

**The complexity of
pastoral care middle leadership
in New Zealand secondary schools**

Kiely Murphy

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Educational Leadership and Management**

Unitec Institute of Technology

2011

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to interpret from multiple perspectives the pastoral care middle leadership role in New Zealand secondary schools. It was based on the rationale that pastoral care middle leadership within New Zealand secondary schools is increasingly complex. Some shifts are happening for pastoral care middle leaders as they play more of a role in supporting student learning. The traditional pastoral care middle leader role of 'disciplinarian' has evolved into a more holistic role with a focus on improving student outcomes. However, these shifts have brought new challenges and a greater need for targeted professional development for pastoral care middle leaders. Research and literature on middle leadership in education has a tendency to default to the curriculum middle leader role in schools, which has left the pastoral care middle leader role largely unaccounted for. These are therefore critical times for pastoral care middle leaders.

This qualitative research involved three interviews with three senior leaders and three focus groups with a total of eighteen pastoral care middle leaders. The findings highlighted the importance, challenges and professional development needs of pastoral care middle leaders. In a relatively new policy/curriculum environment, pastoral care middle leadership has become a multifaceted role, which is fundamentally supporting learning through maintaining a holistic, school-wide view in order to bridge the gap between pastoral care and academic issues for improved student outcomes. Due to increased pastoral demands and the shift to a more holistic school-wide view alongside existing silo subject departmental structures, the greatest challenges for pastoral care middle leaders are: people management issues; leadership dilemmas; work intensification; and, the under-resourcing of people and time. Provisions need to be made for intensive context-based training and targeted leadership and management development and training, both inductive and on-going, in order to meet the unique and increasingly complex demands of the secondary school pastoral care middle leader role.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been completed without the support of many. My sincere thanks go to:

The three Principals - who generously opened their doors for this study.

The three senior leaders and the eighteen pastoral care middle leaders - who so willingly shared their time and took part in the interviews and focus groups. The time that they took out of their incredibly busy schedules was really appreciated.

The Study Awards people and the Baradene College Board of Trustees - for supporting my application for study leave to complete this research. I am also thankful to my colleagues who provided encouragement and Sarah who so willingly gave proofing assistance.

Howard Youngs – for always being positive and supportive. The feedback, encouragement and guidance Howard provided was invaluable.

Unitec MEdL&M team – for support and assistance during my time as a student and Carol Cardno for her encouragement and professionalism.

My dear friends and mentors Verity and Sherilee - who were unwavering in their belief that I could do it and not afraid to tell me 'how it was', when I needed it most.

My family and friends - for supporting me in so many ways and Max for his companionship through it all.

And most important of all, Chris – for his love, support, comfort and encouragement every step of the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLES	v
ABBREVIATIONS	v
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Setting the scene	1
Problematizing pastoral care middle leadership: the rationale for this research	6
Research aims, questions and setting	8
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Introduction	11
Leadership in schools	11
Middle leadership in secondary schools.....	17
Pastoral care in secondary schools.....	19
Pastoral care middle leadership roles in secondary schools.....	21
Challenges of the pastoral care middle leadership role.....	23
Professional development and the pastoral care middle leadership role ...	29
Summary.....	35
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction	36
Methodological approach	36
Research design	39
Data analysis.....	49
Research validity and reliability	51

Summary.....	53
CHAPTER FOUR FINDINGS	55
Introduction	55
Part One – Interview findings for senior leaders.....	56
Part Two – Focus group findings for deans.....	67
Summary.....	80
CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	81
Introduction	81
A complex and demanding role doing ‘everything’	81
Relationships, working in teams and people management challenges	89
Professional development.....	95
Summary.....	103
CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSION.....	105
Introduction	105
Recommendations	111
Limitations of the research	113
Recommendations for future research	114
Conclusion	115
References	117
Appendices	125

TABLES

Table 3.1	Schools participating in this study.....	41
Table 4.1	School and participant codes.....	56

ABBREVIATIONS

ACTS	Academic Counselling and Target Setting
BES	Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration
HODs	Heads of Department
HOFs	Heads of Faculty
HOLAS	Heads of Learning Areas
KLP	The Kiwi Leadership for Principals
MOE	Ministry of Education
NCEA	National Certificate of Educational Achievement
NZC	New Zealand Curriculum
RTLB	Resource Teacher: Learning Behaviour
TIC	Teacher in charge
UREC	Unitec Research Ethics Committee

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Setting the scene

In a typical New Zealand secondary school organisational model, there is a hierarchy of leadership and management. The first tier at the top of the hierarchy is the principal and the second tier consists of the senior leadership/management team. The third and fourth tiers encompass the middle leaders/managers who are typically from two main groups, those leading curriculum and those leading pastoral care. At the bottom of the hierarchy are the classroom teachers. However, educational leadership in New Zealand secondary schools is contextually based and increasingly complex.

Educational leadership is distinct from generic leadership through its focus on teaching and learning in educational settings. In recent years, educational leadership and management has been acknowledged as a discipline, a field of theoretical knowledge in its own right (Bush, 2003). Educational leaders' roles and responsibilities are constantly changing and increasing as schools are subjected to frequent and varied reforms and restructurings (Cranston, 2007). Bennett, Crawford and Cartwright (2003) indicate that this increasing and changing workload facing educational leaders has changed the nature of 'leadership' and being an educational leader. Educational leadership involves multiple levels of phenomena with deep structures and many different styles which are very dependent on context. Contextual factors in the educational environments such as school size and organisational conditions moderate a leaders' impact on student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 2011). In large secondary schools, which are the focus of this study, the principal and senior leader's direct leadership effect on student outcomes is low; their indirect leadership is high, with greater evidence of distributed leadership practice (Southworth, 2004). Fitzgerald (2009) states that work connected with

organisational performance and external demands for efficiency is increasingly connected with those 'in the middle'. Leadership and learning is espoused to be connected by senior leaders strategically organising the distribution of leadership to middle leaders (Southworth, 2011). A large amount of responsibility for the leadership of learning practice has been passed on to teachers who are in the position of middle leadership in schools, largely due to the concept of distributed leadership. The literature base on middle leadership and management constantly alludes to the fact that middle leaders are vital to the quality of teaching and learning (Fitzgerald, Gunter & Eaton, 2006).

Middle leadership

A review of the literature reveals there are critics who question the value and necessity of the 'middle leadership' role. Included in this critique is Bennett (1995) who argues that the role has been devalued. However, Fitzgerald (2000) argues that the middle leader's current role within secondary school organisations is not necessarily widely understood because middle leaders are neither part of the senior leadership team nor are they just teachers. Middle leaders can be seen as 'conduits' (Feist, 2008) and the role 'middle' presents its own challenges. Studies show that the role of the middle leader is often one inherent in tension where the middle leader is positioned between the sometimes competing demands of senior leaders, such as the principal, and the members of their team, the teachers (Bennett, Woods, Wise, & Newton, 2007; Feist, 2008; Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2008). Spillane and Diamond (2007) argue that it is the secondary school structure itself that provides secondary schools with leadership challenges.

Due to the responsibility for learning and learners shifting from the apex to the middle tier, middle leaders in secondary schools are, in effect, expected to be leaders of learning (Fitzgerald et al., 2006; Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2006). The Ministry of Education (MOE) revised New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) (MOE, 2007) and the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) have led to change, with middle leaders playing the lead role in initiating and

sustaining pedagogical changes. Southworth (2011) argues there has also been a change in the last decade as many in the middle leadership role have moved from managing resources (such as materials and budgets) to leading people. Middle leaders become dependent on these people putting into practice the ideas and policies agreed and adopted by the school (Southworth, 2004). Middle leadership in New Zealand secondary schools has also become increasingly complex with significant change, increased external accountability and pressure to improve student outcomes.

The New Zealand secondary school context

There are two types of middle leader in secondary schools: curriculum middle leaders and pastoral care middle leaders. Heads of faculties (HOFs) and heads of learning areas (HOLAs) are typically placed in the third tier of the leadership hierarchy and are typically answerable to the second tier of senior leaders above. Heads of departments (HODs) and teachers in charge (TICs) are typically placed within a larger faculty and sit in the fourth tier of leadership. Feist (2008) proposes the HOFs are seen as having more positional authority within the leadership hierarchy and act as a conduit for senior leadership to ensure that decisions and policies are communicated to the other leaders (HODs, TICs) within the faculty. This type of silo subject structure sees HOFs/HOLAs/HODs/TICs as specialist teachers working in silos, with limited areas of responsibility and functional specialisms (Bennett, 1995). In this study, the people in this group will be referred to as curriculum middle leaders.

Deans/Heads of year/House Leaders are also placed in the middle tier, but are required to have a holistic school wide-view called pastoral care or student support. Structurally these leaders are placed within the pastoral care team or the student support team/network. Deans/Heads of year/House Leaders sit somewhere between the third and fourth tier of management. Their positional authority in relation to curriculum middle leaders is difficult to define. Deans/Heads of year/House Leaders are typically answerable directly

to senior leader(s) in the second tier. In this study, the term pastoral care, pastoral care middle leaders and pastoral care team will be used.

Within the New Zealand education system, responsibilities and remuneration for middle leaders are defined locally and vary within and across secondary schools. Middle leaders of curriculum and pastoral care receive varied remuneration in the form of: Management Units, which are currently \$4000; Middle Management Allowances, which are currently \$1000; and, a time allowance per week as recognition for their role (PPTA National Office, 2011). Typically, curriculum middle leaders of larger faculties or departments receive greater remuneration than those of smaller faculties and departments, and pastoral care middle leaders. Moreover, another difference is that curriculum middle leader roles are advertised externally while pastoral care middle leaders are appointed internally. Pastoral care middle leader positions can be fixed-term or permanent while the overwhelming majority of curriculum middle leader positions are permanent, unless they are long term relieving positions.

Pastoral care structures

Pastoral care, in an educational context, has become a diffused concept with a limited understanding (Calvert, 2009). Pastoral care has been described as an 'umbrella term' as it encompasses: counsellors, learning co-ordinators, teaching assistants, careers advisors and pastoral care middle leaders (Best, Jarvis, & Ribbins, 1977; Calvert, 2009). The pastoral system has a significant role in secondary schools where there can be highly complex pastoral care teams (Blandford, 2006). Within a curriculum team, the focus is mostly curriculum centric or student achievement data centric, and teachers are most often a team of subject specific or learning area teachers who have similar professional qualifications. Within a pastoral care team the focus is more student centric and the team is made of paraprofessionals and teachers who are the pastoral care middle leaders. These teachers are most likely to be assembled from different subject or learning areas and it is unlikely that there are similar professional qualifications within the team. McKinley, Madjar, van der Merwe, Smith, Sutherland, and Yuan (2009) define a pastoral care middle

leader as “a member of staff at a secondary school with responsibilities in student personnel services, which may include discipline, administration, pastoral care, and course placement” (p.77). Schools usually have multiple pastoral care middle leaders, each of whom is responsible for a particular group of students within a pastoral care structure. There are some fundamental expectations of the pastoral care middle leader role which apply across all schools. However, the interpretation of pastoral care within schools is contextual and therefore pastoral care structures and systems, often ingrained within secondary schools, vary greatly. These include: pastoral care structure; systems; time allocation; remuneration; job descriptions; formal responsibilities; and, accountability within the wider organisational structure.

The two most common pastoral care structures are a horizontal year level system or a vertical, house-based structure. Students are arranged into groups typically called a tutor group, a form class or a homeroom, with a teacher assigned to the group. In this study the term tutor group and tutor teacher will be used. Some secondary schools run a horizontal structure where students are in year level tutor groups with other students from their year level only. This is usually for one year only and each year a new tutor teacher is assigned to a new tutor group. A pastoral care middle leader would be responsible for a year level including the students and tutor teachers within this structure. Another variation is possible within the horizontal structure where the pastoral care middle leader only moves up each year through years 9-13 with the students. In effect the pastoral care middle leader is with the same group of students for five years. Other schools run a vertical structure where students are in tutor groups dependent on their ‘house’. Tutor groups are multi-age as there is a range of students from year 9-13 in a house tutor group and they may remain in the one house tutor group with the same students and the same tutor teacher for their five years of secondary school. A vertical structure caters for ‘housing’ siblings together and role modelling and mentoring to occur within tutor groups. A pastoral care middle leader would be responsible for the students and tutor teachers in their allocated house.

Problematizing pastoral care middle leadership: the rationale for this research

The traditional middle leadership pastoral care role in its many facets is enduring but changing (Lodge, 1999). Traditionally seen as a disciplinarian role within the school, there have been some shifts for the pastoral care middle leader in New Zealand secondary schools. Recent policy/curriculum change and increased accountability for schools has had implications for educational leaders in pastoral care middle leadership roles. External documents, such as the revised NZC (MOE, 2007) and the main secondary school qualification, the NCEA, have brought opportunities but have largely contributed to a change in secondary schools' teaching, learning, assessment as well as the traditional pastoral care role. Increased accountability and the publication of league tables in magazines and other media have increased pressure and responsibility for secondary school Boards of Trustees and senior leaders, in a climate where school performance and excellence is measured on assessment results (Fitzgerald, 2009). This has also contributed to change and potentially challenges to the traditional pastoral care middle leader role.

Internal changes, such as the evolution of the Student Management System which joins the 'data dots' across silo subjects and tracks assessment results, have repositioned pastoral care and evolved and grown the role of the pastoral care middle leader within secondary schools. The majority of secondary schools are still structured in and functioning in silo subject departmental structures through learning areas and there is a need for a school-wide view. Pastoral care middle leaders are having to maintain a holistic school-wide view for two reasons: firstly, to work across the silos for improved student outcomes and, secondly, to bridge the gap between what was traditionally seen as two separate issues, pastoral care and academic issues. To improve student outcomes, they are collaborating across a wider range of parties, both within and beyond their organisation, than ever before. This has brought new challenges to the pastoral care middle leader role. As the role evolves and grows, there is the potential for work intensification and

under-resourcing, as pastoral care middle leaders have to do more with the same resources they had before.

Through organisational change, leaders can become unsure of what their duties are, how to relate to others, and who has the authority to decide what to do (Bolman & Deal, 2008). As the pastoral care middle leader role evolves and grows, new challenges are presented. Efficient performance management systems and targeted professional development for pastoral care middle leaders to manage these challenges are vital. Although not referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, Spillane, Healey, Parise, and Kenney (2011) propose that there is less attention for middle leaders within the available professional development. The Secondary Teacher Workload Study Report supports this finding by stating middle leaders felt “inadequately trained and supported in carrying out their management roles” (Ingvarson, Kleinhenz, Beavis, Barwick, Carthy, & Wilkinson, 2005, p. 19).

At a global and local level, pastoral care and its various models and the pastoral care middle leader role are largely unaccounted for within the body of research and literature. Middle leadership research and literature in New Zealand secondary schools has a tendency to default to the HOD or HOF roles in schools (Fitzgerald, 2009; Fitzgerald et al., 2006). There is a strong justification for gaining understanding of the pastoral care middle leader role in New Zealand secondary schools as it is a little understood phenomenon. This is problematic as in the current educational environment the role is growing in importance largely through an increased role in assisting student learning. Specific insight into the importance of the role, the challenges those in the role face, and the professional development needs of pastoral care middle leaders is largely missing from the body of research and literature.

This thesis aims to study, from multiple perspectives, the pastoral care middle leader role within New Zealand secondary schools and to create recommendations to support leadership and management development within this role. Within this research the importance of the role, the issues and challenges that those in the role face, and the professional development needs of the role are analysed. Both senior leaders’ and pastoral care middle

leaders' viewpoints were sought to allow for the differing perspectives to be examined and critiqued.

Research aims, questions and setting

The overall aim of this study was to interpret, from multiple perspectives, the pastoral care middle leadership role in New Zealand secondary schools.

The three research aims proposed for this investigation were:

1. To explore the importance of pastoral care middle leadership roles in New Zealand secondary schools.
2. To examine and interpret the challenges that pastoral care middle leaders face.
3. To examine what leadership professional development is needed in pastoral care middle leadership roles.

The three questions that guided this research were:

1. Why are pastoral care middle leadership roles important in secondary schools?
2. What challenges do pastoral care middle leaders face in their role?
3. What leadership professional development is needed for pastoral care middle leaders?

To answer these questions the research employed an interpretive qualitative approach, set within the educational context of three large New Zealand secondary schools in Auckland. School A was an integrated single sex school. School B was a co-educational state school. School C was a co-educational state school. It involved a total of three senior leaders in individual semi-structured interviews and eighteen pastoral care middle leaders in three focus groups. Involving these two groups in the interviews allowed the differing perspectives of each group to emerge. A comparative school versus

school analysis was not the focus of this study, which aimed to focus on pastoral care middle leaders across a number of schools.

Thesis organisation

Following this chapter, the thesis is divided into five chapters and each is outlined below.

Chapter Two, the literature review, further examines international and New Zealand-based research and literature in educational leadership, middle leadership, pastoral care and pastoral care middle leadership. These areas provide a background both for examining current understandings of pastoral care middle leadership and for evaluating the findings of this study.

Chapter Three, the methodology, outlines and justifies the methodological approach utilised for this research. It introduces the two groups of participants, senior leaders of pastoral care and pastoral care middle leaders, and describes how and why they were selected. It also describes the methods used, how the findings were analysed and what the ethical considerations were.

Chapter Four, the findings, provides an overview of the main themes that emerged from the interviews: 'Expectations and Experiences', 'Issues and Challenges' and 'Professional Development Needs'. This two-part chapter first analyses findings from the senior leader interviews and then analyses findings from the pastoral care middle leader focus groups.

Chapter Five, the discussion, brings the senior leader and the pastoral care middle leader findings together to synthesise the alignment and non-alignment of these two perspectives, identify key themes, commonalities and differences, against the relevant literature from Chapter Two. The headings are 'A Complex and Demanding Role Doing "Everything"', 'Relationships, Working In Teams and People Management Challenges' and 'Professional Development'.

Chapter Six, the conclusion, offers conclusions in response to the three research questions. It considers the implications of these findings and outlines limitations of the study and recommendations for further investigation.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter focuses on literature about the role and expectations of the pastoral care middle leader in secondary schools, the challenges they face whilst performing their role, and the professional development needs of a pastoral care middle leader. Themes emerging from the literature include: educational leadership, middle leadership, pastoral care, the importance of pastoral care middle leadership, challenges of the pastoral care middle leadership role, professional development and the pastoral care middle leadership role and additional literature added after data analysis.

Pastoral care and the pastoral care middle leader role in secondary schools are largely unaccounted for within the body of research and literature on middle leadership. At times, the critique of middle leaders within the literature was restricted to curriculum middle leaders and did not single out anything specific in relation to the pastoral care middle leader role. Particularly in the secondary school context, middle leaders of curriculum have a narrow deep focus as specialist teachers working in silos and middle leaders of pastoral care have a broad focus through working across the silos for improved student outcomes. To what extent the literature on the first group is transferable to the second group and is connected to my findings, is an area that requires further research.

Leadership in schools

In New Zealand secondary schools the title of Senior Leadership Team or Senior Management Team is most often used to describe the principal/head and deputies, while Middle Management is used to describe any role of responsibility above that of a teaching role. Titles vary between schools and are contextually based. Regardless whether the team within a school is called

management or leadership, the core function of the role is to improve teaching and learning. Adding to this debate, there is no scholarly consensus about what distinguishes leadership from management, what defines each and how each may change in a variety of circumstances (Bush, 2003; Fidler & Atton, 2004; Gronn, 2003; Harris, 2005). Title debates aside, research conducted by Cranston (2007) found school leaders identified a variety of both management and leadership skills and competencies as critical to their role. They described their role as requiring “a competent manager as well as a leader” (p. 24). Interestingly, Cranston’s (2007) study also found the educational leaders wanted fewer management aspects to their role which they felt dominated over the opportunity for more strategic and educational leadership. Ultimately, there are generic principles of management and leadership that can be applied to all settings; however, distinguishing between the two concepts can be difficult.

Spillane and Diamond (2007) are convinced that “while leadership and management may be analytically distinguishable, in practice it is often difficult to distinguish between the two. Specifically, organisational routines that serve leadership functions often serve management functions as well ... they play out in tandem” (p. 149). Nonetheless, the leadership imperative appears to dominate over the managerial imperative in what scholars write about leading and managing in educational settings (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). The term leadership is currently more in vogue in education, in comparison to management, and Simkins (2005) argues it has been popularised ahead of all other alternative terms. Therefore, for the purpose of continuity in this study on education, the term leadership will be used with the intention of serving both functions.

Educational leadership as a concept

There are many generic theories of leadership and practice or style available, however, Sergiovanni (2001) warns educational leaders against using imported theories of leadership and practice or style that do not work well in the education environment. While there can be little doubt that the core

imperative of educational leadership is student learning and student achievement (Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2006), there is no agreed or correct definition of the concept of leadership (Bush, 2003). Structures underline formal leadership roles and processes, however, they do not represent the experiences of those within the role. Gunter (2005) argues that power structures that emphasise a leader-follower dichotomy can limit our understanding of leadership to those in 'official' organisational roles. The organisational role perspective cannot be looked at without considering the social aspect and vice versa. Leadership is often associated with influence (Gronn, 2003); therefore, relationships with others are at the very core of leadership practice. One of the early theorists of leadership theory, Mary Parker Follett, argued that leadership can occur in places where we least expect to find it (Graham, 1995). Weber (1987) describes the practice of leadership as "power granted with the will of the followers. It is authority readily invested in a trusted person and thus qualifies as a kind of moral and transformational power over the organisation" (p. 2). Ultimately, the practice of leadership is about influence and is essentially a social process.

Being an educational leader

The educational environment is unique and "the school leadership field is a difficult terrain to traverse" (Harris, 2005, p. 76). Bush (2003) suggests four influences that highlight the unique and special characteristic of the educational environment for an educational leader. These influences are: educational objectives; having children and young people as 'clients'; classroom autonomy for educational professionals; and, time factors for senior and middle leaders to carry out managerial aspects of their work. Cranston (2009) states "school leaders today require a broad range of capabilities to carry out their increasingly diverse and pressured roles" (p. 233).

Research on the key capabilities of an educational leader identifies strong interpersonal/people skills as crucial to undertaking the role effectively (Cranston, 2007). The capacity to delegate/empower, to be an effective and efficient manager/administrator, and to be able to inspire and vision change

also rated as important. “Leading learning at any level in a school involves the act of influencing and working with others in a highly collaborative, collegial and supportive environment that encourages risk and innovation and which places learning at the centre of all activities” (Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2006, p. 8). To influence and inspire others requires activity and action, more than just ‘being’ an educational leader. Gunter (2005) considers the meaning and activity of doing and experiencing educational leadership as more important than the ‘must’ of being a leader. Within the Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (BES), Robinson, Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) found educational leaders promoting and participating in teacher learning and development - as leader, learner or both - had the greatest relative impact on increasing student outcomes. Leading in the educational environment requires influencing and working with others to achieve the core function of improving student outcomes.

Educational leadership definitions, models and perspectives

A literature review of educational leadership definitions, models and perspectives in current theory and literature is far-reaching. Current theory and literature on educational leadership is described by Harris (2005) as large, disparate, and generating various theoretical perspectives. Having a large theory base to draw from has its advantages as no one educational model is a panacea and it is very much a case of ‘not one size fits all’. A detailed prescription to a single definition or model is neither wise nor possible (Southworth, 2011). Research is making important progress in understanding how leadership contributes to school improvement and student learning in different school contexts (Hallinger & Heck, 2011). A model or framework provides support; however, educational leaders must then make sense of how to use it in their own context. Simkins (2005) argues for moving beyond models or metaphors and “that ‘making sense’ requires theorizing” (p. 21). In a New Zealand context, two recognised avenues for making sense of educational leadership definitions, models and perspectives are contained in

The Kiwi Leadership for Principals (KLP) (MOE, 2008) and the BES (Robinson et al., 2009).

The KLP model (MOE, 2008) takes account of the particular conditions in which New Zealand schools operate. It is based on: principals' experiences of what works; principal initiatives since 2001 such as the First Time Principals' Programme; and, evidence from New Zealand and overseas about leadership and student achievement. It is underpinned by research evidence that was being developed in the BES (Robinson et al., 2009) and from school leaders' insights derived from their experience. The central purpose of the New Zealand based BES (Robinson et al., 2009) was to draw together bodies of research evidence to identify and explain characteristics of school leadership that influenced student outcomes. Clear direction for enhancing student outcomes through educational leadership is provided however, some critique of the BES (Robinson et al., 2009) is relevant to this study. Youngs (2011) warns the BES (Robinson et al., 2009) needs to be read critically, particularly in relation to the transferability of context across nations and time periods. He argues there is a risk of overlooking other aspects of school leadership and management activity as it is not a case of 'one-size-fits-all'. While the core imperative remains, Robinson, Bendikson and Hattie (2011) believe research carried out in primary schools should not be generalised to the secondary school setting because of school size, departmental organisation and the nature of the student body. The BES (Robinson et al., 2009) notes "how little information there is on secondary school, particularly relating to the leadership provided by faculty heads, heads of departments, or their equivalents" (p.101). Secondary schools will vary in type, structure and community; however, they are all generally larger sized schools. As the size of a school increases, the configuration and nature of learning-centred leadership changes in its emphasis and content (Southworth, 2004).

