University of Plymouth

PEARL **https://pearl.plymouth.ac.uk**

04 University of Plymouth Research Theses 01 Research Theses Main Collection

1994

THE DAY-TO-DAY WORK OF PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY

REVELL, ROGER JAMES

http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/2107

http://dx.doi.org/10.24382/1454
University of Plymouth

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

store

THE DAY-TO-DAY WORK OF PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY

R. J. REVELL

Ph. D. 1994

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with its author and that no quotation from the thesis and no information derived from it may be published without the author's prior written consent.

SIGNED R. Revell

DATE 31 – 3 – 94

TITLE PAGE:

TITLE: The Day-To-Day Work of Primary Headteachers: an ethnographic study.

AUTHOR: Roger James Revell

AWARD: The thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of a Doctor of Philosophy award by the University of Plymouth, in collaboration with the Rolle Faculty of Education.

DATE: March, 1994.

University of Plymouth
Library
Item No
9001706191
Shelfmark
Thesis 371.2012 REV

TITLE: The Day-to-Day Work of Primary Headteachers

AUTHOR: Roger James Revell

ABSTRACT: There is a scarcity of empirical data on the nature of primary headteachers' work. Our understanding has to rely heavily on managerial studies or prescriptive commentaries.

The study is an ethnographic investigation of my headship and that of other headteachers, using perspectives drawn from symbolic interactionism. Data-collection is by means of open-ended interviews and a one-year journal of my own headship.

The findings of the study indicate that the daily work of heads is intense, immediate, pragmatic, discontinuous and unremitting. There are often few opportunities for heads during the day to reflect or make other than short-term plans. Much of heads' work has a purpose of running the school and often consists of dealing with daily problems Respondents feel such work is trivial and banal but it is obligatory. There is also another kind of work that is personal to heads, serves idiosyncratic purposes to shape the school, carried out in ways that are independent. The daily work of heads is also characterised by information-processing, decision-making and short-term planning.

There are many affective features to headteachers' work, relating to the periodicity of the school year as well as to school-related and personal work. Heads enjoy aspects of their work involving relationships especially the time spent with children. Headteachers' personal work is often occluded by the immediate tasks of running the school.

There are several parallels between the study's portrayal of headship and what we already know about teaching. The existence of these similarities indicates that values and norms of teaching may leave a legacy in headship.

The study examines a number of implications to arise from these findings. The nature of daily headship is at some variance with government assumption of a responsive line-management. The study considers ways of enhancing the personal, rather than functional aspects of headship, and examines the implications of having separate non-teaching administrators, in addition to head teachers who teach.

The study adds to the corpus of ethnographic studies that emphasizes the importance of the person in practitioners' work, viewed in terms of emotions, values and histories.

LIST OF CONTENTS: VOLUME 1

	PAGES
Copyright Statement	i
Title Page	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
Abbreviations Used	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
Author's Declaration	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	**1**
Origins	4
Values and Assumptions	6
Framework of Thesis	13
Contribution of the Study	17
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	**20**
Centrality of Headship	22
Typologies of Styles	24
Headship as Rational Management	26
Prescriptive Accounts	29
Descriptive and Qualitative Studies	32
Conclusions and Research Implications	35
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	**38**
Ethnography as Research Perspective	39
Particular Research Methods	45

CHAPTER 4: THE NATURE OF DAY-TO-DAY PRIMARY HEADSHIP 84

The Day-to-Day Experience of Headship 86

a) The Sense of Here-and-Now 90

b) The Sense of Dislocation 92

c) The Sense of Intensity 95

The Day-to-day Work of Primary Headteachers 99

a) School-Related Work in Daily Headship 102

Keeping the Wheels Turning 102

Dealing with Paper 106

Problems of School Buildings 109

Problems of Staff Absence 110

Problems of Pupil Behaviour 112

b) Personal Work in Day-to-Day Headship 114

The School as Canvas 117

Shaping the School 120

Working with Children 124

c) Characteristics of Day-to-Day Headship 127

Information-Processing 128

Gathering Information 129

Dealing with Information 132

Making Decisions 134

Making Plans 139

CHAPTER 5: FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS IN DAILY HEADSHIP 143

Literature on Affectivity in Headship 143

Feelings in Relation to Time and Seasons 150

Feelings and Emotions of School-Related Work 154

Feelings and Emotions of Personal Work 161
Affective Aspects of Working with Children 168
Feelings and Emotions of Daily Encounters 177
CHAPTER 6: THE OCCUPATIONAL LEGACY IN HEADSHIP 186
The Institutional and Physical Context 190
Isolation, Insularity and Independence 194
Autonomy, Privacy and Individuality 197
The Day-to-Day Work of Teachers 202
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY, ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS 215
Summary of Research Findings 218
Current Concerns and Legislative Reforms 223
Assumptions and Expectations on Headship 228
Government Assumptions and Study Findings 235
a) Leadership and Headship Roles 236
b) Headship as Line Management 241
c) Headship as Curriculum Delivery 244
Implications and Recommendations for Policy 246
a) Primary Headship as Affective Work 247
b) Primary Headship as Personal Work 253

Appendix A: Conditions of Employment of Head Teachers xi
Appendix B: Code of Ethics xvi
Appendix C: Education Reform Legislation, 1988-1994 xvii
List of References: xix

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Interviews on 'Headship and Change' - Background Information on Respondents and their Schools [between pages 51-52]

Table 2: Interviews on 'What Do You Do As Head?' - Background Information on Respondents and their Schools [between pages 74-75]

Table 3: Interviews on 'What Did You Do Today as Head?' - Background Information on Respondents and their Schools [between pages 76-77]

ABBREVIATIONS USED

AERA	American Educational Research Association
BERA	British Educational Research Association
CEO	County Education Officer
DFE	Department for Education
DEO	Divisional Education Officer
DES	Department of Education and Science
ERA	Education Reform Act
EWO	Education Welfare Officer
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectors
HMSO	Her Majesty's Stationery Office
ILEA	Inner London Education Authority
INSET	In-Service Education and Training
JM	Junior Mixed
JMI	Junior Mixed and Infant
LEA	Local Education Authority
LMS	Local Management of Schools
NCC	National Curriculum Council
NAHT	National Association of Head Teachers
NFER	National Foundation for Educational Research
NUT	National Union of Teachers
OFSTED	Office for Standards in Education
OU	Open University
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
SEAC	Schools Examination and Assessment Council
SEN	Special Educational Needs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The reasons for undertaking this study arise from my discussions with colleagues on the nature of their everyday work in primary headship.

I am grateful for the financial support provided by Hertfordshire County Council during initial stages of this research.

Throughout the research I have benefited considerably from the critical guidance and support of my Director of Studies, Professor Jennifer Nias. It is thanks to her unique blend of skills that the study has evolved from initial seed to maturation.

I am grateful to those headteachers who allowed me to visit and to discuss their work at length. I am also indebted to the large number of other colleagues, who listened to my ideas, discussed the research at every stage and otherwise helped in this enterprise.

At the risk of singling out any single individual, or group of people, I am particularly appreciative for the support given by my family in having to share the uncertainties of a quest I needed to make.

Notwithstanding these acknowledgements, any errors or misinterpretations are entirely my own.

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

The author was registered for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of East Anglia until April 1993, when registration was transferred to the University of Plymouth. The author is not currently registered for any other University award.

This study was financed with the aid of Hertfordshire Education Committee until April 1993.

Relevant seminars and conferences were attended at which work was presented and discussed. These have included the BERA conference at the University of Liverpool in September 1993, at which the author presented the paper "Do We Not Bleed? The Affective Nature of Primary Headship".

The author certifies that all material in this submission which is not his own work has been identified and that no material is included which has been submitted for any other award or qualification.

SIGNED: R. Revell C.

DATE: 31 - 3 - 94

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

It is now twenty years, since the publication of Wolcott's (1973) account of the man in the principal's office. It is nearer to thirty years, if we remember Wolcott's data was gathered some years earlier, in 1966. Ed Bell, subject of the study has now retired, along with Taft School, both victim of a nationwide fall in birth rate in America during the 1970's.

Wolcott's investigation uses a shadow study, in conjunction with interviews, as main methods of data collection. My own study relies also on observational data, from a one-year journal of my work as a headteacher, as well as information from interviews with heads. Unlike Wolcott's examination, my study is English rather than American, and uses evidence gathered mostly from a junior school in a satellite New Town near London, rather than an elementary school on the Pacific Northwest coast. My investigation also takes place in a different kind of historical and political context. Such differences in context, of time, culture and geography might mislead us to dismiss Wolcott's work as being parochial, and dated by events. And yet, researchers still continue to acknowledge the insights, provided over twenty years ago by Wolcott. His study is relevant, not only because of a keen observation of one person's principalship, but also because of Wolcott's sensitive and lucid style of writing. His work

is justifiably a classic of ethnographic research in its own right.

One consistent feature in Wolcott's work is an aim to reveal a world that 'is', rather than 'ought'. In common with the seminal study of classroom life by Jackson (1968), Wolcott's research seems to endure because it penetrates to the heart of the subjective world of participants. Wolcott reflects in 1984, that "the principal's role has changed little in the past two decades" (Preface to 1984 edition, p.vi), and this is probably true in terms of his own research. Some commentators might argue that headship remains in a state of constant flux, because of changing demands made upon the role. This is to overlook an important difference between prescriptions about the role of headship, and an examination of headship as it 'is'. One result of this difference is that commentaries on headship proliferate but seem quickly forgotten, unable to touch the heart of headship as a living phenomenon or to withstand the passing of time. Wolcott's study penetrates that subjective world, providing a richness of interpretation still relevant across decades and cultural boundaries. Ethnographic investigation of this calibre is not commonplace, and we are fortunate that one of the few is Wolcott's examination of principalship.

Ethnographic research into primary headship in this country, is scarce indeed. The only study that attempts to replicate

Wolcott's work is by Southworth (1993). He adopts similar methods to Wolcott, in relying on a detailed shadow study of a single headteacher, as a means of making the phenomenon of headship familiar to us. Unlike Wolcott, Southworth uses data on 'Ron' to construct a profile of headship, which he contrasts with current theories on critical leadership and school management. This is helpful, although the emphasis on management theory sometimes takes Southworth away from a reflection upon the practice of headship, towards reflection on theories of that reality. Wolcott is careful to avoid this in his own investigation and admits to finding theories of management unhelpful, as I have, in studying realities of headship (1984 edition, p.xii).

Southworth and Wolcott both rely on detailed evidence gained from a single subject, to make generalisations on the nature of headship. Such generalisations are in the form of what Brown and McIntyre term 'commonalities' (1993: 50). These should not be confused with statistical probabilities, as associated with experimental research, or surveys that use stratified sampling techniques (Cohen and Manion 1980). The aim of such methods is to achieve generalisations valid in a sector of the population. Ethnographic studies of the kind used by Southworth and Wolcott provide findings that are not generalisable across a section of the teaching population, but can be used to link with other similar studies. Brown and McIntyre term such approaches as 'provisional' since the

researcher is seeking to offer conditional conclusions, that remain "amenable to testing in the future with new cases" (1993: 50).

ORIGINS

The present study is part of such a research perspective, seeking to build where possible on existing studies, and to reach tentative conclusions testable by others. This kind of approach is increasingly used in studies of teaching, to a point where we now possess, for example, a corpus of related studies on teacher knowledge and thinking. Clark and Peterson (1986) conclude that, despite a wide diversity of methods, ethnographic studies achieve a high consistency in their findings on teacher cognition. Schon (1987) has also pointed to the incisiveness of ethnographic research in penetrating the nature of experienced-based, context-related knowledge, compared to theoretical constructs unconvincingly applied to individual teachers or teachers in general. This kind of research framework, that builds progressively upon a a corpus of related studies, does not currently exist in the study of primary headship.

There is also a scarcity of funded, large-scale research on the work of primary heads. Compared with secondary headship there are no major studies of primary headship that parallel those undertaken by Morgan et al. (1983), Hall et al. (1986)

and by Weindling and Earley (1987). The lack of substantial research into primary headship is noted by Laws and Dennison (1991: 278), and by Southworth (1993) who confirms there is "no major study into primary school headteachers in this country" (1993: 8). This means we have only a very limited empirical base on which to base an understanding of primary headship or from which new studies can proceed. The present study originates in part as a response to this negligible treatment in the research literature.

There are other reasons for this study which are personal in origin. As a practising headteacher, I felt dissatisfied with our existing understanding of headship. I discern two main reasons for these feelings. First, there seemed little similarity between my day-to-day experience and assumptions made about headship in much of the management theory. Many commentaries seemed idealistic, bearing scant resemblance to the practicalities of daily work. Second, my conversations with headteachers indicated the existence of deep divisions between theory, research and practice. Most colleagues saw theory and research as largely irrelevant to their practice and more importantly, that practice had little to contribute to either of them. In the literature, this was explained as an 'anti-intellectualism' (Jackson 1968, 1990 edition: 148) or 'conservatism' on the part of practitioners (Lortie 1975: 181). Smyth (1981) and Huberman (1992) also pointed to signs of a continuing rift between practice and research. I felt

these taken-for-granted suppositions by practititioners and researchers were not helpful to the occupation. I believed these divisions might be deep-seated and professional, but I was dissatisfied with explanations about their origins. I was not convinced, for example, that heads could be typified as anti-intellectual or conservative people. I wondered too if King (1978: 14) was justified in assuming an occupational insularity. I felt other reasons were possible, perhaps to be found in the characteristics of headteachers' work rather than in the nature of headteachers. There seemed a need for a more clearly delineated portrait of primary headship. I believed this could be helpful in offering an empirical base for practitioners and researchers to examine some of their taken-for-granted assumptions about theory, practice and research. For these additional personal reasons, I decided to embark upon a long-term study of the day-to-day practice of primary headship.

VALUES AND ASSUMPTIONS

From these comments, it may be seen that several assumptions and values underpin the study. I identify several personal values in my subsequent discussion of methodology. In the present section, my intention is to examine the theoretical assumptions that underpin the study. There seem two main assumptions which I now identify and explicate. First, an assumption of my research perspective and that of Southworth and Wolcott is that realities of headship are discernible in

the perceptions of participants. This assumption has been articulated within a theoretical paradigm known as 'symbolic interactionism'. The intellectual roots of the paradigm are diverse and these are adequately summarised by Faris (1967), Rock (1979), and Benson and Hughes (1983). Many of its main ideas have been traced as far as Hobbes, Durkheim and Marx (Blum 1971: 117-132). These ideas have since been developed influentially by sociologists, such as George Herbert Mead (1934), Lewin (1948), Becker (1961), Goffman (1961), Schutz (1962), Garfinkel (1964), Blumer (1969), and Strauss (1978). This short list is not intended as an exhaustive one, but it includes sociologists whose ideas are fundamental within the traditions of symbolic interactionism. Many of their ideas have now become established as particular schools of thought although for brevity's sake I treat the paradigm of symbolic interactionism as homogeneous.

Symbolic interactionism raises a fundamental reservation to what is often termed as the 'objectivist' view of knowledge. Bernstein has succinctly summarised objectivism as "the view that is represented in traditional epistemology and analytic philosophy" (1971: 75). The writings of Merton (1957) and Talcott-Parsons (1949, 1952) are sometimes assumed as being representative of positivist traditions in sociology (Benson and Hughes, 1983: 39; Connelly, 1981: Ch.2).

The individual's view of the world may be objectivist too so

far as knowledge appears to be a "product of the factual and 'real' character of the world" (Blum 1971: 117). Berger and Luckman (1967) argue persuasively however that realities are socially constructed, not objectively defined. A central axiom of their argument is that a dialectical relationship exists between society and people as individuals. Berger (1969) elaborates further that "society is a dialectical phenomenon in that it is a human product, and nothing but a human product, that yet continuously acts back upon its producer" (1969:3). Reality is therefore describable, "not in terms of structural properties of events-in-the-world", but rather as a product of the informal understandings "negotiated among the members of a collectivity" (Blum 1971: 117).

The perspective of symbolic interactionism places particular importance on these understandings and meanings, as "social products formed through activities of people interacting" (Blumer, 1969: 5). Mead (1934) had earlier emphasized the concept of 'self' as the internalisation of social processes by which people interact with one another. The individual learns to construct a sense of 'self' and 'others', through interaction with 'others' (Rose, 1962; Morris and Meltzer, 1967; Benson and Hughes, 1983: 44-45; Nias, 1989: 19-24). Self and meaning are therefore sociological phenomena, which constitute the world which the individual inhabits.

This supposition is especially significant for ethnographic study because of a necessary commitment to the investigation of individually-held and socially-created meaning. Symbolic interactionists seek to penetrate the subjective ordering of a social world. Whorf (1956) suggests that the subjective ordering is controlled by culturally ordained forms and categories, "by which the personality not only communicates, but also channels his reasoning and builds the house of his consciousness" (1956: 252). By penetrating into the nature of such subjectively-held thoughts, symbols and meanings, it is possible for the researcher to discern characteristics of the culture being examined. This method of enquiry does not tend to rely upon questionnaires, sampling techniques or stratified surveys that would merely distance the researcher from the phenomenon being investigated. Instead, authentic understanding must come from the immediate experience of the phenomenon, in a process usually termed 'praxis' (Benson and Hughes, 1983: 45). Symbolic interactionists therefore place particular stress on the value of detailed, 'in situ' examination of the day-to-day processes by which individuals construct and perceive the meanings of their daily world.

In the present study, I assume that immediate experience of day-to-day headship is crucial, in order to gain an intimacy with its realities. My research from this point of view is not an investigation that reflects a "disembodied pure logic but a social encounter" (Rock, 1979: 182). I further assume

that it is essential to gain data on headteachers' meanings and perceptions of headship, since it is they who construct and sustain the realities of headship as a lived phenomenon.

These assumptions are part of my theoretical perspective but they are also epistemological assumptions, since I presume that knowledge of headship is held largely by practitioners. In other words, I place particular value in this study upon the practical knowledge of headteachers. The assumption is articulated persuasively by Elbaz (1983), Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1985), Leinhardt and Smith (1986), and recently by Brown and McIntyre (1993). Brown and McIntyre point to an increasing acceptance by researchers into teaching that over many years "experienced teachers have acquired a substantial practical knowledge about teaching, largely through their classroom experience, rather than their formal training" (1993: 12). Lieberman and Miller (1984) and Calderhead (1987: i) agree that "teachers possess the major portion of available knowledge about teaching and learning" (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: xi). I believe that these arguments are also relevant to the practice of headship.

Finally, I assume that there is value in reflection upon my own practice as a headteacher, as a source of evidence for the research study. This assumption is methodological and relates closely to my earlier comment on a need to penetrate subjectively-held meanings and perceptions. In particular,

I refer to my use of a one-year journal of my headship, as a means of reflection and as a source of data. The use of the journal raises questions on the validity of subjective data, which I discuss more fully in chapter 3 on methodology. In the present chapter, I indicate briefly the assumptions made by sociologists in a much broader and continuing debate upon issues of subjectivity.

In positivist approaches, the subjectivities of respondents, such as attitudes, values, preferences, beliefs or feelings, are treated as measurable phenomena. Positivist researchers assume that the use of schedules, scales, questionnaires and inventories allow access to subjectivities, while retaining a sense of detachment from the phenomenon. These data can then be correlated with objective variables, such as gender, age and social class, to demonstrate social arrangements and patterns. Qualitative research attempts to gain access to subjectivities using different techniques. Becker (1958) argues, for example, that in 'participant observation' it is only by becoming part of the phenomenon that a researcher is able to gain insights into its realities (1958: 682). His comments are accepted by Benson and Hughes (1983), who argue that "it is only by participating, as an actor in the world being investigated" that a researcher can gain an "access to largely private phenomena through his or her private vision" (1983: 63). Schutz (1962) further argues that a researcher should engage in a similar process to that of the individual or social actor, who must interpret their "life-world" as a

matter of daily routine (1962: 53).

Such assumptions are criticised by Giddens (1977) who points to a lack of externally validating criteria for judging such methods, and to dangers of the investigator 'going native'. Rock (1979), Hughes (1980), and Kuper and Kuper (1985) offer a balanced assessment of the central arguments, and counter-arguments, put forward by sociologists from both traditions.

In this study, I introduce subjective data from respondents, and from myself as researcher, since my purpose as Luckmann puts it, "is to describe universal structures of subjective orientation in the world not to explain the general features of the objective world" (1978: 9). My assumption is that I can only discover meanings, values, beliefs and tacitly held norms of primary headship by a participation in its day-to-day subjective realities. The need for such a different way of approach is perhaps important, in view of a preponderance of studies that already offer an abstract, but unconvincing, portrayal of daily headship. My deliberate use of subjective data therefore serves a specific research purpose in seeking to reveal much of an 'insider' view of headship.

This does not absolve the study from the kinds of criticisms levelled by Benson and Hughes (1983), that "some of symbolic interactionism is a lapidary style of investigation" (1983: 55). Their reservation is an important one, and I accept a

need to avoid a sense of journalism in the present study.

My assumptions on the admissibility of subjective data also has support from Stenhouse (1985: 23), as well as from those researchers such as Schon (1987), working within a tradition of reflective practice. Schon argues influentially on the importance of 'reflection-in-action' (1987:51) as a source of professional knowledge. These ideas have been developed considerably in recent years and a helpful overview of the research is given by Morine-Dershimer (1990) and Altrichter, Posch and Somekh (1993). Brown and McIntyre (1993) argue convincingly that there is a need for more research based on reflection which can penetrate the "thinking which underlies teachers' day-to-day teaching, and for theory generated from such research" (1993:11). My study is a tangible product of such subjective reflection on the practice of headship.

FRAMEWORK OF THESIS

The thesis is in six inter-related parts, each contained in a separate chapter, each part serving one or more purposes. In this first part, I summarise the origins, assumptions and claims of the current research. I also point to particular deficiencies in the existing literature on primary headship.

The second part follows from my assertions on the inadequate treatment of primary headship within the literature. The

chapter provides a critical review, in which I identify more closely the nature of those deficiencies. I also examine the assumptions underlying the existing portrayal of primary headship, and of theories about it. This discussion has a number of implications for the focus of the study, since my intention is to redress some of the deficiencies in current treatment of primary headship in the literature.

In the third part, I discuss how I set about doing this. My purpose here is two-fold. First of all, since the study is ethnographic, I clarify the characteristics of ethnography as a methodological perspective. Second, I seek to defend my use of specific methods to gain data on primary headship. These sections within the chapter are principally a detailed explanation of what and why research decisions were taken during the evolution of the study.

The purpose of the fourth part is to show what was found out about headship, using these methods. The chapter is mainly an analysis of the research data, presented to the reader in three main sections. First, I examine headteachers' general impressions of their day-to-day work, drawing upon data from my one-year journal of headship and from the semi-structured interviews with colleagues. Second, I analyse headteachers' perceptions of the purpose of their daily work. I indicate a difference between tasks that are school-related and tasks serving the idiosyncratic and personal purposes of the head.

Third, I examine what heads do each day, and identify those features which seem characteristic or typical of day-to-day headship. These three strands provide a composite portrait of primary headship. This chapter also includes extracts from the data on which the findings are based. My intention in doing this is two-fold. First, the inclusion of original data allows the reader to interpret the evidence, and so to judge my interpretation of it. Second, the incorporation of such data into the main text allows respondents to speak, as it were, with their own voices. In a study concerned mainly with interpreting the subjective world of headteachers, it seems wholly appropriate to allow respondents to speak where possible for themselves. I believe that they achieve this with a directness and a clarity which I would be foolish to paraphrase.

The fifth part follows naturally from the previous one. My purpose here is to examine a consistent theme in the data of an affective dimension in headteachers' work. The theme is 'grounded' in the data (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Burgess 1984) and appears sufficiently important to warrant detailed treatment. I also point to several important implications in recognising that headship has an affective dimension.

My purpose in the sixth part is to consider why headteachers perceive their daily work in the ways described in chapter four. In examining this question, I indicate similarities

between my portrayal of headship and what is already known about the nature of teaching. I argue as a hypothesis that such parallels may indicate an existence of occupational and professional values that endure from teaching into headship.

In the seventh and final part, I consider some of the issues and implications of my research findings. I begin this part by summarising the research, in order to bring together in a convenient form the diverse strands and themes of the study. I then examine two main issues. First, I discuss findings of the study in relation to the current debate in education, in particular to prescriptions about primary headship by central agencies. The need for contrasts to be made between primary headship as it 'is', and as it is 'ought' to be, may be important. Some researchers such as Cortazzi (1991:10) and Southworth (1993) argue that the scarceness of empirical data on primary headship means there is "little influence on policy makers or practitioners alike" (1993: 10).

