers and my father and my little sister, a technical company, that was our world, they always encouraged us to carry on. Yeah, I think these are the most important things for now. |
| Int | You mentioned that (at a certain moment) it became clear to you like 'I am a Christian and I want to remain one'. What did you mean by that? |
| HT1 | That I believe with all my heart what’s in God’s Word, that I believe that He is leading my life, and every once in a while I believe there is also room for me. Yes. But the latter is really independent of the world [2-4 words are inaudible] |
| HT1 | And, working at this school has consequences for myself. Also for my personal life. I mean, I was young of course, and like I told you before, I came here after a rather turbulent period. In the beginning I did things that weren't allowed. That is of course completely ridiculous. I smoked, for instance. But after five years of [name of school] it started to get in the way, I couldn't go on. So my personal life had to correspond. Being authentic, not doing things outside my job, things that don't fit in here. |
| Int | And why did you stop doing them; what is the fundamental reason behind that? |
| HT1 | Because I think, let's put it this way, I felt it had become increasingly sinful to do these things. And sin is not what I want because I have another task. You know what I mean? |
| Int | That's actually what I am looking for. Could I put it this way: You would still not do it any longer, even if you weren't working at [name of school]. |
| HT1 | Yes, exactly! |
| Int | It's your personal conviction that you shouldn't do it, it's not right, because it is a sin. |
| HT1 | Yes. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Can you tell me something about your leadership? What does it look like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>What does it look like? The way it works for me is, I need to think about what I want. A picture or a direction. And I gather this information by reading, by talking, by getting it together, sort of. And this is an ongoing process... And my way of doing things is to then share them with the team, take them with me in my way of thinking. And then something will develop further. And on the one hand my way of doing this is, well, how shall I put it? I think I'm capable of creating a kind of openness and safety that invites people to come forward, so that 1+1 becomes three. And from there, lines will be set out on a broader scale in the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Very good, thank you! You also mentioned just now about, er, you actually changed your mind about this leadership. Because at the beginning it was about pleasing people and later on it was something different. Could you tell me a bit more about this change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>I was so young of course! I didn't even know what leadership was. So what are you gonna do? You start by thinking 'what needs to be done' and then, 'oh yes, a meeting about the school reports'. That is the kind of stuff I used to do. And I wasn’t really mature enough for that. Emotionally mature, or whatever you want to call it. But at the same time I was capable of something. That was rather paradoxical. I did have certain skills, but inside it wasn't stable. So I connected, because of what the group wanted I connected this with a follow-up. So I let myself very much be guided by this. Although perhaps it didn't seem that way at first. But to myself that's how it was. And another example of a concrete situation if something was wrong, students being excluded or something like that, hassle, well I always tried to please the teacher, while now I would take a more independent position, approach the situation objectively and then ask myself, 'What's going on here?' This inner confidence has grown, because I have worked on myself. This may be linked to my upbringing. Somewhere there is an independent streak in me. Deep down, I don't want to, I want to be able to think freely and I don't want to depend on a group. So because of this confidence and this growth and this inner [er] which made me more confident, I was able to give free rein to this and it has actually become dominant over the past years. That I, wherever I am, I don't want to be... and of course I want to connect with people and I have to... but I do want to be able to think independently. And I don't want to be somewhere where I have to keep one person satisfied or I need to do something else, and then I have to do something else again... I just don't want to do that anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Perhaps it is also nice to mention this. What we have to do, I think, is provide a good education, go in the right direction, and we have people with a lot of power and talents, and then we have the hard side, the financial side. And my natural, and perhaps my, my habit was, perhaps directive is too strong, but I was rather steering in indicating the way. But along the way I, and we, with the team leaders, realized: you may have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wonderful insights, great plans, set out lines, people can even clearly say yes [to them], but then they’ll take step A but not step B. And now we are much more focussed: we determine the course and direction. We ask them to engage, to give their opinion, and we map out the next step, and we ask them again what they think. It's more a process of people towards leadership, more like working together. And there we, what I would, the people in the right place. Talents, there are so many different types. We try to connect more people with the things they are good at. And give them a free rein to do them. To do what they want. So also more responsibilities for the people who have the expertise. We are in the middle of that process and we are making small steps. To practise that. Yes, because I still find that difficult.