Distributed leadership in secondary schools

Secondary schools tend to be larger sized schools in which educational leadership is distributed amongst a larger number of leaders. Southworth (2004) describes a school with a large number of leaders as having

'distributed leadership'. Distributed leadership is connected with the notion that a principal's influence in large schools is largely indirect and is "consistent with the view that leadership is a social influencing process" (Southworth, 2011, p. 74). Distributing leadership has implications for those in leadership positions. Through distributed leadership, heads and deputies are required to take on another level of leadership which is that of developing other leaders so that the density of leadership and leader-follower ratio is maintained (Southworth, 2004). Distribution of leadership creates more opportunities for professionals to learn when executed effectively (Timperley & Robertson, 2011). It allows more talent to be utilised; allows individuals to feel empowered; and suggests an openness of boundaries (Woods, Bennett & Wise, 2004).

However, distributed leadership does have its critics. Harris (2008) and Youngs (2007) believe there is a common interpretation of distributed leadership as one of passing on and placing extra demands and tasks on others, namely middle leaders, which actually becomes a form of delegation. Another criticism is that delegating leadership onto others (Youngs, 2008) thereby causes "distributed pain" (Grubb & Flessa, 2006, p. 535). Bottery (2004) supports critique of distributed leadership, stating that it is a form of leadership that is not necessarily distributing leadership, but distributing work. Youngs (2008) recognises terms such as distributed leadership have become popular and have been developed as solutions for overworked educational leaders. Harris (2008) offers an alternate perspective by suggesting that it is not the distribution of leadership that determines its effectiveness, but rather how it is distributed. As mentioned in the literature, distributing leadership is a difficult task. Within secondary schools this is largely determined by the principal and the senior leaders. While senior leaders keep the overall view in schools, middle leaders develop limited areas of responsibility and functional specialisms (Bennett, 1995). In a large school with a number of leaders, year group leaders and subject leaders will increasingly exercise leadership from the middle (Southworth, 2004).

Middle leadership in secondary schools

The middle leader within secondary schools has received less attention and research than that of senior leaders and classroom teachers (Collier, Dinham, Brennan, Deece & Mulford, 2002; Cranston, 2006; Dinham, 2007; Robinson et al., 2009). The middle leader has evolved and grown to play a key role in supporting and leading learning for increased student outcomes. However, Fitzgerald et al. (2006) argue middle leadership and the theorisation as to how the leadership of learning occurs in school is missing in the literature. Within the small body of literature available, there are broad definitions of the middle leader role. Blandford (2006) defines middle leaders as acting variously as a teacher, leader and a team member. Several other writers frequently refer to middle leaders as leading teams, working within teams and building teams (Adey, 2000; Bennett et al., 2007; Fitzgerald, 2000). Fitzgerald et al. (2006) describe middle leaders' work as building effective and supportive teams that are organised around a subject/curriculum or year group. Middle leaders need skills that support them in their work with teams including interpersonal/people skills and a capacity to manage and administer effectively (Cranston, 2009). Middle leaders are supporting and leading learning and building and supporting teams, to achieve the core function of improving student outcomes. The two types of middle leader in a secondary school are the curriculum middle leader and the pastoral care middle leader.

Challenges of the middle leadership role in secondary schools

The small growth in qualitative research studies has revealed the complexity of middle leadership in education. From performing the role to operationalisation of a job description, to understanding the location and exercise of power (Gunter, 2001), middle leaders need to have a clear view of how to manage their time and organise their workload. Unlike a senior leader, the majority of middle leaders also have a full teaching commitment (Blandford, 2006). Those in middle leadership roles need to effectively maintain a high level of teaching expertise as well as fulfil their leadership duties, even while they have less time to plan, prepare and, arguably, teach.

Day-to-day events such as interruptions from students, teachers, senior leaders, parents and others need to be handled appropriately. “Central to effective middle leadership is the ability of the middle leader to identify their role at any given moment in the school day” (Blandford, 2006, p. 6).

Middle leaders are busy (Ingvarson et al., 2005) and getting busier. Cranston (2009) suggests change and intensification in principals’ and senior leaders’ roles means the demands on those in middle-level positions are likely to change and intensify also. This is supported by Fitzgerald (2009) who proposes that in New Zealand secondary schools “the intensification of work teachers have experienced in recent times as a result of educational reforms and changes to curricula and national examinations has been forced downwards” to middle leaders (p. 61). The Secondary Teacher Workload Study Report (Ingvarson et al., 2005) found middle leaders were less satisfied with their work-life balance than teachers and senior leaders and had the most negative perceptions of the manageability of their workload.

Gunter (2001) has criticisms of how the label middle is being used to position people in secondary schools, while the middle itself is stratified according to task, status and pay. As aforementioned there are typically two tiers within the middle leadership hierarchy, while responsibilities and remuneration for middle leaders are contextually based and varied within and across New Zealand schools. A middle leader’s work may be organised into a silo subject departmental area as a curriculum middle leader or it may entail a holistic school-wide view as a pastoral care middle leader. Gunter (2001) argues the label middle leadership inappropriately seeks to represent diverse work according to a unified structural dimension. Middle leaders are placed as conduits (Feist, 2008) and Glover, Gleeson, Gough and Johnson (1998) and Gunter (2001) are critical of the adoption of what they argue as ‘non-educational’ ways of working that this type of ‘middle leadership’ structural dimension brings through line management and achieving accountability to those above and below. They believe this ultimately challenges and undermines the professional culture of teaching. Bennett et al. (2007) identify that it is the organisation of teaching within secondary schools that has

traditionally supported “the creation of hierarchical structures and a culture of line management” (p. 455). Challenges for curriculum and pastoral care middle leaders within secondary schools exist within multifaceted secondary school structures.

Pastoral care in secondary schools

While there are attempts to position pastoral care as a primary function in education, the meaning of the term is elusive and unclear (Best et al., 1977; Calvert & Henderson, 1998; Calvert, 2009). Pastoral care itself has traditionally been associated with notions of help, advice, values development and children’s moral welfare (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007). Calvert (2009) suggests “the concept of care and the ways in which it is provided, have changed immeasurably in the last generation” (p. 267). Drewery (2007) argues young people are maturing earlier, yet are expected to stay at school for longer, which may be placing strains on our schools, families and students themselves. Changes in society and care have implications for pastoral care in secondary schools. “Pastoral demands on staff have increased dramatically as pupils bring more social and emotional problems to school” (Calvert, Evans & Henderson, 1998, p. 82). Furthermore, a student’s social and emotional wellbeing has been connected to their academic achievement and there is strong advocacy that pastoral care should primarily be associated with helping children learn effectively (Downes, 1998; Megahy, 1998). This role of ‘care for improved academic outcomes’ has implications for pastoral care systems and initiatives in secondary schools.

Pastoral care initiatives in New Zealand secondary schools today accommodate a range of contextually based practices, people, roles and attitudes that have changed over time. Historically, pastoral care that was hierarchical in nature was due to growth in school size, increase in pupil numbers and was required to be significantly strong in a disciplinary nature to manage this change (Calvert, 2009). Increasingly pastoral care practises within secondary schools are dependent on paraprofessionals such as counsellors as teachers do not always have the expertise or time address

societal changes and the subsequent increased pastoral care demands. The literature suggests reliance on paraprofessionals increases the potential for tension through organisational cultural differences and the possibility that paraprofessionals' codes of practice may differ from teachers' codes of practice (Calvert, 2009).

Because individual secondary schools direct pastoral initiatives, the approach and structure they take and who is involved is contextually based and there is not one common approach. Pastoral care networks and guidance programmes such as Peer Support have been running in New Zealand schools for many years (Crowe, 2006). However, "the success of these initiatives in each school is very dependent upon the value the school places on the issues and in time and commitment made to the programme" (Crowe, 2006, p. 24). Another initiative which has gained popularity in the New Zealand education community is the use of disciplinary practices derived from restorative justice. The term 'restorative practices' has become a fashionable term for a range of practices employed school-wide, involving less confrontational discipline and with a focus on relational practices earlier in the chain of command (Drewery, 2007). There is evidence within the literature that pastoral care initiatives are also beginning to take an academic focus. For example a research project called The Starpath Project (McKinley, et al., 2009) focussed on transforming educational outcomes for New Zealand students and research conducted by Youngs (2010) on students' perceptions of who influences their learning environment, where the NZC (MOE, 2007) and NCEA are included within the pastoral care approach. These initiatives are supported by Calvert (2009) who questions teachers' knowledge about pastoral care and its objectives, when pastoral care is seen as separate to the academic issues.

There is evidence within the literature to indicate schools' desire for better academic performance and excellence are connected to shifts in the role of pastoral care. Fitzgerald (2009) identifies the structures and discourses of the public sector reforms of the late 1980s, broadly known as New Public Management, as stimulating a climate of increasing demand for public

accountability and responsibility. In response to this climate, Russell (2007) believes that each individual school's choice of where and to whom they direct their pastoral care initiatives is being influenced by their own need to improve academic results and survive within the competitive, quasi-market environment.

McGuiness (1989) supports connecting social and emotional wellbeing with academic development and takes the concept of pastoral care beyond something that is associated only with the care of students. She argues, "pastoral care is at the very heart of the school as a learning community, because it challenges teachers to continue to make sense of their own lives and experience, before they have the humility (or temerity) to support pupils' social and emotional as well as academic development" (p. 60). This community of care is a crucial consideration for secondary schools in an age of increased pastoral demands on staff (Calvert et al., 1998). Drewery (2007) adds that in many ways schools are already 'communities of care', and calls for a re-examination of the notion of care that is predominating in schools.

Pastoral care middle leadership roles in secondary schools

Bennett et al. (2007) reveal that through their review of empirical research of middle leadership in secondary schools, pastoral leadership as a topic was notable only by its absence. They were not aware of any systematic research that had been "carried out into the ways in which teachers with responsibilities for pastoral care have understood their work, or others' expectations of their role" (p. 455). What little is available on the topic of pastoral care middle leadership within the literature, is limited to definitions and the nature of the role (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007; Downes, 1998; McGuiness, 1989; Megahy, 1998).

Tutors and tutor time

The pastoral care middle leader works within teams, including the pastoral care team and builds teams and relationships with curriculum middle leaders,

other teachers, students, parents, community and external agencies to improve student outcomes. To support this fundamental aspect of the role, Blandford (2006) believes middle leaders of pastoral care need to be good managers, capable of building teams, resolving conflicts and providing support. An important duty of the pastoral care middle leader is to lead a team of tutors within the organisational structure.

Tutors typically meet with their tutor group once a day. Megahy (1998) claims the purpose of the tutor role is to gain insight into the whole learning experiences of the tutees/students. This insight can then be communicated to the pastoral care middle leader, who is usually expected to have a school-wide picture of the students in their care. The tutor teachers assigned to a year level or house usually meet with their pastoral care middle leader regularly as a group once or twice a week. Megahy (1998) argue the pastoral care middle leader can then have the evidence to report back to curriculum leaders on ways in which further gains in learning could be made.

Within the literature, allocated tutor time and the role of the tutor have their critics. The tutor teacher role can be viewed purely as an administrative role within the school structure: a time to disseminate information to the students and complete everyday requirements such as attendance. Downes (1998) indicates tutors constantly complain that there is not enough time to get to know the pupils as individuals. Hylan and Postelwaith (1998) argue tutors should be playing an increased role in pastoral care with students. They place the onus on pastoral care leaders to try to find ways to minimise unproductive time and maximise valuable personal contact for tutor teachers and tutor groups.

The literature suggests tutors may struggle with the notion or purpose of pastoral care, as tutors and as teachers, within their own subject-based classes. Hall (1998) proposed the nature of pastoral care and the personal involvement that it requires concerns itself with relationships and human interaction. He believes this differs from some of the mechanical, subject-based approaches to teaching. It cannot be assumed that the skills that good teachers bring to the teaching process will be automatically applied to their

pastoral care roles as tutors. Calvert (1998) argues that teachers who feel competent and confident in their own subject disciplines may, and often do, feel very different about their pastoral work. He points to a lack of pre-service and in-service provision for tutors.

Teams and relationships

The pastoral care middle leader has the responsibility of leading a team of students from within their year level/house. It is expected that the middle leader of pastoral care will have a school-wide view of the students in their care. However, within the reviewed literature, there is a lack of research and literature available on pastoral care middle leaders leading students as a cohort within secondary schools and on pastoral care middle leaders and their work with paraprofessionals in a pastoral care team within secondary schools. Pastoral care middle leaders have responsibility to build relationships and teams with curriculum middle leaders, teachers, students, parents, community members and external agencies to improve student outcomes. Within the reviewed literature, there was a lack of research and literature available regarding pastoral care middle leaders building teams and relationships, with others, to improve student outcomes.

Challenges of the pastoral care middle leadership role

Low status

Curriculum and pastoral care are placed side by side in the structural hierarchy of middle leadership in secondary schools however, the small body of available literature has indicated that pastoral care has a lower status. Scaife (1998) believes pastoral care has a low status in schools because: teachers are not trained for, nor competent in, the pastoral role; there is no consensus on what pastoral teaching involves; it cannot be taught; and, it is impossible to assess the effectiveness of pastoral care in schools. Lack of status can lead to challenges for pastoral care middle leaders who rely on others, such as tutors, to implement pastoral care policies within the school.

Given its low status, Calvert and Henderson (1998) believe pastoral care is often left to its own devices; it 'chugs along' rather than being lead and managed strategically.

Megahy (1998) argues that the failure to develop any shared vision of, and priorities for, pastoral care, is a familiar pattern in schools. de Jong and Kerr-Roubicek (2007) consider implementing pastoral care policy at a local level in schools to be weak. They advocate for more work on developing and implementing effective standards for effective pastoral care practice. Developing and implementing standards would require pastoral care and pastoral care middle leaders to be led, managed strategically and supported from the top of the organisational hierarchy. Fitzgerald et al., (2006) propose that teachers are highly motivated when there is a sustained level of support from senior leaders. Because pastoral care is contextually based, senior leaders would need to support work on establishing objectives for pastoral care practice within their own schools.

Teams and relationships

Within New Zealand's educational institutions teamwork is widespread and is considered an appropriate and necessary part of school structures (Cardno, 1999). Bush and Middlewood (2005) note that while teams and teamwork are increasingly advocated as part of the school structure, their value depends on whether they operate effectively and contribute to the development of successful schools. Determining effectiveness is complex and Cardno (1999) notes there is little published research on the "incidence or effectiveness of teams" (p. 3). Although not necessarily referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, Fitzgerald et al. (2006) propose that working in teams can be a complex and messy role. A review of the available literature body has found virtually no published research on the incidence or effectiveness of pastoral care teams and the teamwork of pastoral care middle leaders in secondary schools.

Teams and teamwork can create challenges and for pastoral care middle leaders. There is a suggestion within the literature that pastoral care teams are seen as inferior to curriculum or subject teams within secondary schools. Bennett (1995) argues that in secondary schools the subject department is the key section of the school to which secondary teachers feel an allegiance. Scaife (1998) supports this by stating pastoral care is not seen as important by teachers or students. This suggests potential challenges for pastoral care middle leaders in leading their pastoral care teams. Furthermore, Calvert and Henderson (1998) argue there is an obvious academic/pastoral divide within secondary schools and that the pastoral is clearly inferior. This suggests that teachers who are tutors will be more committed to their responsibilities within their subject team(s) than in their pastoral care role. In addition, Bennett (1995) states that “because the proper approach to guidance and the teaching of personal and social education is so much a matter of contention, pastoral teams are likely to be less cohesive than most subject departments” (p. 104).

Adding to the challenges of pastoral care middle leaders is an increasingly diverse parent community. Pastoral care was historically required to be strong in a disciplinary nature while the pastoral care middle leader’s role was described as a discourse of power and control with a caring dimension to their work, or ‘superdisciplinarians’ (Calvert, 2009). Drewery (2007) proposes schools by law are required to be ‘in loco parentis’. She questions the relevance and acceptance of this status for schools today, and is doubtful that all parents might reasonably be expected to share the values of the ‘disciplinarians’ of the school in our increasingly diverse communities. This diversity presents challenges for the pastoral care middle leader as ‘disciplinarian’ or now ‘school-wide holistic carer’.

Intensification and workload

Although not referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, lack of time has been indicated as a negative aspect of the middle leader’s role in many studies (Brown & Rutherford, 1998; Cranston, 2006; Fullan, 2007; Harris, 2000). The shift to having a school-wide view, combined with an increase in

pastoral demands (Calvert et al., 1998) and changes in curricula and national examinations (Fitzgerald, 2009) causes work intensification and challenges for the pastoral care middle leader. Ingvarson et al. (2005) argue that the current secondary system appears to allocate management jobs to middle leaders, rather than provide leadership roles for teachers to enhance the professional development of other teachers. Although not referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders Collier et al. (2002) suggest for middle leaders, there is “too little time available to deal with the multiplicity of demands of the position” (p. 24). They are spending time on administrative matters and not on the professional leadership aspects of their role, which by their own admission “they are currently compromising or even neglecting” (Collier et al., 2002, p. 24).

There is a strong indication that alleviating administrative tasks from pastoral care middle leaders would go some way to assisting workload and maximising available time. Administration tasks for pastoral care middle leaders can include: monitoring attendance; reporting writing and checking; writing testimonials and references; and, monitoring student appearance. Studies identified by Downes (1998) found that teachers spent time on tasks that could be done more effectively and less expensively by non-teachers. Ingvarson et al. (2005) found the monitoring of and subsequent dissemination of tasks deemed administrative would go some way to relieving the strains of the pastoral care middle leader role. This would enable all teachers and all those operating within the pastoral system to have the maximum time for working with pupils (Downes, 1998). It is not only pastoral care middle leaders that are overwhelmed by administration; as aforementioned it is also tutor teachers.

Pastoral care middle leaders are required to divide their workload between their pastoral care middle leader role and their teaching role within their subject team(s) as the majority of middle leaders have a full teaching commitment (Blandford, 2006). The Secondary Teacher Workload Study Report (Ingvarson, et al., 2005) found that middle leaders reported strains in combining teaching with pastoral and administrative roles. Within this study,

middle leaders felt that planning and preparation for their teaching suffered as they struggled to find time for pastoral and management duties (Ingvarson, et al., 2005). Crowe (2006) argues because of workload issues, teachers are less available to undertake guidance and pastoral care roles and are frequently leaving this work or referring this work to the guidance counsellor. The small body of literature suggests it may be a struggle for pastoral care middle leaders to balance their middle leader and subject teacher workload. A lack of planning and preparation for teaching can lead to staff stress, burnout, staff absenteeism, irritability, lack of control and loss of caring (Tew, 2010). In addition, pastoral care middle leaders lack support through insufficient guidance and lack of training which adds stress to the role (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007; Irving, Moore, & Hamilton, 2003; Lodge, 1999). This presents a tension for the teaching professional who strives to be an effective pastoral care middle leader and an effective subject teacher.

The middle leadership roles of pastoral care and curriculum are being shifted closer than ever before. Academic coaching, monitoring, counselling and mentoring schemes linked to pastoral care are being implemented purely to raise student achievement in curriculum (The University of Auckland, 2011; Youngs, 2010). This has arguably shifted some of the onus of student achievement away from just the classroom teacher and the curriculum middle leader, to a third party, of the pastoral care middle leader. However, research on a mentoring scheme related to curriculum implementation and initiatives to improve student achievement conducted by Youngs (2010), found that endeavours to improve student learning through academic counselling and student mentoring were more challenging than first envisaged. Tensions between the change that the schools wanted to see and what they actually experienced arose due to day-to-day demands, other initiatives and a limit to resources. Other research projects in secondary schools using pastoral care initiatives such as mentoring to intentionally increase students' academic results were inconclusive, although they proved to subsequently increase well-being of the students through self-esteem, confidence and motivation (Irving et al., 2003; Russell, 2007). Arguably, this is the primary objective of pastoral care.

The Starpath Project is working with cluster schools and pastoral care middle leaders on using data and student tracking to provide a sound evidence base for setting student targets and guiding student achievement (McKinley, et al., 2009). In-depth research was conducted into a school which implemented an Academic Counselling and Target Setting intervention (ACTS) (McKinley, et al., 2009). In the project, some pastoral care middle leaders saw their role as continuing to do what they had always done, with academic counselling as 'extra work' (McKinley, et al., 2009). Others recognised that academic counselling created a more fundamental shift in their jobs, as they came to realise that most of their previous interactions with students had centred on disciplinary matters (McKinley, et al., 2009). This work provided a platform for change and pastoral care middle leaders used academic counselling to construct positive interactions with students (McKinley, et al., 2009). Staff time was the most significant cost of the project.

Jurisdiction

Middle leaders are charged with specific responsibilities and jurisdiction over decision-making areas assigned to them (Cardno, 1998). The two main decision-making areas in secondary schools for middle leaders are that of pastoral care and curriculum. An aspect of the pastoral care middle leader role is to build teams with curriculum middle leaders and subject teachers to improve student outcomes. Curriculum and pastoral care have moved closer than ever before. This has the potential to raise questions of jurisdiction between curriculum middle leaders and pastoral care middle leaders over academic issues concerning students or curriculum teachers. While problems may be relevant to teachers and they may have the expertise, they may not have the jurisdiction (Owens, 2004). Cardno (1998) argues it is essential that the limits of jurisdiction are clarified.

Dilemmas

Middle leadership can be a complex and messy role (Fitzgerald et al., 2006). The work of pastoral care middle leaders is often perceived as pastoral care for students or student support however, they must juggle the conflicting demands of students, teachers, parents and senior leaders which can result in dilemmas. "Dilemmas are complex, tension-fraught problems that arise when a leader is challenged to achieve more than one objective" (Cardno, 2007, p. 33). They contain tensions between goals, values, stakeholders, moral positions and role and are dreaded because they arouse emotive responses. Pastoral care middle leaders can experience 'leadership dilemmas' through the pastoral care of students as the type of problems they encounter in their role can require them to consider both collegial relationships and organisational quality goals simultaneously (Cardno, 1998).

With increased pastoral demands, a greater need for relationships and teamwork, and shifts within the pastoral care middle leader role, there are challenges for pastoral care middle leaders. The body of research and literature on challenges and tensions specific to the pastoral care middle leadership role is minimal. Although not referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, Ingvarson et al. (2005) found that middle leaders were less satisfied than both senior leaders and teachers with their perceived workload and the balance of this work with their private life.

Professional development and the pastoral care middle leadership role

Performance management

In reviewing the literature, performance management of the pastoral care middle leader is a contentious issue. Calvert and Henderson (1998) propose pastoral care effects defy crude performance indicators and measures of output, therefore pastoral care has not, as a rule, been accountable. However, there are those who suggest that pastoral care middle leaders should be more accountable in their role. Calvert and Henderson (1998) argue there is a need

to be able to demonstrate effectiveness of pastoral care practices to ensure adequate use of resources. Megahy (1998) suggests “there is no reason why pastoral managers should be any less subject to the process of accountability than heads of curriculum areas; accepting responsibility for gathering and analysing both quantitative and qualitative data and devising strategies for improvement” (p. 45). He argues that there is a need for both self-evaluation and sensitive external evaluation to ensure good quality provision in pastoral care. In contrast, Scaife (1998) believes it is impossible to assess the effectiveness of leading pastoral care in schools. While the question of ‘how to know if you are doing your job properly’ in leading pastoral care can come up, Scaife (1998) argues the answer should be in understanding, not of targets or competence specifications, but of interpersonal processes and societal values.

In a New Zealand context, there are performance indicators for the pastoral care middle leader within the Professional Standards for Secondary Teachers (PPTA National Office, 2011). These indicative standards apply to Unit Holders who have assumed specified leadership, pastoral, administrative or task-specific responsibilities (PPTA National Office, 2011). However, these standards are generic and there is no reference specifically to the pastoral care middle leadership role. They also make no mention of the notion of team development and leadership of teams within the Unit Holder’s role. However, in many schools, the professional standards for teachers “are used to create a generic job description and additional tasks or responsibilities are appended as ‘clip-on’ additions” (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005, p. 28). The literature suggests a performance indicator or professional standard method fails to assess a pastoral care middle leader’s effectiveness (Scaife, 1998) while a generic job description fails to recognise the complexity and contextual based nature of the pastoral care middle leader role. Bush and Middlewood (2005) state job descriptions list tasks and responsibilities of the middle leader; however, people behave differently from their job descriptions by responding to both the expectations of the set role and their own individual interpretations of the position. However, Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) propose job descriptions are “the mechanism for an on-going dialogue about

accountability” (p. 28) and act as a keystone for all aspects of performance management. The reviewed literature indicates a suitable performance management system would go some way to ensuring quality provision in pastoral care.