Second, I examine the practical implications of my findings that headship has personal and affective dimensions, as well as abstract features. I discuss two central issues in these sections. Firstly, I consider what expectations are made on the office of headship and then discuss those that are often rewarding and fulfilling to primary heads, as well as those expectations that are not. Secondly, I make the proposition that the duties and responsibilities of heads should now be re-examined, especially in view of the accumulated evidence

that personal norms and values are resistant to change. In other words I ask if headship should be changed, not heads.

I discuss the implications of such possible changes and then provide an outline of the action needed to implement them.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

This study contributes to ethnography, and our understanding of headship, in three main ways. First, unlike the existing studies by Wolcott (1973) and Southworth (1993), it provides insights into primary headship from the vantage point of a practising head. Such a study, based upon empirical data, is unique and is not replicated in the current literature on primary headship in this country.

Second, the study offers new evidence on day-to-day headship as a felt experience. Affectivity is the focus for several studies in teaching, notably by Gabriel (1957), Richardson (1973) and by Salzberger-Wittenberg et al. (1983), but it is not previously investigated in headship, including the study by Wolcott. The neglect of this dimension of headteachers' work has led to an incomplete portrayal of headship (Revell 1993).

Third, this study provides evidence of a difference between headteachers' school-related work and their personal work in

shaping the school. Some of this evidence confirms previous knowledge of individualism, independence and idiosyncracy in headship. It is new to argue, however, that headship like teaching is work that has personally-directed as well as externally-required aspects. The argument builds upon, and extends, a small corpus of ethnographic studies, represented by Nias (1989), Goodson (1992), Pollard (1992), Hargreaves (1992) and Woods (1993). These researchers argue that the work of teachers involves a heavy investment of the person, in terms of emotions, values and the self. In the North American literature, these ideas are developed by a number of researchers such as Ashton and Webb (1986), Barth (1990), Cortazzi (1991), Fullan (1992) and by Hunt (1992). Several researchers such as Perrenoud (1983), Hatton (1989), Yinger (1987) and Huberman (1992) are influential in developing supplementary ideas on teaching as a personal craft skill. My research complements this corpus of ethnographic studies, by indicating that headteachers' work is also characterised by personally-oriented features.

The study also points to evidence that the origins of heads' perceptions of their work lie in previous experiences within the occupation of teaching. My argument here is that there are characteristics of teaching as work which form habitual ways of thinking in teachers that endure in headship. Such inherited thinking helps in turn to shape heads' perceptions of their work. My conclusions suggest not only an existence

of personally-held values and meanings in teaching (Ball and Goodson 1985; Lieberman and Miller 1984; Nias 1989) but also that these persist into headship. Evidence indicating the continuity of personal norms and values in headship does not appear to exist in the literature, which treats headship as though part of a different occupation. Southworth (1993) argues recently on similar lines that heads are a product of the occupation of teaching. Southworth offers evidence to indicate that the professional identity of his respondent is partly a continuation of a personal identity. Such arguments offer new insight into the nature of primary headship, since the relationship between headship and the characteristics of teaching are largely unexplored in the existing literature.

The present chapter is an introduction to the study. It is intended to set the scene by explicating the assumptions and aspirations of the research. Nias (1989) suggests there is a scarcity of research "to portray a subjective reality from the standpoint of, or in the words of, teachers themselves" (1989:19). This argument seems at least as relevant for the work of primary headteachers. The need has seemed a clear one, both in terms of present knowledge and current debate, for a study to investigate the world of headship as it 'is', not as it 'ought' to be. I endeavour to meet this need, in a study that examines the phenomenon of primary headship, at a time when the voice of 'ought' seems especially strident.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The intention of the present chapter is to consider what has already been written about primary headship and to judge the portrayal of primary headship in these accounts. Since there seem to be weaknesses in this portrayal, it is also my intention to identify the nature of such deficiencies and inconsistencies. The discussion has implications for the research focus, since my aim from the outset has partly been to redress weaknesses that I discerned in the literature.

Although the literature on headship is extensive, it appears to offer only limited insight into the phenomenon of primary headship. In terms used by Huberman (1990) much of it seems "rationally elegant but is not sufficiently street-smart, or school-smart" (1990: 33). Several researchers with headship experience share Huberman's conclusion. Hayes (1993) and Southworth (1993), for example, both accept Ball's appraisal that the literature fails to discern the "street realities" of headship (1987: 80). There seems 'prima facie' evidence of an apparent failure in the literature to offer a portrait that is convincing to practitioners. Few studies, with the exception of Wolcott (1973), Southworth (1993) and Sedgwick (1989) appear to provide a plausible description of headship as a "lived reality" (Nias, 1989: 2). Wolcott's research lacks a recognition of headship as a felt experience, while Southworth's study has a particular bias towards theories of

management. Sedgwick's anecdotal account of a year in the life of his school has, by its own admission, a "paucity of theory generated by data" (1989: 152). Sedgwick's style is entertaining and journalistic, but from a research viewpoint his account is 'lapidary', rather than analytic (Benson and Hughes, 1983: 55). As Cicourel has commented, "descriptive statements are interpretations by the observer, infused with substance that must be taken for granted, without telling the reader how all of this was recognised and accomplished" (1973: 24). Despite these limitations, all three studies possess a sense of authenticity and realism which is lacking in much of the literature on primary headship.

There is evidence that the literature fails to differentiate between headship as an office or role, and headship as daily work of heads. This continuing focus upon what headship is assumed to be, or should be, remains largely unquestioned in the literature and the assumptions underlying this kind of emphasis even less so. In the present chapter, I seek to justify my assertions by a discussion in three main parts.

In the first part, I examine assumptions made about headship in the literature. First, I consider the assumption that headship is central in school affairs. This seems to have a broad acceptance by writers from various backgrounds using different perspectives. Second, I examine assumptions that headship is categorised according to various typologies

or dimensions of style. Third, I consider the assumption that the work of headteachers is mainly a linear activity, consisting of rational, discrete procedures. Commentaries of this kind are often characterised by various abstractions and models, reducing the phenomenon to formula terms.

In the second part, I examine studies offering prescriptions on the 'ought', rather than the 'is' of headship (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 78). I refer only briefly in this section to prescriptions made by central government since a separate discussion of these seems warranted in my final chapter.

In the third part, I consider studies which seek to describe headship as it 'is'. These studies are scarce and often use qualitative approaches to offer descriptions of day-to-day headship. Such studies have tended to be short-term, small-scale, and to focus on pressures in headship or upon heads' use of time.

In the fourth part, I summarise my conclusions, and point to particular gaps in our present knowledge of headship. These deficiencies have helped in the formulation of the study, as gaps in our current understanding that I seek to redress.

CENTRALITY OF HEADSHIP

Researchers and commentators seem in agreement that headship

is central to school affairs. It is seen as pivotal in the way schools are run, in the quality of education provided by schools, in the morale and effectiveness of staff and in the successful implementation of reform.

This view of headship is hardly revelatory and, perhaps, may be inevitable in view of the extensive executive powers that are invested in the office of headship (Pollard 1985: 120). The duties of headteachers are enshrined in Statutory Orders of April 1st 1992, which itemise the twenty-two requirements and responsibilities for headteachers in discharging their duties (Appendix A). These duties include the formulation of overall school aims, the deployment of staff, security of school buildings, implementing an appropriate curriculum, evaluation of teaching and learning, establishing effective relationships with external agencies, the promotion of self-discipline in pupils, pastoral care of pupils, liaison with other schools, provision of regular information for parents, appraisal of staff, and allocation of financial and material resources.

The nature and scope of such duties place headteachers in a central position within the life of schools. Some writers argue further that headship is such a central aspect that it determines the entire 'climate' of a school (Hoyle, 1986) or what Pollard (1985) terms as its 'institutional bias'. Some studies view headship as crucial for the creation of schools

that are 'healthy' (Holtom, 1988: 61), 'participative' (ILEA 1985), 'effective' (Paisey and Paisey 1987), 'purposeful' (Alexander et al., 1992: 47), 'collaborative' (Southworth 1987) or 'coherent' (Alexander, 1984). Such studies assume that headship is not only central to school affairs, but is instrumental in achieving those qualities felt desirable for the whole institution.

TYPOLOGIES OF STYLE

Several studies focus on typologies of headship style, often incorporating normative judgements on the effectiveness of a particular style. Holtom (1988) reviews this aspect of the literature, pointing to an underlying assumption that "style of the head is the fundamental influence upon the atmosphere of the whole organisation" (1988: 63). Some researchers have identified a single characteristic, such as 'paternalism' (Coulson, 1976: 287; Johnston, 1986: 224), or 'autocracy' (Alexander, 1984: 163). Others focus on polarities such as the 'autocratic-democratic' (Winkley, 1983) or 'nomothetic-ideographic' dimensions of headship (Waters, 1979: 55).

A number of studies use continua on which several dimensions are located. An influential study by Yukl (1975) identifies three main dimensions in headship of 'initiating structure', 'decision-centralisation' and 'consideration' (1975: 162). Several researchers adopt these dimensions, including Lloyd

(1985) who further refines Yukl's initial categories. Lloyd identifies six styles of which an 'extended professional' is considered the most effective in headship.

A frequent strand within the typologies is the dimension of leadership. The notion has many connotations, although it is often used synonymously with headship (Lloyd, 1985; Ball, 1987). Duigan and Macpherson (1992), as an example, assume headship is 'educative leadership', while Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1992) argue it is 'expert leadership'. These comments echo Mortimore and Mortimore (1991) who assume that the role is one of "conductor of the orchestra" (1991: 130). Coulson (1986) and Southworth (1987) use the term to express a sense of exemplary professionalism towards others. Many researchers and commentators link leadership with notions of 'school effectiveness' (Greenfield 1987; Ball 1987). Yates (1992) argues that quality of leadership is a high priority for "any organisation that wants to function effectively" (1992: 2). These views are closely shared by Alexander and others (1992) who emphasize that "headship is leadership in quality assessment and assurance" (1992: 46).

Typological accounts appear simplistic as interpretations of headship. There is a tendency to assume that categories are discrete, and the relationship between different categories is unclear. There also seems the supposition that headship can and should be changed in the direction of those styles

judged most effective for schools. Huberman (1990) argues that these kinds of archetypes may not exist as generalities (1990: 25). Other researchers, such as Boyd and Hartman (1989) suggest that the leadership influence of heads is, in any case, mitigated by the micro-politics of schools, since heads "depend heavily on the co-operation of teachers to get their tasks accomplished" (1989: 26). There is also a lack of evidence to demonstrate that effective leadership, once identified, can be transported into the practice of others. Southworth concludes that such studies are only "Procrustean analyses", since "neither the data nor the conclusions drawn from them are based upon an observation of heads in action" (1993: 15).

HEADSHIP AS RATIONAL MANAGEMENT

There is a large corpus of published work that sees headship as a series of rational procedures. The assumption is that headship is an ordered, measured, sequential and considered activity. Such studies often focus on management features, using the terminology of aims, goals, strategies and review, the implementation of which will ensure "the very success of the educational enterprise" (Whitaker 1983: 137). Paisey and Paisey (1987), as example of these studies, assume that heads' work is managing "the inclusive job of presiding over all that is happening in the school organisation" (1987: 2).

Yates (1992) shares this view, in asserting that "increasing numbers of headteachers see a coherent management strategy as a way to balance the heavy demands of everyday management with the need for longer term planning and organisational development" (1992: 2).

Several writers offer theoretical models of management, such as those by Westoby (1987), Bush (1989) and Whitaker (1993). Bush (1981), as example, offers an 'hourglass' model, while Paisey and Paisey (1987) offer a five-point competence model to be used with a self-administered check-list of a hundred items. Esp (1993), as a further example, provides several 'competency' models, from which heads select the model which they feel is appropriate to their own situation. Whilst such models may be useful in identifying particular features of headship, they often lack empirical evidence or use terms that are confusing (Pugh, 1983). Models tend to remain as simplistic representations bearing scant resemblance to day-to-day workplace realities. Writers may also generalise or anonymise individuals, in a way that is neither recognisable nor convincing to practitioners. Fullan (1985) and Rudduck (1984) argue, in a context of educational change, that these generalised approaches can often ignore meanings assigned by participants. Model-based interpretations of headship may similarly ignore perceptions of heads towards their everyday work.

Many studies emphasise planning procedures, as a fundamental need in headship (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991; Pountney, 1993; Skelton et al, 1991; Hopkins and Ainscow, 1993). Many extrapolate from theories of business management. Beare et al.(1989) offer methods taken directly from advertising and commerce to identify procedures necessary within headship to create effective schools. Riches and Morgan (1989) offer an educational management approach to planning based explicitly on the commercial world. Tomlinson (1992) provides a case-study of IBM as a model for efficient financial planning in headship. Several commentators adopt mnemonic approaches to educational management, using strategies drawn from the business world. Sallis (1992) and Murgatroyd and Morgan (1993) provide the 'TQM' model designed to improve quality of managerial skills in headship, while Esp (1993) offers an 'MCI' model to improve effectiveness of headteachers.

Strategies and advice proliferate in the wake of the current legislation and government reforms. There is a plethora of studies on dealing efficiently in headship with the demands of financial management and budgeting (Blanchard et al, 1989; Cave et al, 1989; Cave and Wilkinson 1990; Thomas 1990; Levacic 1989). Other commentators provide advice on effective ways to implement the requirements of the national curriculum (Bush, 1989; Preedy, 1989), local management of schools (Leighton, 1992), staff training (Gough et al, 1987) and property management (Warner and Kelly, 1993). Many of

these studies make broad assumptions on headship as a linear and measured series of activities.

These kinds of study, often relying on management paradigms of commerce and industry, are severely criticised by Bottery (1992) and Southworth (1987). They argue that extrapolation from the business world is inappropriate within educational settings. Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989) also dismiss approaches "designed originally for business and industry" (1987: iii). Bowers (1990) offers a more general criticism of the 'rational management paradigm'. Bowers censures its increasing application to everyday life, "that reduces every aspect of experience to techniques which can be rationally formulated for the purposes of improving prediction, control and efficiency" (1990: 5). These purposes underlie a number of accounts of headship that are prescriptive in outlook and aspirations.

PRESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNTS

Many studies prescribe what headship ought to be, instead of describing what it is. These accounts characteristically provide advice designed to improve headship practice. There is often discussion about such matters as human and physical resources, school organisation, external relations, managing time, leadership qualities, curriculum development, record-keeping, monitoring of performance, financial budgeting, and

staff development. Hart (1987) exemplifies this kind of study in offering a practical guide to "specific tasks small and large - from badges to curricula - which must be done if a school is to be run efficiently and happily" (1987: 123). This corpus of published material is written largely by non-headteachers but may incorporate contributions by practising heads. The study by Briault and West (1990), as an example, examines statements by practitioners about current concerns. These contributions are analysed by the authors, in offering general advice on strategies to adopt in headship. Skelton and others (1991) analyse school development plans submitted by primary heads, in advising on good practice for producing successful plans. Mortimore and Mortimore (1991) draw upon heads' written contributions, in concluding that headship is largely a matter of co-ordinating with others, as a means of working "on behalf of the nation's most precious asset: its future generations" (1991: 130).

These studies are based only superficially on headship as it 'is' and assume that incorporation of contributions by heads justifies claims made about headship. The lack of empirical evidence, particularly of primary data, seems not to inhibit such commentators from making broad assertions on the nature of headship. Paisey and Paisey (1987), as example, assert without empirical evidence that "heads of primary schools may arrive in posts late in their teaching careers, and are happy to see the remaining years until retirement taken up

with discharging the headship task" (1987:168). Statements of this kind seem to characterise many such studies. These commentaries lack direct empirical data, focus narrowly upon the prescribed duties of headship, and provide no more than advice to heads in carrying out their work. This advice is now augmented by a variety of publications from OFSTED, and the DFE, including most recently "a good practice guide for locally managed small schools" (DFE, 1993). Its publication illustrates a continuing tendency to identify what is or is not good practice, and to suppose this can then be implanted successfully elsewhere. Huberman (1990) questions whether there is any single formula for effectiveness, arguing that "the factor may be there alright, but it can't be lifted out and put somewhere else" (1990: 25).

Such studies have an explicit purpose of improving headship in some way. There is often an emphasis upon the newness, effectiveness and sophistication of strategies recommended (Kent, 1989; Beare et al, 1989). Kent (1989), as example, offers advice on the qualities needed by a 'modern', primary head. Kent's study assumes that achieving effectiveness or competence is self-explanatory and a self-justified goal in itself. Commentators continue to see the need to improve 'managerial skills' (Beare et al, 1989), 'effectiveness' (Reynolds and Cuttance, 1992), 'competence' (Esp, 1993; West, 1993) or 'qualities of leadership' (Holmes 1993;

Green, 1993). Such notions are rarely questioned, and the assumptions and values underpinning them even less so.

DESCRIPTIVE AND QUALITATIVE STUDIES

Research of a descriptive nature has only recently begun to redress these kinds of weaknesses and deficiencies in the literature. Influential studies into teaching by Jackson (1968), Lortie (1975), Elbaz (1983), Woods (1990), Connell (1985), Pollard (1985) and Nias (1989) have begun to portray the phenomenon of teaching from direct observation and from accounts by teachers themselves. This empirical base is not replicated in the study of primary headship in this country.

Descriptive research, including the observational study by Hall et al. (1986), refers solely to English secondary heads while other studies tend to be transatlantic in origin. In the North American literature, a number of studies portray the work of school principals, and include the small-scale research undertaken by Kmetz and Willower (1982), Greenfield (1987), and Burdin (1989).

In this country, and in North America, there is a nucleus of published work that begins to describe how heads spend time. The studies by Clerkin (1985) and Harvey (1986) are helpful, especially since they avoid the problems of using pre-coded

categories (Hilsum and Cane, 1971). Clerkin and Harvey rely upon questionnaires and practitioners' diaries, in achieving similar findings to Manasse's study (1985). Manasse finds that principalship is characterised by interruption of prior plans, variability of work, a predominance of unimportant decisions, few self-initiated tasks, interaction mainly with subordinates, and an unpredictability and discontinuity of tasks (1985: 440). Manasse's study adds to the findings of the observational study by Kmetz and Willower (1982) who found headship was a reactive rather than proactive activity (1982:72). Blease and Lever (1992) offer recent support for the notions of intensity and reactiveness in headteachers' work. Clerkin (1985) summarises the day-to-day work of headteachers as not characterised by a "systematic ordering" (1985: 295). These studies offer foundations for developing an understanding of headship as it 'is', although these are not long-term studies and do not offer detailed exploration.

Another strand in the literature indicates that headship may be problematic as a daily activity. The research by Coulson (1976, 1986) begins to touch upon this notion in a study of the managerial work of primary heads. Coulson suggests that a feature of successful headship might be a 'high tolerance of ambiguity' (1976: 123). Lieberman and Miller (1984) use a one-week journal in finding that the work of principals is "conflictual and uncertain" (1984: 71). These studies do not closely define or explore the notions of problematic or

conflictual headship, but they begin to offer an alternative description to those based upon rational management. They indicate the possibility, for example, that headship may not be as certain or unambiguous as conveyed by the literature.

Recent studies of headship indicate increasing pressures in the work of headteachers. Hayes (1993) points to the "rapid pace of change" and the necessity for his respondent to cope with reforms by adopting collaborative strategies (1993: 1). Wallace (1991, 1992) notes the problems for headteachers, in coping with multiple innovations (1991: 187). Kirkpatrick (1990: 12) Harris and Clarke (1989: 19) and Hellawell (1991: 321) point to increasing pressures on heads in coping with the demands of LMS (1990: 12). A similar finding is made by Laws and Dennison (1991) who indicate the dilemmas in heads' use of time as a result of external reforms (1991: 47). All of these commentaries agree on increasing strains in primary headship as an effect of legislated change.

Several writers assume that current pressures are creating a range of paradoxes and contradictions in headteachers' work. Hayes (1993: 201) as an example, offers a case-study showing dilemmas in headship resulting from new National Curriculum arrangements. Stone (1989) examines 'ambivalence' between personal beliefs and the philosophies underlying the current reforms (1989: 4). These studies suggest there is a sense of contradiction in headteachers' work as a direct result of

external changes.

There also seem limitations in these kinds of arguments. The notion of 'ambiguity' in heads' work (Coulson 1976) predates legislation on LMS and the Education Reform Acts. There is a danger, in other words, that our interpretation of day-to-day headship is influenced by a pre-occupation with current legislation. The sense of preoccupation is understandable. At the outset of the present research, I felt that the study would need to acknowledge the climate of externally-imposed reforms. My deliberations as a headteacher, in common with Wallace (1992), were on implications and anticipated effects of LMS and government reforms. Such preoccupations directed the research briefly towards a study of primary headship in a context of external reforms, not towards an understanding of headship as a day-to-day phenomenon. These comments are explicated in my discussion of methodological issues in the next chapter.

CONCLUSIONS AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS:

The literature assumes headship has a central and continuing importance within schools. Despite the acknowledgement of this centrality, the literature provides few insights into the phenomenon of primary headship. Some existing studies focus narrowly on typologies of styles, usually linked with notions of effectiveness. Other studies offer prescriptions

designed to improve practice, or which assume heads' work is a matter of linear, managerial procedures. The description conveyed by the existing literature seems both unconvincing, and two-dimensional, in its delineation of the phenomenon as a lived reality.

Studies portraying the day-to-day realities of headship seem sparse, or emanate from transatlantic sources. We lack the empirical base which now exists in North American literature (Wolcott, 1973; Kmetz and Willower,1982; Manasse, 1985; Greenfield, 1987; Burdin, 1989). Research in this country has tended to focus on secondary heads (Hall et al, 1986; Weindling & Earley 1987) to the neglect of primary headship. The recent case-study of a single headteacher by Southworth (1993) only emphasizes rather than remedies the scarcity of studies. Southworth agrees with Coulson (1988) that studies of primary headship in England remain limited, both in their scope and methodological "time-scale" (1993: 9).

The purpose of the present research is to fill a significant gap in our knowledge by providing insights into the reality of day-to-day primary headship. In undertaking this study, I am guided by particular weaknesses of treatment within the literature. First, there seems an absence of any detailed empirical base, on which to base an understanding of primary headship. Second, there is no research in this country that constructs a detailed profile of headship on a daily basis,

or over an extended period. Third, there appears only scant research that conveys what it is like being a head, or which reveals the insider's view rather than the "outsider's" view looking in (McNamara, 1980: 113; Nias, 1989: 1). Fourth, the affective dimension in headship is neglected within the literature. This disregard seems evidence that dialogue in the literature tends to be with the office of headship, not with the experience of those who are headteachers.

These deficiencies in the literature lead me towards a long-term study of headship as it 'is', as part of a small corpus of ethnographic research seeking to portray the realities of everyday life-worlds. The study focuses in particular upon the day-to-day work of primary headteachers, as a phenomenon that is substantially neglected in the existing literature.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter is about the methods used in the study to gain information about the nature of headship. The study itself is ethnographic in outlook and in use of particular methods. My discussion in this chapter therefore seems to fall fairly naturally into two related parts, one about ethnography as a research perspective and the other about my use of specific techniques.

In the first part, I discuss the central characteristics of ethnography as a theoretical and methodological perspective. I provide reasons why I adopted it for this study. Some of my reasons are autobiographical in origin, while others stem from the suitability of an ethnographic perspective for this study. I illustrate some of my main points by reference to the existing research literature.

In the second part, I discuss my use of specific techniques in this study. These include using a one-year journal of my own headship and interviews with headteachers. I justify my adoption of these methods in two main ways. First, I refer to their use by other researchers and to discussion in the literature about their use. Second, I refer to the research process itself. My assumption is that decisions are taken and must be justified as such, within an evolving research process. Such decisions are not pre-formulated but are made as a response to changing research needs, as part of the

'reflexivity' (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983: 123) and 'self-consciousness' of the research enquiry (Delamont 1992: 9).

ETHNOGRAPHY AS RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

My adoption of an ethnographic perspective in this study has several origins. First, I felt that the use of a positivist approach was unsuitable as a means of providing an authentic description of headship. Existing research seemed to be deficient in its ability to provide a convincing portrait of primary headship. Commentaries on headship also appeared unable to penetrate the subjectively-held realities of daily headship, providing only abstract or prescriptive accounts. I believed that a more sensitive approach was needed and did not feel that a positivist stance would provide it. What seemed necessary was a way of gaining a clearer insight into how heads themselves saw their work and what they felt about what they did. I decided that an ethnographic perspective, using a symbolic interactionist stance, provided a sensitive means of penetrating into the subjective world of headship.