Int What makes it so difficult?

HT1 Because we need to... you have to let go of an old pattern if you like, where managers know it all, and you have to start making use of the expertise and responsibilities that are available. Let's put it like this: I need to learn how it works, how to facilitate and organize this. And also perhaps I secretly think: Perhaps I know best? And you need to experience that the other way also works, maybe even better.

Int Okay. That is clear.

You also mentioned, earlier in the interview, that people considered you as having a very business-like attitude, while you are in fact highly emotional, something like that. And that this has changed. How do you see that?

HT1 Well, I need to think about that one. I think it has to do with, if your self-confidence grows, you can also have confidence in others. Something like that. And I'm not afraid, well let's put it. What I've learned along the way is that leadership is not about arranging things, organizing things, but leadership is much more about appealing to what motivates and drives people. What their problems are and were. Let's put it this way: I've always had this in me, but I was afraid to show it. And because of this course, because I had more confidence in myself, I was no longer afraid to take that same step towards others. And if you take that step, I also had to show a bit more of myself to connect with the other person. This mutuality, I think it has grown in the last few years. And I think I also have, something I realized last week, which also, er, didn't hamper me in this process, but a kind of 'oh yes, this is a Reformed school and I'm working among Reformed people so I'm not allowed to say anything wrong.' I have more or less left behind this tense feeling. [...] I also want to give room to my free child sometimes. This is me and sometimes I just say stupid things.

HT1 I'm not afraid to question people further, about what moves them. But I also dare to just say: this and this is what I think, also about their functioning. Let them know how they're doing. The good parts, but also if there is something that...

Int You don't like.

HT1 I don't like. Exactly.

And in the last five years, one of the consequences of that has been, very unpleasant, that I have had to say goodbye to a couple of people,
and I used to be afraid to do that, or it didn't even occur to me to do that.

Int  Yes that can be the consequence.

HT1  Yes.

Interview 2 Headteacher 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int</th>
<th>You have a number of values of course. Which of them would you mention in terms of: what are my most important values?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Well... I think, values are such abstract terms. I cannot pinpoint exactly what a value is. But when I have to respond off-the-cuff, I think confidence is an important value. I think development is an important value. Er... What else do I think is important... What I do think, but perhaps I cannot find the right words for it, but to me it is very important that something is consistent, that it is right, or something. What I say here should be consistent with what I say in another setting. Erm... Resilience I think is also an important value to me. I can't think of anything else. Maybe something will pop up along the way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int</th>
<th>I would like to ask you more about each one of them, but let's go back a little bit first. These are the ones you mention now. Where do they come from? Why are they important to you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>It has to do a lot with myself, I think. With my socialization, I think. What I think is very important, like I told you just now, is that something is consistent. I myself experience that when people do what they say, my trust grows. And then I want to do the same. That part, that comes from me. But I also think from the point of view of identity, I think it is very important to act the way it is. To not have a hidden agenda. It is also very important to me that there is openness, although of course within certain limits. But that there aren't any underlying layers. Erm... In fact I think what people see and hear should be genuine. Of me but also in conversations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int</th>
<th>You actually mention two things: your socialization – your upbringing and everything connected to that. And the [religious] identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int</th>
<th>And you mention them in that order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Yes, I don't want to rank them in a particular order, because socialization is also identity, I think.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HT1 | ... And what I also think is important I'm thinking right now, and I'm not sure that's a value, is that I always like to work from something, I don't like it to be 'separate’. Preferably from a vision that was developed or perceived beforehand. I don't like separate-separate-connected. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int</th>
<th>It has to be purposeful. Is that the right word?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What's important to me is to think ahead about why we do something. And, er, to me – that may be a value too – I then like to do things to achieve this goal. And then. I don't like loose ends. You need to work towards a goal. The goal is important, but at the same time the way to get there, well, it may be this way or that, it may vary, I don't really mind. Look, I have mentioned development. To me development is also learning together. In fact, to me the process is 'learning'.