Professional development needs

The literature reviewed indicated appropriate support and training is required for those who move from teaching into pastoral care middle leadership positions. The desired attributes of a pastoral care middle leader may not be directly transferable from a classroom teacher’s role. Scaife (1998) believes that teachers are not trained for, nor competent in, the pastoral role; there is no consensus on what pastoral teaching involves and it cannot be taught. In contrast, Hall (1998) advocates for support and training specific to the transition into the pastoral care role which requires pastoral care middle leaders to reflect on their own attitudes and beliefs. Irrespective of these viewpoints, Calvert and Henderson (1998) argue the support and guidance that is required for teachers to make the transition to become pastoral care middle leaders is somewhat lacking. Although not necessarily referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, for many middle leaders, learning on-the-job and watching others has been the closest to any form of training they have been given (Adey, 2000). “Teachers and managers need continuing assistance and professional development to help them ensure that all aspects of their work are being done effectively and efficiently. This applies in particular to those aspects of work that are performed in non-contact time” (Ingvarson et al., 2005, p. 187).

The literature reviewed suggests it is likely professional development needs of pastoral care middle leaders are not being met. Lack of training and support means pastoral care middle leaders are not being given the opportunity to build leadership capacity within themselves and subsequently others. Although not necessarily referring to pastoral care middle leaders, Adey (2000) found lack of training and support can add further tension to the middle leader role as they learn to grapple with the complexities of their job such as:

resolving conflict between staff; motivating staff; conducting appraisal effectively; managing teams; managing their own time; and, taking action to address problems with teaching quality and competence. In order to do their jobs effectively middle leaders need to be supported to make any changes that are necessary to improve performance (Piggot-Irvine & Cardno, 2005, p. 26). This support should come from senior leaders as developing other leaders is necessary for effective distributed leadership (Southworth, 2004). With pastoral demands staff increasing (Calvert et al., 1998), leaders must be able to build capacity in themselves and others to respond swiftly, knowledgeably, and responsibly to the constant currents of uncertainty and change (Crowther, Kaagan, Ferguson & Hahn, 2002). Furthermore, Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) argue that to develop, in a professional sense, is an essential part of belonging to a profession.

The reviewed literature points out schools need to be more proactive about professional development plans for pastoral care middle leaders. Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, and Fung (2007) note a particularly urgent issue facing the New Zealand education sector is the need to promote teacher learning opportunities in ways that impact on student outcomes. Timperley (2011) is sceptical of one-off courses which abound with little evidence that they make any real difference. She believes professional learning plans need to be developed by identifying strengths and learning needs. To make the best use of resources, Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) suggest a considered and systematic approach for developing and operating a plan for professional development for the school and for each individual. The nature of pastoral care and pastoral care middle leadership presents an argument for this beginning within the workplace. Southworth (2011) is supportive of this, stating “on-the-job learning should be seen as part of working in any school. There should be an expectation that we are all learners and that we all learn from our work: the workplace is our learning workshop” (p. 79).

Schools have a number of formal and informal structures that can be utilised to enhance leadership activities (Fitzgerald et al., 2006). However, school structures, organisational routines, resources and time can also restrict

leadership activities. Spillane et al. (2011) suggest social interactions among school staff in their work can act as on-the-job professional learning opportunities to get around organisational routines and tools that may restrict professional learning opportunities. They endorse social interactions such as conversations in the hallway or planning sessions or meetings with colleagues where learning is more likely secondary or incidental (Spillane et al., 2011). In contrast, Timperley et al. (2007) *BES on Teacher Learning and Development* found professional learning opportunities for teachers need to be organised and managed opportunities. Important factors to impact positively and substantively on a range of student outcomes include: providing sufficient time; engaging external expertise; focusing on engaging teachers in the learning process; challenging problematic discourses; providing opportunities to interact in a community of professionals; ensuring content is consistent with wider policy trends; and, in school-based initiatives, having leaders actively leading the professional learning opportunities (Timperley et al., 2007).

The body of reviewed literature offers differing viewpoints on whether professional development for pastoral care middle leaders is the responsibility of the individual, senior leaders within schools or of national bodies. Southworth (2011) argues “professional learning is collaborative as well as individual; we have a responsibility for one another’s learning as well as our own” (p. 79). Cardno and Fitzgerald (2005) promote leadership development as primarily a personal responsibility; however, they believe it is also an institutional obligation. Robinson et al. (2009) proposes the development of leadership capability is the responsibility of both schools and government. Although not necessarily referring specifically to middle leaders, Southworth (2011) calls for more provision at a national and local level, stating “head teachers, deputy heads and assistant head teachers need support in leading and managing the distribution and development of middle leaders” (p. 82).

Robinson et al. (2009) claim “there has been some discussion in the sector about the need for a ‘Kiwi Leadership’ framework for middle managers such as department heads and curriculum leaders” (p. 207). There is no specific detail that this will be applicable to pastoral care middle leaders. The nature of

the pastoral care middle leader's role could bring challenges to the relevance of a generic framework. The body of research and literature reviewed focussed specifically on pastoral care and pastoral care middle leadership, from which to inform the basis of a framework in New Zealand schools, is sparse. Bennett et al. (2007) also note a lack of research on a global scale. Without this research, it could be argued that those at a national level are not aware of the growing importance of the pastoral care middle leader role within secondary schools and are, at this time, unable to deliver the necessary support to develop a framework relevant to pastoral care middle leaders.

Performance management system

As teaching professionals, pastoral care middle leaders are required to be part of a performance management system. Piggot-Irvine (2003) sees effective appraisal as a regular event which celebrates and encourages achievement and encourages reflection, innovation, risk-taking and professional growth. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) view appraisal as an evaluative cycle of activity meant to benefit both the individual and the organisation by providing a means for demonstrating accountability through meeting job descriptions, meeting organisational goals and acting as a means for targeting development needs. The primary focus of effective appraisal is to improve the quality of leading, managing, teaching and learning (Piggot-Irvine, 2003). Piggot-Irvine (2005) argues that performance appraisal definitely "reflects the quality of the performance of the teacher as well as the quality of the school" (p. 18). Appraisal for pastoral care middle leaders should inform their professional development, while pastoral care middle leader professional development is an inherent part of appraisal. A contextualised adjustment of Cardno's (2005) model of holistic professional development would go some way to addressing the professional development needs of pastoral care middle leaders. Southworth (2011) argues a detailed prescription to a definition or model is neither wise nor possible. Within the model, development of school, management and professional development would remain; however, curriculum would be replaced by pastoral care. Within the

model, these four development areas are linked to strategic goals, are underpinned by educational leadership and have performance appraisal at the centre.

Summary

Pastoral care middle leaders are supporting learning and building relationships and teamwork across the organisation for the betterment of students. However, an increase in pastoral demands combined with low status and a lack of objective for pastoral care have created people management challenges and increased workload for pastoral care middle leaders. Professional development needs for induction and on-going leadership development and training to overcome these challenges are not being met. An increase in internal provisions will begin the process of building the knowledge and skills of pastoral care middle leaders that will result in improved outcomes for students. The focus of the next chapter is to outline and critique the methodological approach utilised for this study.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides detail of the methodological, sampling and analysis approaches used for this research. The choice of a qualitative investigation within an interpretive research paradigm is outlined and justified. The details of the focus group and interviewing methods utilised for data collection are analysed. An introduction to the three participating schools and the selection of the sampling strategies used is examined. The process of analysis is described and explained. Finally, the considerations for maximising validity and ensuring ethical practice are outlined.

Methodological approach

Educational leadership has many dimensions. Three dimensions of leadership which make for a very complex research topic are: multiple levels, dynamism, and social construction (Conger, 1998). Researching the topic of pastoral care middle leadership and navigating through these dimensions required an appropriate methodological approach. A strategy of inquiry or research design is underpinned by philosophical assumptions about knowledge and “is governed by the notion of ‘fitness for purpose’” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 78). This study sought to interpret from multiple perspectives the importance, challenges and professional development needs of the pastoral care middle leadership role in New Zealand secondary schools. Therefore, the research problem was most appropriately positioned within an interpretive paradigm based upon the principle that individuals develop continual subjective meaning to their lives, relationship and resulting behaviour; actively constructing their social world accordingly (Cohen et al., 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 2005; Merriam, 1998). Positioning the research within this paradigm allowed for the perspectives and experiences of those with responsibility for

pastoral care to be studied in-depth. This paradigm was also appropriate as it generated some patterns of meaning of the pastoral care leaders' reality (Creswell, 2002). The pastoral care middle leader role is active, multi-faceted and sometimes overwhelming. This aligns itself well with interpretive research that considers education "to be a process and a school is a lived experience" (Merriam, 1998, p. 4). The emotions, actions, values and resulting behaviour that stem from being a pastoral care middle leader within a secondary school are best studied from an interpretive perspective.

Research through an interpretive paradigm seeks to gain access to people's 'common-sense thinking' and hence to interpret their actions and their social world from their point of view (Bryman, 2008). Understanding the complex and evolving nature of the pastoral care middle leader role within the secondary school environment through an interpretive approach was a good fit. This is supported by Cohen et al. (2007) who propose that an interpretive approach views setting or the social world as: multi-layered and complex; evolving and; changing over time. Approaching the research questions through an interpretive paradigm enabled a better understanding of the ways in which senior leaders and middle leaders with responsibility for pastoral care have understood their work and others' expectations of their role.

Bryman (2004) states "qualitative research on leadership is much more likely to problematise the concept of leadership" (p. 757). Qualitative research focuses on process, meaning, and understanding (Merriam, 1998). Problematizing the role was necessary because of the need to move beyond basic definitions and the nature of the pastoral care middle leader role. Using qualitative methods for pastoral care middle leadership research had the principal advantage in its ability to generate contextually rich data (Conger, 1998). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) explain that "qualitative researchers study things in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (p. 3). This allowed for contextual differences or phenomena within the pastoral care middle leader role to be made explicit. One of the basic functions of qualitative fieldwork is to describe the characteristics of the phenomena or topic

observed and the forms it displays (Lofland, Snow, Anderson, & Lofland, 2006). Furthermore, a qualitative research design or strategy was appropriate for this study as it was interested in individuals' points of view (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Qualitative fieldwork was suited to interpreting middle leadership of pastoral care which involves multiple levels of phenomena, as the product of a qualitative study is richly descriptive (Merriam, 1998). Cohen et al. (2007) emphasise the complexity of behaviour itself as being very apparent in school settings. This behaviour, added to the multiple layers of leadership phenomena, make pastoral care middle leadership roles in schools highly complex and therefore a considerable factor in rejecting other methods.

Quantitative research was less appropriate for this study as there was a need for humans/leaders to be able to share their experiences and individual perspectives of a complex and changing social world/setting to answer the research questions. Cohen et al. (2007) argue that qualitative research is more successful than quantitative research when applied to the study of human behaviour. The leadership dimension of this study was a determining factor in choice of methodology. Conger (1998) proposes quantitative research for leadership fails to help us understand the deeper structures of leadership phenomena and is far less effective in a subjective, ever-shifting reality where human beings shape its creation. Quantitative methods in and of themselves are insufficient on the grounds that they capture relatively uni-dimensional and static perspectives on leadership (Conger, 1998).

Alternatively, Cohen et al. (2007) suggest a multi-method approach of both quantitative and qualitative data to explain more fully the richness and complexity of a research problem. However, Morrison (2007) raised challenges around epistemological commitments, paradigm arguments, resources and expertise to combine approaches. Bryman (2008) considers mixed-methods research to be not intrinsically superior to mono-method research with subsequently the same considerations and constraints of any research method or design. Conger (1998) agrees the subject of leadership ultimately demands multiple research methods, however believes these multiple methods should be within qualitative methods to ensure not only

between-method triangulation of data but also multiple perspectives on the phenomena being studied.

Research design

Data collecting methods

Merriam (1998) considers qualitative research to be an umbrella term that has numerous variations. Examples of forms include narrative research, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography and case study (Creswell, 2002). While they all conform to overall interpretive paradigm beliefs, they provide alternative ways to understand human behaviour (Creswell, 2002; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Of consideration for this study was that certain types of qualitative studies are much more prevalent in education than others (Merriam, 1998). The basic or generic qualitative study was best suited for this research study which sought to discover and understand a phenomena and the perspectives of the people involved (Merriam, 1998). To avoid bias or distortion and increase validity and comprehensiveness in this research, two different research tools and techniques were employed across two different groups of leaders in schools, those in senior and middle positions of pastoral care.

Consideration of bias or distortion in this research was embedded in the overall aim or purpose of this study; to interpret the pastoral care middle leader role from multiple perspectives. Therefore at least two different groups of pastoral care leaders within schools were needed. The perspective of the middle leaders of pastoral care was required as they were 'doing the job'. The second perspective I chose was the senior leader with responsibility for pastoral care because their overarching perspective would provide valuable data to compare and contrast with the perspective of those 'doing the job'.

Choice of method was determined by the form of research. Firstly, a deep interpretive study based on qualitative focus groups with pastoral care middle leaders within a secondary school was conducted. Secondly, a deep interpretive study based on qualitative interviews with senior leaders with

responsibility for pastoral care and pastoral care middle leaders was conducted from within the same secondary school. This multiple perspective approach of gaining a deep interpretive understanding of pastoral care middle leader and senior leader perspectives and experiences, by using two research methods, helped minimise bias or distortion. It also allowed for more meaningful data to be generated on the pastoral care middle leader role within New Zealand secondary schools.

Sampling frame and design

Sample selection in qualitative research is usually non-random, purposeful or purposive, and small (Merriam, 1998). When considering participant schools, I employed a nonprobability sampling strategy by means of a purposive sampling method. Purposive sampling is essentially a strategic process requiring researchers to choose samples on the basis of wanting to interview people who are relevant to the research questions (Bryman, 2008). Purposive sampling was employed in the sample choices of senior leaders with responsibility for pastoral care and pastoral care middle leaders as these samples were considered to be the ones from which most insight could be gained (Merriam, 1998).

I invited three different secondary schools in Auckland to participate (see Table 3.1). This is known as maximum variation where widely varying instances of the phenomenon are chosen (Merriam, 1998). This was for the purpose of representing the widest possible range of characteristics of interest for this particular study. The sample included schools whose pastoral care middle leaders were making some shifts into conducting initiatives to support student academic achievement and outcomes. This sample also included schools which were espousing a shift away from the traditional pastoral care middle leader as 'disciplinarian' to a more 'holistic' pastoral care middle leader role. Three types of pastoral care structures were included in the sample (see Appendix 1, p. 125).

Table 3.1: Schools participating in this study

School A. An integrated single sex school in Auckland. Decile 8. Approx. 1106 students. Horizontal year level pastoral care system. Deans stay at their allocated year level. One dean plus an associate dean per year level.

School B. A co-educational state school in Auckland. Decile 10. Approx. 1940 students. Vertical, house based pastoral care system with one dean per house.

School C. A co-educational state school in Auckland. Decile 3. Approx. 1185 students. House based pastoral care system, horizontal in tutor groups. One dean per house as well as a dean at year 9 and 10. Te Kotahitanga school.

Further demographic details are provided in Appendix 1 (p. 125).

New Zealand secondary schools employ a range of pastoral care structures and systems. Purposively sampling a range of three schools, each of which employed different pastoral care structures and systems, increased the likelihood of readers determining if the transferability of findings is possible to their own contexts. However, there are limitations to this sample. This is because New Zealand secondary schools vary in; type, size, location, decile, structure. Wellington (2000) cautions the researcher that it can never be certain “that our sample is representative of the whole population (limitations). Sampling always involves a compromise” (p. 58). The intention of this research was not to generalise pastoral care middle leadership to a wider population and the limitations of this study are recognised by the researcher.

Small samples were used for both the interviews and focus groups as this is expected and manageable for a small qualitative research project. A smaller sample of three schools with one interview and one focus group within each school was also more desirable in consideration of the timeframe available. Smaller groups are also recommended when participants are likely to have a

lot to say on the research topic, are very involved in the topic or the topics are controversial or complex (Morgan, 1998a, cited in Bryman, 2008) as was the case across the three participant schools. A focus group maximum of seven was adequate for this deep, interpretive study. Smaller focus groups proved to be fit for this research as participants of the focus group were passionate about the importance of their pastoral care middle leader role within their school and deeply concerned that the challenges and needs of their role were heard. Bryman (2008) highlights the issue of 'no-shows' when considering small sized samples; however, this was not a concern for this study. This could be attributed to a number of factors including: the lack of focus on the pastoral care middle leader role within the body of research and literature available; the lack of professional development opportunities available for these middle leaders; and, the lack of opportunity for pastoral care middle leaders to come together as a group and air their views on their role.

Interviews

The first method I used was a semi-structured interview with senior leaders. Within the literature, there is evidence that interviewing is the best method to capture experiences of individuals (Davidson & Tolich, 2003; Hinds, 2000). Ribbins (2007) argues the "purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in somebody else's mind ... to explore their views in ways that cannot be achieved by other forms of research" (p. 208). Merriam (1998) suggests it is "probably the most common form of data collection in qualitative studies in education" (p. 70). This person-to-person method was used three times to gather data from senior leaders with responsibility for pastoral care from within the same three secondary schools as the focus groups were conducted. Interviews were selected as the most appropriate method for this study for the following reasons.

Firstly, Hinds (2000) proposes using interviews when: in-depth information is required; subject matter is potentially sensitive; and, issues under investigation could benefit from development or clarification. Interviews were considered to be the most appropriate way to get in-depth opinion on the

pastoral care middle leader role from the senior leaders. Interviews are about obtaining what is in and on someone's mind. Because the senior leader was above the middle leader in the hierarchy, it was important to separate their opinion and allow for sensitive issues to be discussed freely. As the required in-depth data could not be directly observed or measured, the interview allowed the interviewer the advantage of being able to ask questions, within the semi-structured format in such a way as to obtain meaningful information, as suggested by Merriam (1998). Interviews also offered the opportunity to 'hear' what was not explicitly stated but implied, as well as to note the silences (Merriam, 1998). This was evident when a senior leader replied with "that's a good question" or "I'd be interested to hear what the pastoral care middle leaders say about that" which could have implied a number of things including: they did not know the answer, they were uncomfortable in the response or there was some sensitivity around the issue.

Secondly, a semi-structured interview involves the use of an interview guide with open-ended questions which direct the conversation (Lofland et al., 2006). Fairly specific topics are covered; however, the interviewee is able to share their experiences, has a great deal of leeway in how to reply and the interview process is flexible (Bryman, 2008; Cohen et al., 2007). The use of a semi-structured interview within this study allowed for flexibility when a senior leader's answers were sufficient and needed no further questioning. A further advantage of this type of interview was that it allowed for supplementary questions to be asked and questions to be left out that have been answered sufficiently or were not relevant, ultimately allowing the researcher to respond to the situation at hand (Merriam, 1998; Walliman & Buckler, 2008). In all three schools within this study, the interviews were conducted before the focus groups. This had the advantage of allowing the interviewer to probe further questions from the senior leader around the school-specific pastoral care system and structure, allowing additional contextual understanding in preparation for the focus groups. Additional prompts (Hinds, 2000) or probes (Lofland et al., 2006; Merriam, 1998) are able to be developed during an interview to obtain more comprehensive or additional information, or to clarify responses. This type of interview also allowed for clarification of information

and had the advantage of supplying a large amount of data fairly quickly (Bryman, 2008; Hinds, 2000).

Data was collected from the senior leaders at the interviews by asking the same open-ended, broad, questions as were asked of the pastoral care middle leaders within the focus groups (see Appendix 3, p. 127). When considering issues of bias (Bryman, 2008; Cohen et al., 2007), using the same questions between interviews and between the interview and focus groups helped to reduce any researcher bias or subjectivity between participants. In support of this, Ribbins (2007) suggests a strength of a semi-structured interview format is “it substantially reduces the possibility of interviewer bias and increases the comprehensiveness and comparability of interviewee response” (p. 210). Another consideration for interviews is that of subjectivity and complexity in the interview encounter, making the interviewer-respondent interaction a complex phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). Bias, predispositions and attitudes colour the interaction and the data elicited (Merriam, 1998). To avoid these issues as a researcher, I took a stance that was non-judgemental, sensitive, and respectful to the interviewee, as suggested within the literature by Merriam (1998).

Interviews can be time-consuming in actual interviewing time and transcribing the interview data. I was very aware that the participants' time was precious and that the subsequent data had to be transcribed, so I needed to work within the time constraints available for this research project. The interviews were restricted to fifty minutes in length. A copy of the interview questions was provided in advance and participants were interviewed at a place, date and time convenient to them. This went some way toward saving time and having a more focussed interview. To manage time, I did not leave analysis of qualitative data until all interviews were completed and transcribed. Another advantage of early transcription was that emerging themes became evident that could be probed in later interviews.

Focus groups

The second qualitative data gathering method I employed was a focus group. A focus group is where a group of people are interviewed together in order to achieve an accurate representation of the views of the group (Ribbins, 2007; Walliman & Buckler, 2008). This method was used three times in total, once in each of the three schools, to gather data from the pastoral care middle leaders within each school. Focus groups were selected as the most appropriate method for this study for the following reasons.

Firstly, in a focus group, participants have more control and the format is flexible (Fontana & Frey, 2005). Focus groups are generally structured through pre-set questions around a set topic or issue with some negotiation of responses. Adopting this method allowed for in-depth individual and group discussion around direct experiences, perceptions and specific contexts concerning the pastoral care middle leaders within the group. Using focus groups also had the advantage of allowing participants more time to reflect and to recall experiences, as suggested by Lofland et al. (2006). Using this format for this study allowed for the depth and flexibility necessary to better understand the participants and how they interpret the pastoral care middle leader role. Pastoral care middle leaders within this study were able to largely control the discussion around the pre-set questions and the necessary contextual aspects of the role from within each school to emerge. Positioning the researcher within this paradigm allowed for the perspectives and experiences of those with responsibility for pastoral care to be studied in-depth.

Secondly, in a focus group method, responses can spark new ideas or connections for other participants allowing modification or amplification of thoughts (Fontana & Frey, 2005; Krueger, 1994; Lofland et al., 2006). This was an advantage of the focus group method and generated discussion which was a more authentic account of what pastoral care middle leaders experienced. Within this study, this occurred when some participants had forgotten professional development training that they had undertaken which others remembered, generating discussion within the focus group. In addition,

pastoral care middle leaders openly agreed or disagreed with each other on matters such as the challenges of the role. Lofland et al. (2006) propose that people may not agree with one another on matters of opinion, providing interchange between contrasting perspectives. This offered the opportunity for pastoral care middle leaders to probe each other's reasons for holding a certain view, while also allowing for a deeper understanding of why participants felt the way they did (Bryman, 2008). It should be noted that a limitation of the focus group is that responses are opinions that are shared and people may respond in a different way than if interviewed individually. However, Walliman and Buckler (2008) state that in contrast to this a participant "may feel more comfortable responding in a group setting and may actually say more than they would in an individual interview" (p. 173). As I researcher, I acknowledge that members of the focus group may have withheld opinions that they did not want to share. However, I feel confident that the supportive and comfortable atmosphere I observed within each focus group enabled participants to speak freely, openly and disagree. There is also evidence within the data of how supportive pastoral care middle leaders are towards each other as a team or 'family', possibly because of the nature of their pastoral care role within their schools.

To ensure quality questions were asked and the timeframe was adequate, a pilot focus group of deans was conducted. The pilot was run with a group of deans from within my current educational setting that was not part of this research. Feedback from the pilot showed I had too many questions for the time allocated and there was some crossover within the questions, only realised once piloted. Merriam (1998) believes pilots are crucial for interviewing practice, learning which questions are confusing and need rewording, which questions yield useless data and which questions respondents suggest be included. From this pilot, focus group questions were re-written to be more succinct around the topic allowing all participants to have the opportunity to fully discuss their experiences and perceptions of the pastoral care middle leader role. This was an essential part of the process as "quality answers are directly related to quality questions" (Krueger, 1994, p. 53).