There are also autobiographical reasons why the study adopts an ethnographic perspective. These reasons tend to predate the study, as a part of my underlying beliefs and 'a priori' value-judgements. Hutchinson (1988) describes such tacit beliefs as part of the researcher's 'mind-set' (1988: 130). Berger and Kellner (1981) argue that beliefs are constituent

in the research process in which "psychological constitution and cognitive peculiarities of an interpreter are inevitably involved" (1981: 48). The research need is a constant one, of making such beliefs, values and preconceptions 'explicit' for others (Delamont 1992: 76).

Part of my own preconceptions, pre-dating the present study, is the commitment to ethnography as a means of investigating everyday phenomena. My commitment has origins in reading the seminal writings of such sociologists as Goffman (1961), Jackson (1968), Becker (1968) and Wolcott (1973), whose work seems to combine clarity and insight. It stems from other autobiographical experiences. These include work on an M.A. degree course in Applied Research in Education, where I used a case-study approach to gain a clearer understanding of the value-conflicts in a junior school (Revell 1985). It also includes supervising students on courses in Advanced Diploma in Education which confirmed for me a value in ethnographic research by practitioners. It includes other less rewarding experiences, such as using stratified sampling techniques and statistical data analysis, in an Open University course on traditional modes of educational enquiry. It was likely in other words, that prior experiences would influence me in choosing an ethnographic approach.

The term ethnography is not closely defined in the research literature. In this study, I use 'ethnography' as an over-

arching term to refer both to my theoretical perspective and to my use of specific methods. This usage corresponds to that of Goetz and LeCompte (1982), Dobbert (1984), Fetterman (1984), Silverman (1985), Woods (1985), Clifford and Marcus (1986), and by Yates (1987). Some researchers such as Miles and Huberman (1983), Athens (1984), Strauss (1987), Tesch (1990) and Wolcott (1990) prefer the use of 'qualitative' as their wide-ranging term. The term may presumably help in showing a kind of antithetical research exists that is more 'quantitative' in its methods. Smith and Heshusius (1986) argue that it may be timely to "close down the conversation" of the long-standing debate on qualitative and quantitative methods. Less frequently, some researchers use derivatives such as 'ethnomethodology' (Sharrock and Anderson 1986), and 'meta-ethnography' (Noblitt and Hare 1988). Other terms include 'naturalistic inquiry' (Owens 1982; Lincoln and Guba 1985), 'interpretive research' (Spindler 1987), 'educational anthropology' (Jackson 1990; Atkinson and Delamont 1990) and 'observational research' (Delamont 1992). The list is not an exhaustive one.

Despite such differences in terminology, there seems a broad overlap of research aims. These similarities are sufficient for Noblitt and Hare (1988) to recommend a synthesis of such qualitative studies into a new 'meta-ethnography'. However, a lack of consensus over terms may also indicate there are deeper theoretical divisions. In the present study, I have

attempted to avoid these divisions by following the practice of both Atkinson (1990) and Hammersley (1990), in preferring the use of 'ethnography' as a term.

I discern three central aspects to ethnography as a research strategy. Firstly, it is an attempt to understand social behaviour in its everyday context and not in an experimental framework formulated by the researcher. Ethnographic study therefore places particular importance on the daily world of participants as social actors. In symbolic interactionism, the emphasis is upon an exploration of the meanings created by participants within their everyday social context (Fullan 1982; Sarason 1982; Rudduck 1984). A second feature of ethnography is that the collection of data is initially non-selective, in the sense that the categories for gathering or interpreting data are not pre-determined (cf.Flanders 1970). Unlike normative studies, data collection usually precedes theorising and interpretation (Cohen and Manion, 1980: 27). Some degree of interpretation will inevitably take place, at the same time as data collecting, but does not preface it. Hammersley (1990) points out this does not imply ethnography is unsystematic, only that initially "such data is collected in as raw a form and on as wide a front as feasible" (1990: 2). A third feature of ethnography is that analysis of data involves interpreting social behaviour and offering insights for others (Cohen and Manion, 1980: 28). The form of this interpretation usually relies on description, rather than on

statistical analysis or 'quantification' (Hammersley, 1990: 2).

The particular contribution of ethnography as a strategy for research has support in a growing corpus of literature. The main tenets of ethnography as a methodological paradigm have been stated in the work of Schutz (1962), Glaser and Strauss (1967), Becker (1961) and Schatzman and Strauss (1973). The recent publications by Benson and Hughes (1983), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Burgess (1984), Silverman (1985), Atkinson (1990), Hammersley (1990) and Delamont (1992) offer helpful summaries of its main principles and methods. Jacob (1987), Strong (1988) and Atkinson (1988) provide reviews on ethnographic research in this country and in North America. Rose (1982), Finch (1986), and Noblitt and Hare (1988) offer evaluations of ethnography as a branch of social research. Each of these evaluations applies criteria from positivist traditions as a basis of the assessment. Hammersley (1990a) Freeman (1984) and Foster (1990) provide critical evaluation of individual case-studies. There is also a small corpus of autobiographical studies by Burgess (1984a), Walford (1987), Spindler and Spindler (1987), Hammersley (1990b), McKeganey and Cunningham-Burley (1987) who record their reflections on the use of ethnographic methods.

Ethnographic approaches are increasingly used in educational contexts, almost to the extent of becoming a "new orthodoxy" (Bell 1985: 175). The scope and variety of these settings

is shown by studies as wide-ranging and diverse as those by Eickelman (1985), Valli (1986), Walker (1988) and by Stanley (1989). The use of ethnographic methods in more traditional educational contexts is discussed comprehensively by Hopkins (1985), Walker (1985), Woods (1985), Lewis and Munn (1985), Sherman and Webb (1988), Hitchcock and Hughes (1989), Webb (1990) and by Walford (1990).

Several authors offer more detailed discussion of particular ethnographic techniques within educational settings. Measor (1985), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Lofland and Lofland (1984), Foddy (1993) and Powney and Watts (1987) discuss the use of interview methods. Plummer (1983), Ball and Goodson (1985), Christensen (1983), Riseborough (1985), Woods (1987) and Sikes, Measor and Woods (1985) examine the use of life-histories. Burgess (1984) discusses case studies, while Edwards and Westgate (1987) and Cortazzi (1992) consider the techniques of narrative analysis. Pilcher et al.(1989) and Wolcott (1981) examine direct observation methods. I refer again to several of these studies in my later discussion in this chapter.

It is perhaps unsurprising that ethnographic approaches have been used increasingly in educational settings. I discern two main advantages over other methods. First, methods such as participant observation and direct observation provide a range of primary data on behaviour as it occurs. This sense

of directness is not possible, for example, in using survey techniques. Second, data can be collected over a period of time, thus enabling a researcher to develop an intimacy with participants and with the phenomenon. This intimacy is not possible, although perhaps not desirable, with experimental methods. Third, the physical context of the research is not artificial. Cohen and Manion (1980) argue that ethnographic study takes place in a more naturalistic environment than is used in experimental or survey methods (1980: 103). Having a sense of intimacy and naturalism are essential for the 'in situ' investigation of the realities of social interaction.

These advantages were relevant for my choice of ethnographic approaches, in preference to other approaches. However, as I indicate in the following sections my full-time employment as a head created opportunities, as well as limitations, for my choice of particular techniques to use.

PARTICULAR RESEARCH METHODS

My main objective in this part of the chapter is to consider the use of specific methods in the study. My discussion of methods is located in a narrative account of main events and decisions in the study's evolution. The discussion is in the form of a series of arguments built into a chronicle of events, acting rather like staging posts in my narrative. I pause figuratively at these moments in order to discuss more

fully why specific methods are used.

There are a number of reasons for presenting a discussion in this way. First, a narrative form is more coherent and less involved for the reader to follow than an analysis unrelated to the sequence of events. Second, a narrative is nearer to the realities of the present research process, including its occasional detours and 'pitfalls' (Delamont 1990: 1) than an abstract presentation. My reasoning is similar to Delamont (ibid) who uses a metaphor of a golden journey to Samarkand to describe the research process. Her metaphor appears an over-exaggerated one, particularly in its references to "the pilgrims prepared to face deserts and heat, thirst and hunger, fear and loneliness" (ibid, 1), but the underlying image of a journey is a helpful one. The use of a narrative appears an appropriate way to record the landmarks of such a journey, not as a pre-planned itinerary but as an enterprise of some uncertainty.

The present dissertation is part of a continuous process of reflection and enquiry begun in 1988. From the outset, I maintained a diary of events as part of the documentation of the research process (Burgess 1984; Yin 1984). The diary acts as a logbook of the research journey, as a record of my reflections during that journey. The diary fulfils two main purposes. First, it summarises main events and happenings during the course of the study. This is its use essentially

as a research 'calendar' (Jorgensen 1989: 104). Second, the diary contains field observations, analyses of data, draft chapters and reflective memos. These elements constitute a record of my interpretations and reflections on the data and emergent themes. Draft chapters are an initial discussion of the themes and theoretical issues. The diary as a whole is a sequenced account of my reflections during the study's evolution. I have not included the diary as part of this submission because of limitations of space, and I refer only briefly to it as part of my discussion in this thesis. The main purpose of the diary is in a sense mainly fulfilled and the diary is redundant. The thesis itself is a distilled summary of those accumulated reflections but I have included for reference purposes, field observations (Ref.881123 TL1), preliminary analysis (Ref.881125 TL2), analysis of interview (Ref.890128 TL3) and a reflective memo (Ref.890204 TL5). All four items refer to a single interview held in 1988 and show something of my thinking about the interview, and illustrate the nature of my initial reflections on its evidence. They are included as part of ancillary text to this dissertation (Volume 2: pp. 1-16).

The first year of the study was spent in refining my initial research focus, in gathering preliminary evidence and making decisions on ways to proceed. In terms of my metaphor, time was used to explore possible routes, to draft a provisional map and, finally, to discard items of inappropriate luggage.

The process illustrates what Hammersley (1990) indicates "is especially important in the case of ethnographic research, since it employs an exploratory and developmental approach where the initial focus of the research may be transformed" (1990: 130). Such minor transformation and redefinition of my own research focus occurred during the first year of the study.

My initial proposal in 1988 was to examine the affective and cognitive world of primary heads, in the context of the ERA 1988. The proposal was a negotiated one, following several discussions between LEA officers and myself, and it was also agreed that I would be on a one-year's full-time secondment, from September 1988 until August 1989. The proposal was a compromise between my own motivations outlined at the end of chapter 2 and the needs of the LEA. This compromise led to an initial focus on primary headship in relation to external legislative reform. There were reasons for the compromise. The first stemmed historically from effects of the Education Acts 1986 and 1988 and from the preliminary legislation that delegated financial management to schools. These reforms created a climate of considerable anxiety and uncertainty in schools and LEA's. In such a climate, it was understandable that both the LEA and myself should agree on a proposal that seemed relevant and topical. A second reason was a strong interest by the LEA in gaining tangible evidence upon heads' perceptions, not only of the external reforms in general but

also towards the LEA's Review and Development initiatives. A condition of the secondment was that I would submit a report to the LEA, at the end of the one-year secondment, on heads' perceptions towards Review and Development initiatives.

In order to examine the perceptions of primary heads towards external reform and the LEA's Review and Development scheme, I arranged a series of interviews in the Autumn 1988 and the Spring 1989. There were five interviews with LEA officers and fifteen with primary headteachers. The purpose of the interviews with the LEA officers was to gain data on the LEA Review and Development scheme and to gain some understanding of the LEA's expectations about the scheme. I interviewed five officers who had a responsibility for INSET, each being nominated by the Assistant CEO for Primary Education. These interviews took place at Teachers' Centres in the county and at County Hall. I asked each of the five LEA officers: Are you involved in Review and Development work? What are your expectations about Review and Development schemes in school? The questions were also given to respondents when arranging the interviews. The questions provided starting-points for meetings, in which I encouraged respondents to elaborate as much as possible. Interviews were tape-recorded.

I also interviewed fifteen primary heads who served in four different LEA's. Initially, I made contact with only ten headteachers whom I approached or who offered to take part

in the research. Such contacts were opportunistic, often made informally during the course of conversations at in-service meetings and seminars. There was no deliberate selection involved on my part in these contacts and my only criterion was that such respondents should be primary heads willing to talk to me about their work.

I then considered the extent to which these ten individuals might be unrepresentative as a group of headteachers. It seemed possible, for example, that the group might be composed excessively of male or female headteachers, or of mainly younger or older heads. This kind of possibilty was apparent when I reflected that four of the ten contacts had been made at a Special Needs conference. I realised that each of these four heads worked in an urban environment, similar to my own school, in which there was a high proportion of children with special educational needs. There seemed a danger, in other words, that my method of making contact with individuals was not entirely random and might be reflecting unintentional biases in selection of one kind or another. Whilst accepting that respondents would not be individually or collectively representative in statistical terms, I also felt that my group of headteachers should not be manifestly unrepresentative.

I therefore examined the basic information available to me on each of these ten headteachers and their schools. This

information included gender, approximate length of headship service, type of school, size of school and whether the school was taking part in the LEA's Review and Development initiative. There seemed other categories such as initial training, age and career which might also be relevant, but I had insufficient information on those aspects.

I recorded in a tabular form the categories of information available to me. These included whether the respondent's school was denominational or non-denominational, its type and size, and whether the school was urban or rural. I also recorded the LEA and the approximate length of headship service of respondents. When I examined these categories, it was apparent that the group contained only one head of a village school, and only two respondents who had served in headship for longer than ten years. In addition, eight of the ten respondents were male and only two were female. I felt that the composition of the group was not a balanced one and I tried to remedy this by approaching five heads who were either female, long-serving, or who worked in rural schools. Each of the five heads satisfied at least one of these three criteria, although no-one met all three. These five individuals were known to me, either as headteachers of neighbouring schools or colleagues on professional training courses.

I did not feel that these additional five contacts made the

CATEGORIES	RESPONDENTS															
	AB	BC	CD	DE	EF	FG	GH	HI	IJ	JK	KL	LM	MN	NO	OP	
Denominational School	X	X	/	X	X	X	X	X	/	/	X	/	X	/	X	
Headship less than 2 years	X	/	X	X	/	X	/	X	X	X	/	X	X	X	X	
Headship 2-10 years	X	X	/	X	X	/	X	/	/	X	X	/	/	X	X	
Headship more than 10 years	/	X	X	/	X	X	X	X	X	/	X	X	X	/	/	
Group size of school	3	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	6	4	2	5	2	2	
Junior School	X	/	/	/	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Infant School	X	X	X	X	/	/	X	X	/	X	X	X	X	X	/	
Junior/Infant School	/	X	X	X	X	X	/	X	X	/	/	/	/	/	X	
Special School	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	/	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
L.E.A.	H	H	H	H	B	H	H	H	C	C	H	H	B	N	N	
Involvement in LEA Review and Development	X	/	X	X	X	/	/	X	X	X	X	X	/	X	/	
Urban School	/	/	/	/	/	/	X	/	/	/	/	X	/	X	/	
Rural School	X	X	X	X	X	X	/	X	X	X	X	/	X	/	X	
Gender (M/F)	M	M	M	M	F	M	M	M	M	M	F	M	F	F	F	

N.B. Initials assigned to each respondent are fictitious in order to protect confidentiality.

Table 1: INTERVIEWS ON 'HEADSHIP AND CHANGE': BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

group representative, but I believed that the composition of the final group was now less unrepresentative than it might otherwise have been (Table 1).

I interviewed a total of fifteen heads in four different LEA's. Nine headteachers were employed by my own LEA and six employed by other LEA's. Ten heads were men and five were women. Seven were heads of JMI schools, four were heads of Infant schools, three were heads of JM schools and one was head of a Special School. The interviews were held in respondents' schools during, or at the end of, the school day. The interviews were tape-recorded and each lasted for between forty minutes and an hour. The tenor and style of each of the interviews was 'informal' (Hutchinson 1988: 130; Jorgensen 1989: 88 and 'open-ended' (Hammersley, 1990: 31). Apart from requesting basic biographical information I asked headteachers: What changes are you involved in? What do you feel about those changes? What helps or hinders change for you? In addition to these questions, I asked the nine heads from my own LEA: Are you involved in Review and Development work?

I used a written code of ethics with all of the respondents, compiled in the light of advice by Burgess (1989) and Bulmer (1982) on the need for "informed consent" (1982: 164). The purposes in using such a code were to ensure confidentiality and anonymity for respondents. After each interview, I sent

a copy of the transcript, asking respondents to check on its accuracy and authenticity. Assignable references within the transcript were made fictional or anonymous. The code of ethics corresponds closely with guidelines recently adopted by BERA (1992). A copy of the code of ethics used in this study is attached to the main text (Appendix B).

Informal and open-ended interviews of this kind may often be used in ethnographic research. They are sometimes termed 'unstructured' (Delamont 1992: 110) but the use of questions as a starting-point seems to provide structure of a kind. I have therefore used the term 'semi-structured' in this study as a means of describing informal and open-ended interviews. The use of interview methods is examined fully by Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Lofland and Lofland (1984), Powney and Watts (1987), Measor (1985), Woods (1986) and Foddy (1993). Hutchinson (1988) summarises the purposes of interviews as "to clarify the meanings participants attribute to a given situation and to help researchers see situations through the eyes of the participants" (1988:130). I discuss Hutchinson's arguments from a symbolic interactionist perspective, at a later point in this chapter.

Following these interviews I felt clearer about expectations and responsibilities of the LEA officers towards Review and Development initiatives. The findings from interviews with primary heads showed that these respondents felt under major

pressure due to a lack of time, restrictions imposed on them by LEA bureaucracies, excessive paperwork and problems about staffing. Heads saw governmental reforms as extraneous to their own personal judgement of school needs. Headteachers saw themselves as epicentral. They were the embodiments of the school which acted as the stage, on which heads were the central players. Headteachers saw themselves as principal initiators and filters of change, and to a large extent they claimed ownership of everything taking place in the school. Change of any kind seemed a constant feature in their work, but an aspect remaining firmly within their jurisdiction and province. These headteachers saw themselves and their work in self-centred, possessive and independent ways, in which external reforms had little relevance or credibility.

These findings indicated differences between perceptions of these headteachers and the LEA officers. The latter saw legislative reforms, and Review and Development schemes, as plans with a finite time scale and certain expectations for their implementation. The disparity confirmed arguments by Fullan (1992), Fullan and Hargreaves (1991) and by Broadbent (1992) on the importance of understanding the perceptions of participants, in the creation of a shared commitment towards change.

A consistent theme to emerge from my interviews with primary heads was an individualism, possessiveness and egocentricity

of respondents towards their work and the school. There was a matter-of-fact assumption by heads on the primacy of their view of the school. These views included the importance of promoting collaborative work, enhancing the school-community relationships, managing the school in more effective ways, improving the quality of children's work, establishing more cordial staff relationships. These views were different and idiosyncratic but the right to implement such views, without hindrance or interference from other people, appeared taken-for-granted by these respondents. I discuss this theme more fully in chapter 4, as part of my examination of the study's findings, and again in chapter 7 as part of my discussion of research issues and implications.

My explorations in the first year of the research had seemed fruitful but two main issues needed to be resolved. First, I needed to decide if the research focus should be redefined in the light of my findings. Second, I needed to select appropriate methods following any re-alignment of the focus.

I decided to limit my focus to the investigation of the day-to-day work of headship. There were a number of factors influencing this decision. Firstly, the need to redefine my research aims had become apparent during the year. I was attempting in effect to explore two aims, one related to the perceptual world of heads and the other to heads' perception of external reforms. These aims were not incompatible but

there seemed a danger of achieving both aims superficially. Secondly, the data available to me indicated the importance of penetrating further into the nature of day-to-day primary headship. For instance, some commentators assume externally-directed change is mainly a matter of linear, sequential and a rational series of procedures (Dickinson 1986; Morrison and Ridley, 1988). Yet much of my evidence indicated that change was a diffuse part of the daily processes in headship and the matter-of-fact assumptions of headteachers. Change from 'out there' seemed subject to what was 'in there'. My reflections on this finding (Research Diary, reference JN4) also began to raise questions on whether other features of headship such as leadership, authority, mission, management and role, might also be examined through an investigation of heads' daily work. Thirdly, the issue of research ownership had been resolved towards the end of my first year, in July 1989, when restructuring and changes of personnel in the LEA removed the need for me to examine the responses of heads to external reforms. The restructuring also removed any further commitment for me to provide feed-back to the LEA about its Review and Development initiatives. Fourthly, I felt that my evidence relating to heads' perceptions about reforms was limited. The line of enquiry did not appear likely to add substantially to our existing knowledge of disparity between formulations of change and the perceptions of participants (Fullan 1985, 1992; McTaggart, 1989; Sarason, 1990; Pollard, 1992). My evidence relating to headteachers' perceptions

of themselves and their work seemed to offer both productive and novel lines of enquiry. For reasons stated in my review of the literature in chapter 2, a focus on the daily work of headteachers seemed likely to make a clearer contribution to current knowledge.

I decided for these reasons to examine the nature of day-to-day headship, posing as my initial research questions: What is headship? What do heads do each day? What does it feel like to be a head? What is the experience of headship for heads? It was probable that these questions might require further refinement since, as pointed out by Lewis and Munn "the first set of research questions is not likely to be the set you finally use" (1987: 12). The purpose of my questions was two-fold. First, I felt that these questions would help to restrict my data-gathering and so avoid the enquiry being too nebulous. Second, these questions seemed to be the most fundamental I could ask, in seeking to determine "what is taken for granted and what is made problematic" (Oberg and McCutcheon 1989: 124).

The second issue at the end of the first year concerned the most appropriate ways of gaining data on the nature of daily headship. I decided to adopt two methods. One was to keep a daily journal of my own headship and the other was to hold interviews with practitioners and ask them about their daily work. I saw these methods as complementary in many aspects,

one providing detailed close-up data and the other providing additional contrasts.

There is also an important difference between data gained in interviews and data gained from my using a one-year journal. The purpose of the interview, as Hutchinson (1988) suggests, is to clarify the meanings held by participants and for the researcher to perceive those meanings "through the eyes of the participants" (1988: 130). Achieving such a purpose is not straightforward. Interviewing is a practical encounter, in which the researcher must seek to resolve any ambiguities of meanings, make judgements, interpret responses, or decide to extend one line of enquiry but not another. The interview is a social and practical activity in which "the interviewer must necessarily pay at least as much attention to managing it as a social encounter" (Benson and Hughes, 1983: 80). In other words, some researchers suggest that access cannot be gained into everyday realities, since the interview "breaks down the ongoing flow of life into verbal categories" (Mehan and Wood, 1975: 49). The objection being raised is that the interview is itself an artificial contrivance, and therefore is inappropriate as a means of penetrating daily realities. This objection does not have broad support from researchers, but it illustrates the nature of the issue for me in relying solely on interview data. I felt, in common with Hutchinson (1988), that information gained in interviews was admissible as evidence of heads' perceptions of their work but the data

was not, in the sense used by Mehan and Wood (1975), primary data.

For these reasons I felt that another method was required to provide detailed primary evidence of the phenomenon of daily headship. Keeping a daily journal seemed to offer a means of gaining detailed empirical data not available to me using other methods. Interviews offered only secondary evidence, and some methods such as 'direct observation' (Wolcott 1981; Hammersley and Atkinson 1983; Burgess 1984; Pilcher et al. 1988; Jorgensen 1989: 22), did not seem readily available to me because of my full-time headship commitment. My one-year secondment had ended and I had returned to full-time work at my school, in September 1989. I felt too that I should not disregard or try to closet my own headship in a study of the work of primary headteachers.

However, the question of the validity of such data seemed an important one. I justified it with the following arguments. Firstly, the general principle of practitioners undertaking research into their own work is well-established in existing literature. It is firmly rooted in ethnographic approaches and is termed 'practitioner research' (Webb 1990; Altrichter Posch and Somekh 1993), 'pedagogic research' (Bassey, 1983), 'action research' (Carr and Kemmis, 1986; Hustler, 1986; McNiff 1988; Oberg and McCutcheon, 1989; Oja and Pine, 1989; Winter, 1989; Elliott, 1991), 'classroom research' (Hopkins,

1985; Rowland, 1986), and 'teacher research' (Hitchcock and Hughes 1989; Weiner, 1989). There are a number of different emphases in these approaches, but each extols the benefit of research into their work by practitioners. Most of these approaches assume practitioners are exclusively teachers but the principle appears equally as relevant to headteachers' work. For this reason, I prefer 'practitioner research' as a general term, as used by Herbert (1990) and Webb (1990).