The process to achieve this goal, you mean?

Yes. The goal is important. But the process to get there, the learning, is just as important. And maybe even more important.

We've got a couple of things going on at our department. [...] One day we sat down to think from scratch. Like ‘What should our education look like in 10 years’ time?’ And from there, like 'So what do we want?' and 'Why do we want that?'

And even the question: ‘Why are we here as a school? What makes us different from others?’ From that concept something has developed, a vision. On this basis we have started a process. The process of developing things, experimenting, doing things, but meanwhile also adjusting things, because they turn out to go differently than we expected. We are really constantly switching, learning, getting back in contact with people. And the goal for me is that something happens. And that it has an impact on children. This is an example.

And who are ‘we’ in such an example?

I am more or less the leader in this, and the group of team leaders in the whole school – no, wait a minute, this is a project group, consisting of two team leaders and also two or three people from another department. So we also do this beyond the individual departments.

And can you indicate how for example trust or resilience or consistency play a role in this?

Trust, yes, how do you create trust? In my experience this involves various aspects. First of all, people need to have confidence in me, not that I know it all, but that I know about things in general or something.

That sounds mysterious?

When you know it all, then this knowledge is set in stone. I don't think that will inspire confidence. But the persuasiveness that you want to and will do something together will inspire trust. That people have confidence and that they are willing to join me in such a process. And of course that trust is based on previous experiences. And that's where there is a kind of supervisory role, transparency for me. Very open. This also means vulnerability. That also means doing as I say, and if it doesn't work I will say so. That is trust, I think. And sometimes, yes, trust can sometimes be achieved by means of an unpleasant message, or something. By being very honest.

You also use words like connection. Am I correct?

Yes, yes yes yes.

What exactly is connection?

That would indeed be my next question

To me connection is: there is a kind of emotional layer in it, and also a kind of top layer.
Well, how do I know whether I'm connected with someone? Well, I need to think about how to say that. I think connection, that another individual has and gets and feels the room to say what they want, from who they really are, without people judging them right away. And that I myself also experience that room. And at a certain point that results in some sort of ‘click moment’.

Int  Okay.
And then you concentrate this connection on the relationship you have with the other person at that moment.

HT1  Yes, but it certainly has content.

Int  Can you elaborate on that?
To what extent does it matter, what it is about, you know.

HT1  To connect with someone you don’t have to agree on content of course, but content is a means in that case. A sort of intention to go for it together. For a certain content.
Let me think. [Thinking pauses] I never think very deeply about these kinds of things... What will happen if I...
Connection is also saying things at a content level. And this can develop in a conversation. The fact that there’s room for this. Maybe it is the content, it’s the relationship, the relationship can be very technical, but you can also sense it, you can see that someone experiences it.

Int  You also mentioned something like resilience, right, in the list you just gave me. I have a few questions about that. But one of them concerns your socialization. Your socialization and resilience, are they related?

HT1  Yes, very strongly.
Yes, I think at some point I was given a kind of message like: ‘You shouldn’t give up too soon.’ I’ve actually experienced that in my life. I remember, a small example, the gym class. The teacher said: We’re going to jog around the gym for as long as we can. And then I just carried on for two hours [Laughs]

Int  Admirable!

HT1  So not giving up. Maybe there's also a competitive drive behind that. But also in my time... But let me put it this way, my switch to the teacher training course, the message at the time was like ‘Well, just give it a try.’ We’ll find out if you can do it. And it turned out I could, by trial and error.
Here at school sometimes... I really fell down, through resistance, through people, through... But I picked myself up time and again. And that's like second nature to me, and it really makes me happy, that I can eventually, yes, leave behind previous resentments or pain. To make new room for, for... getting back on my feet, something like that.

Int  And an aspect like development, right, because that is an aspect that I, you yourself just mentioned it... Could you talk a bit more about that, like why is it important to you, why is it important at all? And how does it show?