In keeping with the traditions of qualitative research described by Bryman (2008), I provided a fairly unstructured and flexible setting for the focus groups where questions were not necessarily kept in the order I had written them. This was for the purpose of extracting the authentic and open views and perspectives of pastoral care middle leaders. Conger (1998) advocates for this type of questioning stating the 'volunteer-directed' response more often appears to reflect actual respondent feelings. A further advantage of using focus groups over interviews in this research was that they saved time, as was argued by Walliman and Buckler (2008). The focus groups were restricted to a fifty minute timeframe. Once the questions were adjusted from the pilot focus group, this timeframe proved to be adequate to gather the in-depth data required. I was very aware that the participants' time was precious and that the data had to be transcribed. Therefore, it was important to keep within the time constraints set for this research project. A copy of the focus group questions were provided in advance (see Appendix 2, p. 126) and the focus group was conducted at a place, date and time convenient to the school, which went some way toward saving time and having a more focussed session.

Participants must know and understand relevant information such as the purpose, methods, benefits and burdens of the research project that they have been asked to become part of (Wilkinson, 2001). I provided the school leaders with a draft outline of the information sheet which gave a clear statement of intent for the research so they had full information available to make organisational consent possible. After Unitec Research Ethics Committee approval, all participants were provided with an information sheet (see Appendix 4 and 5, pp. 128-129) about: the purpose of the research; their proposed participation; method; how the data would be recorded, used and stored; and, the way of data storage. This is vital if participant's autonomy and well-being is to be respected (Wilkinson, 2001). Adequate time was given for potential participants to consider participation and no inducements were offered, which did not interfere with the voluntary nature of the participants' involvement. All participants had the right to withdraw their participation up to when the data analysis was about to start. Three focus groups were

conducted for this study: one focus group of seven; one focus group of six; and, one focus group of five participants. All groups consisted of a range of pastoral care middle leaders from various year levels and houses within the same secondary school. Eighteen participants were involved across the three focus groups.

Ethical issues were a consideration for conducting focus groups. Research can offer benefits as well as impose burdens so, ethical reasoning must be employed (Wilkinson, 2001). Ethical issues arise at a variety of stages in the research process and concern: values in the research process; the integrity of a piece of research; and, the disciplines that are involved (Bryman, 2008). Ultimately ethical issues can be addressed and awareness increased, but not entirely eliminated. 'Harm' is defined as that which adversely affects the interests or welfare of an individual or a group. Within this study, there was some sensitivity in regards to the depth of questioning around issues in pastoral care middle leaders, especially within the focus groups. To avoid deception, participants were informed that data was collected from both the middle leaders and the senior leader within the school for data analysis. Participants were asked not to use specific names but still were encouraged to discuss issues and challenges. Participants were assured that anonymity would be preserved in the analysis of the data. Participants were asked to observe confidentiality around the opinions shared within the focus group; however, I recognise that this matter is out of the researcher's control. Senior leaders were not given access to the data from the middle leaders and middle leaders were not given access to the data from senior leaders in keeping with the confidentiality commitment. Participants were given a consent form to sign confirming their understanding of the research (see Appendix 6 and 7, pp. 130-131).

Methods of data collection

Collecting the data was the same for both the focus groups and interviews. As Bryman (2008) suggests, a good recording instrument and a quiet and private setting were required. An advantage of using a voice recording method is it

captures exactly what is said by taking tone of voice, pauses and other verbal indicators into consideration (Walliman & Buckler, 2008). It also ensured that everything that was said was preserved for analysis (Merriam, 1998). A disadvantage of recording is that the interviewer can find themselves not listening because they assume all is being recorded. I took sparse notes through the course of the interview to keep a close count of what had been and what remained to be talked about, as suggested by Lofland et al. (2006). This also added to my ability to probe as I had followed with accuracy what was going on in the interview.

Data analysis

The researcher is the primary instrument in data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998). The researcher has great influence on what specific data will be reported and how it will be reported (Fontana & Frey, 2005). All data within this study was collected, transcribed and analysed by the researcher. Watling and James (2007) suggest in qualitative research, analysis of data inevitably takes place throughout the project from the design to the writing up of the report. In a qualitative study, the data is in-depth and descriptive. In a basic or generic qualitative study, the analysis usually results in the identification of recurring patterns (such as themes, factors, variables) that cut through the data (Merriam, 1998). Themes were evident from within schools, across schools and between the interviews and focus groups.

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) state that the interpretive practice of making sense of one's findings is both artistic and political and there is no single interpretive truth. By collecting, transcribing and analysing the findings, a greater sense of the focus group dynamics between participants was achieved by the researcher. Merriam (1998) believes the analysing process to be "a highly idiosyncratic, intuitive, and lonely process, the success of which depends on the investigator's sensitivity and analytical powers" (p. 22). 'Threats' to this process can never be eliminated completely; however, effects can be attenuated by attention to validity and reliability throughout a piece of research

(Cohen et al., 2007). Validity and reliability are addressed in the forthcoming paragraphs.

Respect for rights, confidentiality and anonymity were a consideration for data analysis. Anonymity could not be completely assured for the focus groups, compared to other research methods such as an anonymous survey, as participants shared realities with each other and all participants and their opinions become known to the researcher. However, a level of anonymity and confidentiality was maintained through: avoiding recording participants names or schools' names on data or transcripts; not speaking to other focus groups or interviewees about others information; and, using pseudonyms for schools and participants both on transcripts and in my final report. Pre-interview confirmation and consent was sought for recording and helped towards maintaining anonymity and confidentiality (Hinds, 2000). Data storage was secured during and after research, with password protected electronic documents and paper copies secured.

Once the data was collected, analysis was required where the raw data was turned into 'findings' or 'results', as recommended by Lofland et al. (2006). I analysed systematically and methodically through coding. Lofland et al. (2006) describe codes as the words or labels for organising ideas applied to chunks of data or to answers of questions. They describe the process as one of sorting your data into various categories that organise it and render it meaningful. Through coding, the strength of common feelings was highlighted from: within the focus group; between the focus group and the interview within the same school; and, interviews and focus groups across schools. Bryman (2008) raises a point of caution around coding data because of the possibility of losing the context of what is said and the resulting fragmentation of data. I took care to avoid this eventuating by frequently referring back to the raw recorded data and my written notes as to not affect the reliability of the research.

Once coded accurately, I identified commonalities through the organising of data and conceptualised them in a chart(s) which was useful for developing analysis and illustrating how key concepts were related, as suggested by

Lofland et al. (2006). These formed categories and sub-categories which eventually formed the basis for the summary and interpretation of the main findings in my research. Care was taken when findings were published to not identify individuals or schools (Bryman, 2008). However, care was taken to ensure the essence of the statements given remained.

Research validity and reliability

Reliability and validity in data analysis were addressed by the researcher. While there is no perfect truth, the focus on reliability, validity and triangulation has contributed to an acceptable level of authenticity and made this study meaningful and worthwhile, as suggested by Bush (2007). To support validity I checked interview questions thoroughly against the aim and key questions, and I piloted the questions as a type of measurement validity, as suggested by Bryman (2008). Davidson and Tolich (2003) support this by stating the best way to ensure validity is through pretesting the concepts and questions. To support reliability, the sampling process was purposive and the interviews were semi-structured with prepared guiding questions. Because I was the only researcher involved in the process, the variables for reliability in this context were reduced. This kind of intense personal involvement also secures a greater level of validity and reliability when considering in-depth responses of individuals. All focus groups and interviews were conducted in a culturally sensitive and appropriate manner with a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi principles.

External validity through transferability was a consideration for conducting this study, as my intention was for the results to be of benefit to other secondary schools. By studying a problem from more than one perspective, Cohen et al. (2007) suggest the problem may be more fully understood and the results may offer the potential for inferring their application to similar contexts. By using two different data gathering methods of focus groups and interviews at two different levels of pastoral care leadership hierarchy and across three schools this study has employed methodological triangulation by honing in on the problem from different angles, as suggested by Davidson and Tolich

(2003). This takes the standpoint that the interpretation of pastoral care middle leadership is not to be apprehended from that of the middle leader alone.

Triangulation is essentially a means of cross-checking data to establish its validity (Bush, 2007). All participants within the study were asked the same questions. This allowed for responses from each of the participants to be compared within participant groups, between the different participant groups, between schools and within schools, a form of triangulation. Employing this process further validates the evidence, the conclusions drawn and the theory being developed (Keeves, 1997). Multiple perspectives allowed for the interpretation of pastoral care middle leadership in secondary schools to be evaluated. Evaluating the findings involved using analysis of the participant's responses alongside the literature review to confirm, examine and refine established educational research and understandings. If different sources of information are saying the same things, there can be greater confidence that the findings are valid (Davidson & Tolich, 2003).

It was essential with the focus group method that I established a positive connection by building trust, establishing a rapport, asking quality questions and listening intently, as suggested by (Merriam, 1998). This enabled me to get a more authentic account from participants. In all settings, further connection was established with participants before the focus group began by spending time talking about the research project and my own role as a pastoral care middle leader. Ribbins (2007) suggests such procedures may help create an environment where participants feel more relaxed, open and able to focus, thereby increasing the likelihood of honest and free responses.

Establishing rapport and trust was a consideration for the interview method. Merriam (1998) states "empathy is the foundation of rapport" (p. 23) and with this, the interviewer is better able to have an interview in an atmosphere of trust. Pastoral care and pastoral care middle leadership was discussed in-depth and there was the potential for sensitivity around the role from the senior leaders as they have overarching responsibility for this role. Gaining trust and rapport with the senior leaders was essential for interview reliability

and validity. I established a connection with senior leaders by providing a copy of the focus questions in advance, and conducting the interview at a place, date and time convenient to the participant. Fontana and Frey (2005) argue each interview context is one of interaction and relation and the result is as much a product of this social dynamic, as it is the product of accurate accounts and replies. In all settings, connection was further established with the participant before the 'official' interview began by spending time talking about the research project and my own role as a pastoral care middle leader. One tactic Bell (2007) suggested for building rapport and interaction was to place any difficult or sensitive questions down the order of the pre-determined questions so respondents don't think it is too hard. Within the interview, questions considered more sensitive around the challenges of the pastoral care middle leader role were placed down the order of questions.

Honesty and avoidance of conflict of interest was a consideration. Participants were well informed in writing prior to participating of the purpose, the focus group or interview process, and the time commitment. Protocols were established for giving transcripts of focus groups and interviews to participants for checking. Bush (2007) believes "the main potential source of invalidity in interviews is bias" (p. 98). Scott and Morrison (2006) argue "the risk of bias may be reduced through respondent validation" (p. 252). Set timelines on requesting and responding to these were given as not to drag the process on. Bryman (2008) describes respondent validation as an exercise towards corroboration while also working to ensure good correspondence between their findings, their perspectives and experience of participants. Attention was given to the avoidance of any conflicts of interest. This study ensured participants had no professional, social or personal relationship with me and no financial gains were made from this research by me or by participants.

Summary

The best way to interpret from multiple perspectives the pastoral care middle leadership role in New Zealand secondary schools was to hear the experiences of those who were involved. In-depth interviews and focus

groups framed within a qualitative approach were chosen to provide the opportunity for senior leaders and middle leaders to share their experiences and individual perspectives on the pastoral care middle leader role within their own schools. The rich data gathered from the three interviewees and three focus groups will be examined and analysed in the subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the data gathered during the research. Three senior leader participants were interviewed by the researcher from the participating schools (n=3). Across the participant schools, pastoral care middle leaders were called either deans or house leaders. In the analysis and discussion of the findings, the term dean will be used. Eighteen deans participated in three focus group sessions, with five to seven deans in each group (n=18). One focus group included an International Dean and another included a Maori Dean. These deans were invited by the senior leader of the school. It is outside the bounds of this research to include specific details concerning their role; however, generic data related to being a dean within their school and team was valued and has been included. Details of the three schools, including their differing pastoral care structure and systems, are presented in Appendix 1 (p. 125). This chapter is organised around the boundaries put in place by the research questions and within and across these are several themes. The data in the chapter is the evidence of these themes and these themes will be discussed with the literature in Chapter Five. The findings from the semi-structured interviews in Part One are analysed under the three headings (determined pre-analysis based on the research questions) “Importance”, “Issues and Challenges” and “Professional Development”. The findings of the dean focus groups in Part Two are analysed under the same three headings which has allowed for more cohesive synthesis between the two perspectives. This two-part analysis summarises the data and leads on to the Chapter Five discussion of this data in light of the literature reviewed in Chapter Two.

Table 4.1 – School and participant codes

School Code	Senior Leader Code	Dean Code
School A	SLA	DeanA1 – DeanA5
School B	SLB	DeanB1 – DeanB7
School C	SLC	DeanC1 – DeanC6

Part One – Interview findings for senior leaders

Senior leaders' perceptions of the importance of the pastoral care middle leader role

Senior leaders discussed the need for deans to have a large amount of specialist institutional knowledge and experience in relation to students, staff, parents, community and systems. SLB discussed how this was vital to becoming a dean and understanding “how it really works, rather than how it is on paper. Because you can not write it down on paper”. Senior leaders acknowledged that not all teachers were suited to being a dean and some unique qualities were required to be effective in the role. SLA indicated that teachers were generally suited for either a dean or a curriculum leader’s role, but rarely were teachers suited to both. SLA said the “type of teacher and the strength of their relationships with people” determined their suitability for the pastoral care system. Qualities identified by senior leaders as appropriate for the dean’s role were: consistency, mana (Maori word for prestige) (Mead, 2003), the ability to form and maintain relationships, flexibility, being accepting, having integrity, charisma and be a good communicator. SLB argued that deans needed to relate to all students “and make students feel special, no matter who or where they may have come from”. SLA and SLB both referred to the need for deans to be efficient and skilled practitioners in the classroom. SLB stated being “respected in your own field” was helpful for being a dean.

SLA and SLC believed it was the dean’s job to make the school flow or run smoothly in regards to students and their behaviour while SLB regarded this as keeping “their house in order”. All senior leaders expected deans to have a

school-wide picture of the students in their care. Common areas of responsibility for deans identified by the three senior leaders included: student behaviour, student appearance, leadership tasks with tutors and students, collaboration with internal and external bodies, administrative tasks and raising student achievement. However, senior leaders went further by explaining they expected deans to do 'everything':

Their job is to produce an environment in the school which is conducive to learning. That is their job... A great many things... And that is huge of course, that is everything, that is the works... (SLC).

All deans and senior leaders worked within different pastoral care structures. School B had a vertical system for deans, tutors and students which SLB viewed as an advantage to the organisation because of the continuity for students. School A worked within a horizontal level system for deans and tutors which SLA believed was better suited for their students as it enabled them a fresh start as they matured through the school. SLA explained this system allowed the school to "utilise" deans and teachers more at a year level that suited their strengths. Within each year level, School A's deans each had another title: academic dean to "support academically" and discipline dean to do the "discipline type deaning". SLA allocated these roles on the character of the dean. School C had a vertical system of house leaders SLC called "super deans" and an additional dean at Year 9 and 10 to assist. However, there was a clear expectation from SLC:

An ordinary staff member... would go across to the student centre and say 'who is on duty here?' The house leader for the house might not be there... but there is another house leader sitting there and they will handle it.... everyone will handle what walks in the door (SLC).

Senior leaders believed it important for dean's to be supporting and working collaboratively and collegially. Common people or groups, both internal and external of the school, identified by senior leaders as requiring collaboration and consultation from deans were: students; staff; tutors; international deans; curriculum leaders; senior leaders; school counsellors; career advisers;

learning support; school nurses; attendance officers; youth workers; tertiary institutes; and, charities. Deans were expected to be good communicators, build strong relationships and a sense of teamwork which SLA discussed as “huge” believing it takes a “different person” to achieve this. SLB emphasised the teamwork:

They follow through on behaviour management system, work closely with level managers and tutors and HODs and parents to ensure that students are responding to our expectations and also raising student achievement as best they can (SLB).

Collaboration and consultation with others over individual students was necessary for effective pastoral care within a school as senior leaders recognised deans do not always have the expertise or time to be dealing with all issues:

So they spend a lot of time on personal problems, discipline problems... the deans see it first usually and often try and deal with it by themselves to a large extent and then make a referral to guidance afterwards (SLC).

All three schools had a recognised Pastoral Care Team within their overall school structure. The makeup of these teams differed slightly in each school. Included within these teams were: year level/house deans, counsellors, career advisors, learning support, dean of international students, dean of attendance, Maori dean and senior leader(s). Senior leaders expected deans to attend pastoral care meetings and to collaborate and communicate with the other members of the team. These meetings varied across the three schools from once a fortnight to three times a term while the purpose of these meetings also varied. SLB indicated they could be used more effectively:

Unfortunately (with) a lot of it, time does get spent with the nuts and bolts. We try to lift the student support network as we call it, into higher levels of strategies to improve attendance, things like that. So there is that opportunity but... (SLB).

Deans were discussed by senior leaders as being a separate entity or team of their own. In all three schools, deans were placed in the same central location, either in one room or in separate offices within the same corridor. The deans' area was central, familiar and accessible to all students and teachers at all times, and a place where deans were on duty to support each other and deal with whatever walked through the door:

There could be lots of problems... if we did not work together... they all work together and they all help each other and when they are under stress they take others and if someone is sick they take that house in and so on they are really good. They are a team (SLC).

Deans within the three participant schools were expected to lead a team of tutor teachers within their house/year level. All senior leaders expected deans to meet regularly and communicate with tutor teachers, both formally and informally. SLA expected deans to help tutor teachers in "any way". SLB was considerate of workload and overburdening tutor time however; he did consider tutor teachers could do more to follow up on students and subsequently ease the deans' workload. As part of their leadership role, deans within School B were expected to have "hard talks" and "difficult conversations" with their tutors and teachers if needed.

All senior leaders expected deans to lead a team of students within their house/year level through organising events and running regular assemblies to address house/year level administration school-wide and house/year level issues, and celebrate house/year level excellence. SLA explained that through deans celebrating excellence by way of assemblies and their own initiatives such as newsletters, School A had moved its pastoral care system away from a traditional discipline one "to a more pastoral care focussed holistic type of pastoral care". SLC also expected his deans to lead their team of students innovatively and "think for themselves, go out there do things a bit differently". Developing leadership within students was seen by SLB as "a wonderful positive side" to the deans position which gave students extra opportunities beyond the classroom perhaps.

Deans collaborating and communicating 'effectively' with students' caregivers within their house/year level was an expectation from all senior leaders. SLA believed deans should be able to relate "well not only to children but to adults and provide a perspective". SLC expected deans to be available, constantly "talking to the families" and inviting them into the school. SLB believed deans needed to portray "integrity and trustworthiness" to students and parents as they had to develop, pretty quickly, a rapport with them.

All senior leaders agreed the dean's job description did not reflect what was expected of the dean's role within their school because of the evolving and changing nature of the role. SLA stated that he and the deans had a "clear understanding" of the changes made over the past 18 months; however, this had not been written and signed off as a job description by the deans. School B was also in a process of developing new systems and processes for deans. SLB put the accuracy of the current job description compared to the actual role within the school "in the hazy basket". SLB regarded the school as fortunate to have longstanding deans which somewhat eased the need to rely on the job description to inform deans of their responsibilities. SLC was honest about the job description for deans within School C:

There is a job description which is around and it is rubbish... it is crap... it says you will be in charge of this you will be in charge of this... I expect them to do anything that comes along and handle it in some way (SLC).

Each participant school had slightly different methods of completing the appraisal process. Deans at School B were appraised by their line managers through an interview which included "feedback from the tutors" and in turn, were expected to appraise the tutors within their house. However, SLB went further by saying that a HOD's appraisal within the subject area would be more of a priority for the tutor/teacher being appraised. SLB explained the appraisal process at School B as largely qualitative but commented in the future he would like "more data" such as detention numbers "to be able to inform decision making". SLA discussed how School A's appraisal process for deans included "a huge SWOT analysis" through an interview, quantitative

measured data on areas including detentions, stand downs and the number of 'lates' within each year level, and comments from tutor teachers:

What it builds up is a clear picture of a dean who is efficient and working with their homerooms or someone who is not as efficient. Some do not like it because it actually highlights something that is less efficient of the deans (SLA).

Senior leaders' perception of the issues and challenges of the pastoral care middle leaders' role

Senior leaders identified teaching staff to be at the core of a number of the challenges for deans in their pastoral care role. SLB discussed how School B had encouraged teachers to deal with problems on their own however, deans, as case managers, still needed to be informed. Deans experienced frustration when teachers sat on problems, tried to deal with problems themselves and did not alert them about misbehaving students sooner to enable them to get a school wide view. SLB argued deans got a large degree of co-operation from their colleagues; however, there were still times of frustration when they were left asking "why did a teacher do that?" SLC also acknowledged that deans were "managing staff" who could be difficult and extremely unreasonable at times:

And some staff would probably be unreasonable in what they do to kids and the way they handle kids and things like that... and staff have to be told at times 'you should apologise to the child' and that does not go down well. That is hard to do with your colleagues... their job is not just getting kids and giving them detentions and things... you manage the staff as well (SLC).

All senior leaders identified time and workload as a major challenge for the deans. School B had their deaning time reduced because of budget cuts. SLB stated this was affecting the deans' ability to be less reactive and more proactive in areas such as "tracking of academic performance". SLB recognised time was viewed as a luxury budget item for deans School B could

not afford. SLA acknowledged that deans at School A were very busy but added that a “fair time allocation had been given” for them to fulfil their duties. SLA added that it was his role to support the deans when they were overloaded. Given more time, SLA argued deans would “still say that they are still short of time, because the more you deal with the more time you actually need”. SLC had a similar view:

And we try to talk to them about that, that the job is endless and it is never finished... there is always more to do. And you could do the job so much better if you had time. And we cannot afford to give them more time... and if you gave them all double their time they would all use it, they would all be there working (SLC).

Two senior leaders identified parents and differing values as an increasing issue and challenge for deans in their schools. SLA and SLB identified lack of support from parents as one of the biggest challenge for the school’s pastoral care system, and chiefly deans, when dealing with student issues:

I think lack of parental support would be the biggest issue... especially when we are talking values and the values are different from home.... It is not their role to deal with aggressive or confrontational parents (SLA).

There are some things and some times where deans have to go and say to parents that this is not acceptable (SLB).

Linked closely to concern with differing values in the home was concern for a changing society and the issues and challenges that created for deans. SLA believed students today were a more brittle, insecure generation whom he explained “broke down very quickly and needed more support”. SLA believed the challenge for deans lay in reassuring them and supporting the student’s “lack of resilience”. SLB identified common issues of the western world such as “drugs or alcohol or facebook” as a challenge for deans as well as a more demanding student body who will challenge authority rather than accept authority instinctively.

Other challenges and issues for deans were identified as being whatever the need of the students and school was on any given day. SLC believed this contributed to the endless nature of the dean's job and worry and stress for every dean he had worked with as there was a "temptation just to keep going and going". When stress, tiredness and illness set in, SLC stated deans at School C worked together to help each other and alleviate stress from each other because "they're a team":

There is the whole thing of the kid who turns up and crying... there's something gone wrong at home, and they are pregnant... contact the right authorities... and all that sort of thing and that has got nothing to do with the job description. But you are looking after the needs of the kids and the needs of the school (SLC).

Senior leaders' perceptions on professional development for pastoral care middle leaders

Overwhelmingly, the senior leaders recognised that professional development for deans, both new and experienced, was lacking. SLA discussed the number of external professional development courses available for new principals and HODs but what was available externally for new and experienced deans was poor and limited. In a similar vein, SLB perceived the bulk of external professional development to be "focussed on curriculum and particularly with all the realignment of standards and things like that, NCEA". SLB referred to the lack of professional development available for deans and how this had also been a frustration for him when he was in the role. SLB stated he had made deans aware of what was available and they were also supported to do individual professional development. However, SLB commented:

I am not aware of any wonderful professional development channel that would provide that sustained support for and extension of our deans any more than tapping into the knowledge and professional practice that they have at the moment (SLB).

SLC echoed the other senior leader's experience around a lack of professional development for deans. He believed very few of School C's deans "would have had formal training because there is not anything suitable out there and that is a weakness". SLC argued available external courses for deans were limited and "fairly useless". SLC raised the 'not one size fits all' consideration for pastoral care structures and systems regarding professional development:

They do not fit, this is a very different school from School X, Y, Z... with very different clientele... so external courses, when they come up, we tend to find that they are not much use, they have got Nigel Latta talking to you or something and it is not, it is good fun, but it is not particularly relevant to here (SLC).

School-wide professional development on Restorative Practice had occurred at School B and School C. SLB recognised it was a challenge for deans to "remain up-skilled in having those learning conversations with as you say tutors, subject heads and parents and of course the students themselves". SLB explained that staff turnover presented difficulties for deans in maintaining good school-wide practice on Restorative Practice. SLC discussed this system as a useful tool for teachers and departments to address student behaviour through departments and ease workload for the deans.