Many of the central principles of practitioner research are guided by Stenhouse (1975) who argues seminally that "it is not enough that teachers' work should be studied: they need to study it themselves" (1975: 143). Some commentators such as Bassey (1983) and Anning (1986) argue that practitioners' research into their own work is often more relevant, as well as more convincing, than investigations of practice carried out by non-practitioners. Bassey (1981) argues the need for detailed pedagogic or practitioner-research, concerned less with a pursuit of generalities and more with "a descriptive and evaluative study of single pedagogic events" (1981: 86). Published accounts by practitioners, such as Russell (1990), Wright (1990), Revell (1988) and Winter (1990) indicate that a number of such studies exist, often as part of anthologies that consider wider methodological issues (Blyth 1988, Nias 1988, Connor 1988, Webb 1990). This corpus of studies helped to confirm in principle that an examination of my day-to-day work as a headteacher could be a valuable contribution to an

investigation of primary headship.

My second argument is that I saw value and validity in using a journal written by myself as a source of data for research purposes. My use of a personal journal is not objective in the sense used in quantitative research for such techniques as observational schedules, experimental designs and designs using correlation coefficients (Cohen and Manion 1980: 174). Thorndike and Hagen (1989), for example, as researchers in this tradition, argue that testing has the advantages of reliability, objectivity and permanence, whereas "it is hard to observe and record behaviour accurately as it takes place since inaccuracies and biases tend to creep in, the observer is hurried and attention may lapse" (1989: 21; 7th edition). My use of a journal does not meet, or attempt to meet, these forms of criteria and the assumption of external objectivity is itself questioned by Kuhn (1970) and Habermas (1973). The data from the journal are clearly subjective in a sense of lacking external structure. However, Hammersley (1990) has argued "the structuring of data that quantitative research employs to overcome subjectivity also has reactive effects, in increasing the chances that the behaviour studied is an artifact of the research process and not representative of the phenomena purportedly studied" (1990: 9). Thorndike and Hagen nevertheless raise important issues for my use of the one-year journal and in particular whether these data can be accurate, unbiased and reliable. I now consider such issues

of validation, by examining two related purposes of research journals, the first as a personal record and the second as a method for reflective enquiry.

Journals are a personal record of experiences over a period of time. A journal may be written in a variety of styles including journalistic, creative, descriptive, introspective and evaluative (Holly and McLaughlin, 1989: 264). Journals may also be impressionistic, as "spontaneous thoughts and feelings" (ibid, 1989: 262). Journals, in whatever style, are personally constructed documents, as a continuous record over time of an insider's world of meaning and action (Adler and Adler, 1987; Jorgensen, 1989: 36).

The journal can also be a technique of research enquiry into the nature of practice. It provides a means to observe, to reflect upon what is observed, to discern some of the taken-for-granted assumptions in everyday practice and to "clarify ideas and experiences" (Holly and McLoughlin, 1989: 263). In a similar way to my use of the research diary, previously outlined on pages 46-47 of this chapter, the journal is part of what Peters and Waterman term as 'reflective rationality' (1982: 123). However, unlike the studied reflections in the research diary, my journal is used for immediate on-the-spot ideas and interpretations of events, in addition to being a moment-by-moment record of happenings as they occur. Both the journal and the research diary seem part of reflectivity

in the research, the former as a record of moment-by-moment ideas and thoughts, and the latter as studied analysis.

The notion of reflectivity is discussed fully by a number of researchers, including Schon (1983), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), Benson and Hughes (1983), Pollard and Tann (1987), Holly (1989), Louden (1991) and Hammersley (1993). Tripp (1985) summarises its main feature as one of "problematizing practice" (1985: 123), in a process which Elliott (1989) has argued is without any "necessary division of labour between practitioners and inquirers" (1989: 256). Altrichter, Posch and Somekh (1993) investigate the particular use of journal-writing for the purpose of recording 'in situ' reflections and ideas about practice. Holly and McLoughlin (1989) have reported on the use of journals by practitioners, concluding that the more descriptive the entries then "the richer the base for analysis and interpretation" (1989: 265).

The use of a journal is always, and necessarily, subjective. Traditional criteria of validity cannot easily be applied in this context, particularly since ethnographers do not claim that journals provide generalisable or replicable evidence.

Autobiographies and diaries are further examples of personal accounts which generate subjective data. A diary is usually written contemporaneously with events as a subjective record of the minutiae of happenings as they take place. Diaries

may lack the coherence provided by reflection and hindsight, but their value is in their sense of realism and immediacy. Autobiographies are a more considered attempt by individuals to provide a chronological record of their life-experiences. Both kinds of account are necessarily subjective, conveying personal values and thoughts of individuals in the selection and interpretation of events. In reflective practitioner research, the individual engages upon an analytical exercise to gain insight into some aspect of his or her work, usually with the aim to improve practice in some way. The exercise is a deliberative one but, in common with autobiographies, memoirs and diary-writing, it shares a personal quest to generate, select and interpret subjective experience for the subject, and for others.

In case-study and life-history methods, it is the researcher who is attempting to work with the subject in generating and interpreting subjective evidence. In oral-history and life-history techniques, the researcher attempts an accurate and faithful rendering of the subject's perceptions of past and present experiences. Case-studies too place particular importance on subjectivities, in which the researcher seeks to gain empathy with, and to interpret for others, the life-world of a single individual. All of the above methods are part of a continuing tradition that places emphasis upon the quality and integrity of the subjective record.

Such methods lack generalisable findings or a replication of evidence. However, researchers who use such methods have few claims to either. The intention is a different one of gaining understanding of the subjective world. The strength of such approaches is therefore to be found in their ability to penetrate subjectivities, and in the quest by individuals and researchers for greater insight, accuracy and knowledge. The external reader can share in that quest, but can neither invalidate nor validate the evidence generated in the search process. That is achievable only by the subject.

External validation of such evidence is examined by LeCompte and Goetz (1982), Smith and Heshusius (1986) and Hammersley (1990). Hammersley (1990) concludes that the problem of external validation may be an insoluble one. This does not remove validity as an issue for the ethnographic researcher. The need still remains for what Goetz and Lecompte (1984) term as an 'internal validation', rather than validation by external criteria. Hammersley (1990) argues that an ability to 'capture' human behaviour is one assessment to apply to ethnographic research, using such criteria as 'credibility', 'plausibility' or 'relevance' (1990: 95). The evidence in my journal is not validated by the use of external criteria, although it must remain convincing to the researcher as well as to the reader. The sense of internal credibility for me as researcher is conveyed by a subsequent reflective comment that "when I re-read entries for a particular day, the notes

seem to re-capture the day for me" (Journal 18/9/89). There is also a need for such subjective data to be available for public scrutiny by others (Stenhouse 1975; Kirk and Miller, 1986). Skilbeck (1983) points to a particular obligation for such data as well as interpretation of it to be made 'public record' (1983: 6). Jorgensen (1989) has also stressed the importance of 'public peer review' (1989: 65). For these reasons, I feel it is important to incorporate at least some of the journal as part of the study's documentation. It is not possible to include all the journal since this comprises nearly 300 pages of text. I have therefore included only entries for every tenth day through the school year, 1988 to 1989 (Volume 2: Ancillary Text, pp.17-35).

A final comment is necessary on my role as a headteacher and researcher, since I was performing both simultaneously. In commonsense terms, we are each able to manage multiple roles in our day-to-day lives and to live with dissonance in role-conflicts (Festinger et al., 1956). Jorgensen (1989) argues that being both researcher and participant is a prerequisite in participant observation, since "it results in accurate, detailed description of the insider's experience of life". However, Jorgensen warns that in carrying out this strategy, it is important that the researcher is able to switch back and forth between the insider's perspective and an analytic framework" (1989: 65). I did not experience the difficulties experienced by some researchers in moving from a participant

role to a researcher role (Berger, 1981; Haaken and Adams, 1983). Every day in school I acted in my role as a primary headteacher, but on five or six occasions each hour I became a researcher in writing down my impressions, thoughts, ideas and feelings about what was happening around me. My role as researcher was rarely in conflict in school with my headship role and, as a question of priority, the work of being a headteacher had to come first. The warnings by Douglas and Rasmussen (1977) and Adler and Adler (1987) on 'becoming the phenomenon' were relevant, although in practice I found that I could move easily from a headteacher role to a relatively detached research role. My work in school already contained a multiplicity of roles as confidant, playground supervisor, father-figure, trouble-shooter, emergency teacher, heating engineer, fund-raiser, dining-room assistant, father-figure, chief executive, financial controller, marriage counsellor, probation officer - and in addition as researcher.

In contrast, there seemed advantages in being a researcher within a reality experienced each day as an 'insider'. My return to the school after a one year secondment offered the opportunity, not always available to researchers, of feeling and living the phenomenon being studied. It allowed access to the affective and subjective aspects of headship, and the opportunity to generate new understandings to verify against the testimony of other insiders. The advantages of having access to the subjective world of primary headship had to be

balanced against a loss of being 'anthropologically strange' (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983: 34; Hammersley, 1990 16). I felt Hammersley was persuasive in arguing that a great deal of research is "invalid because the ethnographer remains an outsider and fails truly to understand the world from a participant point of view" (1990: 13). In the question of validity, the potential lack of penetration or authenticity in my investigation offered as great a danger to the study's integrity as did accusations of a lack of objectivity.

Having considered advantages and pitfalls in using a journal as a primary source of data, I decided to maintain a daily account of my headship for a period of one school year. I considered this to be an appropriate period of time, in view of a sparseness of such extended case-study in the research literature (Southworth 1993: 4). The selected period of time would also help to capture the 'periodicity' within headship (Lieberman and Miller 1984: 72). I asked myself the questions: What am I doing?, What am I thinking about? and What are my feelings about what I am doing? These three questions seemed the most fundamental that I could ask and provided a focus for my observations (Delamont, 1992: 112). The questions also related closely to the general issues I was seeking to examine in the study.

I wrote frequent scribbled jottings to record inner thoughts and feelings, and transcribed notes each evening into a more

legible form, but without embellishment. It was clear that I would be unable to record all conscious impressions during the course of the day. I was helped by limits imposed by my research questions and by the fact that certain events tended to re-occur in an almost identical form. The daily reality I was attempting to describe had pattern, as well as a uniqueness. This gave me time to record in greater detail what seemed unique and significant. The reasons underlying a selection were often included as part of reflective comments written at the end of each day. There were a few occasions when the pressure of events prevented me from maintaining notes. At these times, jottings were written as near to events as possible and noted as such. My style of writing was usually 'introspective' and 'journalistic' (Holly and McLoughlin, 1989: 264) but I occasionally wrote descriptive passages to add in-depth colour. I began to use tape recordings of my conversations in the first few days, but discontinued this when it became clear that various ethical difficulties were beginning to emerge. I maintained the journal for one year until the end of the Summer Term 1990. By this time I felt that categories were saturated, and that few or no new themes were emerging from the data (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983, Burgess 1984).

I analysed data from my journal at a number of points during the year, the first during the Autumn Term 1989 (Research Diary reference 891029 JN7). In this analysis, I attempted

to identify broad clusters of journal entries. I identified a number which referred to administration, interactions with others, feelings, decision-making, prioritising, reactive tasks and organisation. This analysis helped to provide a preliminary sense of order in the journal. I felt that some categories were beginning to emerge which were grounded in the data (Glaser and Strauss 1967), but I had not at this early stage identified broader themes to link them together. The process of identifying such categories and themes was continuous, rather than an isolated activity (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983: 174). Categories emerged at this stage, but I found that they might also overlap, dissipate or re-emerge, in ways reminiscent of Horbury's experiences (1990: 223).

During the Easter Term 1990, I again analysed data from the journal (Research Analysis 900220 JN8). I felt that much of the evidence was now confirmatory and that I could begin to describe my data according to provisional themes. I did this by reading and re-reading my journal entries, looking for ways of interpreting the mass of evidence. I found some themes such as 'affectivity' were suggested by the weight of evidence since they were intrinsic and threaded consistently through the journal. Other themes stemmed from my search for adequate interpretations of the data, including the data noted in the journal as particularly significant or atypical in my work.

Overall, I felt that there were three provisional themes in the data. The first was that of a 'school-related' headship since much of my daily work seemed to relate to running the school in some way. The second theme was that of 'personal' headship, since a large number of entries related to me as a person. A third theme seemed to overlap both of the first two, since it involved my feelings and emotions towards both personal and school-related aspects of my work.

I differentiated between personal and school-related work on grounds of the purposes served by day-to-day tasks. There seemed two main purposes underlying my work. First, there were those actions, thoughts and decisions which fulfilled a purpose of keeping the school operating in some way. They included those tasks concerned largely with administration, organisation, supervision of pupils, maintenance of the buildings, dealing with problems of staff absences and managing pupil behaviour in school. I decided to term such tasks as school-related, since their central purpose seemed to fulfil the operational needs of the school. Second, there were tasks which seemed mainly to reflect my own purposes. These entries referred to my thoughts, values and actions in trying to change the school in some way, and to choices that I made in relation to what I did each day. I decided to term this part of headship as 'personal', since it described day-to-day tasks in relation to my own values, preferences and purposes. The term 'personal' has numerous connotations

and sub-meanings. I discuss more fully the meanings of the term, and to my use of it, in chapter 4 (pp.115-117).

The differentiation between school-related and personal work was helpful in interpreting the data in the journal. I used the criteria of 'purpose' and 'choice' to decide whether, on the balance of evidence, a task was either school-related or personal. For example, dealing with the problem of the non-arrival of wages for canteen staff (Journal, 22/3/90) seemed largely a school-related task. This work was necessary for the school to operate and I felt under an obligation to deal with the problem. A few days later, I take a gift of a box of chocolates to parents who have helped to organise a Flea Market in school (Journal 27/3/90). My action in doing that seems mainly personal, on grounds that I have chosen to give a gift and that it reflects my own purposes and values, not the operational needs of the school.

Nevertheless my differentiation of the data between personal and school-related is not clear-cut. It seems arguable for instance that giving chocolates to parent-helpers is school-related in purpose, since the intention of the action was to meet the school's future needs. In this particular example, I felt that the action was not necessary for the school to operate and served my own purposes, perhaps as an expressive act to demonstrate the value I place on such voluntary help. In other words, differentiation between 'school-related' and

'personal' work is not a precise division. The allocation of tasks to these categories has been a matter of judgement, based upon specific criteria. I was probably in a unique position to make these decisions whereas, in the interviews later on, my judgements on the purposes of other heads' work are more speculative.

There is a further reason for the nebulous nature of school-related and personal work as categories. The categories seem mutually inclusive, not exclusive, since headteachers' work contains both school-related and personal characteristics at the same time. For example, the daily chore of dealing with the mail seems mainly to serve school-related purposes. And yet, entries in the journal indicate that my personal values are also involved in the selection and discarding of mail (Journal, 19/3/90). Whilst it may therefore be useful to consider tasks in daily headship as serving school-related or personal purposes, both categories overlap extensively in practice.

The extent to which both categories overlap is not a feature of headship that seems finite or readily measured. It seems inappropriate, for example, to try to measure the proportion of primary heads' work that is school-related or personal, or to locate tasks on a continuum between school-related and personal work. The reason is that the two categories merge constantly with one another, so that elements of one are

always contained within the other - rather like two strands, each with continually changing dimensions and yet constantly intertwined with one another.

The distinction between school-related and personal work was not arbitrarily contrived, since it was prompted by the data available to me. However, the categories are an analytical contrivance, created as a means to interpret data for myself and for the reader. They should be seen as an abstraction derived from, and applied to, the phenomenon of day-to-day headship, as representations and interpretations of reality. They are an analytical device used as a means to understand, and to interpret for others, the complexities of day-to-day headship.

I felt at this point in the study that it would be helpful to compare my evidence with information from other sources (Hammersley, 1990: 9). The comparison was intended as a way of providing alternative perspectives to contrast with my own subjective data and to examine the integrity of themes and categories emerging from my own headship (Jorgensen, 1989: 36).

I therefore arranged semi-structured, open-ended interviews with five headteachers during the Easter Term 1990. I had not previously held interviews with these respondents. Four of my initial contacts were opportunistic, not selective. I

CATEGORIES	RESPONDENTS				
	PQ	QR	RS	ST	TU
Denominational School	/	X	X	X	X
Headship less than 2 years	X	/	X	X	X
Headship 2-10 years	/	X	/	X	X
Headship more than 10 years	X	X	X	/	/
Group size of school	2	4	4	3	2
Junior School	X	X	X	/	X
Infant School	X	/	X	X	X
Junior/Infant School	/	X	/	X	X
Special School	X	X	X	X	/
L.E.A.	H	B	B	H	H
Urban School	X	/	X	/	X
Rural School	/	X	/	X	/
Gender (M/F)	M	F	F	M	M

N.B. Initials assigned to each respondent are fictitious in order to protect confidentiality.

Table 2: INTERVIEWS ON 'WHAT DO YOU DO AS HEAD?': BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

examined the information available to me on the respondents and recorded it in tabular form. The group contained only one small school and no denominational schools. I therefore selected a fifth headteacher ('PQ' in Table 2) as a means to achieve a less unrepresentative group. Three of the final five respondents were men and two were women. Their length of headship service varied between half a year and eighteen years. Two of the respondents worked in an L.E.A. different from my own. Two heads preferred to be interviewed at my home ('PQ' in Table 2) and at my school ('TU' in Table 2). The other three interviews were held during the school day at respondents' schools.

I contacted each respondent by phone prior to my visit, giving the question I wanted to use as a starting-point. The question was: What do you do, or try to do, as a headteacher? Each interview was tape-recorded and lasted for between forty-five minutes and an hour. All five respondents spoke at length about their work in school and provided information on concerns as disparate as those of being a teaching head in a village school (Research Diary reference 900403 PB2) and exploiting teaching staff (ibid, reference 900410 BA3). The most consistent theme to emerge was a confirmation that there was a personal dimension to headship, in terms of idiosyncratic beliefs held and enacted by respondents. When I reflected upon the information gained in these interviews, I felt that the phrasing of my

initial question had probably been ambiguous for respondents. Several respondents interpreted the question in terms of their aims and aspirations as a headteacher. I also felt that the interviews held at my home or my school were often lacking in detailed description by respondents of their experiences during the day.

I decided that in order to achieve my research objective, I needed to use a more precise focus for future interviews and to hold interviews at the end of the day in respondents' schools. This precision also seemed best achieved by asking questions relating only to the day of the interview, and by using the identical questions that I had asked myself in keeping the journal. The use of these questions offered a direct means of testing categories and themes in my data and would limit the answers of participants to here-and-now aspects of their work. I decided too that these interviews should be two-stage, since a follow-up interview would help me in clarifying respondents' comments from the initial interview, and would also allow me to discuss any ideas that seemed especially productive.

I arranged initial interviews and follow-up interviews with five headteachers. My contact with three of the respondents was opportunistic but I also selected two headteachers ('UV' and 'HE' in Table 3), as a means to ensure that at least one man and an Infant school was contained in the group. The

CATEGORIES	RESPONDENTS				
	UV	VW	WX	XY	YZ
Denominational School	X	X	X	X	/
Headship less than 2 years	X	X	X	/	X
Headship 2-10 years	X	/	/	X	X
Headship more than 10 years	/	X	X	X	/
Group size of school	6	4	3	2	4
Junior School	/	X	X	X	X
Infant School	X	X	/	/	X
Junior/Infant School	X	/	X	X	/
Special School	X	X	X	X	X
L.E.A.	H	H	H	H	B
Urban School	/	/	/	/	X
Rural School	X	X	X	X	/
Gender (M/F)	M	F	F	F	F

N.B. Initials assigned to each respondent are fictitious in order to protect confidentiality and anonymity.

Table 3: INTERVIEWS ON 'WHAT DID YOU DO TODAY AS HEAD?': BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

final group of five respondents was composed of one man and four women, working in both rural and urban settings and in three different types of schools. The length of service in headship varied between nine months and twelve years (Table 3). Interviews were semi-structured and informal, and took place in the Autumn Term 1990 and the Spring Term 1991.

I contacted respondents by phone and gave the questions for the interviews as: What have you done today as headteacher? What kind of things did you think about today? What are your feelings about what you did during the day as headteacher? I arranged interviews to take place in respondents' own schools at the end of the day, in order to allow heads to talk with some sense of immediacy about their day's work. I sent transcripts of these initial interviews to respondents as starting-points for follow-up discussions.

I analysed these interviews during the Summer Term 1991, and examined what heads were saying about their experiences of daily headship (Research Diary Ref.911129 JNE). I analysed the transcripts according to five related categories: What tasks do heads undertake? How do heads set about doing those tasks? How do heads see the school? How do heads see others? and How do heads see themselves? I felt that three themes permeated the descriptions of these headteachers, as "recurrent patterns" (Delamont, 1992: 150). The first was the extent to which feelings and emotions seemed embedded in

their day-to-day work. The second was the functional nature of much of heads' work in trying to keep the school actually operating. The third was the consistently independent and possessive ways that heads viewed their work, the staff, the school and themselves.

I then compared the evidence from these interviews with the themes and categories on my own headship. I also made some comparisons with data from the earlier interviews with heads in 1988, since I felt these held evidence that warranted re-examination. I do not attempt at this point to summarise my main findings from the analysis, since this would repeat the substance of the following chapter.

However, it is probably helpful to the reader if I describe the process by which I selected from data available to me in writing the text of this thesis. In selecting from the data my guiding principle has been to seek corroboration between my two chief sources of data - the one-year journal and the interviews with headteachers. For example, there seems a weight of evidence from both sources to support the finding that heads are intensely preoccupied by their work. I cite from both sources in order to indicate the degree of corroboration. I have also selected for the reader those extracts that seem best to illustrate headteachers' sense of preoccupation.

At other times, the corroboration between the two sources of evidence has to be qualified in some way. There may still be broad consensus between both sources but agreement is not total. In such cases, I offer reasons for my qualification and cite from both sources to allow the reader to judge my interpretation of the evidence. For example, a few entries in the journal indicate that daily headship is not always as fragmented as conveyed by accounts of other heads. I offer evidence from my journal to support my reservation, although concluding that the weight of journal evidence confirms the extensive fragmentation of heads' work. I provide reasons to explain why a disparity exists between my two sources of data (pp.84-85).

Where corroboration does not exist between my two sources of data, then I have excluded such evidence from the findings. This form of selection has meant that important evidence in the journal and the interviews is not treated in the present thesis. For example, the journal contains a great deal of detailed information on such day-to-day aspects of headship as in-service training, school assemblies, staff meetings, parental contacts and meetings with external agents. These are clearly endemic features of headship that a reader might expect to find described within the thesis. The neglect of treatment does not mean that these aspects are not part of the work of other headteachers, only that my respondents did not report them in interview.

There are several reasons for such omissions in the accounts of respondents. One of the reasons is that my visits to schools were often arranged for the end of the school day, at a time when events such as staff meetings and in-service courses might otherwise have taken place. A further reason is that data collection in my final, and perhaps most finely focused group of interviews, was limited to only one day's evidence. Even allowing for follow-up interviews with the five respondents, I am relying rather heavily on evidence of only ten days. This has imposed some restrictions on one of my main sources of data since - as heads themselves reminded me - no day in headship can be considered typical. It seems inevitable therefore that evidence appears in the journal which is omitted in the accounts of respondents. There are therefore limitations imposed on this study by my method of collecting evidence and by the criterion of corroboration I use to select data for this text.

Other data are found exclusively within the journal because of unique circumstances in my own headship. For example, there is detailed information which conveys my feelings and thoughts on the proposal to amalgamate with the adjacent Infant school. These particular data are not paralleled in the accounts of other heads and I therefore exclude the data from my findings in the text of the thesis. In contrast, the evidence showing a daily preoccupation with the school's plumbing problems, and my feelings about them, is similar to

the accounts of other heads, in dealing with problems of the school buildings. I therefore include such evidence, since it fulfils my central criterion of corroboration between my data sources.