HT1  Development on the one hand is gaining new insights, new knowledge. I find that important. That you broaden your own world a bit and stay involved in what happens. On the other hand development is, er, a reflection process on myself also in my relationships with others. Because this has always been an
important aspect of my work. And that's why I relate this very strongly to the work itself. Working for me is in fact a constant reflection process. And for myself I think it is important to put others in this reflection. And again doing this at a deeper level. And it has... Let me put it this way, both aspects are almost conditional for me to be able to do my job. Sometimes I also need new things, different... different ideas, to be able to develop a bit of a vision that, erm... []

Int  Yes. So to you leadership involves getting further than where it stands at the moment.

HT1  Yes.

Int  In several ways: your own development and that of your people

HT1  Yes!

Int  Okay. [] I'd like to check what I've heard in your story so far. Which is that your personal values are very much in line with your professional values, the things you think are important professionally. That's also the way you are, so to speak

HT1  Yes!

Int  Not just because you are the headteacher here [name], so to speak

HT1  No, that is indeed the way I am.

Int  Yes, so you always think that is important.

HT1  Yes

Int  Even when you go home at five.

HT1  Yes.

HT1  Well, to be honest that is, when talking about the aspects of my leadership... Let's put it this way: I do like to know something about a lot of things. Do something with them. Sometimes, when I compare myself with another headteacher, they find it much easier to hand things over to other headteachers, they, they, for them to develop or define a vision. I... And that's it. In this respect, I find letting go a bit difficult sometimes. But at the same time I just love content. To do things that have to do with content every now and then. And to be honest I don't want to be a headteacher who hands it all over. I don't think I have found an ideal combination when it comes to that. That's why my diary is sometimes packed. That's an issue, I haven't quite worked that out for myself. I can certainly let go of things and leave them to other people, er, but I just want to know in advance, to keep, like, in tune a little bit. Something like that.

Int  I would like you to tell me a bit more about that, focussing on `what has this to do with your values of confidence, development, consistency, resilience, openness?'

HT1  In a process like that, which I have to start? By the way, I don't do that on my own, but again with others. [Thinks, hesitates] First of all. Let me put it this way. What I think is important is to have the right people in the right place. People whom I think are, from their expertise, from their personality... these should be complementary. I think it is important to have an influence on that. And then with a group like that.
The framework I described just now is still more or less a blank canvass. Then you really start to think with the group, like: what does it mean and what does it look like and what exactly do we want? That’s when something will start to develop. My role in this, and I think that is perhaps more or less my strength, is to ask the questions. Then it will start to develop. And then it is... then we will agree. And then there will be many other people who support it, and also to create connections. Then we get to work!

**Int**

Okay

Something else. We talked about you and [name of school], your values and so on. But you also have to deal with government policy in a certain way. Erm, directly, or it will come to you through the board or school policy. Or maybe other things, but I'm thinking of the government in particular.

To what extent does this affect your room so to speak to assert what's important to you in your department?

**HT1**

Look, what the government wants is, let me put it this way, if we don't do it this will affect, erm, our right to exist almost, because then you don't meet the quality criteria. All the rules. So I, I [Thinks] in that respect [Thinks], to me these rules are mainly leading.

Although I tend to take some rules more seriously than others, where I take the liberty to implement them as I see fit.

At the same time, I have sometimes felt disappointed by the government, so that trust isn't really growing. So I have a more, erm, critical attitude, to what it means for us. To me it doesn't conflict with what we as a school want. Because I think the rules provide enough room to make our own choices. Look, to us, in the next few years we want to develop [mentions two examples] because it is important to us, the personal equipment of children. We will also invest more time in this. That means you'll have less time for other things. Which has consequences for the outcomes. And we have to look for a way to secure these other things. But anyway, I think that's the game. So it's actually constantly looking for an answer to both.

**Int**

Yes. Yes. Clear. And you said: that trust isn't really growing. Sometimes you need to implement policy changes as you see fit, is what you literally said. Could you give me an example?