SLC discussed there being a huge market for a good deaning course aimed at deaning in lower decile schools. He believed this needed to be organised by someone who had been through the role, understood it and "could go step by step through processes that lower decile schools run" and the management of their wider community. SLA (who is a senior leader from a much higher decile school) also referred to the need for professional development for deans in dealing with the wider community:

I think they need to look at how to deal with confrontational parents and issues. I have done a couple of very good courses in that... I did one I think about seven years ago that was fantastic and I have not seen it

since... I think courses like that would be really supportive to new deans... I think there needs to be ways of supporting teachers dealing with that type of new generation (SLA).

SLB argued for deans, “the best money to be spent is just to provide the time resource for the deans to be able to work together and share ideas” and build a sense of teamwork. He was “sceptical about the one offs” having a sustainable effect. SLB believed deans within School B could teach each other as they were incredibly dedicated; however, it came back to the issue of time.

SLA stated School A deans would benefit from structure based professional development around management and time management to help them balance their two roles of teaching and middle leader. SLA discussed how leadership training or models would support deans to grow in their leadership role of leading tutors and students. SLA believed the lack of professional development opportunities meant the onus fell on schools to put deans “in the right position” and have senior leaders to support them. SLA recognised a potentially good dean would cease to be a dean when they “are not prepared for what is going to hit them”:

They move on quickly, it is too much for them. If you are deaning and you see bad issues all the time you are probably not made out for deaning because there are plenty of issues out there you need to celebrate and enjoy. Others get hit with this wall of negativity and just put up their hands (SLA).

SLC stated deans at School C “learned the hard way”. This involved getting in there and doing the job, consulting with SLC, consulting and helping other deans and learning things. SLA attributed most of the support for new deans in School A as coming from within by “running alongside them, showing them the ropes as it were”. SLC argued a lack of professional development meant new deans do not start the job running “but stumbling” which was not the deans’ fault:

The very first day they are on, they are handling kids and they have not had any training at all. None. Then we start to have our meetings and talks about things and things like this but they have usually handled a couple of hundred people that have passed through their books by the time they really start to get any meaningful talks let alone any official training (SLC).

Senior leaders' summary

Senior leaders placed much value on deans and saw them as vital in the hub of day-to-day school practice. Senior leaders viewed deans as special people with unique qualities and specialist knowledge which enabled them to handle anything and 'everything' that arose within the multifaceted role. Senior leaders deemed it important for deans to be communicating, collaborating, consulting and building relationships and a sense of teamwork with each other and a wide range of people. It was considered important for deans to be effective teachers and to lead and support tutor teachers and students. Senior leaders placed importance on deans supporting students learning through tracking and monitoring academic performance, having a holistic school-wide view of their students and, addressing discipline. Senior leaders were committed to completing an appraisal process for deans and acknowledged that the lack of an accurate job description for the deans was an issue. A challenge for deans, as viewed by senior leaders, was managing difficult teaching staff and increasingly difficult parents. Senior leaders also acknowledged that lack of time was a major challenge for deans in their job which was endless in nature due to school and student demands. The external professional development available for deans to access was viewed by senior leaders as virtually non-existent and of concern to them. The majority of professional development for deans was 'on-the-job'. Senior leaders acknowledged a lack of external training and support meant new deans struggled and more experienced deans had few options for professional development to meet the challenges of the job, people management and time. Overall, senior leaders entrusted deans to do

everything for students in the midst of multiple issues, in a restrained time environment and with little formal professional development.

Part Two – Focus group findings for deans

Deans' perceptions of the importance of the pastoral care middle leaders role

Deans across the three participant schools stated there was not one common approach to deaning and that specialist institutional knowledge was required to undertake the role successfully. Deans discussed the role as contextually based and complex. DA1 had deaned in four different schools stating that “every school does deaning differently”. DA4 argued that no “new teacher to a school could ever be a dean straight away” and one or two years’ service within the school was required. DB1 supported this view:

If you're head of department there are certain things that are generic across departments and not just in any school, but across all schools. Whereas deaning is very specific to whatever school you are in (DB1).

Deans across the three schools discussed how they were expected to be ‘problem solvers’ for students, staff, parents and the community. DB5 recognised part of the expectation came from being “the people with the office and the phone... so we are the people they ask advice from... we have a direct link to talk to parents”. Deans repeatedly used the words ‘link’ and ‘glue’ to describe their role. DB4 explained that deans were looked at by others as being the glue to “hold the school together”. DA4 identified deans as being “a link between family, senior management, classroom teachers and students”. DB5 identified the dean’s work in pastoral care as having a curriculum basis with close links to the front end of the NZC and attributed this to community involvement and the “cultural, social, school values activities that deans become involved in”.

Common areas of responsibility that deans identified within their ‘wide web’ included: student behaviour, monitoring student appearance, leadership tasks, organisation, collaboration with internal and external bodies and raising

student achievement. In addition, deans were expected to have a good school-wide picture of the students in their care. DB2 was of the opinion that deans “seem to be a central figure in everything” which DA1 attributed to “part of the nature of the dean’s role”.

Deans within the three schools considered it important that students in their year level/house had the support and conditions to achieve their academic potential. This included: assisting students’ entry into the right courses, monitoring their academic achievement throughout the year including NCEA credits and liaising with inside and outside agencies where necessary. Considering both the academic and discipline issues with students simultaneously was important. DA1 commented that often deans “pick up students for behaviour or an attendance issue which triggers looking at their academic stuff but in theory they dealt with both issues”. As deans, they were expected to “take into account a whole raft of things” (DA5) or the bigger picture:

Discipline to a significant extent... supporting them when they are having difficulties... with schoolwork... with a home situation... with illness... liaison with things like subject choices (DA2).

Deans across the three schools deemed it important to support and advocate for colleagues and students. Deans discussed how a large part of their role involved being a collaborator through consulting, communicating and building relationships with groups which were identified across the three schools as: students, staff, tutors, international deans, curriculum leaders, senior leaders, school counsellors, career advisers, learning support, school nurse, attendance officers, resource teacher: learning behaviour (RTL), youth workers, parents, tertiary institutes and community. School B deans referred to themselves as ‘case managers’ of students whose role is to call upon whatever means necessary to ‘solve the case’. However, deans acknowledged that they did not always have the expertise or time to be dealing with all issues and their work with paraprofessionals in the pastoral care team was important. DC1 believed deans need to “draw on as many

areas that you can get your hands on to help support the student that needs pastoral care, be it the nurse, be it RTL, whatever”.

The sense of teamwork and support that deans showed for each other within their own ‘team of deans’ was strong. Deans from School A stated showing a united front was necessary for consistency across the school when dealing with students. DB5 indicated that deans acting as a leadership team and as a unified body was important to keep their leadership status and be a recognised group of people within the body of the staff. DB5 added that the deans did not always agree with each other and “scrap amongst each other like a family”, however, this did not detract from working together.

The deans’ work with tutors was considered important across all schools. DA4 discussed how deans “keep tutors in the loop with decisions made higher up”. The success of the dean’s role relied in part on the efforts and support of the tutor teachers to uphold expectations with students. DA1 stated she was lucky to have a good team of tutors who were “all giving the same message about uniform, about hair, about shoes, about anything really”. DC1 acknowledged that her tutor teachers were great but, there were those who were less motivated and slower off the mark with certain requests. Deans valued a good relationship and a sense of teamwork with their tutor teachers:

It took me a while to get to this stage. At the start of the year I was new to this job and it felt like I was talking to a brick wall, but that came down pretty fast and my teachers are very supportive of me (DC3).

Deans were expected to show leadership and build a sense of teamwork with the students in their year level/house. This was achieved through: running assemblies, executing and participating in events, and creating opportunities for students to show leadership. For deans to lead the students, DA4 believed it important to model expected behaviours and leadership “not only through the students but through the homeroom teachers that we have got in our year group”. DB4 discussed leadership activities with students:

I think actually we would like to see that side of our job as being more important, that is probably the more enjoyable aspect of the job, the

actual house organisation... so being proactive. But that tends to be, in terms of our time, I think probably lesser than all the other issues (DB4).

As part of the holistic pastoral care of students, deans deemed it important to consider all factors outside of school. To achieve this, deans were expected to have good relationships with students' caregivers. DA3 described how the deans at School A try to intervene early with students and identify the needs of the family including areas such as financial needs. DA5 discussed some of the factors to be considered:

You have to bear in mind where they are at, at home, or have they got jobs outside of school, or are they finding subjects and teachers difficult (DA5).

Deans' perception of the issues and challenges of the pastoral care middle leader's role

Inconsistency from teachers and departments when dealing with student discipline issues caused frustration for deans in all three schools. DA3 had experienced deans "mopping up a lot of issues that are really not deans' issues, they are classroom teacher issues, things that are taking up time and not the issues they should be dealing with". Deans having to deal with other teachers' shortcomings was a significant challenge and a major issue:

I think for me it is staff. That is the most challenging aspect of the job (DC1).

Staff... not the students at all. If it was only the students, our jobs would be easy. It is staff who cannot control their own classes, who do not know what to do so they do not have the classroom management techniques or skills, or they are still kids themselves. A little bit harsh maybe (DA4).

DC6 discussed student discipline and how teachers "do not like you to question them, it is seen as your job, you deal with the overall issue". DB4

argued that the way teachers deal with students and discipline can be half the problem. He attributed this to teachers who exacerbate or create situations in which students were not always at fault. DB4 explained the difficult conversations for deans “come when you can see that the student has got a point”. DA5 commented on the challenge when teachers referred students to deans without the teacher trying to address the issue clearly with the student first. DB6 discussed the “fine line” deans have to walk:

I think as a dean that we are always sort of walking a fine line between the student and the teacher and that the teacher thinks that we can solve their issues and the children so you have got to find some meshing in there and quite often it needs both people to move. And often one or the other does not want to move (DB6).

DC2 stated the ‘fine line’ caused tension between deans and teachers, meaning “some of us, we are fighting against each other instead of fighting with each other in some situations”. DC3 stated some “teachers need to put away their broomsticks and just help the kids because that is our primary job”. DC1 was similarly frustrated by difficult staff:

I think an area of that, that I find frustrating is the staff that are unable to forgive, like the kids forgive and forget, make a fresh start... they are kids at the end of the day they are going to make mistakes, we have got to be there and allow them to get back on track and there is those staff that dig their heels in and that is it, they are going to make sure that they are out of their class or move hell and high water to make it difficult to get them back into class and I have had kids that are not that bad... it is just crazy (DC1).

Deans discussed a teacher’s professional ability and the content of lessons as a catalyst for student behavioural issues, subsequently creating challenges for the deans. DC1 believed deans could not discuss lesson content without offending teachers and diplomacy had to be employed. Other deans had experienced similar professional issues with teachers:

I have found I have had to have some more serious issues with staff than I have had with students (DC2).

Deans discussed the issue of teachers who thought it was the dean's job to look after students. DC5 explained "yes we are the pastoral care team, but it is not just our job to look after the kids, it is school wide it is everybody's job, that is why you become a teacher". DC4 discussed teachers not meeting expectations to be only five to ten per cent of the teachers while both DC4 and DA3 identified teachers "possibly towards the end of their careers" as the ones closed to change and accepting new ideas and concepts that the deans and school were trying to make. DC2 explained being in the middle was a challenge for deans:

One of things that is probably quite difficult is that we as deans have to pass on procedures and things that are decided at senior management level... to teachers and so that is when you get looked at as you know bastard or a bitch or whatever... but that is just part of the role I suppose, that when you are in that middle management level... it can be difficult (DC2).

Deans found it a constant challenge to balance the administration component of their dean's role with the 'human' or 'people' contact time they desired for pastoral care. Administration involved areas such as discipline 'paper trails', attendance and academic tracking. DB3 gave the example of "the greater number of reports, progress reports, and the stocktake that is involved following the reports". DA4 had struggled to get the "balance right to make sure the admin is done, but at the same time put enough time aside to actually do the human stuff as well". DC3 commented that dealing with all the issues that cropped up during the day "means my own housework gets left behind, the admin side of the house". DB3 found her "biggest challenge was this race to consult and collaborate with a whole wide range of partners, so you know that expectation in itself is a pretty steep one". DB5 stressed the importance of people contact time:

I think effective pastoral care has to go beyond the boundaries of the administration... you are only allowed so much resources... those resources tend to be focussed on administration... that actually does not lead to effective pastoral care and I am not denying that we have to get administration basics done... but the purpose of the job is to provide the personal support needed to the people within that (DB5).

Deans found it a challenge to balance their deaning with their teaching load. DB3 stated deans needed to “deliver effectively in the pastoral area and we need to also deliver equally superbly in the classroom as a subject teacher”. Deans believed they had to be ‘expert’, ‘skilled practitioners’ ‘superbly confident’ in their teaching. DB5 discussed how deans “do not have the luxury that other teachers have for marking and lesson preparation” which had to be done outside of school while DC2 stated “I have not worked out when I do my teacher planning”. DC1 found this challenge “a necessary evil” of the dean’s role and accepted that any time in school was absorbed by pastoral care as “you have got to deal with what is in front of you and kids are here 9 till 3 and that is your time”.

DC6 found herself “deaning in my class period. I am supposed to be teaching and I just juggle the hats, teach then also do a bit of deaning and following up on students immediately instead of just pushing it away for tomorrow”. DA2 compared the two middle leader roles:

I presume that in theory HODs could do the bulk of the administrative work that they do at any time for example when it is in a non-contact period during the day or after school or in the weekend or whatever. A lot of ours requires a student to be present. Which makes a difference to how between 8.30 to 3.15 goes. And it is unpredictable when you might be required to look at something in relation to students (DA2).

Deans identified lack of time as an overarching issue and a major challenge in their role. DB2 explained how School B’s time allowance for deans had been reduced in recent times while the roles allocated had evolved and increased. DA3 stated “things are added but not very often taken away”. DB3 credited

the introduction of new initiatives as providing challenges for deans under time constraints. DA1 believed “to be a good dean and to be able to do a dean’s job properly you need time”.

Dealing with difficult caregivers and parents who did not back up the school was an issue and challenge for deans. DA3 had experienced parents willing to back their children before they had heard both sides of the story. DA3 added that this “can be a really tough battle to fight over and over again”. DA3 and DA5 raised the issue of parents communicating negatively with deans using technology through “the power of email, they can hide behind it”. DA1 referred to the challenge of “obstructive parents” who do not want to help with what the deans are trying to achieve. DA2 added that this had not always been a challenge for deans and it was more prevalent now.

Deans found that having to be the problem solvers within the school was an issue and a challenge at times. DB4 regarded deans as having “no more equipment to solve the problem”, yet widely perceived as having the time to solve the problem. DC5 stated the mantle of ‘problem solver for all’ robbed deans of the time they needed to dedicate to their own teaching and dean’s workload. DC1 and DC2 both agreed strongly that deans could not save everybody and it was about investing your time in a few places where you could make a difference, for both staff and students.

DC2 recognised that “sometimes it just feels like you are on just a conveyor belt, it is a bit of a challenge just getting through that some days”. DC4 argued the dean’s role was a “pressurised job”. She explained this came from “the demands that you get from the whole of the college and staff members and maybe some of the feelings you get from things that you have to deal with”. DB5 described her feelings:

My biggest challenge would be what I would call the unsolvable problem that you have a student who might be misbehaving in a class and have all sorts of learning difficulties within a classroom and when you start to unpick it, you are looking at divorced parents and you are looking at poverty and you are looking at substances and you are looking at a

whole bunch of dysfunctions that you do not have any power to control or solve... you just do not have the resources or time... I feel powerless in those types of situations (DB5).

Overwhelmingly, all deans argued that their dean's job descriptions did not reflect what they were experiencing in their role. DC2 questioned how the dean's job description could ever be written down, as "you probably would never get anyone to apply for the job". DB1 stated "my role now is completely different to what it was four years ago and I have not really been aware of what specifically I am supposed to (do), apart from you look after your tutors and the general stuff". DA2's comment sums up the common feeling of deans around the job description:

On paper I think it is fair to say we have a clear job description. I think probably the role is actually a bit larger than the job description (DA2).

School A's academic and discipline deans' roles explained they were doing both roles anyway. DC2 also argued house leaders and deans within School C "all do the same thing" with the exception of monitoring attendance by house leaders. DC3 believed the senior leadership wanted deans to 'dean' their own house, but it did not work that way:

When I'm deaning... I try and take ownership and I try and deal with it in that period cause I know that my colleagues who are on next, I just feel stink handing over something that I could have done (DC3).

We both wind up doing each other's sort of defined role at various times... you simply would not turn them away... I cannot say 'well I am the academic dean so I cannot deal with that'. Usually any problems they are having impinge on their academic progress anyway so I find the line quite blurry (DA5).

Deans' perceptions on professional development for pastoral care middle leaders

Repeatedly deans discussed learning their role 'on-the-job' with the help of other deans and senior leaders. DA4 regarded deans training as being "hands on stuff, you learn it in the role, if you make a mistake you do not make the same mistake again". DC1 likened it to an "apprenticeship" adding "there is no outside agency or person who could come in" and give the type of training and support deans received from their colleagues (other deans). All deans agreed there was not a lot, if any relevant specialist school based pastoral care training available. DB1 compared this to the raft of useful professional development opportunities available for curriculum leaders and stated it left deans in "isolation". DB5 stated:

We are left in a passive role saying 'is there anything for me?', no there is not I will just keep going with what I am going on with and so the result is you go for a long period of time and then you reflect back and you think 'oh I have not had any professional development' because nothing came up (DB5).

A significant number of deans had attended professional development that did not meet their needs while others had attended no professional development specific to the dean role. DB1 discussed what he had attended and added "certainly that that I have been on has not been very helpful". A noteworthy number of deans had attended a course called "being an effective dean" which they all found to be a waste of time with "very little practical nuts and bolts" (DA2). DC6 believed special courses or people coming from outside to do presentations did not work "because they are up there, they are not down here, they are not on grass roots here with us, they do not know our type of student and how we deal with them". DB4 discussed being on an external course as a new dean:

I was in my first year... the course leader was just finding out information about the different ways in which pastoral care ran in different schools in New Zealand... it did not actually give me anything to tell me what the job entailed for me or any sort of training to help me do my job (DB4).

DC4 had been on training as a new dean on time management which she found “babyish”, “stupid” and “overall pointless”. DC4 added professional development needed to be individualised to the school “because different people have different hours, just different systems, you cannot take ten systems and then blanket it or even have I think a reasonable discussion about progress”.

Some deans had experienced a variety of professional development that they found was transferable to the dean’s role. DA2 discussed how he occasionally attended courses on “anger, violence sort of thing, bullying” where often the majority of people there were not teachers, they were from “Child, Youth and Family, social workers, etc.” School B’s deans had been on a team building day which they argued worked well as a team building exercise but did not help them to be more effective deans. DB2 had been to a talk at Whirinaki Child and Adolescent Mental Health Unit which she found useful. DB5 acknowledged talks from experts available on adolescence such as Celia Lashlie which can “give you ideas, but there is not a lot of specialist school-based pastoral care training”.

Deans considered having professional development on dealing with demands from difficult staff members and having difficult conversations would be worthwhile. DA1 added “the same could be said for difficult parents”. DB3 believed having Restorative Practice professional development school-wide helped when having difficult conversations with teachers as they “know we are not coming up with something new”. DA3 recognised the leadership ‘tools’ deans needed to be able to access:

One thing that new deans could benefit from... is how to deal with other staff members... I mean we are all very good at speaking to students and talking to students and working with students but when it comes to our colleagues, especially if that colleague is older than us or more experienced or a little bit stroppy sometimes you have got to have a few techniques and a bit of ‘know how’ I suppose (DA3).

Deans from School A and B considered looking at other schools pastoral care structure and systems would be time well spent. DB1 argued clusters of deans meeting locally from three or four schools “once a term, once a year even just to see how other people are doing things” and share ideas would be useful professional development:

I think one of the best ways for schools to support deans is time... time to do the job... time to go out and visit... I do not think you can write a rule book on being a dean but I think to go and look at what other schools do would be useful and interesting (DA1).

Other areas of useful professional development were discussed by deans. DA5 considered professional development on issues students so deans remain “open to seeing what in their world is really important”. Deans at School B explained how counselling training would help them to manage students more effectively beyond simply referring them along to the counsellor. DB1 argued professional development was needed on the external agencies available to call on for support. Once again, deans recognised the problem of time to organise and utilise these facilities for professional development.

Deans identified that professional development around school systems could support them in their role as new deans. DC1 explained this would “take a lot of stress and sweat off before you arrive in the job because I arrived in the job and I did not know any systems... I did not know anything on day one, it is quite scary”. School B deans commented on a lack of guidelines for school systems from senior leaders and that somehow they were expected to know what systems to put in place. Closely related to this type of in-house professional development, DC1 discussed sharing anonymous case studies would be useful professional development:

If you were new to the job here... what do I do with chronic non-attendance, what is the first port of call, what do I do next, what do I do with a kid who is getting bullied, who do I go to first, what do I do when

there is contraband, there is so many things and when I arrived... I did not know what to do (DC1).

Deans argued their meeting times could be used more effectively for professional development opportunities. DB3 wondered if pastoral care meetings were “intended for us to ‘osmotically’ imbibe whatever system is used at school... it has dwindled down to just being an administrative meeting”. DC3 stated more structured pastoral care meeting times to reinforce structure, support, process, procedures and give “positive reinforcement or encouragement” to deans would be useful professional development.

Alternatively, DB5 commented on the appraisal mind-set within schools that says you are required to improve yourself through professional development during the year:

The answer I got through to the end of the year in a sane fashion is not seen as a good enough answer, so you are supposed to say ‘this is what I have done to improve’ and that is where if there is not a specific professional development available for the role, that you see as your key management and function within the school, that is where you feel underprovided for (DB5).

DC4 and DC2 also offered an alternative perspective by recognising that at times, no amount of professional development would help deans. DC4 believed life skills and resiliency were needed to cope with the pressure and demands of doing the job effectively “and if the person does not have it then they will not survive, that is the end of it”. DC2 was unsure professional development for deans could be done:

I think the only reason I survive is basically my life skills I suppose, come from a pretty rugged background myself so I put myself in that situation sometimes and just the support I know I have got in this room really it gets me through, the support I have got at the top as well (DC2).

Deans' summary

The deans perceived their role to be specialised and unique. They saw themselves as the 'link' and 'glue' of the school with a school-wide picture of the students in their care. Deans saw their role as evolving and growing as they collaborated and consulted across the school and supported students with their discipline and academic issues. Deans were staunchly supportive of each other. They were expected to build relationships and a sense of teamwork with a wide range of groups including tutors and students. Deans were practising holistic pastoral care to create the conditions for students to achieve their academic potential. Major challenges included people management issues with staff, difficult caregivers and unsolvable problems. Deans were struggling to have time for people contact and completing all tasks required of them; including administration and their teacher planning. Deans did not believe their job description reflected the true nature of their role as they found themselves doing 'everything'. Deans had found external professional development for deans to be of little help and they were learning on-the-job. Deans suggested professional development on dealing with difficult staff members and current societal issues, as well as time to view other schools and do further in-house training, would be beneficial to their role.

Summary

The data revealed that pastoral care middle leaders have a complex and demanding role. This was conveyed from both leadership perspectives. The expectation and subsequent experience of a pastoral care middle leader is that they will work with everyone and do 'everything' to support student learning. A range of challenges dispersed through this role include workload and people management challenges. Pastoral care middle leaders are struggling to deal with these challenges as there is a severe shortage of suitable professional development opportunities available to assist them in their role. Further discussion of the findings linked to the literature reviewed from Chapter Two are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the significant findings of the research topic on middle leaders of pastoral care in three New Zealand secondary schools, from the data reported in Chapter Four. The discussion integrates the literature from Chapter Two with the thematic findings under the following sections: a complex and demanding role doing ‘everything’; relationships, working in teams and people management challenges; and, professional development opportunities. At times, the critique of middle leaders within the literature was restricted to curriculum middle leaders and did not single out anything specific in reference to pastoral care middle leaders. To what extent this critique is transferable and connected to my findings is an area that requires further research. Within the chapter I use the term pastoral care middle leader, except when I am referring to the specific role in the findings when I use dean.

A complex and demanding role doing ‘everything’

Senior leaders placed a high value on deans and saw them as the hub of day-to-day school practice where everything came together. Deans argued that deaning is specific to each school, while the bulk of a curriculum middle leader’s role is generic within and across secondary schools. There is evidence that a large amount of specialist institutional knowledge of systems, staff, students and community is needed to undertake the pastoral care middle leader’s role successfully. However, there were some generic expectations of the role across all three schools including: collaboration, consultation, relationship building, teamwork, and support for other deans, students, staff and caregivers. My findings indicate the pastoral care middle leader’s role is eclectic and there are new specialisms within the role that have emerged recently within secondary schools. The findings show some

shifts have happened for pastoral care middle leaders and the expectation of their role.