I enclose transcripts of the final ten interviews with heads for reference purposes, since these are my central source of data on the day-to-day work of other primary heads. The inclusion of these transcripts enables the reader to assess my analysis of them as a source of evidence. I also include a copy of the transcripted interview with the headteacher of Whitehall JM School, since this transcript provides a cross-reference with the entries I have included from the research diary (Volume 2: Ancillary Text, pp.1-16). All of the above transcripts are located within this same volume (Volume 2: Ancillary Text, pp.44 onwards).

My research journey was not ended. Time was now needed for rumination about the research journey, for a reflection upon my own travels and to read what other travellers had written about their routes and itineraries. I was reassured by the accounts of seasoned travellers. Elbaz (1983) and Louden (1991) had shown the advantages of using case-studies of one participant. Wolcott (1973) and Southworth (1993) had also used single case-studies in their respective examinations of principalship and primary headship. Holly and McLaughlin (1989) had written specifically on journal-writing as a mode

of gaining data, and Lieberman and Miller (1984) had used a week's personal journal to provide insights into the nature of principalship. Webb (1990) and Elliott (1991) were both convincing on the value of practitioner research, although I saw greater value for my study in their arguments on gaining insights into practice, than as a means to improve practice. Stenhouse (1985) was helpful on admissibility of subjective data, as well as Kuhn (1970), Habermas (1973) and Hammersley (1990) on limitations and assumptions in using positivist or quantitative research approaches. In brief, there were many previous travellers who offered explanations, justifications and rationalities for various parts of my research journey.

I began the journey with a number of certainties about many aspects of research and primary headship. These certainties were part of the intellectual encumbrances and superfluous luggage discarded at various points on the journey. It is perhaps apparent to the reader that my deliberation on links between headship and external reform and admissibility of my subjective evidence were important for the study. It may be less apparent that both decisions led to the jettisoning of some of my prior assurances. Processes of deliberation also forged new certainties, more sharply perceived than before. Both decisions were important and known to be so, since they would have major repercussions for the direction, tenor and credibility of the study. These decisions made the research journey much less pedestrian and conventional than it might

otherwise have been, but perhaps closer to the living heart and subjective realities of day-to-day primary headship.

CHAPTER 4: THE NATURE OF DAY-TO-DAY PRIMARY HEADSHIP

The purpose of this chapter is to provide insights into the nature of primary headship. I seek to achieve this purpose by offering three perspectives, each contributing towards a composite portrait of day-to-day primary headship.

My first perspective is of headship, as broadly perceived by respondents in the study, including myself as a respondent. My emphasis in this first perspective is less on the detail of headship and more on the impressions these headteachers have of what the phenomenon is like for them. I cite extracts from the journal and from interviews as evidence of these broad perceptions. I have found both sources offer a rich vein of data but, more than this, such extracts help to convey a great deal of what the phenomenon feels like. There is often a tone and flavour in these extracts which portrays much of headship's lived realities. I illustrate my points with a balance of data from my two main sources. The balance and selection of this evidence has been a matter of judgement, in which my guiding principle has been to compare and sift carefully the data from both sources, and then to select those extracts that seem typifying and illuminating.

My second perspective shows aspects of what headteachers do each day. Through this perspective, I consider the nature of headship as work undertaken for particular purposes by

respondents. My focus is more detailed and close up, but one nevertheless in which I am abstracting from a reality of some complexity. In considering the evidence available to me, I have taken the view that the day-to-day work of headteachers fulfils two central purposes. One relates to running the school, the other to the personal purposes of the headteacher. I describe the former as school work and the latter as personal work. I provide a range of evidence to support and illustrate the distinction I make.

In my third perspective, I bring together and build on these insights in examining further characteristics of day-to-day headship. My emphasis remains on the work of headteachers, but viewed here in terms of what is typical about it both as personal work and school work. I focus particularly on such aspects as daily planning, decision-making and processing of information, as practical responses by heads to the context of their work.

These perspectives offer insights into the research question 'what is the nature of day-to-day primary headship?' Each is inter-related and contributes towards a composite profile of the context, work and characteristics of daily headship. They abstract inevitably from a reality which is messier and more blurred at the edges, than my use of these perspectives may suggest. Such contrivance seems necessary in an attempt to portray existential realities. I use those perspectives

that are supported by data and which offer fundamental ways for the reader to gain an understanding of the phenomenon of day-to-day headship.

I refer only briefly in this chapter to two chief findings. The first is that headship is deeply infused by feelings and emotions. This aspect of headship has received only scant attention in the literature and warrants further discussion (Chapter 6). My second main finding is that headteachers' work is characterised by its strong sense of independence, possessiveness and idiosyncracy. Several writers discuss these characteristics but little has been written upon their origins in heads' perceptions. I explore such origins as a theoretical issue, and discuss whether some characteristics of teaching as an occupation are inherited within headship (Chapter 7). Both findings seem sufficiently important for me to discuss separately in subsequent chapters.

I begin by presenting my first perspective on headship, and examine the broad impressions of respondents upon the nature of day-to-day headship.

THE DAY-TO-DAY EXPERIENCE OF HEADSHIP:

The experience of headship is not easily encapsulated either by researchers or participants. Southworth (1993) observes that his respondent is unable to reduce headship to 'recipe

terms' or to a 'pithy succinct statement' (1993: 9). This observation should not imply headteachers are inarticulate. On the contrary, I found that respondents were able to talk at length about their work in school. What seems likely is that day-to-day headship by its nature cannot be reduced by practitioners to simple statements. These respondents do not experience a phenomenon that is orderly, sequential or simple. The experience of day-to-day headship seems complex and deeply felt, not easily synthesized for others. Heads' testimony indicates that day-to-day headship is experienced as a melee of happenings and 'fragmented interactions' (Coulson, 1976: 123), occurring at 'unrelenting pace' (Kmetz and Willower, 1982: 72), mingling with immediate thoughts, decisions, actions, impressions and feelings. My own one-year journal is a systematic attempt to record the fluidity and evanescence of headship, but even this attempt is sometimes swamped by the sheer pace and intensity of events (Journal, 25.4.90). The phenomenon of day-to-day headship is not a 'systematic ordering' (Clerkin, 1985: 295), and so is not readily summarised by respondents to an essence or to a formula.

Some respondents attempt to convey the essential nature of a particular day by recounting a single event in detail. A respondent may suggest that the event typifies much of that day (Transcript 37: 002; Transcript 39: 022). Other heads seem preoccupied by a specific crisis they are trying to

deal with. Their sense of preoccupation seems to take over all impressions of the day and on occasions may tend to take over the interview itself (Transcript 30: 008-024). Some entries in my journal appear to serve a similar purpose, of needing to dwell upon specific incidents (Journal 14.12.89; 28.11.89 and 13.11.89).

Respondents may also use affective statements as a means of summarising their experiences:

"...and I'm moaning because I've got to come in half-an-hour earlier....it's peanuts really....it makes you remember that you're a professional....you have a job to do....and the kids are bloody awful....and seventy five per cent might be bloody awful but that's your life.....that's what you're here for....that's what you're paid to do....so keep things in perspective.....have a smile....have a chuckle...have a laugh....have a pint on a Saturday....make sure you do other things in the weekend to relax....and come back on Monday and be almost human again....in the hope that this week won't be as bad as last week....and nothing serious has happened today....." (Transcript 34: 40).

Headteachers use metaphorical language, as well as affective language, in their attempts to convey the nature of day-to-day experiences (Transcript 34: 010; Transcript 13: 013). Cortazzi's analysis of anecdotal narrative appears relevant, in suggesting practitioners may use metaphor as a means "to aid verbalisation about the unknown or the inexplicable" (1991, p.132). I examine respondents' use of metaphor, in a later section of this chapter.

Researchers may also admit similar difficulties to those of

respondents, in suggesting that experiences of practitioners must be felt to be fully understood. Huggett (1986), as an example, has suggested that "no one but teachers can fully appreciate the constant stresses and demands that are made on them" (1986, p.xv). Huggett's comment seems helpful in underlining the difficulties faced by researchers in seeking to penetrate into the nature of headship. There also seems an implication in Huggett's comment, made more explicit by Connell (1985), that there is "something a little mysterious and evasive at the heart of the business of teaching" (1985: 70). This supposition begins to invest the experiences of practitioners with esoteric qualities, not open to scrutiny by others. It is impossible for me to judge the extent of such esotericism, although the investigation and explication of my own headship may help to inform and to shed light upon its mysteries.

My own assumption is that the experience of headship should be available for examination, despite the clear difficulties in achieving this by practitioners and researchers. Lang is nearer to the crux of the researcher's problem, in warning that "any portrait filters life" (1977: 188). Ignoring this warning can lead to what McNamara (1980) terms succinctly as the 'outsider's arrogance' (1980: 123). What needs to be avoided is the supposition that our theoretical abstractions are the reality experienced by participants (Salzberger-Wittenberg, et al.1983; Cortazzi 1991). McNamara's advice should not inhibit our efforts to penetrate further into the

realities of headship, as a phenomenon of some intensity and complexity. The humility is in accepting that our attempts are interpretations, not embodiments, of that reality.

In the following sections, I offer an interpretation of what headteachers experience in headship, as a context that seems fragmented and intense, characterised by its pervasive sense of here-and-now.

a) THE SENSE OF HERE-AND-NOW

Day-to-day headship has an instantaneous air. Respondents describe the daily buzz of incidents and interactions, all brief and ephemeral in nature. The notion of 'immediacy' is preferred by some researchers, including Doyle (1986: 123), Calderhead (1987: 2), Brown and McIntyre (1993: 53) and also Cortazzi (1991: 5). These researchers have used the term in describing classroom life, although the notion is apposite to the day-to-day experience of headship. Desforges and Cockburn (1987), for example, use 'immediacy' as a means to describe the "pressures of multiple factors and simultaneous events, compounded by a rapid pace of classroom life" (1987: 16). This definition conveys much of the urgency and here-and-now busyness in respondents' accounts too.

The here-and-now quality in headship seems best illustrated in the detail of a single account. The headmistress of an

Infant school describes her first hour in school:

"So first thing today I'd brought this card in and was saying is this alright to people.....and then I talked to the music co-ordinator because she was playing through a few tunes.....about Christmas.....then I spoke to a dad on the phone who I knew would ring me.....[DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF TELEPHONE CALL]....the welfare assistant who looks after one of our special needs children wasn't going to be in this afternoon....so I sorted that out.....who was going to cover for that....and I remembered I hadn't filled in a form for the Language Support people and that referred back to the Summer term and I thought it's been on my table for ages so I needed to do that....and so I zipped round to people and said just remind me....and I opened the post and threw it around in different directions ....and looked at it....then I decided what to write about the drugs letter and did all that and gave it to the secretary....I gathered together some more stuff for the Inset Day....and wondered when I'd get the time to staple it together and give it to the staff because I wanted them to have it today.....then after that J.J. rang to talk to me about the Downes Syndrome little boy and a meeting about that....the B.B.C. pamphlets for next term had come and I didn't understand the invoice.....I kept thinking about the Ethnic Statistics forms which I didn't give out to parents in September in time.....and I kept thinking about that.....so I got that letter out to have a look at it....I went down the corridor to fetch something and met a parent who'd been doing some language work and had a chat to her...I had a cup of coffee then and relayed some phone messages to different staff about what was the matter with some of their children.....health things....I slammed a few things under the photocopier...and the secretary brought some cheques to sign so she could go to the bank.....and two children came to see me to show me their work.....because it was nice and they wanted some praise about that....and then as I came back up the corridor the teacher from K.T. came to get the gerbils.." (Transcript 30: 032 - 038).

The extract may help to convey a sense of the tempo of day-to-day headship. The extract also illustrates much of the transitory here-and-now-ness. This respondent uses verbs of action: 'opened', 'zipped', 'rushed', 'slammed', 'gathered', 'threw' and so on. The description also indicates the short-term nature of day-to-day work: opening mail, photocopying,

talking to staff, preparing for a meeting, arranging supply cover, talking to a parent on the phone, passing on messages to staff, praising a child's work, chatting with a parent-helper, discussing a child on the phone, reading letters and so on. These all seem short-term actions. Other heads are able to offer these kinds of breathless accounts, confirming the sense of immediacy and brevity in day-to-day headship (cf.Transcript 31: 006; Transcript 38: 030):

"...and I tried to speak to P.W. about the budget...and I've spent time with the staff....clitter-clattering back about the Friends of P.G. meeting I was at last night until twenty past ten....I've spent time with two of the committee of the Friends of P.G. following the meeting last night.....I've chatted to quite a few children.....I can't remember anything else.....oh, we couldn't find the census form for school meals...I've signed a few things....because I've got a very good secretary....who gets on with things....I've spoken to Mrs.B. who comes in about violin....and organised an extra few pupils to teach for violin.....wrote to another parent whose child unfortunately won't be included on the list...." (Transcript 33, 038).

Several qualitative studies also observe "pace, variety and brevity" (Kmetz and Willower 1982: 72) in headship. Manasse (1985) points to the high proportion of activities of "short duration" (1985: 123), while Clerkin's observational study describes the 'high intensity' of day-to-day headship (1985: 295).

b) THE SENSE OF DISLOCATION

A second aspect of the experiential world of headship is its

sense of dislocation. Hilsum and Cane (1971) have described teaching in similar terms, observing the existence of many 'disrupting factors' (1971: 185). Desforges and Cockburn (1987) use the term 'fragmentation', in their observational study of teaching, in confirming that teaching is subject to "interruptions and distractions" (1987: 16). In studies of headship, the observational study of headteachers at work by Hall, Mackay and Morgan (1986), reaches similar findings. The authors use shadow-studies to provide direct evidence of the "fragmentation of activity" (1986: 123) Shadow studies by Holtom (1988) also confirm "task fragmentation" in daily headship (1988: 275-277). Peterson (1981) has attempted to quantify this feature and estimates that heads may undertake as many as fifty different tasks each hour.

My own respondents provide evidence that day-to-day headship is indeed disjointed and discontinuous, scarcely experienced as an orderly or sequential reality. Observations recorded in fieldnotes on my visits to respondents' schools, indicate that heads were often in demand by others. The accounts of respondents confirm that daily headship is a very dislocated reality for them. In the following account, the head of a rural primary school illustrates the piecemeal nature of her first few minutes in school:

"I did a card and 'pressie' [sic] for my secretary which was something I managed to achieve.....In came our History lass with her notes so we had to talk about that....a few moments

later another teacher came in with the notes about the English and the writing bit we've done...so I accepted those ....now I've got to work on them a little bit to finish them off....J. my deputy arrived....he's given me a great sheaf of papers from the two days when I wasn't in school....and I suddenly remembered something I hadn't put down and was urgent....so I actually had to phone before school.....the deputy told me about the 'B.J.' phone call....because he'd had this funny phone call...and I had a few moments with him and told him to come back at break...the 3rd year girls arrived with their stuff.....cook came in and said the ceiling's still leaking.....which I rushed to have a look at because I thought 'It hasn't rained so that means problems' ....it means it's leaking from the roof and coming in from a strange area...and then Mrs.B. arrived for assembly...great assembly...[DESCRIPTION OF ASSEMBLY]...and then there was a phone call.....a fairly long phone call in fact....." (Transcript 36: 010 - 012).

In this account, the respondent is interrupted by others who approach her directly, or who telephone her. Conversations are interrupted, and even these can be interrupted in turn. Some commentators describe this kind of experience in terms of 'reactive management' (Paisey and Paisey, 1987: 109), although this may assume interruptions are only created by events and by other people. In the above extract, the head has initiated some of the interruptions herself, adding to the fragmentation in her work. Whatever the causes of such discontinuity, the evidence of respondents' accounts points to a dislocation and 'an unpredictable flow of work' in the work of heads (Manasse 1985: 123) (cf. Transcripts 33: 032-040; 31: 006). In the following brief account, the head is interrupted in succession by a delivery of books, a parent, a message from the Nursery and the caretaker:

"I know, then the books arrived...some books arrived...so I immediately opened these up to see what there was and there were two or three books there that had been ordered for the

Nursery...they were very nice solid books...so I immediately took those across to the Nursery....and showed them and they were pleased.....then returned into school where another parent was waiting to see me.....only a few words.....about something the child had left at home.... and at that stage I was conscious of wasting time because I had to go back to the Nursery because it had been reported to me that the heating had been working all last night....there was nothing visible and the controls were just as they should be.....but certainly it had been working in the night...so I needed the engineer in to sort that out....so I spoke to the secretary about that and asked if she'd do the necessary phoning..... and get someone to come out and have a look at it....then I was caught by the caretaker who wanted to talk about the Direct Services Organisation.....about what the system was going to be..... because someone was supposed to have come and talked to them about it....but they haven't" (Transcript 22: 048).

Evidence from the one-year journal seems more equivocal in comparison to interview data. Although most entries in the journal confirm extensive fragmentation in my everyday work (Journal 26.2.90; 5.3.90; 15.3.90) a few entries suggest the opposite. I describe a number of days as being 'relatively uneventful' (Journal 22.3.90) or 'rather bland' (Journal 28.3.90) or 'fairly relaxed' (Journal 2.4.90). On several days in the year, I am able to work continuously on a single task such as setting a budget or writing a report:

"....this seemed a generally tranquil day and I was able to spend quite an extended period of time on the Special Needs Policy with relatively few interruptions" (Journal 26.3.90).

Entries in the journal extend over a period of one year and some variations from the norm are probably inevitable during this time. There are far fewer days experienced as cohesive rather than dislocated ones, and the occurrence of these may only confirm Manasse's observation that day-to-day headship

seems 'unpredictable' (1987: 123). The journal data may of course indicate that my headship is different in nature from that experienced by others. Alternatively, respondents may have been anxious to present to me as busy a description of their work as possible. Both alternatives seem conjecture and cannot be substantiated by the evidence available to me.

A further characteristic of day-to-day headship is its sense of intensity and the feelings of preoccupation experienced by respondents.

c) THE SENSE OF INTENSITY

Southworth (1993) concludes that his respondent is consumed by headship to such an extent that "headship was always with him, it filled his head.....thinking about the school filled much of his day and was forever with him" (1993: 31). My own respondents think ceaselessly about their headship, both during the school day and throughout conscious moments. As one respondent puts it, thoughts about school seem endlessly "ticking away at the back of my mind" (Transcript 32: 074)

A particular incident or crisis (Transcript 30: 008-024) may further preoccupy respondents. Thoughts and feelings seem intensified throughout the day, to a point where events have 'over-ridden everything and filtered into everything that is going on' (Transcript 38: 18). Data within the journal also

confirm the sense of total distraction caused by particular events (Journal 14.12.89; 28.11.89; 13.11.89). I consider this aspect of headship in more detail in Chapter 5, in my examination of the affective nature of headteachers' work.

Respondents are more often preoccupied by a multiplicity of thoughts, ideas, anxieties and reflections about their work in school. The sense of introspection and obsessiveness seems to continue throughout most waking moments - driving to school, in the car-wash (Transcript 36: 059), in the bath (Transcript 32: 002) and at the breakfast table:

"I was actually thinking about school when I got out of bed at seven o'clock.....I usually start thinking about the day then.....I may have thought about it the evening before but I'm usually thinking about the day as soon as I get up..... particularly in the bath when I've got peace and quiet...and time just to think about what's going to happen or what has happened in school.....or likely to happen....I remember, or else I'll look in my diary at breakfast.....to see what's going to happen during the day and then I think about things that need doing....that I'm currently working on....or ought to have finished or need to check up on....and I suppose fit those into the day where I suppose they go...the part of the day when they need to be done.....and I was thinking at breakfast that the Nursery are going to take it home and I'm going to be busy from eleven o'clock when someone was coming for the gerbils and I knew you were coming.....so I'd better do it early on otherwise there won't be time for the duplicator...and the Nursery go home at half past eleven..." (Transcript 30: 002-006).

Thinking about school never seems to leave heads, and in a sense neither are the families of heads unaffected:

"It becomes part of your nature, really.....but I find as a head that I'm thinking about school all the time....when I'm digging the garden I find I'm chewing things over in my mind .....and the family are driven mad by this.....to keep on

discussing what's going on in school....because my wife's a teacher and my two sons are teachers.....but it's certainly a full-time occupation...there are only very rare times that one is totally away from it" (Transcript 22: 026).

Several entries in the one-year journal confirm how thoughts and ideas emerge in moments of time outside of the school (Journal 13.10.89). What seems lacking in the journal and in interview data is evidence of new ideas created during the school day itself. This finding is relevant to remarks by Hayes (1993), in a case-study of a primary headteacher, that heads lack the time for any 'adequate reflection about issues' (1993: 3). Accounts by my respondents suggest few opportunities exist during the school day for "uninterrupted sustained thought" (Transcript 32: 078-080). A respondent, asked about his thinking during the day, replies simply "I don't remember thinking a lot, haven't had much time for that" (Transcript 36: 059). The evidence seems to suggest that the scope of respondents' thinking during the school day is restricted by the nature of day-to-day headship.

The sense of preoccupation outside of school may be helpful and necessary to headteachers, as time to reflect, to create new ideas as well as for short-term planning (Transcript 30: 028; Transcript 36: 031-033). There is also evidence however that the sense of distraction is sometimes involuntary:

"I work all weekends...and at nights....and that's something else....I find that the issues arising as a head.....I can't always switch off from when I go to sleep.....because many of them are non-accidental injuries to children and there's

a high incidence of child abuse and I'm afraid I still go to bed thinking about them.....I've had quite a few disturbed nights this term really....which isn't normal for me... most of the evenings I work" (Transcript 5: 034).

Some heads try consciously to separate thinking about school from personal time:

"...I catch myself thinking about school when I would prefer not to be.....there I am painting the dining-room and catch myself doing it...and I feel that that's my time and not the school's....and very often you find that most waking moments are being spent on school issues..." (Transcript 10: 030).

Headship seems to engross these respondents, to absorb their sentiments and conscious thinking to the point when headship "becomes part of your nature" (Transcript 22: 026).

THE DAY-TO-DAY WORK OF PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS

The focus of my interviews with respondents during 1990 was on their day-to-day work. I transcribed the fifteen hours of taped interviews and asked myself what heads were saying about their work. At first, I found their comments matter-of-fact and familiar, providing detail of a perceptual world to which I felt accustomed. There was also a strangeness in the data that I could sense without discerning the cause. The inconsistency seemed to continue as long as my question in addressing the data was: What do these heads say they do? The data from the one-year journal also contained a similar sense of anomaly. The inconsistency in the data was removed when my question was changed to: What purpose is served by

the work that heads say that they do?

The nature of the anomaly may be summarised as follows. On the one hand, respondents provide a detailed description of day-to-day headship. This description, even one based only on evidence so far in this chapter, indicates a reality of immediacy, discontinuity and intensity. This seems to be a consistent and valid portrait of day-to-day headship, and supported fully by the data. On the other hand, respondents appear to be saying this portrait of headship is not really headship. Headship is, in a sense, two different headships. The anomaly is illustrated in the one-year journal, when I query whether entries made by me on that day are useful since they are mainly a record of only "one sort of headship" (Journal 17.11.89). Later in the year, I reflect on what had seemed a productive day in school:

"This seemed reasonably positive as a day almost a different kind of headship....but suspect I was still drawn into usual sort of headship by having to sort such a lot of low-level administrative tasks..." (Journal 14.6.90).

Respondents in interview also seem to raise doubts on their own evidence. Despite their detailed comments, describing a busy and animated reality, these respondents often dismiss the day as "fairly normal" (Transcript 35: 002) or "typical" (Transcripts 22: 056; 30: 040; 36: 035). The day may be discounted as "a mass of trivia" (Transcript 21: 002), or as "not doing the things one ought to be doing" (Transcript 22:

28), or dealing with "what crops up" (Transcript 38: 006) or "purely functional" (Transcript 21: 016). There seems a constant expression of the unimportance and irrelevance of what heads experience in daily headship:

"Most days it's the same impression....I haven't started yet to do anything I intended to do when I came in to school.... because most of the things I've been doing are things that have cropped up since I came in..." (Transcript 33: 002).

The inconsistency is that what is experienced is not what is preferred. What heads do is not what they want to do. The data also suggests a sense of the headteacher who 'is', and the headteacher that respondents want to be:

".....and you're not actually doing the job that perhaps you initially perceived it to be and from my point of view the child aspect of a headship is the most important one.....and it's what I've spent years gaining experience in...and it's what I'm best equipped for...to understand the teaching side of it and the needs of the children..." (Transcript 39: 22).

In the following sections, I explore the kind of distinction respondents appear to be making. I offer further evidence to support the view of a contradiction and anomaly in heads' perceptions of their work. I use these notions as a way of abstracting meaning from respondents' perceptions of day-to-day work.