**HT1**

Well I... the biggest disappointment to me had to do with the societal internship. I think that was so bizarre, one cabinet said this, and we as a school... and we thought it was important. But then all of a sudden there is [Inaudible, something like government policy?]. Well I cannot follow that. And this experience has taught me to think twice about: Does it suit us? And are we gonna do it low-level or full power. That kind of thing. With mathematics policy for example, and reading and writing, I know this, it's actually about five or six years ago that this came up for the first time. That was when a member of the board said: ‘Oh, we'll see.’ In retrospect this 'we will see’ was an error of judgement.
Yes, because this was really serious. And I think we could have dealt with that much sooner and better. So sometimes it is...

Int Looking for...

HT1 Probing...
And at the moment they're concentrating on, this discussion about learning outcomes, culture as a part of education, I sometimes think it is a bit of a... Sometimes things are being very much put on opposite sides. That when you focus on learning outcomes you cannot work on education at the same time. I think it can very well be done at the same time. You make your own choices in this.

Int You mean: they're put on opposite sides by the government?

HT1 Also in the discussions here at school sometimes.
I think, precisely because of the equipping and formational education programme, because of our identity, we have a duty to bring out the best in ourselves and our pupils. And I think: you can link these beautifully.
And I'm not, that's not how I am, how shall I put it? Some people are very good at selling themselves, just look how good and excellent and... I am not at all interested in that. I sometimes forget it too. And that's not always useful, particularly, sometimes it would be better to have some more...

Int I recognise this

HT1 I don't experience a lot of tension in that respect. There is room for manoeuvre for me.

Int Yes. At the same time that sounds to me like: okay, you have enough room to do the things you find important and to do them in a way that matches with what you think is important. But it doesn't sound very helpful.

HT1 This government?

Int This government. And the unpredictable and sometimes even the volatile...

HT1 Volatile! That's what I find very annoying. And also, when talking about difficult, I think... Look, the outcome chart, that kind of aggregated stuff that doesn't reflect reality at all. So you get like, er, a kind of artificial... Which makes me think: okay.
I can understand you need measurement data. I do understand that.
Look, as a school you receive €20 million, so you have to... But as far as I'm concerned, this process which is being implemented at the moment, where the inspection leaves a bit more room and does not until it really goes wrong, I think that is a positive development. The inspection being more of a critical learning friend than the... We were once in a trajectory with the inspection when our academic results were too low. That is really very unpleasant. We thought we provided really good education... And then all of a sudden we were burnt to the ground. Then you need to deal with how that works. Gain self-confidence again. Although there are many things we do well, but they are not, they happen to be not important to them. We had to learn that too.

Int Yes.

Int You've been a headteacher for quite some time, last time you told me how you came to work here. When you look back 5 or 10 years or maybe even the whole period, what has been your main development?
**Interview 3 Headteacher 1**

**Int** I'm really curious to know whether you can see a relationship between what you believe, I mean as a Christian, that kind of belief, and your values? You have mentioned a whole list there [Points at paper]. Can you see a connection? Or are they not related?

**HT1** No, they are related. I think. I need to ponder that one. Whether I can find the right answer straightaway.

What I believe is an integral part of me, of my identity. But it also relates to talents and abilities. And to the structure of my upbringing. Those values have evolved from that.

And the identical aspect is on the one side: ‘What do you understand by the providence of God?’ That I was raised in a certain context and that certain values originate from that. That I've been given talents or gifts, and that I feel that I have to use them to answer my purpose in life, to contribute. And this contribution is also a, albeit in a school setting, spreading of the kingdom of God. That's the whole point. That is the relation I can see.

**Int** Okay!

Because if you look at this list, these are the things you mentioned, confidence for instance, and development, can you also see...