Within the New Zealand secondary school structure, the curriculum and pastoral care middle leader roles are often 'lumped' together with the label middle leaders or managers. When the term middle leader is used within the reviewed body of literature and research, it is highly likely that it is the curriculum middle leader role that is being referred to. My findings present a strong case that there are major differences between the curriculum middle leader and the pastoral care middle leader role within secondary schools.

It takes a different person to survive

Senior leaders and deans acknowledged that: not all teachers were suited to being a dean; it took a "different" person to be a dean; and, unique qualities and relationships were required to be effective in the role. Qualities identified by senior leaders as suitable for the dean's role were largely interpersonal and intrapersonal qualities which centre on their interactions with people. This finding is supported by Cranston (2009) who identifies interpersonal/people skills as critical for middle leaders. In one school, deans believed life skills and resilience were needed to survive in the role.

There was evidence of deans needing to show resilience because of a more demanding student body and unsolvable problems. The deans were dealing with issues impacting on students' behaviour such as: drugs, alcohol, teenage pregnancy, abuse, social media, poverty and dysfunctional families. The literature supports that there have been changes in societal factors in the concept of care (Calvert, 2009) and in students (Drewery, 2007). Deans discussed the impact of increased student pastoral care needs on their time which is supported by Calvert et al. (1998). Deans had to be selective and only invest in student and staff cases where they could make a difference because of a lack of resources and time. Deans are dealing with some unsolvable problems which require them to show resilience. The findings present a strong case that an increase in pastoral demands and issues - and a lack of time to address these issues - is impacting on pastoral care middle leaders within secondary schools.

A supporter of student learning

A key theme within the three participant schools was that deans were supporting student learning. Although not referring specifically to deans, Fitzgerald and Gunter (2006) state “teachers ‘in the middle’ have a pivotal role in the leadership of learning” (p.8). My findings suggest that as middle leaders, the pastoral care middle leader might not have a direct or pivotal role, but they have a supportive role. The pastoral care middle leader is supporting student learning because of the in-direct influence they have on students’ learning. This influence is evident when deans described themselves as the: link, glue, problem solvers and cultural keepers who did everything for students. They are bringing many internal and external components of the organisation and community together to support student learning. This expectation of the deans doing everything, has parallels with the umbrella term of pastoral care which has no bounds (Best et al., 1977; Calvert, 2009).

A senior leader spoke of deans being very good at evaluating faults within the school. Within the participant schools, deans are supporting learning through picking up what would otherwise fall through the cracks. Senior leaders believed it was the dean’s job to make the school flow or run smoothly in regard to students and their behaviour. The larger the organisation, the more leaders and the more complex leadership becomes. Within the secondary school structure, curriculum middle leaders and teachers are focussed on their own subject and department and tutor teachers are short of time. There is evidence that schools are turning to pastoral care middle leaders to focus on individual student achievement. In contrast, the high value placed on the pastoral care middle leader contradicts the lack of available research and literature on the role, the low status of pastoral care identified in the literature and the argument that there is a lack of competence in the pastoral role (Calvert & Henderson, 1998; Scaife, 1998). My findings propose that there have been some shifts in secondary schools which have placed the pastoral care middle leader into a position of higher value and a greater role in supporting learning than in the past.

Deans were supporting student learning through utilising data through Student Management Systems, having school-wide mentoring type conversations and collaborating widely about student needs and student achievement across multiple subjects. Throughout the year, deans were monitoring individual students' behaviour, discipline and academic achievement, including NCEA results. This shifts some of the onus of student achievement away from just the classroom teacher and curriculum middle leader, to include a third supporting party in that of the pastoral care middle leader. This finding is in line with other academic coaching, monitoring, counselling and mentoring schemes, linked to pastoral care that are being implemented to raise student achievement in curriculum (The University of Auckland, 2011; Youngs, 2010).

The findings within this study show some shifts are happening for deans in secondary schools which, according to those interviewed, are for the betterment of the students. There was a very strong focus in the three secondary schools to ensure that all the students were learning to the best of their ability and achieving as best they could and that the deans were supporting this. However, deans within this study were straining to meet new demands under the old secondary school structure which has not shifted:

We are reliant on HODs or teachers inputting grades or marks to be able to have a conversation with a student about how many credits they have got, if that does not happen, it is very hard to get a big picture (DA1).

Supporting student learning had been added to their role using an existing structure and with little or no change to pastoral care structures, policies, funding, resources, time and staffing to student ratios for deans. My study presents evidence that some shifts are occurring for deans without increasing the necessary resources and time.

Being expert teachers

The need to deliver effectively in the pastoral area and equally superbly in the classroom as a subject teacher had led to deans' deaning when they were supposed to be teaching or planning. There is evidence this was because of

administration workload, the reactionary nature of the role, its day-to-day demands and the need to address issues promptly. This finding is supported by Ingvarson et al. (2005) who found that middle leaders within New Zealand schools reported strains in combining teaching with pastoral and administrative roles. One dean spoke of deaning in non-contact time and at home at night which left little time to do his teacher planning. Deans spoke of interruptions for pastoral care reasons at any time of the day, including in their allocated teaching time. Blandford (2006) states “central to effective middle leadership is the ability of the middle leader to identify their role at any given moment in the school day” (p.6). However, there is evidence in the findings that the deans were ‘deaning’ every moment of the day and the role had no end. A senior leader discussed how a lack of time to do the dean’s job, teach and plan resulted in “stress and tiredness” which is supported in the literature by Tew (2010). There is evidence that taking on the role of pastoral care middle leader impacts on a teacher’s capability in the classroom through absorbing planning and lesson time.

Evolving and growing the role

There was evidence within the findings that the pastoral care middle leader role is constantly evolving and growing. One senior leader had re-structured by separating the dean and assistant dean’s role into an academic and discipline dean. This change is supported by Best et al. (1995) who state pastoral leaders are often both creative and thoughtful with pastoral care initiatives. However, there is evidence from the findings that change and initiatives can increase the complexity and demands of the role. The senior leader advocated strongly for the new system and deans did have a clear understanding of the intention of the separated roles; however, in reality deans were not making the distinction between the ‘academic’ and ‘pastoral’ roles. This finding is supported by Youngs (2010) whose research found that academic counselling and student mentoring were more challenging for schools than first envisaged. Across all three schools, deans indicated

academic and discipline issues needed to be addressed simultaneously as they were often interrelated.

Deans spoke of the challenges of new initiatives such as intensive academic monitoring of students within the school. There was evidence this was having an impact on their time and causing them to have to reorganise and reschedule their already overloaded workload to meet the demands. Deans across all schools discussed how school initiatives and adjusting of school culture and teacher expectations were continually evolving their role further away from their job description:

Our job expands as the senior managers or anybody sees it will, if there is something that needs to be done our job is continually expanding, I have not seen it reduce in the time I have been a dean (DB6).

School initiatives within this study were evolving the pastoral care middle leader's role further away from the traditional 'disciplinarian' with a caring dimension (Calvert, 2009) into a more academic or supporting learning role, with a caring dimension. My findings indicate pastoral care demands on deans are increasing while schools are subsequently increasing the academic 'mentoring/monitoring/coaching' demands on deans. Supporting these findings, Russell (2007) states that each individual school's choice of where and to whom they direct their pastoral care initiatives is influenced by its own need to improve academic results and survive within the competitive, quasi-market environment.

Within the three schools the dean's role was continually increasing and never reducing. This is supported by the literature which states that the educational leader's roles and responsibilities are constantly changing and increasing (Bennett et al., 2003; Cranston, 2007). Within New Zealand secondary schools, Fitzgerald (2009) attributes the intensification of work being forced down to middle leaders to educational reforms and changes to curricula and national examinations. Youngs (2007) asserts that with the intensification for leaders brought about by the NZC (MOE, 2007), the "environment has been ripe to distribute leadership across a school's professional staff" (p. 3). Deans

spoke of their already stretched workload and time being stretched further leaving less contact time with students and making the deans' work more reactionary and less pre-emptive. Senior leaders spoke of wider school restraints restricting a further time allowance; however, both deans and senior leaders discussed that to be a good dean and to be able to do a deans job properly, you need time. Although not necessarily referring specifically to deans, a report from Ingvarson et al. (2005) found middle leaders to be less satisfied than either senior leaders or teachers with their perceived workload. The findings show that for deans, there is an increase in their day-to-day demands, the role is evolving and growing and there is a severe shortage of time to meet the demands of the role.

An expectation of holistic pastoral care and cultural gatekeeping

Senior leaders and deans spoke of the shift to a more holistic type of pastoral care where deans have a school-wide picture of the students in their care and a good understanding of their home environment. This finding is supported by Calvert (2009) who notes the shift in the pastoral care middle leader role. However, my findings show that traditional 'discipline' type dean work has not abated:

All the other disciplinary issues that tend to take precedence because we have got people banging on our door, hitting our emails, hitting our phones and saying they have got a problem with a student, so these tend to be the things which predominate (DB4)

Added to this, senior leaders and deans within the three schools were concerned for the differing values between home and school and a changing society. This concern is supported by Calvert (2009) who states that pastoral demands and the concept of care placed on pastoral care middle leaders has increased and changed with societal factors, welfare and the development and education of children. A dean stated there was a curriculum basis to their work within the front end of the curriculum through upholding values and as the 'cultural keepers' of the school. These findings are supported by Cranston

(2009) who states “school leaders today require a broad range of capabilities to carry out their increasingly diverse and pressured roles” (p. 233). Pressure within the dean’s role was a common theme in the findings:

It is a very pressurised job from the whole of the college... you need the life skills to be able to cope... the demands... some of the feelings you get from things that you have to deal with (DC4).

Role objective

The eclectic and specialised nature of the pastoral care middle leader role was well understood within the three secondary schools. One dean did not think any of the current deans went into the position unaware of the reality and the demands of the actual role. However, there is evidence within the findings that there is a lack of understanding around clear objectives for the pastoral care middle leader because of the evolving and growing nature of the role and the lack of an updated job description. One dean spoke of a job description so general it could be used for anything. Although not necessarily referring to pastoral care middle leaders, Fitzgerald (2000) highlights that the lack of understanding of the purpose of the middle leadership role can add to the challenges of the role. A senior leader spoke of the deans’ objective being to create an environment in the school which is conducive to learning. A dean spoke of how changes had left him not really aware of what specifically he was supposed to do. Deans spoke of having a good working knowledge of the role and its ‘rhythms’ purely because they had been deans for several years. There is evidence in the findings that confusion exists around the specific objective of pastoral care and the pastoral care middle leader’s role. The shift into supporting student learning has arguably enhanced the confusion for those in the role. This is not unexpected given my findings show that the role is eclectic, continually evolving and growing.

The deans identified the issue of teachers within their schools showing a lack of understanding of pastoral care and the dean’s role. This is supported by Calvert (2009) who suggests that it is highly unlikely that staff within a school

are *au fait* with pastoral care and its objectives. My findings propose that while the pastoral care middle leader role is supporting learning, the reverse is not occurring as some teachers and curriculum middle leaders continue to perceive 'pastoral care' to be the dean's job. The findings put forward there is uncertainty amongst staff around pastoral care, the pastoral care middle leader role and its objective within schools:

80% of the year you are the kids' parents and so you have a lot of influence on them, but I do not think some of them get it (DC5).

Relationships, working in teams and people management challenges

Pastoral care middle leaders' communication skills, collegiality, relationships, collaboration and teamwork with others were key themes evident in my findings, potentially determining their suitability for the role. Although not necessarily referring to the pastoral care middle leader role specifically, this finding is supported by the literature on middle leaders, teams and teamwork (Adey, 2000; Bennett et al., 2007; Fitzgerald, 2000). Pastoral care middle leaders are supporting learning and having an in-direct influence on the individual student outside of the classroom by means of relationship building, teamwork and influence with students, parents, staff and community. This is supported by the literature which states the practice of leadership is about influence (Gronn, 2003) and is essentially a social influencing process (Southworth, 2011).

Students and caregivers

There was evidence in the findings that deans enjoyed showing leadership, building relationships and a sense of teamwork with students but had found, in terms of their time, it was less than all the other duties they were undertaking. This is supported by Cranston's (2007) study where educational leaders wanted fewer management aspects to their role, which in turn they felt

dominated the opportunity for more strategic and educational leadership. The reviewed body of relevant literature makes no other direct reference to the relationship between deans and their leadership work with students to support the findings.

Both senior leaders and deans referred to the importance of having good relationships with caregivers for supporting student learning and positive student outcomes. However, a lack of support from home and difficult parents were providing challenges for deans and placing a strain on positive relationships with caregivers:

Obstructive parents... so we are trying to achieve something and they do not want to help us with that (DB1).

This perceived tension between caregivers and deans is supported by Drewery (2007), who doubts that all parents might reasonably be expected to share the values of the 'disciplinarians' of the school, when our communities are increasingly diverse. Senior leaders and deans spoke of caregivers not backing the school, not wanting to help with what the school and deans were trying to achieve and differing values between school and home as an increasing problem. Differing values is a concern for the deans within this study as this has the potential to hinder the shift from 'dean as disciplinarian' to a more holistic carer approach and supporter of student learning role that deans were trying to take in their relations with students and caregivers. It is likely that the disciplinarian part of the deans' role will endure as long as discipline issues remain, deans are the port of call for discipline issues and, they are prime contact and support between school and caregivers parents. This is supported by Lodge (1999) who states the traditional middle leadership pastoral care role in its many facets is enduring but changing. There is a lack of literature available specific to pastoral care middle leaders and their work with and caregivers to support the findings.

Teachers and curriculum middle leaders

The deans and senior leaders discussed the importance of the deans' relationships and teamwork with tutors, teachers of curriculum and curriculum middle leaders for their role in support student learning. There is evidence to suggest deans, curriculum middle leaders and teachers within these schools were not working together as well as they could be. This was creating people management challenges for deans. My findings show that there were some tensions regarding hierarchy and jurisdiction between the middle leadership roles within the three schools.

Senior leaders across the three schools spoke of curriculum middle leaders and deans as having a similar role and equal status within the school, despite differences in management allowances and time allocation. Feist (2008) states the HOF can be seen as having more positional authority within a developed management hierarchy than a HOD or TIC; however, there is no direct reference in the literature to the positional authority between the curriculum middle leader and the pastoral care middle leader. In two schools the dean's position was a permanent position while in one school deans were on a two yearly contract, creating a point of difference from the permanent curriculum middle leader position. Despite the differences in Management Units, time allowance and in some cases permanency of position - senior leaders felt overall there was equality between deans and curriculum middle leaders which did not interfere with relationships or working collaboratively and collegially with colleagues. This was in contrast to the deans.

The deans' discussed tension, hierarchy and jurisdiction issues between the middle leaders. Some deans discussed being more important than HOFs and HODs, while others made distinctions, above HODs but not HOFs. One dean spoke of a much fuller job with more emphasis and more responsibility on the deans than curriculum leaders, because of the wider school links. Some deans proposed students viewed deans as having more authority than curriculum middle leaders while others saw them as serving an equally important role and function. A dean spoke of 'power' issues that had been raised by curriculum leaders because it was perceived that deans were

meeting more often with senior leaders. The senior leader from the same school alluded to meeting structures having been made equal to avoid issues between middle leaders. Overall there was no consensus from deans on middle leadership hierarchy. Spillane and Diamond (2007) suggest that it is the distributed structure of secondary schools which subsequently provides them with leadership challenges. Bennett (1995) also argues a secondary school's structure presents a situation ripe for the creation of both formal and informal hierarchies. There is evidence within my findings of leadership questions and challenges within the middle leader hierarchy.

The deans were experiencing frustration with teachers and curriculum middle leaders. This frustration was mainly due to inconsistency from teachers, departments and faculties regarding issues with students labelled as discipline and behavioural issues. These types of issues could be in actuality learning or home based issues once a teacher is capable of seeing past the dean as the issue problem solver. Having to deal with what deans perceived to be other teachers' shortcomings was a major challenge for deans across the three schools. This raises questions of jurisdiction and performance management issues which are potentially outside of the pastoral care middle leader's responsibility:

A student will come and say I am really not getting on in maths... you know that that maths teacher is the worst maths teacher in the school, barely functional... you cannot solve that problem for the student. It is those sort of dilemma management problems that are my biggest hassle (DB5).

The question of whether deans have the jurisdiction to enter into performance management dialogue with teachers and curriculum middle leaders and how far their authority stretched was raised in the findings. Woods et al. (2004) state distribution of leadership allows more talent to be utilised; allows individuals to feel empowered and suggests an openness of boundaries; however, the evidence from my findings propose that through distribution to the middle, the reverse is occurring. Cardno (1998) states middle leaders are charged with specific responsibilities and jurisdiction over decision-making

areas assigned to them. There is evidence across the schools that the deans' increased responsibility for academic issues has subsequently blurred the line between what is considered a pastoral care middle leader issue and what is a curriculum middle leader issue.

Due to "collegial respect", deans felt very uncomfortable "putting someone in their place" and telling them they are not doing something right. This is supported in the literature by Owens (2004) who states that while problems may be relevant to teachers and they may have the expertise, they may not have the jurisdiction to address them. Within the literature, both Glover et al. (1998) and Gunter (2001) are critical of the adoption of what they argue as non-educational ways of working that this type of middle leadership structural dimension brings through line management and achieving accountability to those above and below. A dean referred to the two separate worlds of curriculum and pastoral care being a powerful force if they were to join forces. Within the three schools the formal accountability structure remains in middle leadership through separate 'curriculum' and 'pastoral care' middle leader roles, yet there is evidence within the findings deans are having to shift outside of this structure to support student learning. There is no specific evidence in the reviewed literature body about jurisdiction between the curriculum and pastoral care middle leader or around the complexities of relationships and teamwork between middle leaders within secondary schools.

Tutor teachers

Within the findings there is evidence that deans preferred leading a team of tutors who were consistent, motivated and supportive of their work. One senior leader believed tutor teachers could be more active in their pastoral care role to subsequently ease the dean's workload. This finding is supported by Hylan and Postelwaith (1998) who believe tutors should be playing an increased role in pastoral care with students. However, Hylan and Postelwaith (1998) also argue it is the role of pastoral care leaders to try to find ways to minimise unproductive time and maximise the valuable personal contact for

tutor teachers and tutor groups. Conversely, a senior leader from a school with a horizontal tutor system expected deans to 'serve' tutor teachers in any way. Tutor teams across the three schools varied in their structure and size as did the expectations of the deans leading them.

Leading tutor teams could at times be a challenge for the deans as their conduit (Feist, 2008) middle role meant they had to pass on procedures and information to their team that were not always popular. Deans identified 'old school' teachers as the ones likely to oppose change and acceptance of new ideas and concepts that the deans and school were trying to make. A senior leader acknowledged that deans were 'managing staff' who could be difficult, extremely unreasonable and challenging at times. Supporting this point, Bennett (1995) states "pastoral teams are likely to be less cohesive than most subject departments" (p. 104). Unlike subject departments, tutor teams are most likely assembled with teachers from different subject or learning areas and it is likely that there is not one common professional qualification within the team or a common goal. While Hall (1998) and Calvert (1998) suggest that teachers' subject skills may not be easily transferable to their pastoral work, as aforementioned, deans within the study suggested some teachers may not want to transfer their skills to pastoral care work preferring to leave the bulk of pastoral care work to the deans. There is evidence in my findings that deans as middle leaders were dependant on tutors upholding attendance and other pastoral care policies, a finding supported in the literature by Southworth (2004). However, they are also dependant on tutors' playing a role in supporting student learning:

And again that is where that teamwork comes in by deans working with tutors, working with subject teachers so that students can achieve (SLB).

Pastoral care teams

Senior leaders discussed deans as a separate entity or team of their own within the wider pastoral care team. They argued they are a team within a team. The evidence within the findings around the nature of the role, the

special qualities and resiliency required of those in the role and the common location for deans within each school lend themselves to an intimate and supportive team relationship. Deans from one school perceived that others saw them as a family:

We are seen as being together, being united, but we actually are like that, we spar off each... we are in each other's offices quite frequently, we work together and we share each other's work (DB5).

Deans across all schools were working with paraprofessionals. There is evidence within the findings that deans were referring students to counsellors because they do not have the counselling skills or expertise to manage. Deans referred to the increased amount of time dedicated to collaborating in their work with internal paraprofessionals and external agencies. The aforementioned societal changes and the increased pastoral demands that students bring to school (Calvert, 2009; Calvert et al., 1998) are making the dean's job with paraprofessionals more work intensive. Within the literature, Crowe (2006) raises the issue of increased strains on the school guidance counsellor. There was no evidence within the findings of the suggested tension between paraprofessionals and deans (Calvert, 2009). The reviewed body of relevant literature makes no direct reference to relationships and teamwork of pastoral care middle leaders and little reference to the work of paraprofessionals and pastoral care middle leaders within pastoral care teams to support the findings.

Professional Development

Professional development opportunities

A key theme evident in the findings was the lack of professional development available for secondary school pastoral care middle leaders which was labelled by one as a "weakness". Senior leaders spoke of the "few and far between" opportunities for new and existing deans. Although not necessarily referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, Spillane et al. (2011) argue there is less attention within professional learning in education for the

role of middle leaders. However, my findings go further than this statement and suggest that there is even less attention on the role of pastoral care middle leader than curriculum middle leader.

Within the findings, deans and senior leaders perceived there to be a large amount of suitable external professional development available for curriculum middle leaders within secondary schools. This again could be attributed to the revised NZC (MOE, 2007), NCEA and Fitzgerald's (2009) aforementioned view that educational reform, changes to curricula and national examinations have been forced downwards to middle leaders. Deans and senior leaders perceive there to be more available for curriculum middle leaders; however, they discussed curricula and assessment training, not leadership and management training. The literature supports this by stating there is a lack of generic leadership and management professional development available for curriculum middle leaders (Cranston, 2006; Naylor, Gkolia, & Brundrett, 2006). Senior leaders and deans within this study did not make the distinction and perceive it as curriculum leaders having more opportunities.

There is evidence within the findings that national and local professional development in education is not meeting the need of pastoral care middle leaders. The lack of professional development left deans in "isolation" and "underprovided for":

Training, what is that? (DA4).

Although not necessarily referring specifically to pastoral care middle leaders, this is supported in the literature by Ingvarson et al. (2005) who found that middle leaders felt "inadequately trained and supported in carrying out their management roles" (p. 19). Overall, there is an absence of research and literature on pastoral care middle leadership (Bennett et al., 2007) as the majority of literature is focussed primarily on curriculum or subject management and leadership (Blandford, 2006; Busher & Harris, 1999; Cranston, 2009; Feist, 2008; Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Pastoral care middle leadership is included in middle leadership literature by default, so the complexity and uniqueness of the role is not

highlighted. The implications are that understanding of the role can get lost in generalisation, so targeted assistance for a pastoral care middle leader does not eventuate due to the lack of any specific research-informed theory base.

A lack of time available for professional development was a theme evident in the findings. One dean referred to this as a senior leader's responsibility. The literature suggests this is an obligation for senior leaders as through distributed leadership, heads and deputies are required to take on another level of leadership, which is that of developing other leaders (Southworth, 2004). The findings revealed that a lack of time combined with the lack of options for suitable training and support meant deans were likely to finish the school year having not addressed their professional development needs. Timperley et al. (2007) state providing sufficient time for teachers to engage in extended opportunities to learn and develop can have a substantial impact on student learning. Arguably the lack of time for professional development is a generic problem for all teachers in New Zealand; however, this is escalated for pastoral care middle leaders. These teachers have dual roles as leaders and teachers, so the time to do the professional development for their teaching and leading is possibly less:

Busy people getting busier... we do not have enough time to do the job already and on top of that we are having to learn on-the-job... I always find that I am running around just chasing my tail (DA4).

A lack of professional development meant new deans were not starting the job running but "stumbling" and some even "learned the hard way". This is reinforced in the literature, which states the support and guidance that is required for teachers to make the transition to become a pastoral care middle leader is somewhat lacking (Calvert & Henderson, 1998). A senior leader acknowledged this was not the deans' fault as they were not trained in anything and they did not know what they were doing. Adey (2000) states middle leaders "are likely to receive no training to prepare them for promotion" (p. 422) which can add further tension to the middle leader role. One dean described the "stress and sweat" of being promoted from a classroom teacher to a pastoral care middle leader.