I begin my discussion of headteachers' work by suggesting it is differentiated into two kinds. First, there is the work of running the school and second, there is work which serves

heads' personal purposes. I describe the first as school-related work and the second as personal work.

a) SCHOOL-RELATED WORK IN DAILY HEADSHIP

My examination of school-related work is in five parts. In the first part, I consider respondents' impressions of their school-related work which I describe as mostly about keeping wheels turning and dealing with different problems. In the subsequent parts, I offer further detail of what is involved in school work. I describe problems of dealing with paper, buildings, staff absences and pupil behaviour. I begin with headteachers' general perceptions about school-related work.

i) KEEPING THE WHEELS TURNING:

Heads undertake tasks each day to ensure the school is able to operate. This work is necessary, to use Huberman's metaphor, as a means of "keeping the ship afloat" (1990: 31). The head of a junior school describes this sense of operational necessity on a day in which:

"It's been just a question of physically making sure that the school is actually operating.....that the staff can physically get into the place...covering for a teacher who's away....covering for the mid-day assistants....I think what have I actually done today other than hold the ring somehow ....have I done anything constructive...other than make sure that things were ticking over?" (Transcript 32: 036-042)

Lieberman and Miller (1984) have described this kind of work

as 'transactional', as a form of 'plant management' in which "principals are ultimately responsible for the smooth operation of their building" (1984: 74). School work seems more broadly-based than this definition, although the sense of operational necessity is the same.

School-related work occupies much of the day, sometimes all day (Transcript 23: 032), often interfering with work felt more "appropriate" (Transcript 33: 002-004). Heads dismiss much of their work in running the school as inconsequential, and banal, as "the usual things which only the head can deal with" (Transcript 3: 068), or "the sort of day-to-day things you can't plan for" (Transcript 38: 010) or more simply as "incessant trivia" (Transcript 21: 002).

Respondents see themselves as central figures in fulfilling this work. It is the headteacher who, as plant manager by obligation, ensures the wheels keep turning. It is the head alone who strives to keep "the machine oiled" (Transcript 1: 060), "the wagons rolling" (Transcript 13: 029), "the show on the road" (Transcript 14: 033), and "the whole thing homogenous" (Transcript 37: 012).

Taylor (1984) and Aspin (1984) have investigated the use of language in educational discourse. They suggest analysis of metaphorical language provides a basis for understanding practitioners' conceptual frameworks. The metaphors of my

own respondents seem to suggest role-centralisation in their view of school-related work. Cortazzi (1991) uses similar arguments in examining teachers' narrative use of metaphor. Cortazzi suggests that practitioners use metaphor as a means of encapsulating what is difficult to synthesize rationally, for example, in using metaphors of movement to explain pupil learning (1991: 123). Cortazzi uses symbolic interactionist perspectives, as I have, in recognising that metaphors are "interactive productions, cognitive representations and deep structures" (ibid: 9).

My respondents sometimes use a metaphor of keeping plates in motion, perhaps to convey rapidity and incessancy of day-to-day events (Transcripts 34: 014; Transcript 13: 013). Use of this metaphor may also illustrate how participants see their role as central but isolated, in undertaking school-related work:

"I'm chasing my backside.....permanently trying to keep all the saucers going on the end of the poles before they drop off the end" (Transcript 9: 044).

"It's giving that plate a tweak and then running down the other end....and starting another plate spinning.....it's that sort of game.....you're asking yourself all the time 'how many plates can I keep spinning?'...and some plates are now starting to fall off....." (Transcript 10: 010).

Respondents often use the term 'problems' when referring to school work. Dealing with problems seems a major part of running the school, often linked by respondents to perceived obligations of the role:

"Most things are problems in some ways.....because people are not coming to you to say 'Do you know I've had a really good morning, I just thought you'd like to know, and now I'm off to do the shopping'.....so it's normally something I'm going to have to give information about or reassure or react to or organise or refer them to someone else..." (Transcript 31: 050).

The notion of 'the buck stops here' expresses much of the obligation and incumbency felt by these respondents in their central role:

".....I thought it was a nuisance....there was nobody else that could have done it ....and it all had to be shifted before a quarter to nine before the cook arrived....and the only person who could possibly have done it was me....so I stuck all the glasses and stuff outside....and it was pouring with rain....because I have no caretaker I also have to unlock the school....because if I don't unlock the school then nobody else will....so all that consists of undoing ten different doors..." (Transcript 21: 010).

Problems in running the school occur unexpectedly throughout the day, prompted by events (Transcript 22: 046; Transcript 37: 004) and by people (Transcript 33: 012; Transcript 35: 051; Transcript 38: 010):

"It often happens...there's the parent problem and there was a parent who came in about a stranger who seems to be causing some trouble in the area.....so I had to ring and speak to that parent because I was in a meeting....as a result of that I needed to phone the police.....another incident at lunchtime means I have to get back to the police at some time this afternoon.....all these sorts of things ....I mean, I'm not saying that I have to phone the police every day but it's just an illustration that you can't schedule things.....you can't predict what will happen....." (Transcript 38: 012-016).

In the following sections, I examine some examples of heads' school-related work. Day-to-day tasks of headteachers are

difficult to typify, but the following aspects seem constant in the work of respondents. I identify four main aspects. These are the day-to-day problems of dealing with paperwork, school buildings, staff absence and pupil behaviour. I begin by analysing the daily chore of coping with paperwork.

ii) DEALING WITH PAPER

Paperwork is a constant feature of headship. Entries in the one-year journal indicate that I spend time daily in dealing with paper. The work usually involves administrative tasks such as keeping notes, filing papers, drafting letters, sorting financial accounts and compiling written reports for others. Much of this administration is seen by respondents as being time-consuming and time wasted (Transcript 2: 020):

"I knew there was a lot of paperwork that comes to heads.... but I had no idea there was such a colossal amount that you have to sift through...that's the other problem...it arrives on your desk and you've got to go through everything because something there might be important....but thirty per cent of it.....sometimes fifty per cent of it goes straight into the waste bin.....because it's usually advertising.....but it's still time...I usually sort it at the end of the day...which is not good management....it comes in and there it is on the desk..." (Transcript 5: 028-030).

The incoming mail seems to have particular significance for respondents. Dealing with the post is a daily obligation, rarely delegated or entrusted to anyone else (Transcript 5: 028). Newly appointed heads seem surprised at the volume of incoming mail (Transcript 2: 020; Transcript 5: 28). It

is a feature of school work that headteachers feel they must constantly battle against or it engulfs them (Transcript 10: 006; Transcript 36: 006; Transcript 3: 060).

Heads sift through the mail as a daily routine. Much of the mail is discarded as irrelevant to the school (Transcript 5: 028). Headteachers decide on what mail is allowed to enter the school and who has access to that information:

"Now then.....as for keeping it at arm's length.....well the great proportion of the mail goes straight into the bin..... you then select those bits...those pieces of paper that must be done....no argument, must be done....absolutely essential ....then have the rest of them as a fringe area...desirable ...."I ought to read this if it will help me".....but what I do with those things that can't be done is leave them....if they're not desirable.....I haven't the time.....I shall put them away in a file somewhere.....the odds are I shan't read them....There are one or two returns I must do.....and the NAHT sent a report this morning...very, very helpful....with headings...(READING)...'Salaries and Conditions of Work'... 'Administrative Matters'.....'Child Abuse'.....'National Curriculum'.....'Qualified Teacher Status'....I really ought to read this in certain selected areas....but I shan't..... I'll tell you why.....I have some bushes to plant.....or the frost will get into them" (Transcript 1: 015-017).

A detailed entry in the journal provides a summary of my own decisions on what I discard, file, distribute or act upon (Journal 27.11.89). Other entries suggest that the National Curriculum documentation is also subject to the same process

of sifting, with decisions based on my personal judgement of what is relevant for the school (Journal 10.11.89).

The mail represents the outside world's point of access into schools. Heads see the mail as the central route by which external reform is directed into schools. External change and paper seem synonymous to these respondents:

"...handling change really amounts to the bits of paper that flow across here.....you know, before your eyes.....and it's increasing....and just goes on and on and on..." (Transcript 10: 018).

Headteachers see the school mail and the external changes it represents as constant intrusions, frequently cutting across existing plans of the head or the school (Transcript 9: 032-034):

"There are so many changes and the time-scale of the changes is at such a speed....take this term for instance...the school is obliged to make a response about its second response to L.E.A.policies...we've also got other work...the school has also got to make a response to the L.E.A. about its science curriculum.....and the school has only just received the Science 5-16 document...and has to take account of that in the school's science policy.....and it's naive I think to reject out of hand....as it were...what is already there.... and it's no good us saying with that one "Well, here's the science policy that has been in place here for several terms now".....so even if we are in that situation there has to be further adaptation to take account of a new bit.....so, for instance, when that bag arrives there will be other messages....and there are other messages for the school about multicultural education, technology.....and others about the changing role of the governing body...now, change is no bad thing but its the agenda and the time-scale of change.....you just get swamped by it..." (Transcript 10: 006).

Headteachers seem to feel under siege and "bombarded" by the incoming post (Transcript 9: 026). Dealing with the mail is a constant daily chore, a never-ending labour to fulfil, but never of love. It is school work that has to be done and the head alone must do it.

iii) PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Repairs and maintenance of the building are a source of many day-to-day problems for headteachers. The journal contains almost daily entries during the Autumn Term 1989 on plumbing problems besetting the school (Journal 20.9.89, 22.9.89). Repairs to the building seem to pre-occupy many respondents. Heads tend to deal promptly with these problems, since there are often direct effects on others, but dismiss the problem itself as unimportant and trivial. Accounts of respondents often illustrate the anomaly in heads' daily work. Dealing with problems may be important for the school or for others, yet seem trivial to the head:

"I have been trying to sort out some of the problems with the building.....because we're having to pick up on carpets and furniture....that sort of thing.....getting all the stopcocks in the school loosened or something....they were all seized up....all sorts of stupid little things which hadn't been picked up around the building that could be quite damaging long-term.....eleven ball-cocks....several toilets didn't flush....stupid things like that.....that are actually very important to the everyday life of the children and the teacher in the classroom.....we've a classroom of twenty-six infants and two toilets and one [toilet] doesn't flush...and that's the sort of thing...whilst it's important ...maybe I could be better employed..." (Transcript 33: 020)

Heads feel such tasks are trivial but must be promptly dealt with, since basic needs of people are involved. These needs often include warmth, hygiene, light, ventilation, water and safety. The following extract conveys much of the sense of obligation in dealing with these day-to-day problems:

"So I had to inspect it.....this is all Health and Safety of course....and it had come to me the right way....a member of staff had spotted it and had told her.....so we went out and had a look at it...and realised there was little if anything that could be done about it..it would have to be repaired so I decided that a point had to be made to the children...that they didn't climb on this thing...and in each class make the point to the children....you just don't climb anywhere....so it took me about twenty minutes to go round the school...I'm not sure that was decision-making in any way but it was clear that someone might hurt themselves.....it was in the nature of things that a child perhaps later in the day..... climbing up...could have been the one who had an accident... and who fell back and hit their head...and killed themselves so it had to be done immediately....so that was done.....so that took until about ten to ten" (Transcript 22: 046-048).

Dealing with problems of the school building seems important because of consequences for other people, but it is a source of what appears unimportant and trivial to these heads.

iv) PROBLEMS OF STAFF ABSENCE

Headteachers also ensure the school has sufficient staff to operate. Heads usually check at the beginning of each day that staff are not absent:

"...and then I normally go round and have a word with each member of staff.....I don't know if this is general but I always feel it makes a pleasant start to the day....just going round and saying 'Good morning' to people....and it serves the practical purpose of knowing that everybody's there of course....and that the school is functioning...it's a thought, you see.....because this morning one member of staff wasn't in school....now, this was twenty-to-nine....so there was still plenty of time for that member of staff

still to come.....but it was someone who always arrived in school by about seven....who enjoys working early in the morning....and there was just a little panic in the mind because this was not his usual practice....perhaps something had gone wrong....perhaps I'd better find out about it...and the decision hardly made when of course he walks in the door ...it was just a morning when he doesn't happen to be early ....but that was the first slight panic of the day....but if I hadn't have gone round and spoken to people then I wouldn't have known that he hadn't arrived....because I don't have any other system so that someone else comes and says 'so and so' hasn't arrived" (Transcript 22: 038).

Entries in the journal indicate that an established routine for me each morning is to greet staff and to check if anyone is absent (Journal entries F145, F164, F158). Heads try to arrange cover for absent members of staff, although this is not always possible, particularly if it involves people such as the caretaker or secretary. At such times, the nature of heads' work may alter considerably, since heads feel obliged to undertake some or all of the work of the person absent:

".....and it was my caretaker saying he'd got 'flu and he wouldn't be in.....so that was a good start.....and I'd only been saying to the staff on the previous day on the Inset day that it was a very pleasant day we spent...and now we're back to harsh realities....and we certainly were...I usually get to school about ten past eight...quarter past eight.... but because it meant I had to unlock everything and switch off the alarms I got here about twenty to eight....about half an hour earlier in fact" (Transcript 32: 004-008).

"....at lunchtime I'm being Senior Supervisory Assistant because we've got two MSA's short as well as the Supervisory Assistant....so I spent an hour at lunchtime actually organising the lunch....so that's one thing I've been doing at the moment....which I wouldn't normally be doing.....but have to because of staffing...." (Transcript 33: 010).

The additional work may be as varied as distributing cartons of milk (Journal 13.12.89), clearing horse manure (Journal

15.12.89), or serving puddings (Journal 20.12.89). Detail of this work seems less significant than headteachers' sense of obligation in doing it.

v) PROBLEMS OF PUPIL BEHAVIOUR

Headteachers spend time in dealing with problems of pupil behaviour. The one-year journal shows many occasions when my contact with children is disciplinary in nature, often in support of other members of staff (Journal 11.9.89, 15.9.89, 6.12.89, 12.10.89), or as direct response to events (Journal 4.10.89, 28.11.89, 7.12.89). Lunchtimes are a common source of such problems.

Respondents tend to deal with pupil misbehaviour as promptly as possible:

"....they just happen...and in a sense the boy who in a fit of temper...took a swing at a glass panel in a door...there has to be an immediate response..." (Transcript 32: 048).

Many headteachers seem to feel that in dealing with problems of pupil misbehaviour their relationship with children is different from that of a class teacher (Transcript 2: 006):

"As a head you <u>are</u> involved with kids....sometimes a bit remotely but you get very involved with a very small minority of kids....you spend your time with ten per cent of the kids...but it's a different relationship you have...you don't get so many opportunities of having that relationship you have with a class..." (Transcript 32: 024).

Time is also spent in supervising children, often as a means of monitoring or inhibiting potential misbehaviour:

"Checked playground,thought 4th year girls were over-excited in game they were playing so told them to calm down, talked to Mrs.D. (MSA) about it..... Went out again to playground and spent 20 mins. watching the children at play, thought football matches were O.K. and children were noisy but getting on with the game, suggested that one big game might be better than two 'overlapping' games using same patch of the playground.... Checked children as they left school, especially G.P. and S.B., noticed that E.L. left by another door from the one where his father was waiting for him, suspect there'll be more problems to come" (Journal 20.3.90)

The one-year journal shows that supervising the children is a daily routine for me, especially the arrival and departure of children at the beginning and the end of the day (Journal 29.1.90; 28.2.90; 2.3.90; 19.3.90). Wet playtimes involve me in a heightened sense of responsibility for good order in the school. There also seems a more acute awareness and apprehension of potential hazard for children:

"Wet playtime so supervised for much of the time, thought it was a real hurly-burly everywhere, noisy games predominating - noticed E.L. (3rd yr) being told off by MSA for kicking someone under the table, checked around the classrooms, main impression was of argumentative games of marbles and so on, seems compelling that I continue to supervise, probably because I don't think MSA's cope very well and S.L. and B.B. are not doing their SSA role very fully, perhaps none of them quite pick up the same danger signals about safety, discipline, etc. Came across massive spillage of powder paint in 4th yr. class, C.L. was pretending to 'feed' A.S. with it and knocked over a whole tub full, had a fairly 'sharp' talk to all the 4th years. about their general behaviour at lunchtimes" (Journal 19.3.90).

Heads supervise the children and deal with problems of pupil behaviour. Both aspects seem a part of school-related work

and to reflect headteachers' sense of obligation in keeping good order in the school.

School-related work is work that has the purpose of ensuring the school operates, in a process of keeping wheels turning. Examples of school-related work are dealing with paper, and problems relating to the school building, staff absences and pupil behaviour. Respondents feel an obligation to others, as well as the school, when carrying out this work. These respondents also view school-related work as inevitable, but as time wasted, obligatory but distracting, necessary but trivial, and not - in a limited sense - real headship.

In the following sections, I continue to explore a sense of differentiation and anomaly in the work of headteachers, by examining their day-to-day personal work.

b) PERSONAL WORK IN DAY-TO-DAY HEADSHIP

The term 'personal' has a number of connotations. The term may imply 'autonomous', in meaning heads have power to make independent decisions. It may imply 'idiosyncratic' in the sense of emphasizing individual differences in headteachers' perceptions of their work. It may refer to what is 'self-expressed' in reflecting creative aspects of work. It may imply 'independent', as the ability to make choices that are not subject to another's influence. It may also refer to 'individual' in meaning work that is separate from group

perceptions and processes. It may have connotations about what is 'personally satisfying' in referring to an affective dimension in personal work. It may also include a sense of 'personal investment' (Nias 1989: 19) in referring to a high personal commitment to work. It may include 'expressive' as work "directed to ends such as the presentation of self" (Harre, 1979: 19). The list of connotations is by no means a complete one.

In contrast to school-related work, personal work involves individual choices by heads, as work heads want to do, seek to do, try to do, prefer to do in their day-to-day headship. I define personal work more closely, as work that is not for transactional purposes, which involves individual choices by the headteacher and usually serves idiosyncratic purposes in shaping the school, in ways that are possessive, solitary, independent, and often involving a high investment of self. Other terms, such as self-expressive, autonomous or isolated also have relevance to personal work, but these terms may be misleading for me to use at this stage.

My definition remains a 'hypothetical construct', but is not 'arbitrary' in terms used by Nias (1989: 19). My evidence appears to offer a limited empirical basis for my definition although this should not imply it is empirically validated. My definition remains mainly an abstraction **from**, but is not closely defined **by**, my available data. The empirical basis

of my definition is a differentiation within my data between heads' school-related and personal work, rather in the form of bi-polar opposites (Kelly 1986). As I will indicate in my examination of the day-to-day characteristics of heads' work, this distinction between school work and personal work becomes more blurred at the edges in practice (pp.116-130).

My definition also refers to the purposes of heads' work and I consider this aspect in greater detail in my discussion of day-to-day personal work. The main purpose of personal work seems largely to shape the school. Such purposes are diffuse and idiosyncratic, but they can also be goal-directed and educative. In other words, there seems an overlap between idiosyncratic and educative purposes in the personal work of headteachers. Alexander (1987) seems near to discerning one of the central features of personal work, in suggesting that teaching is an enactment of self "in creating a world in his or her image....comprehensive and uninterrupted over time and space" (1987: 165). Alexander summarises much of what my respondents seem to attempt in their personal work although, as I argue, heads are by no means 'uninterrupted' in these endeavours. School-related tasks seem a substantial source of daily disruption to work serving personal purposes.

I now discuss heads' personal work, and provide evidence to support my claim that personal work serves idiosyncratic, as well as educative purposes. My examination of the evidence

is in three related sections. First, I consider the notion that the school is a canvas for the personal work of heads. Second, I show examples from the data of ways in which heads attempt to shape their school. Third, I consider time spent by respondents in working with children.

i) THE SCHOOL AS CANVAS

Headteachers see the school as a canvas for their personal work in headship. The canvas seems painted in idiosyncratic ways but heads' perception of their right to act as solitary artist seems broadly founded. Lortie (1975) conveys much of what heads presume in their personal work in referring to the 'subjective warrant' of teachers (1975: 158). Nias has argued persuasively on this point, although from a different viewpoint, that "personal values which are incorporated in individuals' substantial selves play an important part in the way they [teachers] conceptualize and carry out their work" (Nias, 1989: 41).

The planning and enactment of this personal work begins from the time of appointment. Accounts of newly appointed heads describe their initial attempts to implement plans, devised by themselves soon after interview for headship (Transcripts 2: 058; 38: 008):

"I could see it was like an over-grown garden.....and what I should really be doing at home.....with my own overgrown garden.....is seeing if there was anything which was

saveable.....that was what I actually did with my garden.... there were areas in my garden that were saveable like the lawn....which needed a bit of mowing....it was okay....and there were a few nice shrubs growing in one area.....but the rest was rough.....but just like my garden it wasn't worth taking things out if you couldn't put anything in there..... they'd only just get overgrown again....so it was a question of marshalling the resources and just like my garden would still have overgrown areas.....we've still got over-grown areas here.....or we've got areas which we've planted and which have become overgrown....(INTERRUPTION).... I'm not an intellectual....I mean, one of the areas where last term it became overgrown if you like.....or, I suppose, using the parable of the sower....it was rocky ground" (Transcript 13: 009-011).

Many of these preliminary plans are modified or abandoned at an early stage (Transcript 5: 050) but their existence, even prior to appointment, seems significant. Predecessors are often condemned with faint praise by their successor perhaps to justify the need for the head to provide a new direction for the school (Transcript 7: 012):

"I would have thought it was a hierarchy before.....and I would have said.....and this is no criticism of the previous head....who did an excellent job here.....but we are very different in temperament and in personality.....and that's going to have its effect on change anyway, as to how the person who comes to look at the problem....how they come.... the kind of person they are....and with what responses they bring to that change.....but the person who was here before me was someone who acted...shall I say....on the spur of the moment, so change very often did happen overnight...it was a decision made one day and implemented the next" (Transcript 5: 004).

Newly appointed heads use metaphors to convey the importance and urgency of their day-to-day work in shaping the school. Metaphors may include, as in the example cited earlier, the image of a gardener reclaiming an overgrown garden. A focus for much of this preliminary work by heads involves physical

changes to the school:

"I wanted to change things.....and I had four classrooms in the school which were absolute 'tips'.....there was just old furniture....old books....no kids in them....broken musical instruments...that sort of thing....and the appointment of a new caretaker.....and again that was by chance.....the old caretaker was a good caretaker but he had really had too much to do...and there was a lot of vandalism going around ....and we appointed a new caretaker who was a handyman..... and we both put on white coats and we spent nearly a term in throwing out rubbish.....burning old books and things like that...we've still got some old books in the school that are okay.....but I emptied twenty black sacks of old textbooks that had been here for years and years which were never looked at.....and then we did some painting and things like that.....we didn't have any display books at all along the corridors.....all we had were modern art pictures which weren't even by children...so we got rid of all of those.... and we borrowed examples of children's work from loans and exhibitions to start with.....and then replaced them by our own children's work.....as soon as we got good work in..." (Transcript 13: 005).

Many newly appointed heads seem to echo the spirit and tenor of these comments (Transcript 07: 016; Transcript 13: 003; Transcript 33: 040):

"...the way that I administered the first major change I had in this school was very different....I think it was far more autocratic but I'd probably have got my own way in the end anyway.....basically, when I came here this room and that room had got fifty children in them and the whole of that room had thirty children in it.....so I was over here with one of the staff in a team-teaching situation....and most of the library books were in the new building with the Infants and it didn't seem to make a lot of sense.....so at the end of that first year I said to the staff "Look, it can't go on like this....it's not the way we should be working.....I can see this room as an Infant room and having done that then part of the arrangement in the other building will allow us to develop the library area"....so that kind of change was fairly autocratic at the time and fortunately they went along with that" (Transcript 12: 058).

These respondents' accounts indicate the personal warrant to use the school as canvas is established at an early stage,

and may involve an initial emphasis upon physical changes to the school.

ii) SHAPING THE SCHOOL

Headteachers see the school as theirs to shape. The head is arbiter, agent, advocate, and initiator of how the school is to be shaped. Their school is canvas for a view of change that is self-centred, idiosyncratic and largely possessive.