**HT1** An aspect of our identity. I think (so?)

**Int** Is there a certain way you deal with that? Or isn't there, I don't want to put words in your mouth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HT1</th>
<th>From my standards and values, based on God’s Word, I think I deal with people in a certain way: you give them confidence, integrity, closeness, er, you are sometimes also, how shall I put it, confrontational. I think that can also be Biblical. But it, I’ve got the feeling they are somewhat related, entwined with one another, but I don’t know exactly how to explain that.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>I really feel that I’m allowed to contribute to the Reformed education, long-term, in these intense, dynamic times, to sustain it, with everything that... And in doing so we make choices and sometimes people cannot understand them yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>But let’s see, let’s explore. Because if you, that’s what you do. That is your motivation, that’s another way to put it, and you do it with a certain set of values, I’m just trying to look at it from different sides. It might also be possible with another set of values. They don’t necessarily result from it, that it should be these values. Or are they these values because they are yours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Perhaps it could also be done with another set of values, that is very well...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Well. I don’t know whether that is true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Could... But I need them anyhow to move forward. Faithfulness. Development. Consistency also sounds as if it has to do with identity. Transparency. Also the vision: what do we want? Goal-oriented also sounds very much like identity: we have a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Yes! Please continue. Because at point 2 you said: ‘I think that is very identity-oriented.’ Where it says goal-oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Where it says goal-oriented, vision, consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Why do you think that sounds like identity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>[Elaborates on consistency] For me that is because I am who I am and how I think people understand me, that there isn’t a kind of underlying layer in the way. It has to do with honesty. [Thinks] Why does that sound like having to do with identity? That is really difficult!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Yes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>If I could simply go over the 10 Commandments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Yes, please do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>When I take the first commandment ‘to honour God above everything else’, why does consistency belong to that? I think that’s the way God is. Maybe that’s what it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>The image! Maybe at the deepest level it has to do with the image of God. That is perhaps the... You could say the same about confidence, about goal-orientatedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>Yes. So if you formulate it like that it is very close to your identity because you really believe, so to speak. And if someone else bases them on something else, then that doesn't matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>That doesn't matter! [Assentingly]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>To you this is what’s behind it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1</td>
<td>Yes!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Int | Some things could originate somewhat less directly from the Bible, but rather from your upbringing, or your personality or your environment. You are here in [name of region] and that’s where they do certain things and in certain ways, somewhere else it is different. What is your view on that?

HT1 | I agree. That you are partly... that it affects you. The fact that it says resilience, or for instance freedom, that has to do with upbringing. That also plays a role. Not giving up, needing space to do things [Looks at the vignette] And the cultural aspect. Maybe I have become more balanced in that. You're talking about [region of the school]. I am from [town of residence] then. What is characteristic for someone from [town of residence]; we have various target groups at this school. Someone from [town of residence] makes a lot of noise to begin with, is explicitly present as a group, not as an individual. Seems to be very open, but it is a kind of... I've got the feeling I'm very independent... [of the culture of the town]. I think my upbringing has a greater impact than the cultural aspects of where I'm from. That does not really determine who I am.

Int | Yes. Because the things you just mentioned, you went over the list, what you can say about that is: they match very well with the family you grew up in and with how you became who you have become.

HT1 | Yes. [Assentingly] That really has, I think it plays a role. And also perhaps my upbringing, but also just character. Characteristics that go from one generation to another. In a manner of speaking.

Int | What characteristics are you thinking of?

HT1 | Connection in particular [Thinks]. And confidence also has something to do with it. I think that somewhere I have, I'm very much like my father in that respect, my mother is very different. That's exactly how it works.

Int | I can also imagine resilience or perseverance have to do with that

HT1 | Yes, that too.

Int | The way you talked about your father, that sounds like the way you talk about yourself.

HT1 | Yes. Yes. No, but that is really true.
Appendix K: Coding

Coding has been discussed in chapter 3.7.2, also how a large amount of codes led to the clustering in a small number of categories. In various tables in chapters 4, 5 and 6 categories have been mentioned and discussed in the text. This appendix shows two tables, as additional specimens. The first table presents the categories found in an interview with Simon; the second with James.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories found in an interview with Simon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second table presents categories found in an interview with James:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories found in an interview with James</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>