Deans regarded their support and training as being “hands on stuff” which you learn in the role: making a mistake in the role meant you would not make the same mistake again. This type of training is supported by Spillane et al. (2011) and Southworth (2011) who states “on-the-job learning should be seen as part of working in any school... the workplace is our learning workshop” (p. 79). There was evidence this was happening between deans in their offices or shared space. A dean discussed how no outside agency or person could come in and give the type of training and support deans received from the other deans in their team. This is supported by Southworth (2011) who argues “professional learning is collaborative as well as individual; we have a responsibility for one another’s learning as well as our own” (p. 79). While supportive of this practice, one dean believed it should not be that way and more pastoral care middle leadership training should be available to develop skills to further support others. Although not necessarily referring to pastoral care middle leaders, this is supported by Cardno (2005) who identifies the development of personal skills in middle leaders as crucial, as their role is to support and enhance the performance of others.

There was evidence within the findings that external professional development workshops did not meet the needs of pastoral care middle leaders. Timperley (2011) is sceptical of one-off courses, proposing there is little evidence that they make any real difference; however, a small number of deans had experienced a variety of professional development they perceived was useful and somehow transferable to the dean’s role. It is worth noting that none of this professional development was tailored specifically for the pastoral care middle leader within secondary schools. Given the complexity of the role, this is not unexpected.

Deans discussed useful courses attended on: anger, violence and bullying; team building; the Whirinaki Child and Adolescent Mental Health Unit; and, talks from experts on adolescence which “give you ideas”. This collection of ad hoc professional development is encouraging; however, it does not bode well for any strategic training and support for deans as middle leaders, as

supported by Timperley (2011). Overall, senior leaders and deans sentiments were:

Courses tend to be fairly few and far between and fairly useless (SLC).

This finding is supported by Calvert and Henderson (1998) who propose pastoral care is often left to its own devices; it chugs along rather than being lead and managed strategically. Hall (1998) suggests this lack of professional development is a management issue which we ignore to our pupils' cost; however, meeting professional development needs for pastoral care middle leaders outside of the organisation is a difficult task for senior leaders, when my findings present evidence that there is a lack of suitable external professional development opportunities available.

Restorative Practice professional development had gone some way to assist and encourage deans to be more comfortable dealing with difficult conversations as other staff had completed the training also. A senior leader spoke of staff turnover and the difficulty of maintaining the value of Restorative Practice within the school. This is supported by Crowe (2006) who states "the success of these initiatives in each school is very dependent upon the value the school places on the issues and in time and commitment made to the programme" (p. 24). Restorative Practice was seen by one school as a useful tool which encouraged teachers and curriculum middle leaders to address student behaviour through departments and subsequently ease workload for the deans. This is supported by Drewery (2007) who advocates for 'restorative practices' employed school-wide. Despite having Restorative Practice methods school-wide, both senior leaders and deans recognised there were still dilemmas between deans and colleagues. There is evidence within the findings that Restorative Practice was seen as positive and had gone some way to easing deans' workload by giving classroom teachers and curriculum middle leaders the tools to address student behaviour first while also assisting deans to have difficult conversation with colleagues.

Professional development needs

There were two major themes within the findings which have implications for professional development support and training needs. One was the need for induction and context-based training of school systems and pastoral care. The other was the need for generic leadership and management training with a development focus around collaboration, teamwork, building relationships, managing dilemmas and having difficult conversations with staff and parents.

A need for induction and context based training

There was strong evidence that deans wanted more in-house, context-based professional development, which would work towards getting some consensus on the objectives of pastoral care within the school. Deans also developing a 'cluster' type network with other schools within their area would be time well spent. Deans spoke of initiating professional development across schools as a useful and practical way of extending the practice of collegial support and training with deans of similar ilk.

Deans discussed learning needs and new knowledge areas for professional development which included: youth issues; societal issues; areas such as the impact of technology and social media on youth; counselling training to help manage students more effectively; and, external agencies. These new knowledge opportunities are in a similar vein to the ad hoc collection of professional development within the findings that deans had found useful. They also sit on the periphery of what would be deemed 'traditional' professional development for educational purposes with more of a 'social work' frame.

There is evidence that deans would like counselling training so that they could do more for students and not have to make so many referrals to the counsellor. Crowe (2006) argues because of workload issues, teachers are less available to undertake guidance and pastoral care roles and are frequently leaving this work or referring this work to the guidance counsellor. While there is convincing evidence within the findings of workload issues for

deans, there is also evidence within the findings that deans were referring students to counsellors because they do not have the counselling skills to manage. This raises the question of whether deans should have counselling skills as this is a specialised area requiring qualifications and supervision to get registered with the New Zealand Association of Counsellors. An implication of deans receiving counsellor training is the increased workload in their already stretched day-to-day workload. It is clear that the capabilities that deans need to be able to deal with the multiplicity of demands that young people bring to school are far reaching.

A need for generic leadership and management training

Deans and senior leaders considered professional development on difficult conversations and dealing with demands from difficult staff members and parents to be worthwhile. It is this type of generic leadership and management training that is needed to make the transition from classroom teacher to pastoral care middle leader which Calvert and Henderson (1998) state is somewhat lacking. While there is evidence in the findings that pastoral care middle leaders would benefit from generic training, there is also a need for specialised leadership and management training because of the specialised nature of the dean's role within secondary schools.

The findings identify major challenges for deans in dealing with situations with their colleagues where students were not always at fault. The deans were facing dilemmas with staff and parents that were, in some cases, beyond their leadership capability. Deans were put in the difficult position of supporting and advocating for both colleagues and students as they try to meet the needs of both parties, a position Cardno (2007) describes as a dilemma. Deans within the three schools were experiencing 'leadership dilemmas' as these problems were challenging them as leaders to consider both collegial and parent relationships and organisational quality goals simultaneously (Cardno, 1998). Deans within the study acknowledged there is a difference between managing difficult students and managing difficult colleagues and parents. The findings show evidence that deans lack the professional knowledge and training to

apply dilemma strategies which result in positive outcomes. This had led to some deans having more serious issues with staff than with students. Pastoral care middle leaders need the professional development to overcome these dilemmas.

Job descriptions and appraisal

The dean's lack of job description was a key theme in the findings. All senior leaders and deans agreed the dean's job description did not reflect what was expected of the role within their school; one put it in the "hazy basket" while another senior leader discussed the job description as "rubbish" and "crap". Bush and Middlewood (2005) suggest people behave differently from their job descriptions by responding to both the expectations of the set role and their own, individual interpretations of the position. This is the reality for deans within the three schools. There is an expectation on deans to do everything, therefore the multiplicity of the role - as presented in the findings - would be difficult to capture in a job description. A formal job description, as a document, is arguably always going to be ineffective under the conditions presented for deans within the three schools. Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) suggest the job description acts as a keystone for all aspects of performance management. Ultimately, the performance management of deans within the three schools is compromised without an effective job description.

Deans from all three schools were appraised by senior leaders which Piggot-Irvine and Cardno (2005) argue provides means for demonstrating accountability. Deans at School B were appraised by their line managers based on Unit Holder responsibilities (PPTA National Office, 2011) and feedback from the tutors. The senior leader discussed the appraisal process as largely qualitative but spoke of wanting to use "more data" such as detention numbers. In contrast, Cardno (2005) argues appraisal needs to be central to management and leadership development and linked to the school strategic plan and the leadership of learning. Data was part of the appraisal process for deans at School A where the appraisal included "a huge SWOT analysis" through an interview, quantitative measured data and comments

from tutor teachers. This practice is not supported by Scaife (1998) who states it is impossible to measure the effectiveness of leading pastoral care through targets and competence specifications. Deans from School A discussed how they were not being measured on the stuff they did well, as so much of the good work they did was immeasurable.

One dean commented they had found informal feedback from tutors to be more useful than their formal appraisal. This finding is supported by Megahy (1998) who argues accountability for pastoral care middle leaders should come in the form of self-evaluation and sensitive external evaluation. Deans within this study wanted more of their appraisal to be focussed on their interpersonal interactions and less on meeting targets or measurements as supported by Scaife (1998) who suggests understanding interpersonal processes for assessing effectiveness of pastoral care. The evidence shows there has been some shift in focus away from 'disciplinarian' to a more holistic pastoral care and support of student learning therefore a contradiction exists when a senior leader focuses a significant part of the deans appraisal on the number of detentions and lateness of students. Cardno (2005) states an effective appraisal system is one that has gained staff commitment and is valued; however, the findings suggest that deans do not value their appraisal.

Summary

This chapter has provided a discussion of the empirical data and linked it to the literature base from Chapter Two. The pastoral care middle leader role is multifaceted, demanding and evolving. It requires a specialist teacher with a broad range of capabilities to undertake it. Deans have an important role in supporting learning within secondary schools. The current expectation placed on a dean is not a sustainable model for delivering effectively as a dean and as a classroom teacher within the structures of the three secondary schools used in this research. Deans need the support of senior leaders to look critically at how and why the role has evolved into the complex and demanding role that it is currently in secondary schools. This type of critical engagement, matching the need to available resources, will enable deans to

be more effective in their role. Relationships and teamwork were at times challenging for the deans. Bush and Middlewood (2005) note that while teams and teamwork are increasingly advocated as part of the school structure, their value lies in whether they operate effectively and contribute to the development of successful schools. A key theme within the findings was that deans' relationships with staff and parents, and teamwork with teachers and curriculum middle leaders were not always operating effectively. Jurisdiction, hierarchical issues and playing a 'conduit' role were providing challenges for deans within the schools. People management issues and dilemmas with colleagues and increasingly parents are the biggest challenge dean's face. Relationships and teamwork within the deans' team is strong and there is little evidence of issues with paraprofessionals within the wider pastoral care team. The findings show deans need clarity in their objective, clear jurisdiction, and support and training to deal with any people management and leadership issues they face in their role. There is a lack of suitable professional development opportunities for the pastoral care middle leader role leaving pastoral care middle leaders feeling underprovided for. Moreover the lack of time for professional development is impacting on induction and in-house training opportunities. Cardno (2005) states "professional development has never been of greater importance than it is right now in order to sustain and advance the profession". Pastoral care middle leaders are in need of induction and context based training as well as leadership and management training to overcome the challenges of their role. The next chapter offers conclusions in response to the research questions and considers the implications of these findings, outlines limitations of the study and recommendations for further investigation.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study has provided a valuable and overdue insight into the role of pastoral care middle leaders in secondary schools. The study has illustrated the importance of these middle leaders and the challenges they face in a multi-faceted and overwhelming role, despite the little published research of this area. Furthermore, the study has also illustrated the type of professional development these leaders need to be more effective in their role. The following chapter focuses on three main areas. Firstly, it considers the conclusions drawn from the study and presents these under the three key research questions which are: Why are pastoral care middle leadership roles important in secondary schools? What challenges do pastoral care middle leaders face in their role? What leadership professional development is needed for pastoral care middle leaders? The chapter then moves onto the limitations of the study and recommendations.

Why are pastoral care middle leadership roles important in secondary schools?

The findings show some shifts have happened for pastoral care middle leaders within secondary schools and they have a complex, demanding and evolving role. To be effective in their role, pastoral care middle leaders need institutional cultural capital; however, they also need strong interpersonal capabilities. Pastoral care middle leaders are a team within a team and they need to support each other to meet the demands of the role. Pastoral care middle leaders require a broad range of capabilities to manage the new specialisms that have recently emerged within the already multifaceted role. These capabilities are important for the holistic type of pastoral care the

secondary schools within this study desired from their pastoral care middle leaders.

Senior leaders are relying on deans to make the school flow or run smoothly in regard to students and their behaviour. They place a high value on the pastoral care middle leader's work through the relationships they build and the sense of teamwork they develop throughout the school and community. Pastoral care middle leaders play an important role in leading tutors and students and developing leadership within students. The study shows pastoral care middle leaders' importance is in: collaborating; consulting; building relationships with parents, community and external agencies; and, working in and building teams (with staff and students) for improved student outcomes. The pastoral care middle leader plays an important role in linking people together within secondary schools to support student learning for improved student outcomes.

The move from a 'disciplinarian' role with care to a more holistic pastoral care for students has seen pastoral care middle leaders acting as cultural keepers who are upholding school values; however, discipline issues still exist in secondary schools. Young people are bringing more social and emotional problems to school than ever before. Drewery (2007) states young people are maturing earlier yet are expected to stay at school for longer, which may be placing strains on our schools, families and students themselves. The findings show pastoral care middle leaders are picking up what would otherwise fall through the cracks in secondary schools through supporting student learning. Pastoral care middle leaders have taken an important role in linking what has traditionally been perceived as two separate entities within middle leadership of secondary schools, that of academic and that of pastoral care for students. Within this study, there was evidence of schools increasing the intensive monitoring of students' academic achievement through pastoral care middle leaders. They are having school-wide conversations about student needs and achievement across multiple subjects for improved student outcomes. Fitzgerald (2009) and Youngs (2007) charge the distribution or intensification of work being forced down to middle leaders as a result of educational

reforms and the policy/curriculum environment. This has placed pastoral care middle leaders in the important role of supporting student learning within secondary schools.

What challenges do pastoral care middle leaders face in their role?

While the senior leaders viewed middle leaders as equally important, this study suggests pastoral care middle leaders experience tension and leadership dilemmas within the middle hierarchy in secondary schools. These are largely over performance management issues with staff and inconsistent behaviour management procedures for students within departments. The potential for tension and leadership dilemmas exists because of several layers within secondary schools which include: the secondary school structural perspective/culture; an increased focus on learning for student outcomes and student achievement; the policy/curriculum environment established through the structure of the NZC (MOE, 2007); and, assessment tools such as NCEA. These layers have contributed to bringing the potential tension and leadership dilemmas to fruition for pastoral care middle leaders.

This study shows that the large amount of communication, collaboration and collegiality required of deans and their teamwork and relationships with tutors teachers, curriculum middle leaders and senior leaders has resulted in the greatest challenge for pastoral care middle leaders: people management issues. Fitzgerald et al. (2006) suggests when middle leaders are working with and through others in teams, it can be a complex and messy role, especially when people are involved. No matter who it is in within the school environment, education is relational. Whatever structures and processes that you have in place are meant to support those relationships. Although not necessarily referring to pastoral care middle leaders, the literature states the middle leader is often positioned between the sometimes competing demands from directly above and below (Bennett et al., 2007; Feist, 2008; Fitzgerald & Gunter, 2008). My study indicates that the literature fails to address the complexity of the pastoral care middle leader's role. This role is positioned between the sometimes competing demands of senior leaders, tutors,

teachers, curriculum middle leaders, students and parents, increasing the people management issues for pastoral care middle leaders.

Secondary schools are structurally set up in such a way that monitoring of school-wide data has to be done by someone outside of the curriculum structure. Tools such as Student Management Systems are set up for individualised school wide conversations and there is more emphasis on individual student achievement and student outcomes, rather than cohort or class outcomes such as pass rates. Teachers of curriculum are focussed on their own departments and tutor teachers do not have the time to have conversations on individualised school wide achievement and student outcomes. Overseeing an individual student's achievement as well as conversations across multiple subjects within a secondary school has defaulted to pastoral care middle leaders. However, pastoral care middle leaders rely on teachers to input grades so they can monitor student achievement. Secondary schools' organisational structures have not changed; however, policy context, curriculum and measuring achievement through assessment have changed. The result is that already busy people within secondary schools have been given a whole new dimension to their job. Here is another example of what Grubb and Flessa (2006) describe as "distributed pain" (p. 535) rather than distributed leadership. Leadership through supporting student learning has been distributed to pastoral care middle leaders, but they do not have the capacity or resources to manage it effectively.

Structurally, pastoral care middle leaders are on the periphery of curriculum and the role is set up to do everything; however, the wider environment that informs the existing structure does not give them the capacity because the structure is not built in such a way to resource them to be able to do everything. One of the overarching challenges is they have too much to do with too little resource in terms of time and personnel. A school runs the risk of people expecting the pastoral care middle leaders to do everything, because it is considered their job to do it and it has been delegated to them. This study shows there is still a perception that it is the pastoral care middle leaders' job

to do pastoral care. Eventually teachers step back and they do not do much because there is a perception that the pastoral care middle leaders will fix it.

The study shows the pastoral care middle leader role is an evolving and growing role; however, there is a continuing failure to address structural and workload issues. The pastoral care middle leaders within this study were straining to maintain their teaching load, the administrative component of their role and their increased workload. The pastoral care middle leader role is continually expanding and increasing, never reducing. This is supported by the literature which states that the educational leader's roles and responsibilities are constantly changing and increasing (Cranston, 2007; Bennett et al., 2003). There is however an expectation the pastoral care middle leader will also continue to be an effective teacher within the existing time allowance. The current expectation placed on the pastoral care middle leader is not a sustainable model for delivering effectively as a pastoral care middle leader and as a classroom teacher within the structures of a secondary school. To be able to do a pastoral care middle leader's job properly, you need time (McKinley et al., 2009).

Secondary schools today have a more demanding student body and the study indicated there is still a need for traditional 'discipline' type work with students. Changes in societal factors, the concept of care and students have subsequently increased pastoral demands on staff (Calvert, 2009; Calvert et al., 1998; Drewery, 2007) and provided them with new challenges. The findings indicate pastoral care middle leaders are endeavouring to uphold school values and manage and change student behaviour, while school support and backing from home is decreasing and social and emotional factors are increasing. The study shows the increase in differing values between home and school has subsequently increased the people management challenges for pastoral care middle leaders with some parents and caregivers.

What leadership professional development is needed for pastoral care middle leaders?

Teachers within secondary schools are continually being promoted into the pastoral care middle leader's role without the training and support they need to be effective. This study shows the bulk of training is occurring 'on-the-job' with the greatest support coming from within the pastoral care middle leader team. Pastoral care middle leaders within this study consider themselves isolated and underprovided for. The lack of time combined with a lack of options has meant pastoral care middle leaders are likely to finish the school year having not addressed their professional development needs. Within the three schools, job descriptions were out of date and pastoral care middle leaders perceived their appraisal to be ineffective. Job descriptions and appraisal should inform professional development and be an inherent part of effective performance management for pastoral care middle leaders. Adopting a modified version of Cardno's (2005) model of holistic professional development would better inform professional development for pastoral care middle leaders.

This study has identified that pastoral care middle leaders want more in-house induction and context-based professional development individualised to their schools. Pastoral care middle leaders want time to be made available in-house to share case studies and strategies and work on internal school systems. Pastoral care middle leaders within this study perceive there to be benefits in developing a 'cluster group' with other schools in their local area and initiating professional development across schools. Pastoral care middle leaders want professional learning with more of a 'social work' frame around youth issues, societal issues, technology, counselling and relevant external agencies. Pastoral care middle leaders want professional development relevant for their type of school and its pastoral care systems and structures.

There is a need for pastoral care middle leaders to have on-going generic leadership and management development and training. Professional development on difficult conversations and dealing with demands from difficult staff members and parents is needed to successfully make the transition from

classroom teacher to pastoral care middle leader. The study shows that the 'fine line' pastoral care middle leaders walk, through supporting and advocating for colleagues, students and parents, presents a need for specialised leadership and management training. The study shows pastoral care middle leaders are facing jurisdiction issues, having leadership dilemmas and difficult conversations with colleagues and parents. It is evident within this study that having difficult conversations with students does not prepare pastoral care middle leaders for difficult conversations with adults.

Recommendations

This study of pastoral care middle leaders within secondary schools has led to the following recommendations.

Senior leaders and Middle leaders

There is a need for senior leaders of secondary schools to work towards developing and establishing clear objectives and standards for effective whole-school pastoral care practice within their schools. Within these objectives and standards, the role of the pastoral care middle leader also needs to be clarified for the whole school.

Principals and senior leaders, in consultation with pastoral care middle leaders, must work to develop relevant job descriptions, effective appraisal and strategic professional development plans in order to address pastoral care middle leaders professional development needs. In-house, context-based training and general leadership and management support and training are one way to meet these needs. It is vital that secondary schools have someone in the senior leadership team who has been a pastoral care middle leader and who oversees pastoral care with links to student learning.

There is a need for principals and senior leaders to clarify jurisdiction between middle leaders within secondary schools. This is necessary because of the

shift for pastoral care middle leaders into a more holistic role, crossing into 'academic' territory. Moreover, principals and senior leaders must consider either increasing the time allowance or reducing the responsibilities for pastoral care middle leaders if they are going to continue to evolve the role. Secondary schools have the flexibility to define within themselves the allocation of Management Units, time allocation and responsibilities for pastoral care middle leaders therefore principals and senior leaders must get realistic about the 'real value' that they place on the pastoral care middle leader role.

New Zealand Ministry of Education

There needs to be a far greater amount of research and literature on pastoral care middle leadership. This thesis demonstrates that pastoral care middle leaders play a key role in New Zealand secondary schools which has extended far beyond what has traditionally been seen as pastoral care. This study has highlighted that pastoral care middle leaders are playing a direct role in supporting student learning and achievement and are identified as the 'glue' of the school culture. A greater amount of research could also assist in better informing professional development for pastoral care middle leaders.

The MOE should acknowledge that middle leadership within secondary schools is complex and there are differences between curriculum and pastoral care middle leadership roles. The professional development that is currently available is not addressing the needs of pastoral care middle leaders. There is a need to specifically address the needs of pastoral care middle leaders through targeted leadership development so that they develop an understanding of the theory and practice of leadership and management development crucial to their role. The establishment of nationwide leadership training programmes for pastoral care middle leaders could support this understanding of theory and practice.

Limitations of the research

A pastoral care team within a secondary school includes a number of teaching professionals. Schools that participated in the study had a range of teaching professionals in their teams including: senior leaders, deans, international deans, Maori deans, attendance deans. It was outside the bounds of this research to include the direct voice of international deans, Maori deans and attendance deans within the findings. How these deans work with the year level or house deans, staff and parents regarding specific students who may lie within the jurisdiction of both deans is relevant for a wider study of pastoral care in secondary schools. Pastoral care is not only situated with those who have the formal authority for it, but it is also part of day-to-day school life that involves all staff.

Schools that participated in the study had a range of paraprofessionals in their pastoral care teams including: school nurse, guidance counsellor, career advisor, learning support, RTLB and youth workers. It was outside the bounds of this research to include paraprofessionals and how these paraprofessionals collaborate with the deans, staff and parents regarding students; however, this is relevant for a wider study of pastoral care in secondary schools.

Within the three Auckland secondary schools who participated, there was one single-sex integrated school and two co-educational schools. A strength of the study was that pastoral care middle and senior leaders were willing to participate and express their views despite the time constraints they face. Pastoral care middle leaders were appreciative of the opportunity to share their experiences of the role. This allowed for two contrasting viewpoints to be accessed. By approaching the integrated school sector I have been able to compare or contrast the state and integrated sector; however, I have been unable to compare or contrast these with the private sector. Thus, the role and challenges of pastoral care middle team leaders within this sector remain untouched. This is also true of other parts of New Zealand. A larger study comparing other schools throughout New Zealand could produce a different set of findings.

Recommendations for future research

- Research into dynamics of pastoral care teams within secondary schools including teaching professionals and paraprofessionals. This could lead to a better understanding of the role of the pastoral care team, pastoral care practice and challenges of pastoral care teamwork overall within secondary schools.
- Research into the relationship between pastoral care middle leaders and curriculum middle leaders within secondary schools. This could lead to a better understanding of how middle leaders can work effectively together to improve student outcomes. It would be worthwhile researching the perceptions of curriculum middle leaders toward the shifts that have happened for pastoral care middle leaders.
- Research into perceptions of pastoral care and pastoral care middle leaders within secondary schools from those outside of the pastoral care team such as principals, students and parents. This could lead to a better understanding of how pastoral care is perceived by the principals, students, the wider school and the community.
- Research into a documentary analysis of written expectations for pastoral care middle leaders and other related documents would be a rich source of perspective. Through the findings, it became clear from both senior leader and deans that any written expectations in the form of a job description were not a reflection of the actual day-to-day expectations of the role.
- Research into vertical and horizontal pastoral care systems within secondary schools would be useful for pastoral care leaders. This could lead to a better understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of the two systems by principals, staff, students and the community within New Zealand secondary schools.

- Research into pastoral care and pastoral care middle leadership roles within private schools. These could be compared to the state and integrated secondary sectors to highlight any differences and/or similarities.