The journal traces the daily progress of my personal work in shaping the school. Entries show my continuing endeavours to introduce word-processing facilities (Journal 5.9.89), reduce Christmas activities (Journal 6.9.89), re-define the responsibilities of governors (Journal 13.9.89), re-locate the Maths area (Journal 21.9.89), re-allocate dictionaries (Journal 28.9.89), co-ordinate special needs work (Journal 4.10.89) and re-site resource areas to link with adjoining classrooms:

"Lunchtime: K.F. wanting to order tubes of ready-mix paints but several staff want sufficient for each class - got into discussion on resources and location. Occurred to me, and I said, that we perhaps needed to mix the teaching rooms with the various resource areas, rather than have separate floors for each. K.F. said she had thought about that already but felt things were too 'established'. Lively discussion began but it was already end of lunchtime. I think what I'm after is more frequent use of resource areas by the children; the whole thing seems very parochial and restricting to me and I feel several staff tend to hoard rather than share resources - that's the principle that seems to be 'moving me' in this" (Journal, 1.11.89).

I also try to improve or maintain aspects of school life on which I place high personal value. These aspects include helping to create a friendly staffroom atmosphere (Journal 21.3.90, 29.3.90 and 3.5.90), keeping the school tidy (Journal 11.10.89, 14.5.90) and maintaining harmonious relationships with, and between, members of staff (Journal 28.9.89, 29.9.89, and 22.11.89):

"Very relaxed chat with staff when I got back from banking the dinner money - it seemed almost an ideal staff meeting because it was informal and spontaneous. Thanked staff who'd helped towards Harvest and chatted with M.E. about my talk with G.C's dad. Said C.P. was doing a very good job as Spec.Needs Co-ordinator in telling M.E. about what we need to be doing next. Chatted with B.B. about how well he'd handled A.J's mum who'd seemed pleased to have sorted everything out with him. Delayed having dinner because it was going so well" (Journal, 6.10.89).

It seems clear that my emphasis during the year was largely on making physical improvements to the school. My detailed description of the school stockroom in September 1989 seems to confirm my own preoccupation in initiating these kinds of changes (Journal 13.9.89). They seem a substantial part of my daily personal work throughout the year (Journal 20.9.89; 28.9.89; 30.10.89 and 2.11.89). It is plausible that this preoccupation also reflects more persistent values, as part of what Nias terms the 'substantial self' (1989: 21). The reasons might also have stemmed from my return to the school, following a one-year secondment. My perception of the needs of the school was similar perhaps to that of newly appointed heads, although established heads also appear to

retain a close interest in the physical appearance of their school (Transcript 7: 016, Transcript 12: 058, Transcript 33: 040):

"...then I went off to see what had been happening with some bits of display work for a meeting we had this evening....so I went round to see what state the school was actually in... in terms of seeing whether displays had actually been done or it needed some emergency work.....or if it needed some last minute notices....and in the course of that I saw that most of the things that had been agreed to be done had in fact been done....and the rest were under way....and were going to be done during the course of the day.....there was some going on as you came in....by the main entrance there....I decided in the course of actually going around that it was rather plain in the hall at the moment....it was a bit bare....although there's quite a nice display at the front of the hall that the Nursery did....but there's nothing on the boards around the top of the hall....they're difficult to get at....you have to have ladders and lift things up and down.....and I thought it might be a nice proposition to have something up there....and I mentioned this to one member of staff who said 'Oh, yes...lots of things under way which can go up there.....and if that's not enough I've got another lot of stuff that can go up there' ...and that took me until about ten o'clock" (Transcript 22: 048).

My respondents appear to have different kinds of emphases in their personal work, different from my own aims in shaping the physical environment of the school. These emphases are less easy for me to establish, based only upon the interview evidence. There is 'prima facie' evidence that respondents' personal work may have purposes as varied as the creation of a shared vision with the staff (Transcript 37: 030-033), joy in children's learning (Transcript 36: 020), more effective communication with the staff (Transcript 31: 043-046), and a shared involvement with parents:

"There was a time when some of the.....if you like.....the

philosophies that I hold were thought to be a little less modern than they are today...I do feel that parents have had a raw deal with some schools in the past.....I see my role with parents....I always say....."We share the children with you".....you know.....and I think that that can be very exhilarating.....that we have a joint feeling for your child and if they've got some excitements in their life we share that.....or if they're being naughty that's a shared disappointment.....so it's important that our parents are given a positive role in the school...and that we listen to what parents feel...I don't always think that teachers by themselves could serve us with P.R. work towards parents... and if you have a family of your own...or the longer you are in teaching.....it's one of those things that comes with experience" (Transcript 13: 029).

Other heads seem to have a purpose of surviving (Transcript 34: 040) or coping (Transcript 21: 006-02). I refer again in my subsequent arguments, in Chapter 6, to both notions as investigated by Hargreaves (1984), Woods (1980) and Pollard (1985).

Heads seem intolerant of interference in shaping the school. Respondents tend to resent what they see as any unwarranted intrusion by governors (Transcript 13: 031) or from L.E.A. officers (Transcript 30:014). Headteachers may also impose their decisions upon staff, even if staff consensus seems to contradict the head's own view of the school (Transcript 37: 036):

"...but now everybody's encouraged to be this collegiate approach....which is all very well but I have reservations about it because I think that I'm reasonably democratic but I do feel that you're unlikely to find unanimity amongst nine or ten people.....so in the end someone has to say well I've listened to all these arguments and I'll take these on board but I really do feel in the end that this is the way that we are going to go....so I don't go all the way down the line on this collegiate approach because I think you can end up with a mish-mash pleasing nobody" (Transcript 16: 012).

Heads seem to avoid however an overt autocracy in their open dealings and discussion with staff. Manipulation of staff views outside of formal meetings appears common (Transcripts 39: 016-020; Transcript 5: 002). Respondents may accept a staff consensus on some matters, although only as a tactical concession upon "little issues" (Transcript 35: 039-047).

Paisey and Paisey (1987) suggest that heads "orchestrate the values and objectives present in the hearts and minds of head and staff" (1987:13). The sense of orchestration seems apposite, although my evidence indicates that heads tend to promote their own views in shaping the school. These values and purposes may still contribute towards educational aims, as pointed out by Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989: 181).

In examining accounts of these headteachers, there seems one constant feature of heads' personal work, as the time heads choose to spend with children.

iii) WORKING WITH CHILDREN

Respondents without exception **choose** to spend part of their time with children. This work is voluntary, rather than a matter of obligation, and seems personal rather than school-related work.

Heads at all career stages choose to spend time in this way.

Many respondents prefer working with children rather than on school-related work, such as dealing with paper (Transcript 33: 014):

".....and apart from that I do bits and pieces of games and P.E....but that in a way is an excuse one could argue..... because I don't like lots of paperwork and things like that ....I don't like sitting in my office thinking....drawing up great big schemes of work.....I much prefer contact with the children...." (Transcript 13: 043)

The voluntary nature of such work is revealed in other ways too. Several heads describe how they may use unanticipated opportunities to be involved in the work of a class:

"....and the infant children were wanting to involve someone from the community in their work.....and so I actually took the grandmother and introduced her to the reception teacher and we were getting her involved in that side of things.... so in that respect I felt positive...and a 'plus' for me..." (Transcript 33: 046).

For newly appointed heads, there seems a deep-rooted dilemma in reconciling their preference in working with the children with the demands of school-related work (Transcript 9: 044):

"I don't think I had any illusions....but I'm very concerned that I am going to have as much time with the children as I would like...I really wanted to be in the classrooms working alongside the children...to be a teaching head....I have got to look at my role as a headteacher and get the balance right...and I know that at the moment I haven't got it right .....I've timetabled myself during the week to take music throughout the school...because it's one of my interests.... and the music was a chance to get to all the children once a week.....but even that is almost impossible.....to keep a definite timetable" (Transcript 5: 024).

This particular 'quandary' (Nias, 1989: 196), or 'dilemma',

(Berlak and Berlak 1981) appears constant, since it seems present at other caeer points too. An effect of the dilemma may be that heads need to justify time they choose to spend with the children. The time is rationalised in a number of ways. Respondents explain that it is necessary, rather than voluntary, in order to maintain credibility (Transcript 38: 038) or to support members of staff (Transcript 35: 051):

"I felt that I ought to be responsible for some sort of appraisal of the staff and I ought to be in the classroom working with the staff....now, that's not revolutionary but it was quite a shock for some of the staff....I still do some class teaching....but it seemed a good idea to go in and work with staff so now I spend half a morning in each class group and I usually work with a small group of children.....perhaps a group with special needs or if it's a junior class I go round and do a bit of teaching or help with individual children with Maths work....that way I get to know the children and I can also talk to the staff about any problems they are having or about children having difficulties and iron out any problems in discussions afterwards...and it's immediately easier to talk to teachers ....and much easier for a class teacher to come round and say 'Look, I'm having problems'" (Transcripts 9: 018).

Other heads explain that they are being an exemplar to staff members (Transcript 10: 024) or keeping in touch with the classroom (Transcript 35: 53) or understanding the needs of class teachers:

"Yes, because if I'm to be effective in terms of leadership so far as the staff is concerned then I need to have knowledge about what's going on.....what children are about and what their needs are....and how this particular school population are shaping....and what the particular problems are....I'm not long out of the classroom so I still have almost a common bond with the staff because they know I've been there recently but if I don't maintain that involvement ...I wouldn't say my credibility goes...but my effectiveness in understanding what problems they are experiencing is going to be lessened....and I actually have got a day.....an

afternoon a week assigned to staff so that they can be released for a session for co-ordinator work.....it's very difficult to do it.....but unless I do keep that balance then I feel I can't be effective in understanding what their needs are.....and support them in the developmental aspect" (Transcript 38: 028).

Choosing to work with children appears nevertheless to serve personal purposes. The enjoyment of teaching children seems never far below the surface of respondents' stated reasons:

"The main reason is that the teacher is having real problems .....and this is coming back via the parents.....and we've looked at input and what we can do to resolve it.....and there's already help there.....a welfare and a five tenths teacher....but I felt the best help was non-contact time so that was the main reason....and I'm enjoying doing that.... so I've started to do something I really want to do...which is to work with the children" (Transcript 35: 051).

I examine the satisfactions of working with the children, in my analysis in chapter 5. In the following sections of the present chapter, I turn to my third perspective relating to the nature of primary headship.

c) CHARACTERISTICS OF DAY-TO-DAY HEADSHIP

In this perspective, I use the evidence available to me to consider what heads spend their time doing in their day-to-day work. My emphasis in these sections is on what heads do, including both personal and school-related aspects of daily headship. I examine those features that seem typical or characteristic about the day-to-day tasks of headship. In analysing my data from the journal and interviews with

heads, there seem three features which are constant in daily headship. I identify these as being information-processing, decision-making and planning. I begin by showing evidence of information-processing in the day-to-day work of primary headteachers.

a) INFORMATION-PROCESSING

Much of respondents' time in day-to-day headship is spent in a constant process of gaining, sifting, assimilating, using, interpreting, transmitting and recalling information. The context of primary headship is deeply immersed in messages and meanings. McLaughlin et al. (1990) describe a similar context in teaching, a context which they suggest permeates work-life and 'shapes the nature and meaning of work' (1990: 8). Headteachers seem at the epicentre of an extensive information-processing network in schools, of which dealing with the mail is only a small part. Information is conveyed in different forms, including orally and non-verbally to and from other people. Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989) also observe that tone of communication is often significant in the culture of schools, for example, in heads expressing disapproval by humour (1989: 156).

In the following sections, I examine two central features of information-processing in day-to-day headship. Firstly, I consider the gathering of information in day-to-day work and

then secondly, I consider the daily process of dealing with information.

GATHERING INFORMATION

Headship involves gathering 'intelligence' (Day, Johnson and Whitaker 1985). Lieberman and Miller (1984) suggest that heads need information as omnniscient overseers, in order to know "everything that is happening in the building all the time" (1984: p.71). Gathering information by heads seems a plausible reason for what Peters and Austin (1985) describe as "management by walking about" (1985: 123). This process seems mainly one of feeling the school's pulse, or what Nias Southworth and Yeomans (1989) suggest is sensing "moods and feelings" and learning "more about their schools" (1989: 209).

My evidence suggests that gathering information may have two broad purposes or functions. One is to gain information on people as individuals and the other is to gather information about people as a group, including the school as community.

Entries in the journal indicate that I gather information on individual people. This is sometimes to monitor or to assess their performance (Journal, 16.11.89, 10.1.90, 15.11.89). I also try to gain information **from** others as a means to gauge reactions, share views and 'gather support' (Wallace, 1992: 156) before implementing decisions. The process may involve

parents (Journal 18.10.89), governors (Journal 11.10.89), or LEA officers (Journal, 2.10.89). Some respondents refer to their use of headteacher colleagues for a purpose of sharing difficulties (Transcript 5: 062; Transcript 10: 018):

"I was head of the district primary heads....the local group ...and most of those meetings were held here...and they were one of the things I really look forward to....because many of those heads were appointed at roughly the same time as I was...we kept in touch...and we bounced ideas.....and I find it keeps you going.....it makes you realise what is possible ....you know, sometimes you do despair.....and sometimes you feel you can't cope with it" (Transcript 3: 068).

Heads may also seek information from individual members of staff as a point of reference before taking decisions, or to share problems. This can involve the Deputy Head, but not always (Transcript 3: 064). The process may even extend to myself as a visiting researcher (Transcript 5: 046-048).

An analytic memo on entries in the journal indicates that I seek out information about people as a group, including the school as a community:

"Particular events, for example, may cause me to seek out the atmosphere of the school or staffroom (Journal 1.12.89). The 'atmosphere' of the school is also routinely monitored (cf. Journal 17.1.90 "trouble brewing"), and action is taken when 'the quiet working atmosphere' is disturbed (Journal 15.11.89). Other events seem to disturb my ideal view of what the staffroom atmosphere ought to be (Journal 24.1.90 'mail order catalogues'). Staff meetings on Mondays are also used as reference-point, although in a more formalised way (Journal 27.11.89)" (Research Diary, 20.2.90).

The notion of school atmosphere is difficult to analyse, but

journal entries indicate noise levels, and responsiveness of others, seem part of my judgements (Journal entries 12.9.89; 21.9.89; 20.10.89). The staffroom seems an important point of contact for me, sometimes to monitor staff conversations as a means to gauge staff morale (Journal 25.9.89). Other entries refer to the monitoring of groups of children or the ancillary staff:

"I have a kind of checking or assessing role towards others. This includes the routine checking of the playground at the beginning of each day and, finally, the children leaving at the end of school (Journal 16.1.90). In neither case does my role seem simply supervisory in nature, but rather it appears to fulfil a need to monitor others, or to 'sniff the air'. Other entries refer to monitoring of ancillary staff at lunchtimes (Journal 13.10.89)" (Research Diary, 20.2.90).

The above evidence appears consistent with findings of Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989), who observe that heads gather information "to monitor the culture" (1989: 209). Nias, Southworth and Campbell (1992) also indicate the extent that heads influence others by means of these informal encounters (1992: 122).

Several purposes in day-to-day headship might be served by a single event. As indicated earlier, the daily routine of greeting staff in the morning seems expressive in purpose, but its main function may be to gain information about staff absence (Transcript 22: 038). It seems likely that several overlapping purposes are fulfilled by particular encounters, as indicated in the following extract:

"Teachers arrived and I made sure that I had seen every one

of them....and said hello...and passed general niceties.... couldn't care a jot.....but the element of conviviality is important...it's a human perspective that I think you've got to have...it's small talk...nothing more...but I think it's my role to find them....and also to inform them that the welfare lady wasn't coming in" (Transcript 21: 018-020).

Journal entries confirm that gathering information is often incidental to, and co-incidental with, other day-to-day work of headteachers. As an illustration, the time spent by me in supervising children, is used for the additional purpose of information-gathering from individual parents (Journal, 13.3.90) or from particular children (Journal, 31.1.90).

Heads gather information constantly in day-to-day headship, often coincidentally with other work. Gathering information also raises questions about how heads deal with information. I consider this aspect in the following section.

DEALING WITH INFORMATION

Heads sift information each day (Journal 12.9.89). In the one-year journal, the surrounding school environment seems a main source of sensory information to me (Research Diary JN7 29.10.89). Sounds, sights and even smells may prompt me to undertake particular tasks (Journal 9.10.89, 30.10.89).

Heads seem to deal with a constant flow of information which must be translated, interpreted and sequenced in some way. Heads make extensive use of lists, written and mental, as a

means of controlling the flow of information. My methods for doing this are extensively recorded within the one-year journal. As a short-term measure in the press of events, some tasks are designated as being 'on-fingers', needing to be undertaken imminently (Journal 9.9.89, 14.9.89, 22.9.89). These are tasks where my location in the school means I have no opportunity to write them on paper (Journal 15.9.89).

The process of sifting through information and deciding what tasks to undertake is described in detail in the journal:

"I seem to work mostly from the 'Now' list each day plus jobs to do 'on fingers' and also tasks on a kind of 'medium-term' list I have. The 'Now' list is not completely dealt with each day - some are - and continues into the next day. I probably gauge whether I'm winning or losing by length of 'Now' list - although because it's a 'rolling' list it's not creating particular anxieties since it probably stays around the same length. I have three lists - a 'Now' list, a 'Medium-Term' list and a 'Plumbing' list, as well as a 'Pending' file - today I also have assembly notes, some National Curriculum bits and pieces in the in-tray....all from the recent post delivery" (Journal 22.9.89).

The working-lists of respondents indicate that most items on heads' lists are concerned with school work, rather than personal work. These items are often "the things which just happen and they're not really my list but things forced upon me" (Transcript 31: 002). Working lists are used by heads to sift information, to review what they did during the day, to record what they didn't do, and to make a note to try and do it another time. The process is illustrated in detail in this longer extract:

"At the end of most days now I write a list of all the things that have cropped up during the day that I haven't actually managed to get to....and the things I feel I should actually be coping with....but that's just a memory thing so I don't forget anything.....sometimes I transfer them to another list...and sometimes I actually achieve something on those lists...a lot of the things on the lists actually concern people...but I mustn't forget so I write them down .....I look at them occasionally but I don't always do anything....I mean sometimes I come in and something really important crops up and so I do that...I look through it.... and say have I forgotten anything important....like a piece of information I need to pass on to a teacher concerning either a parent or a child...shall we have a look?..[FETCHES LIST]...it's things that are...well, I'll tell you what's on my list...'school prospectus'...that's long-term...I've also got a note about a child who had a head bump that was quite serious.....now, things like that there are some that are long-term....some are short-term...things that are important I write down" (Transcript 33: 016-030).

Dealing with information seems constant in the work of heads as an activity reflected in a widespread practice of keeping lists. Information is sifted and heads act upon some of the information by consigning it to a list. Lists are used as an 'aide-memoire' or as an intention to undertake a specific task. Pressure of events often prevents heads in achieving progress on their selected tasks and, from this viewpoint, working-lists of respondents mark the daily passage of work that is unfulfilled.

b) MAKING DECISIONS

Headteachers make decisions constantly during the day. In the course of it, heads may decide to phone a colleague, to write some notes, refer to some files, read a letter from a parent, sort the mail, make time to talk to a staff member, include something on a list of repairs, draft a letter to

to parents, make a phone call to a colleague or to visit the kitchen while en route elsewhere. Each of these activities involves making decisions of one kind or another. Lieberman and Miller (1984) observe that headteachers are constantly making instantaneous decisions, often in order to prevent "small brush fires from becoming conflagrations" (1984: 74).

The journal illustrates the variety of decisions made every day in the work of headteachers. Decisions may relate to school organisation (Journal 7.9.89, 29.9.89), the work of others (Journal 17.1.90, 24.1.90) or the welfare of children (Journal 3.10.89, 17.10.89). Most decisions seem minor and involve day-to-day running of the school (Journal 18.9.89, 30.10.89). Decisions also vary in importance and effects, for others and for the school (Journal 22.11.89, 3.7.90). Some important decisions such as disciplinary action against a member of staff (29.6.90), school amalgamation (15.3.90) and transfer of the sexually abused child (2.3.90) are taken against a background of interruptions and trivial decisions.

Making decisions involves judgements on priorities (Research Diary JN8, 20.2.90). There seem two central priorities in heads' decision-making, one of deciding how to spend time, and the other of selecting between different alternatives in making decisions. The first is a response to the question: 'Why do this task and not that task?'. The second offers a response to the question: 'Why make this particular decision

rather than another?'. I describe the first as being a time priority, and the second as a matter of decision-priorities. As illustration of this differentiation, a decision to sort the mail seems a matter of time-priorities, but decisions on what to keep or discard in the mail are matters of decision-priorities. In the following journal entry, there seem to be examples of both kinds of decision-making:

"Went to playground and heard a long catalogue of complaints from dinner ladies about G.B. (4th yr) swallowing ear-ring, about 3rd year boys kicking ball into hut compound & being 'abusive' when told they couldn't get it; about E.L. (3rd yr) getting muddy & being teased, and B.H. (4th yr) for answering back when dinner lady said she sympathised with his mother. Don't particularly want to spend all afternoon on this - decided to see G.B. and B.H. as the priorities and leave the others. Gave advice to B.H. about playing with younger ch'n & answering back. Talked to G.B. & told her I'd be contacting home - did so, and mother seemed fine" (Journal, 30.11.89).

Decisions on time-priorities seem to confront heads each day with constant difficulties. Paisey and Paisey (1987) argue that primary heads can be typified according to various ways of managing time. Heads are categorised by the authors as being hyperactive, reactive, proactive or inactive (1987: 142). These categories have no empirical basis but reflect a broad acceptance that lack of time is endemic in headship. A decision to spend time in one way means a neglect of other work:

"One of the problems of course is that I can't be with a teacher if I've got some work to do in the office...and I've been re-organising the office to give me more time to work in the classroom with teachers.....I mean sorting out the

office...it means spending more time than is spent in the classroom at the moment" (Transcript 07: 020).

Respondents seem under continuous pressure from the demands of time, unable to square the circle of insufficient time to do all things:

"I mean.....I can't discount or push aside all the other aspects of the job which are necessary....the managerial and administrative aspects which have to go on.....because if I ignore them then I have a big problem...but I have to assess where to slot them in and how much precedence I give them over other aspects of my day....I mean, you're talking about ...as far as the 'relationships' aspect is concerned.....to some extent you've got a finite period in the day, haven't you, where that's important...and it's from nine o'clock.... I mean, slightly before for staffing but the biggest drain on myself as a communicator comes from nine o'clock.....when parents may well want to see me.....to half past three when parents aren't in school.....so I have to then look at that day and decide when is best to slot in the other things necessary for running a school...." (Transcript 39: 010).

The problem of insufficient time seems accentuated by the underlying anomaly between school-related and personal work. Respondents seem to be trying to balance time spent on two kinds of headship, one of school work and the other of personal work. This 'dilemma' (Berlak and Berlak, 1981) seems pervasive and deep-rooted. Paisey and Paisey (1987), in similar terms, point to the constant awareness by heads "of incongruence between what they ought to be doing and what they do" (1987: 134). Dominelli (1991) and Olson and Eaton (1987) also indicate there are intrinsic 'ambiguities' in teaching between 'instrumental' and 'expressive' aspects of the work (Olson and Eaton, 1987: 193). My own argument

is that a sense of contradiction and anomaly exists in day-to-day headship between school work and personal work.

In trying to resolve this central dilemma, heads seem to be influenced more by a sense of obligation than of preference. In decisions about time-priorities, heads believe the over-riding need is that "the school has to function efficiently as a school" (Transcript 21: 028). The path of headteachers' personal work becomes littered with good intentions:

"It looked perfect.....and in fact I'd said to the children yesterday that I'd be in class this period coming round to look at their work...because I want to link up with the work in the class more.....but I'd been away and hadn't been able to see it...yesterday I couldn't because I'd got J.D. in tow ...a short affair...and so I said I'll come back tomorrow" (Transcript 36: 037).

"....and there were also some things that I had to do....at half past one I'd arranged to see a parent....it was one of those where having got the parent to come into school I didn't want to say I can't see you....and the only thing I can do in that situation....I just have to say three of you go to that class, three of you to that class and just spread them around the school...." (Transcript 32: 034)

Heads appear beleaguered by decisions about time-priorities and in constantly making decisions which seem to contradict or cut across other work. Time is a situational constraint in headship, part of what Woods (1990) observes in teaching as "constraints that delimit a teacher's field of activity" (1990: 123). Time also delimits choice for heads but their decisions on their field of activity seem to be swayed more by obligation than by personal preferences. In the process

of 'coping' (Pollard 1985), decisions made by these heads on time seem invariably tactical and not "creative or strategic adaptations" (1985: 4).