Conclusion

In a relatively new policy/curriculum environment, pastoral care middle leadership has become a multifaceted role, which is fundamentally supporting learning through maintaining a holistic, school-wide view in order to bridge the gap between pastoral care and academic issues in secondary schools for improved student outcomes. Pastoral care middle leaders are busy people getting busier. However, the impression is not that they are not getting busier leading or promoting the quality of pastoral care in the school. Some of the issues and challenges pastoral care middle leaders are dealt need to be raised to a more strategic level, while others need to be distributed to, and dealt with at, a classroom teacher level. Schools need to ensure that the responsibility for supporting student learning and student outcomes, within subjects, across subjects and school wide, is heavily resourced in time and personnel. Adding this responsibility to the pastoral care middle leader workload, simply because they sit on the periphery and are able to work across the secondary schools silos, is unsustainable. Time also needs to be made for intensive context-based training and tailored leadership as well as management development and training that is both inductive and on-going, in order to meet the unique demands of the pastoral care middle leader role. Some pastoral care middle leaders are relying on their life skills to meet the demands and pressures of the role. It means that once the caring people that have put themselves forward for the role (as illustrated by those who were part of this research) reach full capacity, they risk possible burnout and are lost to education and most importantly to the students who need them.

Due to increased pastoral demands and a shift to a more holistic school-wide view to improve student outcomes, the greatest challenges for pastoral care middle leaders are: people management issues, leadership dilemmas, work

intensification and under resourcing of people and time. They are forced to be reactive, not pre-emptive, in their role and the quality of their teaching is being compromised to meet the growing demands of the role. There are no clear links between what they are doing as pastoral care middle leaders and the quality of professional practice, or improvement in student learning outcomes and how they are enhancing the professional development of other teachers.

There is a tension and paradox around the pastoral care middle leader role in the way that pastoral care middle leaders are now taking a responsibility in supporting student learning; however, there is little evidence the reverse is occurring with curriculum middle leaders or teachers. The majority of challenges pastoral care middle leaders face stem from what they perceive to be teacher shortcomings when managing the pastoral care of students. In some teachers' eyes, the pastoral care middle leader is still the 'disciplinarian' whose primary role in the school is to deal with the behaviour issues. On one hand, pastoral care middle leaders are highly important to secondary schools, they are perceived as the people you can give things to do as they 'catch all problems'. Yet on the other hand, the question of how highly their well-being is valued and how far their capacity to do this can be stretched has to be raised, as does the question of where the support is for those who have themselves become the greatest support in secondary schools.

If these schools are reflective of other secondary schools in New Zealand, the evidence from these schools suggests that the day-to-day practice of pastoral care middle leadership is at a critical crossroads in New Zealand secondary schools. If we don't address some of the problems raised in this study good people are going to be reluctant to go into the pastoral care middle leader role or will leave the profession altogether. Further research is required to ascertain the breadth of these challenges across New Zealand schools and what needs to be done for the future of our students and teachers.

REFERENCES

- Adey, K. (2000). Professional development priorities. The views of middle managers in secondary schools. *Educational Management & Administration*, 28(4), 418-431.
- Bell, J. (2007). The trouble with questionnaires. In A. Briggs & M. Coleman (Eds.). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (2nd ed.), (p. 224-236). London: Sage.
- Bennett, N. (1995). *Managing professional teachers: Middle management in primary and secondary schools*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing
- Bennett, N., Crawford, M., & Cartwright, M. (2003). *Effective educational leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Bennett, N., Woods, P., Wise, C., & Newton, W. (2007). Understandings of middle leadership in secondary schools; a review of empirical research. *School Leadership & Management*, 27(5), 453-470.
- Best, R. E., Jarvis, C. B., & Ribbins, P. M. (1977). Pastoral care: Concept and process. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 15(2), 124-135.
- Blandford, S. (2006). *Middle leadership in schools: harmonising leadership and learning* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson Education.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organisations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bottery, M. (2004). *The challenges of educational leadership*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Bryman, A. (2004). Qualitative research on leadership: A critical but appreciative review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 729–769.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bush, T. (2003). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Bush, T. (2007). Authenticity in research: reliability, validity and triangulation. In A. Briggs, & M. Coleman (Eds.). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (p. 91-105). London: Sage.
- Bush, T. & Middlewood, D. (2005). *Leading and managing people in education*. London: Sage Publications.

- Cardno, C. (1998). Working together: Managing strategy collaboratively. In D. Middlewood & J. Lumby (Eds.). *Strategic management in schools and colleges*, (p. 105-119). London: Paul Chapman.
- Cardno, C. (2005) Leadership and professional development; the quiet revolution. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(14), 292-306.
- Cardno, C. (2007). Leadership learning. The praxis of dilemma management. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 35(2), 33-50.
- Cardno, C. & Fitzgerald, T. (2005). Leadership learning: A development initiative for experienced New Zealand principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(3), 316-329.
- Calvert, M. (1998). Managing change in pastoral care: a strategic approach. In M. Calvert, & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care*, (p. 112-126). London: Cassell.
- Calvert, M., & Henderson, J. (1998). Conclusion. In M. Calvert, & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care*, (p. 141-144). London: Cassell.
- Calvert, M., Evans. & Henderson, J. (1998). Managing inter-agency support. In M. Calvert, & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care*, (p. 81-94). London: Cassell.
- Calvert, M. (2009). From 'pastoral care' to 'care': Meanings and practices. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 27(4), 276-277.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Collier, J., Dinham, S., Brennan, K., Deece, A., & Mulford, D. (2002). Perceptions and reality of the work of the secondary head of department. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 30(2), 17-26.
- Cranston, N. (2006). Leading from the middle or locked in the middle? Exploring the world of the middle-level non-state school leader. *Leading and Managing*, 12(1), 91-106.
- Cranston, N. (2007). What do we know about middle-level school leaders in New Zealand? An exploratory study of Auckland secondary deputy and assistant principals. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Leadership*, 22(1), 16-30.
- Cranston, N. C. (2009). Middle-level school leaders: Understanding their roles and aspirations. In N. C. Cranston & L. C. Ehrich (Eds.). *Australian school leadership today*, (p. 217-241). Australian Academic Press: Australia.
- Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 107-121.

- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Crowther, F., Kaagan, S. S., Ferguson, M. & Hann, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success*. Thousand Oaks, California; Corwin Press.
- Crowe, A. (2006). Guidance and counselling in New Zealand secondary schools: Exploring the issues. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling* 26(3), 16-25.
- Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (2003). Competing traditions. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.). *Social science research in New Zealand: Many paths to understanding* (2nd ed.), (p. 23-38). Auckland: Pearson Education.
- de Jong, T., & Kerr-Roubicek, H. (2007). Towards a whole school approach to pastoral care: A proposed framework of principles and practices. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 17(1), 1-12.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.), (p. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dinham, S. (2007). The secondary Head of Department and the achievement of exceptional student outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(1), 62-78.
- Downes, P. (1998). Resourcing pastoral care. In M. Calvert & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care* (pp. 95-102). London: Cassell.
- Drewery, W. (2007). Restorative Practices in Schools: Far-Reaching Implications. In G. Maxwell & J. H. Liu (Eds.). *Restorative Justice and Practices in New Zealand* (p. 199-213). Wellington, New Zealand: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Feist, C. (2008). Positions and dispositions: Locating leaders within New Zealand secondary school faculties. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 23(2), 60–73.
- Fidler, B. & Atton, T. (2004). *The challenges of contemporary school leadership*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Fitzgerald, T. (2000). Middle managers in secondary schools: Who are they and what do they need to know? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Administration*, 15, 71-75.
- Fitzgerald, T. (2009). The tyranny of bureaucracy: Continuing challenges of leading and managing from the middle. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 37(1), 51-65.

- Fitzgerald, T., & Gunter, H. (2006). Leading learning: middle leadership in schools in England and New Zealand. *Management in Education*, 20(3), 6-8.
- Fitzgerald, T., & Gunter, H. (2008). Contesting the orthodoxy of teacher leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 11(4), 331-340.
- Fitzgerald, T., Gunter, H. & Eaton, J. (2006). The missing link? Middle leadership in schools in England and New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Leadership*, 21(1), 29-43.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.), (pp. 695-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *Organizational learning; improving learning, teaching, and leading in school systems*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Glover, D., Gleeson, D., Gough, G., & Johnson, M. (1998). The meaning of management: The developmental needs of middle managers in secondary schools. *Educational Management & Administration*, 26(3), 279-292.
- Gronn, P. (2003). Leadership: Who needs it? *School Leadership & Management*, 23(3), 267-290.
- Grubb, W. N., & Flessa, J. J. (2006). Nontraditional approaches to school leadership "a job too big for one": Multiple principals and other non-traditional approaches to school leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(4), 518-550.
- Gunter, H. (2001). *Leaders and leadership in education*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Gunter, H. (2005). *Leading teachers*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Hall, C. (1998). Fitness for purpose: self-care and the pastoral tutor. In M. Calvert & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care*, (p. 53-68). London: Cassell.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2011). Leadership and student learning outcomes. In J. Robertson & H. Timperley (Eds.). *Leadership and Learning*. (p. 56-70). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Harris, A. (2005). Leading from the chalk-face: An overview of school leadership. *Leadership*, 1(1), 73-87.
- Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed school leadership: Developing tomorrow's leaders*. London: Routledge.

- Hinds, D. (2000). Research instruments. In D. Wilkinson (Ed.). *The researcher's toolkit: The complete guide to practitioner research*, (p. 41-54). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Hylan, I., & Postlethwaite, K. (1998). The success of teacher pupil mentoring in raising standards of achievement. *Education & Training*, 40(2), 68–77.
- Ingvarson, L., Kleinhenz, E., Beavis, A., Barwick, H., Carthy, I., & Wilkinson, J. (2005). *Secondary teacher workload study report*. Australian Council for Educational Research. Retrieved from <http://research.acer.edu.au/workforce/2>.
- Irving, S. E., Moore, D. W., & Hamilton, R. J. (2003). Mentoring for high ability high school students. *Education + Training*, 45(2), 100-109.
- Keeves, J. P. (1997). Methods and processes in educational research. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), *Educational research, methodology and measurement: An international handbook*, (pp. 277-285). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.), (p. 191 – 215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lodge, C. (1999). From head of year to year curriculum coordinator and back again? *Pastoral Care* (December), 11-16.
- Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L. & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (4th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- McGuiness, J. (1989). *A whole-school approach to pastoral care*. London: Kogan Page.
- McKinley, E., Madjar, I., van der Merwe, A., Smith, S., Sutherland, S. & Yuan, J. (2009). *Targets and talk: Evaluation of an evidence-based academic counselling programme*. Auckland: Starpath Project, The University of Auckland.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga māori: Living by māori values*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Megahy, T. (1998). Managing the curriculum: pastoral care as a vehicle for raising achievement. In M. Calvert, & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care*, (p. 26-52). London: Cassell.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media Limited.
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Kiwi leadership for principals*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Morrison, M. (2007). What do we mean by educational research? In A. Briggs, & M. Coleman (Eds.). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (2nd ed.), (p. 13 - 36). London: Sage.
- Naylor, P., Gkolia, C., & Brundrett, M. (2006). 'Leading from the middle' an initial study of impact. *Management in Education*, 20(1), 1-16.
- Owens, R. G. (2004). Decision making. In *Organizational behaviour in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform* (8th ed.), (p. 284-323). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Piggot-Irvine, E. (2003). Key features of appraisal effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 17(4), 170-178.
- Piggot-Irvine, E. & Cardno (2005). *Appraising performance productively: Integrating accountability and development*. Auckland: Eversleigh.
- PPTA. (2011). *Secondary Teacher's Collective Agreement (STCA)*. Wellington: PPTA National Office. Retrieved from <http://www.ppta.org.nz/index.php/collective-agreements/stca>
- Ribbins, P. (2007). Interviews in educational research: Conversations with a purpose. In A. Briggs, & M. Coleman (Eds.). *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (2nd ed.), (pp. 207-223). London: Sage.
- Robinson, V. M. J., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why. Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES)*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Robinson, V. M. J., Bendikson, L., & Hattie, J. (2011). Leadership and student outcomes: Are secondary schools unique? In J. Robertson & H. Timperley (Eds.). *Leadership and learning*, (p. 131-142). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Russell, L. (2007). Mentoring is not for you!: mentee voices on managing their mentoring experience. *Improving Schools*, 10(1), 41-52.
- Scaife, J. (1998). The development of understanding in pastoral care: an innovative approach using interpersonal process recall. In M. Calvert & J. Henderson (Eds.). *Managing pastoral care*, (p. 127-140). London: Cassell.
- Scott, D., & Morrison, M. (2006). *Key ideas in educational research*. London: Continuum.

- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Simkins, T. (2005). Leadership in education: 'What works' or 'what makes sense?' *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 33(1), 9-26.
- Southworth, G. (2004). *Primary school leadership in context: leading small, medium and large sized schools*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Southworth, G. (2011). Connecting leadership and learning. In J. Robertson & H. Timperley (Eds.). *Leadership and learning*, (p. 71-85). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (Eds.). (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Spillane, J. P., Healey, K., Parise, L. M., & Kenney, A. (2011). A distributed perspective on learning leadership. In J. Robertson & H. Timperley (Eds.). *Leadership and learning*, (p. 159-171). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Tew, M. (2010). Emotional connections: An exploration of the relational dynamics between staff and students in schools. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 27(1), 129-142.
- Timperley, H. (2011). Leading teachers' professional learning. In J. Robertson & H. Timperley (Eds.). *Leadership and learning*, (p. 118-130). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Timperley, H., & Robertson, J. (2011). Establishing platforms for leadership and learning. In J. Robertson & H. Timperley (Eds.). *Leadership and learning*, (pp. 3-12). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.
- Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES)*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Watling, R., & James, V. (2007). The analysis of qualitative data. In A. Briggs, & M. Coleman (Eds.). *Research methods in educational leadership and Management*, (p. 350-366). London: Sage.
- Weber, J. R. (1987). *Instructional leadership: A composite working model*. University of Oregon: ERIC
- Wellington, J. (2000). *Educational research: Contemporary issues and practical approaches*. London: Continuum.
- Wilkinson, T. M. (2001). The core ideas of research ethics. In M. Tolich (Ed.). *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*, (p. 13-24). Auckland: Longman.

- Woods, P.A., Bennett, N., J. A., & Wise, C. (2004). Variabilities and dualities in distributed leadership: Findings from a systematic literature review. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 32(4), 439-457.
- Youngs, H. (2007). *Having the 'presence' and courage to see beyond the familiar: Challenging our habitual assumptions of school leadership*. Proceedings of the ACEL & ASCD International Conference 10 – 12 October, Sydney, Australia
[Available: <http://www.aceconference2007.com/papers.php>].
- Youngs, H. (2008). *The implementation of the revised New Zealand Curriculum: Unpacking the complexities of sustainability, school climate and distributed forms of educational leadership*. Paper presented at the AARE Conference, Brisbane, Australia.
- Youngs, H. (2010). *The challenge of reaping a harvest from school-based learning initiatives: Sources of learning through the perspectives of school leaders, teachers and students*. Paper presented at the 2010 CCEAM & ACEL International Conference, Sydney, Australia.
- Youngs, H. (2011). The school leadership and student outcomes Best Evidence Synthesis: Potential challenges for policy-makers, practitioners and researchers. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 26(1), 16-27.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Profiles of participating schools

School	A	B	C
Description	<i>An integrated single sex school with a horizontal year level pastoral care system.</i>	<i>A large co-educational state school with a house based pastoral care system.</i>	<i>A co-educational state school house based pastoral care system as well as year level deans.</i>
Decile	8	10	3
School size	<i>Approx. 1106</i>	<i>Approx. 1940</i>	<i>Approx. 1185</i>
Tutor system	<i>Deans – horizontal year level Tutors - horizontal Students - horizontal</i>	<i>Deans - vertical Tutors – vertical Students - vertical</i>	<i>Deans – vertical/horizontal Tutors – horizontal Students - horizontal</i>
Deans per year level	<i>Two deans per year level - one academic dean, one discipline dean (not specific to the dean or assistant deans role)</i>	N/A	<i>Year 9 and 10 deans only. Viewed as Assistant Dean.</i>
House deans/leaders	N/A	<i>One per house. 6 x houses</i>	<i>One per house. 3 x houses. Viewed as House Leader/Dean.</i>
Total deans from year 9 - 13	10	6	5
Students per year level	<i>Year 9 – 210, dropping to Year 13 - 175</i>	<i>Between 350 – 400</i>	<i>About 300 average, dropping in Year 13</i>
Students per house	N/A	<i>Approx. 300 (6 houses)</i>	<i>Approx. 450 (3 houses)</i>
Contract	<i>2 years fixed term</i>	<i>Permanent</i>	<i>Permanent</i>
Units	<i>Dean 2MU and 1MMA Assistant Dean 1MU</i>	<i>3 MU</i>	<i>House Leader/Dean 2MU Year level/Assistant Dean 1MU</i>
TIME allocation per week	<i>Dean 5 hours Assistant Dean 3 hours</i>	<i>House Dean 5 hours</i>	<i>House Dean 2 lines each (2 classes less each) Year level Dean 1 line each</i>
Senior leader/s	<i>One senior leader – Director of Pastoral Care</i>	<i>One senior leader per house - Line Managers</i>	<i>One senior leader for discipline, one senior leader for attendance</i>
Appraisal	<i>Appraised by Director of Pastoral Care. Tutors appraise deans through Director of Pastoral Care. Deans informally appraise tutors through Director of Pastoral Care.</i>	<i>Appraised by own Line Manager. Deans also formally appraise tutors. Feedback given to Line Manager on Deans for appraisal.</i>	<i>Appraised by Assistant Principal for discipline. Tutors appraise deans informally through email to Assistant Principal</i>
Other	<i>Dean of international students</i>	<i>Dean of international students, Dean of attendance</i>	<i>Maori Dean, Director of international students</i>
Initiatives	<i>Men Programme Pacific Pride Maori - Katti programme Pacific Island – PILOT programme</i>	<i>Restorative practice, AME High</i>	<i>Restorative practice, Te Kotahitanga</i>

Appendix 2 - Focus group questions for pastoral care middle leaders

Possible questions:

What's expected of you in your dean's role?

What do you think is your key role as dean?

Do you have a job description and is it clearly defined?

Is what's in the job description what's expected of you in the role?

Are you appraised on your role as a dean/unit/responsibility holder? If so how? / If not why not?

What do you think the priority of pastoral care middle leadership is when compared to other middle leadership roles in your school?

How often do you meet as a pastoral care team and what does this involve?

Do the meetings you have meet your needs?

What are some of the biggest challenges you face in your pastoral care middle leadership role?

Have you been able to address these issues and challenges? If so how? / If not why not?

What evidence or measurement has been generated in this school that there is effective pastoral care middle leadership in your school?

What sort of relevant support and training did you receive to make the transition from classroom teacher to dean?

What sort of relevant support and training have you or do you receive in your role?

What professional development would be useful to you?

What's the effect of lack of professional development for deans?

What issues and challenges have you faced in accessing relevant professional development?

Appendix 3 - Interview questions for senior leaders

Possible questions:

What's expected of the dean's role?

What do you think is the key role of the dean?

Does the dean's role have a job description and is it clearly defined?

Is what's in the job description for deans what's expected of those in the role?

Are deans appraised in their role as a dean/unit/responsibility holder? If so how? / If not why not?

What do you think the priority of pastoral care middle leadership is when compared to other middle leadership roles in your school?

How often do you meet as a pastoral care team and what does this involve?

Do the meetings you have meet the dean's needs?

What are some of the biggest challenges deans face in their pastoral care middle leadership role?

Have they been able to address these issues and challenges? If so how? / If not why not?

What evidence or measurement has been generated in this school that there is effective pastoral care middle leadership in your school?

What sort of relevant support and training do deans receive to make the transition from classroom teacher to dean?

What sort of relevant support and training have or do deans receive in their role?

What professional development would be useful to deans?

What's the effect of lack of professional development for deans?

What issues and challenges have deans faced in accessing relevant professional development?

Appendix 4 – Information sheet for senior leaders



INFORMATION SHEET FOR SENIOR LEADERS

Research Project: The complexity of pastoral care middle leadership in New Zealand secondary schools

Kia Ora

Thank you for your interest in participating in my research into middle leadership of pastoral care. My name is Kiely Murphy I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management degree in the Department of Education at Unitec Institute of Technology and currently completing a major research project as part of my Masters in Educational Leadership and Management.

Research Project

The aim of my project is to interpret from multiple perspectives the challenges of leadership within the pastoral care middle leadership role in New Zealand secondary schools. This research study will contribute to the knowledge base on existing educational leadership and management and help to fill the gap of research on effective pastoral care middle leadership practice in New Zealand secondary schools.

What it will mean for you

As the senior leader with the responsibility for pastoral care, I want to collect data by conducting an interview with you.

The interview will take between 40 – 45 minutes long and will be held at your school and at a time convenient to you. The interview will be recorded and transcribed and a copy will be sent to you for your approval. Neither you nor your organisation will be identified in the final thesis. The results of the research activity will not be seen by any other person in your organisation without the prior agreement of everyone involved. You are free to ask me not to use any of the information you have given in the ten days after receiving the transcript. I will also provide the opportunity to share the overall findings of this research before it is submitted.

I will also be inviting you to sign a consent form regarding this event.

My supervisor Howard Youngs may be contacted by email: [hyoungs @unitec.ac.nz](mailto:hyoungs@unitec.ac.nz) or phone: (09) 815 4321 ext 8411.

Yours sincerely

Kiely Murphy

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2011-1187

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from 30.06.2011 to 30.06.2012. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Appendix 5 – Information sheet for middle leaders of pastoral care



INFORMATION SHEET FOR MIDDLE LEADERS

Research Project: The complexity of pastoral care middle leadership in New Zealand secondary schools

Kia Ora

Thank you for your interest in participating in my research into middle leadership of pastoral care. My name is Kiely Murphy and I am currently enrolled in the Master of Educational Leadership and Management degree in the Department of Education at Unitec Institute of Technology and currently completing a major research project as part of my Masters in Educational Leadership and Management.

Research Project

The aim of my project is to interpret from multiple perspectives the challenges of leadership within the pastoral care middle leadership role in New Zealand secondary schools. This research study will contribute to the knowledge base on existing educational leadership and management and help to fill the gap of research on effective pastoral care middle leadership practice in New Zealand secondary schools. I'm working with three Auckland secondary schools and conducting a focus group with middle leaders of pastoral care and an interview with the senior leader with responsibility for pastoral care.

What it will mean for you

As a middle leader of pastoral care, I want to conduct a focus group interview with the deans/head or year/house from year 9-13 and would appreciate your contribution as a member of the group.

The focus group will take between 45 minutes and one hour and will be held at your school and at a time convenient to you. The focus group will be recorded and transcribed and if requested, a copy will be sent to you for your approval. Neither you nor your organisation will be identified in the final thesis. The results of the research activity will not be seen by any other person in your organisation without the prior agreement of everyone involved. You are free to ask me not to use any of the information you have given in the ten days after receiving the transcript. I will also provide the opportunity to share the overall findings of this research before it is submitted.

I will also be inviting you to sign a consent form regarding this event.

My supervisor Howard Youngs may be contacted by email: [hyoungs @unitec.ac.nz](mailto:hyoungs@unitec.ac.nz) or phone: (09) 815 4321 ext 8411.

Yours sincerely

Kiely Murphy

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2011-1187

This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from 30.06.2011 to 30.06.2012. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Appendix 6 – Consent form for senior leaders



CONSENT FORM FOR SENIOR LEADER - Interview

DATE

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research into middle leadership of pastoral care in secondary schools. Please complete the form below and return in the envelope provided.

Master of Educational Leadership and Management

Thesis Title: The complexity of pastoral care middle leadership in New Zealand secondary schools

Researcher: Kiely Murphy

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research and I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered. I understand that the interview will be 40 to 45 minutes long. I understand that neither my name nor the name of my organisation will be used in any public reports. I understand I may withdraw myself or any information I have provided for this project without penalty of any sort within the agreed period.

I agree to take part in this research project

Name: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

Date: _____

Signed: _____

Researcher countersignature

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2011-1187 This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from 30.06.2011 to 30.06.2012. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.



CONSENT FORM FOR MIDDLE LEADER – Focus Group

DATE

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my research into middle leadership of pastoral care in secondary schools. Please complete the form below and return in the envelope provided.

Master of Educational Leadership and Management

Thesis Title: The complexity of pastoral care middle leadership in New Zealand secondary schools

Researcher: Kiely Murphy

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research and I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered. I understand that the focus group will be 50 to 55 minutes long. I understand that neither my name nor the name of my organisation will be used in any public reports. I understand I may withdraw myself or any information I have provided for this project without penalty of any sort within the agreed period.

I agree to take part in this research project

Name: _____

Position: _____

Institution: _____

Date: _____

Signed: _____

Researcher countersignature

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

UREC REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2011-1187 This study has been approved by the Unitec Research Ethics Committee from 30.06.2011 to 30.06.2012. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Committee through the UREC Secretary (ph: 09 815-4321 ext 6162). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.