In my final comments on characteristics of daily headship, I examine day-to-day planning in the work of headteachers.

c) MAKING PLANS

As suggested in my earlier review of literature on headship, many commentators emphasize a need in headship for effective planning (Everard and Morris, 1985; Hoyle, 1986; Hoyle 1986; Harvey, 1986; Reid et al. 1987; Briault and West, 1990; Mortimore and Mortimore 1991, Sallis 1992, Esp 1993 and West 1993). Day-to-day planning of heads seems less 'proactive' (Paisey and Paisey, 1987: 142), less linear and more related to situational context, than acknowledged in these kinds of commentaries.

Heads seem to plan mostly one day at a time. Much of this planning was shown earlier as taking place at odd moments in the day, often in fragments of time at home (Transcript 22: 026; Transcript 30: 002-006):

"Early this morning I was thinking very much about the tensions....healthy tensions....in our staff meeting last night....so I was thinking about those tensions....and thinking how I could utilise them more this week because... to galvanise one or two....who take less than their full share in all that's going on perhaps...out-of-class commitment I mean.....I was trying to think my way through all that....and thinking of possible ways of using the

actual groupings for better effect and swapping them round ....was that a good idea....or was it better to leave them as they were to work through some of the difficulties....the choice being mine because there were lots of logical reasons for changing it but I could see other sides.....so I was thinking about that....so I was doing that as I was driving along as well" (Transcript 36: 059).

This kind of planning ahead, combined with reflections upon events, is also described earlier as part of my respondents' preoccupation with headship. The one-year journal suggests that my own plans tend to be short-term in nature, usually in preparation for the day ahead (Journal, 12.3.90; 4.7.90; 6.7.90). Other heads make similar preparations, including where to park (Transcript 30: 28) and what to wear:

"What I do.....the night before.....I've got into this habit now.....I look in the diary because I want to know what's going on.....that's a start.....the reason is because I need to know what clothes I'm going to wear....if I'm teaching I don't come in this...it's a bit pathetic to come in this and get clay on my suit...while on a day like yesterday....when the area adviser came...I'll come in a suit or something.... if I've got new parents coming I'll wear my new parents' outfit which is all sunny and bright...you know exactly what I mean....so I look in the diary to see what's coming up the next day" (Transcript 36: 031).

Planning seems more logistical than creative and takes place out of school rather than during the day. Planning during the school day is usually a matter of anticipating what is about to take place:

"Say, for instance, I have to make a phone call to Social Services but....before I make that phone call...what I'll do is think now what are we going to be talking about.....and assess what the conversation might be.....I may know that it might be about certain children so I'll think about what I need to get available....you attune yourself to what you are about to get on with" (Transcript 39: 028)

Heads seem involved in a dilemma of attempting to plan ahead for what is endemically 'unpredictable' (Doyle 1986: 123). A planned agenda of only a few tasks may still be subject to what can occur unexpectedly during the day (Transcript 38: 002- 010). The here-and-now of day-to-day headship seems to negate much of what is planned in advance:

"Things are often pushed out of line because of needing to handle it straight away...most occasions when I'm taken from the plan I might have had it's almost always things to do with handling staffing problems or things that crop up as a result of people being away...things like that...or handling incidents that have happened to do with parents or perhaps a child needing to be taken home" (Transcript 38: 010).

The difficulty for heads is in planning ahead for daily work that is inconsistent, discontinuous and unplannable. Plans formulated are constantly modified by events. What is not achieved is consigned to another day, and to another list:

"We talk about planning our day but it's a waste of time planning the day...because you've no idea what's in front of you.....you can come with certain ideas that today I'll do this and this...and say I'll pay all the bills in the General Account today....but it never pans out like that.... I've always got a list and you just keep chipping away at it ....things gradually get to the top of the list and they get done...some things have to be done....some things have to be done spot on.....immediately.....because they demand it" (Transcript 32: 012-014).

The comments of this respondent summarise much of the daily realities of primary headship. Headship seems a practical response by heads to what Elbaz (1983) terms the "milieu" or situational context of the everyday world of teachers (1983: 14). Headship seems to be a world that is closely "oriented

to situations" (ibid: 15). The phenomenon of daily headship appears characterised by qualities of here-and-now immediacy fragmentation and discontinuity. Headship seems a matter of balancing immediate pressures and contingent demands. It is tactical not strategic, reactive not proactive, constraining not liberating, practical not intellectual, opportunistic not linear, expedient not rational. Headteachers ought to be visionary leaders but often seem moved by practicalities and immediate events, ought to be innovators but cope daily with instantaneous realities, should plan long-term but only tend to anticipate a day ahead, ought to "establish a marked and pervasive climate in the school consistent with the school's educational objectives" (Paisey and Paisey, 1987: 12) and to "face the challenges of new management tasks" (Mortimore and Mortimore 1991: 125) but often appear jongleurs of immediate concerns. The day-to-day work of primary headteachers seems a constant contradiction between what heads do and what they ought to do. In chapter 7, I discuss further a contradiction between what heads do and what others expect them to do. In the following chapter, I examine a pervasive theme within my data that daily headship also has an affective dimension.

CHAPTER 5: THE AFFECTIVE NATURE OF DAY-TO-DAY HEADSHIP

Within the ebb and flow of day-to-day headship, there is another dimension. In considering the dailiness of headteachers' work, it becomes clear that headship is deeply infused with feelings and emotions. The affective world of headship is intense and varied, characterised by hopes and frustrations, uncertainty and reassurance, irritations and deeper satisfactions. It is threaded through with moments of joy, but beset by inner conflicts of self-doubt, anxiety and hidden contradictions. These tensions permeate headteachers' work, accentuated by the centrality of the role and sustained by cultural norms of isolation (Nias et al. 1989: 59; Huberman, 1990: 11), individualism (Hargreaves 1980: 142) and the ethic of privacy (Lieberman and Miller 1984; Little 1989). Headteachers have joys to share and to celebrate publicly, but they suffer anguishes alone. The affective world of headteachers is complex and precarious, providing evidence that headship - like teaching - is always an "uncertain affair" (Lortie 1975: 133).

LITERATURE ON AFFECTIVITY IN HEADSHIP

Despite the embeddedness of feelings and emotions within headship, there is a surprising reticence on the subject in the literature. There may be underlying reasons for this

neglect. A persistent supposition in the literature is that headship and education consist mainly of linear, sequential, ordered, logical and malleable procedures. This form of rationalism underpins many commentaries which emphasize the managerial and organisational aspects of headship, such as those by Paisey (1984), Bush (1986), Coulson (1986), Hoyle (1986), Day, Johnston and Whitaker (1986), Craig (1987), Mortimore and Mortimore (1991) and Bolam and others (1993). Paisey, (1987), as an example of this corpus, advises heads to impose some order on the fine detail of school life, and thereby avoid "muddle, ineffectiveness and probable ill-health" (1987: 8). This rationalism also provides the framework for prescriptions designed to improve headship skills, such as those offered by Everard and Morris (1985), Esp (1993), Whitaker (1993), Sallis (1993) and Murgatroyd and Morgan (1993). Various government-sponsored publications add to the growing volume of advice designed to improve effectiveness in headship, as part of current moves towards efficient planning and staff deployment (DES 1990: 7), improving morale (HMSO 1991: 38) and to ensure an enhanced quality of educational provision (DES 1992: 46).

Perhaps predictably, these perspectives tend to ignore the affective dimension in headship. The assumptions that lie beneath the tautologies of rationalism have been criticised by a number of writers, including Hargreaves (1980), Fullan (1982), Olson and Eaton (1987), Nias (1988), McLaughlin,

Talbert and Bascia (1990) and by Huberman (1990). Schon has been influential, in condemning an emphasis on "technical rationality" (1983: 123), while Olson and Eaton criticise attempts to control practice by scientific methods (1987: 179). McLaughlin et al. summarise a central criticism, in suggesting that everyday complexities "are funnelled through researchers' lenses and problem frameworks and may not represent realities as they are experienced" (1990: 6). Lortie's warning is still apposite that "efforts at rationalization can dissolve into faddism and panacean thinking" (1975: viii).

Other research studies focus narrowly upon the causes and treatment of occupational stress. This feature of the occupation is examined in relation to gender and age (Halpin et al. 1985; Burke and Greenglass 1989), personality (Caplan and Jones 1975; Hughes et al. 1987), the effects of school variables (Hubert et al. 1983); communication (Roth 1990), role conflict (Caplan and Jones 1975, Schwab and Iwanicki 1982) and motivation (Anderson and Iwanicki 1984). Blase (1986) has also examined the relationship between stress and performance in teaching. Blase's study is unusual in being a qualitative investigation of stress, whereas the other studies cited above are mostly examples of correlational research. Many of these studies are North American in origin and rely extensively on survey findings, using questionnaires such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Numerous commentaries exist that provide advice on ways of coping with occupational stress, such as those provided by Heller (1983), Murgatroyd (1986), Gray and Freeman (1988) and Gold and Roth (1993). The Education Service Advisory Committee (1990) offers a guide for teachers and heads on ways to cope with stress, in order to "resolve or change the stressful situation" (1990: 20). There is an emphasis in this strand of the literature on the pathology and treatment of stress.

In research on headship, the affective dimension is largely neglected. Studies by Vincent (1985), Manasse (1985) and by Hall, Mackay and Morgan (1986) describe a daily reality of fragmentation, intensity and discontinuity, but tend not to identify feelings that might be embedded in such a work-context. Other writers point to dissatisfactions in day-to-day headship, but attribute these to deficiencies in headteachers' conceptions of leadership processes (Broome 1984) or in heads' use of inappropriate management styles (Clerkin 1985). Gray and Freeman (1988), as an example of this literature, advise heads to avoid "the occupational obsession of niggling over small and trivial issues instead of broad concerns" (1988: 41).

Several studies and reports examine stress in headship. In this country, recent reports by Jenkins (1989), Kelly (1989) and Dunham (1992) indicate high levels of dissatisfaction

among headteachers, in which work overload, staff and adult problems, inadequate resources and feeling undervalued, are cited as main causes. Jenkins (1989) provides a detailed analysis to substantiate his claim of increasing pressures on headteachers (1989: 3-27). These findings are supported in a survey conducted by Sutcliffe (1989) who reports on the increasing numbers of unfilled vacancies for headships. A survey commissioned by the NAHT, undertaken by the NFER (1989), also indicates there are increasing difficulties in the recruitment and retention of headteachers.

Research literature on stress may provide useful evidence of its incidence within a caring profession (Schonfeld 1990; Gold and Roth 1993). Such studies provide evidence that teaching and headship are emotionally stressful jobs. This evidence is not disputed in my present argument, although my purpose is a different one in suggesting that the day-to-day work of primary headteachers has an affective component. I discuss further the notion of stress in my examination of issues in chapter 7.

A productive strand in the literature examines the way that headship has an effect, and sometimes a responsibility, in influencing the feelings and conceptions of others. Wagner's study, as an example of this strand, indicates that 'knots' in teachers' thinking centre around unsuccessful attempts to resolve dilemmas (1987: 161). In analysing interview data,

Wagner found that the central causes of these dilemmas were 'colleagues' (81%) and the 'principal' (81%). There seem obvious dangers in using percentages in this way, but Wagner's work reminds us that daily headship has an effect on the perceptions and feelings of others. Lieberman and Miller (1984) also observe the extent that headteachers "set the tone for tension, warmth, openness, fear" (1984: 27). These comments echo those of Handy (1985), Hughes (1985) Southworth (1987) and Nias (1989) on positive and negative aspects of the leadership model projected by headteachers. Nias points to the particular importance of headteachers in creating "an atmosphere in which teachers could relax, find mutual support and prepare themselves emotionally for the next encounter with children" (1989: 148). Mortimore and Mortimore (1988) also suggest that sensitivity of leadership is fundamental in the creation of 'a community of interest' (1988: 5).

The relevance of this affective influence on others has been examined further in a number of studies that use participant observation methods. Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989), as example, suggest that headship in collaborative cultures involves sensitivity by headteachers towards other staff, in sensing moods and feelings (1989: 209). The study indicates that tone of communication may be important, for example, in expressing commands by questions, or expressing disapproval with humour (ibid, 210). Lieberman and Miller also confirm that the relationship between principal and staff can "hang

together by various exchanges of conversation..... teachers may perceive the principal's body language as supportive or disparaging" (1984: 28). Huberman queries the effectiveness of this kind of oblique influence (1990: 20), although his objections may overlook the unique influence of headteachers in the culture of British schools. The studies by Pollard (1985), Hammersley (1984) and Hargreaves and Woods (1984) show evidence of the head's influence on the culture of the staffroom. Pollard's study of staffroom talk (1985) offers particular evidence that headship has emotional effects upon others, in this case as a perceived threat to the autonomy of teachers (1985: 27). These studies reveal that headship is work that has emotional effects upon the feelings and perceptions of other people. They seem important to record, in order to emphasise that schools in general are workplaces that have an affective dimension, although my own arguments lie more specifically with day-to-day headship.

Connell (1985) appears nearer to the spirit of the present argument, in suggesting that for a teacher in the classroom "emotional relationships are her work and managing them is a large part of her labour process" (1985: 117). His argument also seems relevant for headteachers' work, although this is neglected in studies of headship. Studies of emotions in teaching are sparse, but begin to offer insights and routes forward. I refer to these studies at appropriate points in this chapter, since they contain important insights not

confined to teaching. I begin my own analysis by examining feelings in headship which relate to time and seasons.

FEELINGS IN RELATION TO TIME AND SEASONS:

Many feelings in headship seem rooted in seasonal cycles and in the arrangements marking the passage of the school year. Feelings can be as changeable as the weather, rainy days from sunny days, Spring-time from mid-Winter. Lieberman and Miller also note the temporal rhythms of schools and the patterns which mark the passage of the school year. They conclude that "there is a periodicity of life in schools" (1984: 72). Many feelings in headship relate closely to the passage of time, in the same way that time-of-day and time-of-week has a significance in teaching (Brown and McIntyre 1993: 73-74).

The one-year journal of my own headship provides evidence of temporal feelings and moods. Mornings are different from the end of the day, early term from late term, Mondays from Fridays. The first few weeks of the Autumn term seem to radiate with feelings of renewed purpose, positive energies and new beginnings (Journal 13.9.89), slowly evaporating as the days progress (Journal: 28.9.89):

"I'm beginning to feel a little overwhelmed and perhaps I'm starting off too many things. There seem various management implications in this and I can't sort out or analyse what's going on. It seems a very positive and a very fulfilling return to school and I feel particularly productive at present. Lots and lots of ideas buzzing around and I feel

that I am chasing things down (i.e. communicating well with people and involving them). It's a good feeling and school seems to be providing the right kind of environment for me. It seems good for the school and good for me. I also sense (without rancour) that I'm juggling with half a dozen things at once" (Journal 14.9.89).

July is the end of the school year. Entries in the journal record expended effort and flagging mind, of asking ruefully "if I'm just tired or whether people are just disorganised?" (Journal: 18.7.90). It is a time of year, we are reminded, that also confronts us with the emotional experience of loss (Salzberger-Wittenberg, et al. 1983: 139).

Particular days of the week seem coloured by different feelings. Fridays may be a day to avoid new work:

"Suspect that Fridays are slightly different days for me in that I may have different objectives - clearing, sorting and so on in preparation for the weekend. I seem anxious not to have too many thoughts pre-occupying me as I start the weekend" (Journal, 27.4.90).

There is irritation when tasks arrive unexpectedly on Friday (Journal, 10.11.89) and satisfaction when I complete tasks ahead of the weekend (Journal, 16.3.90). For my respondents, Fridays can be days of positive feelings:

"The highlight of my week is a sharing assembly on a Friday and all the children and staff are there and it's very informal.....and after assembly it's playtime so then the children can come and talk to me.....and that's wonderful" (Transcript 36: 016).

For other heads, Friday is rather a day to survive until the

sanctuary of the weekend:

"You see.....Friday is P.O.E.T.S. day.....[Push Off Early Tomorrow's Saturday].....I think the worst time of all is late-ish on Sunday evening.....I always find late Sunday evening depressing because it's the thought of Monday morning....Friday is the best time at about six o'clock....I go home and put my feet up, I light a cigar, I've probably poured myself a whiskey" (Transcript 32: 084-086).

Notwithstanding the feelings evoked by different days, each day in headship is unique and is uniquely experienced. Each day unwinds and becomes associated with a particular mood or feeling. Days are overwhelming, pre-occupying, disrupted, disorganised, frantic or draining (Journal entries, 14.9.89, 22.9.89, 26.9.89, 14.12.89, 17.11.89):

"This seemed a day taken up entirely by a possible transfer of the girl from Norwich - feel that I've unintentionally created a major problem. Feel I was probably right to delay making an immediate offer of a place but the EWO thinks it's because we haven't room in that class. Various emotions seem to be churning around - mainly of anxiety, apprehension and a sense of injustice that things have boomeranged so sharply - need to think this through as best I can this weekend, since I now seem very pre-occupied by all of this" (Journal, 2.3.90).

"This ended as a dispiriting day and words like 'stress' and 'pressure' come to mind. This was certainly a deflating day in which I come to mid-evening still feeling clogged up by some events of the day. I am sure this was a day that contrasted quite sharply from the sense of positive action and enthusiasm with which I have felt I was operating so far this term. The change began at the end of school from what I feel was my error in allowing the conversation with P.S. to drift into my own preoccupation with the plumbing. I will need to look at this later and try to disentangle why I felt a sense of 'setback' and 'overload' at the time and still now" (Journal, 20.9.89).

Other days feel positive, reassuring, unstressful, orderly,

bland, quiet, pleasant or placid (Journal entries: 12.2.90, 13.10.89, 30.1.90, 28.3.90, 4.1.90 and 29.3.90):

"This seemed a smooth-running and uncluttered day, with few pressures on me. There seemed a clear predominance of positive things at different points during the day - nice staffroom atmosphere, playground quiet, well-behaved children in assembly, caretaker and secretary all helping towards a 'grand clear-out', and so on - as well as a lack of negative aspects - parents complaining, discipline problems to sort out, unwieldy mail, plumbing leaks or whatever. Judge this to be one of the 'best' days this term (Journal, 13.10.89).

"This seemed a relatively unstressful day with few significant events. I felt able to move ahead on several items and I seemed unencumbered by tasks that I was having to react to - there were no discipline problems or repairs, for example, that needed to be dealt with. Such days seem enjoyable because of the absence of tangible pressures, although too many 'placid' days might be stifling" (Journal 26.1.90).

These entries indicate that the prevailing emotions in daily headship can also vary a great deal, even though some moods and feelings can be traced consistently to time and seasons. The entries also provide a contrast with the evidence gained from respondents' accounts, in which heads gave a consistent portrait of disruption, busyness and fragmentation in daily headship. I have already offered reasons to explain such differences in my data (pp.84-85).

In the following sections, I examine the affective world of primary headship in further detail. In analysing the data available to me, there seem differences in the emotions and feelings of headteachers towards school-related and personal work. I present evidence to substantiate this claim in two

parts, first by considering feelings of heads towards school work and second, their feelings towards their personal work. I argue specifically that such differences further emphasize the anomalies which I find between day-by-day school-related and personal work in primary headship. I begin by examining the feelings associated with heads' school work.

FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS OF SCHOOL-RELATED WORK

The evidence provided in chapter 4 may already indicate that heads' school-related work is embedded with feelings. Such tasks are necessary for the school to operate. The work can occupy much of the day and heads resent such interference in more 'appropriate' tasks (Transcript 33: 002 - 004). Heads feel that school work is inconsequential and trivial, but it is necessary in keeping "the show on the road" (Transcript 14: 033). As suggested earlier, respondents may often use metaphor in summarising their feelings about such work:

"We live a bit like these conjurors who keep plates spinning and occasionally the plates slow down and may fall off...." (Transcript 13: 013).

Unlike conjurers, as Lieberman and Miller (1984) point out, there is "no magic" in this aspect of primary headteachers' work (1984: 77). The pervasive feelings of heads towards these tasks are those of disgruntled resignation. It is work that heads feel obliged to do in response to demands made on them by events and by others. The feeling is substantially

one of an irksome 'noblesse oblige'.

Paper is a constant source of irritation. It is part of the housekeeping and clerical chores which Lieberman and Miller (1984) suggest are continual sources of "annoyance and pain" (1984: 74). Even experienced headteachers feel overwhelmed by paperwork and sifting through the mail:

"Sometimes with the paperwork I feel I'm overwhelmed.....but I think I'm getting a little bit better at knowing what to throw in the bin...I mean, I hate the word 'prioritise'....I loathe it....but I think I'm beginning to do it a bit better but I've a long way to go yet" (Transcript 3: 060).

Many feelings of irritation about the mail seem to stem from the contents of the mail itself, since it may often contain unwelcome messages from the outside world (Transcript 10: 018; Transcript 10: 018). Feelings of resentment towards the messages and the mail become synonymous (Transcript 1: 015-017; Transcript 12: 046). Dealing with the mail seems therefore to be resented because of the intrusiveness of the messages it brings to the school (Transcript 10: 006-012). There is also evidence to show that dealing efficiently with paperwork has little reward for headteachers, since it takes them away from what is their 'real' work:

"....and to some extent if you get a reputation for being an efficient head.....and this is an hypothesis....if someone might get the reputation of being an efficient head.... then there's the temptation to phone them up and think "He's efficient I'll ask him"....or "He'll sort it out for me"... there is the temptation in that to be inefficient....so that you can get on with the 'real' job.....so that you can set

your own timetable and your own agenda" (Transcript 10: 18).

Heads must also ensure that the school has sufficient staff to operate. Staff absences are a source of annoyance to heads. Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989) identify staff absences as one of several elements which may help to create "endemic potential for disequilibrium" (1989: 239). Staff absences create particular feelings of irritation for heads, especially when they have to act as a substitute for those absent. The work may also include covering for non-teaching as well as teaching staff. The head of a junior school describes his feelings at the start of the day:

"It meant I had to sort something out at school early and I actually had to do someone else's job.....for which I'm not paid.....but no-one else could do it....I'm the only one with another set of keys.....and the worst part comes later when I'll have to stay until half past six.....until the cleaners have gone" (Transcript 32: 004 - 008).

The head of a village primary school provides an account of his feelings in covering for the caretaker's absence and the late arrival of the secretary:

"It's a managerial thing to do....it's got to be done...all the outside toilets have got to be opened up because if they're not then you'll be busy teaching and someone comes and says why aren't they opened up.....so I knew that had to be done.....there were a series of phone calls that everyone has to deal with first thing in the morning...about certain people not arriving...one welfare lady not coming in...and the secretary was going to be late....it was purely functional.....it has to be done....there's nobody else to deal with them....the phone has to be answered....can't just leave it...very tempting to" (Transcript 22: 012-016).

The sense of enforced obligation echoes many similar entries in the one-year journal:

"Unlocked school in absence of caretaker; organised work-party of children to prepare dining room and arrange chairs; no secretary and no message - feel quite upset at what seems to be a 'cavalier' attendance by her. Shirley says she's going to the doctor's; feeling that I'm having to carry the school at the moment and this isn't entirely fair. Did the dinner numbers and registers in the secretary's absence. Shirley back from the doctor, he says she's just 'run down'. Organised two Year 6 children to give out milk cartons to classes. Distinct feeling of being 'put upon' because of staff absences. This may be because I feel that I'm having to do - or organise - all kinds of low-level tasks during these times....." (Journal, 13.12.89).

There are also other reasons for the feelings of irritation. Teaching a class of children at short notice may often mean inadequate preparation or using previously employed ideas with the children (Transcript 32: 058). A journal entry in December 1989 records my feelings at covering for absences and what I see as my unenthusiastic and uninspiring standard of teaching:

"The caretaker was absent as expected but there were also phone messages from M.E. (child's illness), C.P. (child's illness) and K.F. (stuck in fog on motorway while driving back from Lake District - and would be hour and a half late). Organised distribution of milk cartons by some older children - rather left them to get on with this. Asked secretary to phone P.S. and see if she could come in to teach class 1; she could. Brought children in from the playground and taught K.F's class (2nd years). Did the register and tried to remember a few names - asked children to read their books but found they didn't settle very well to this. Gave some arithmetic to whole class until playtime. Did bits of administration at playtime. Taught 2nd years again - a puzzle using 3's and symbols - didn't feel much enthusiasm for my teaching. Asked children to write about early Christmas memories - on the grounds that I could use some of these to read to parents. K.F. arrived 5 minutes before lunchtime" (Journal, 11.12.89).

Another reason for feelings of irritation seem to stem from an anticipation of the disruption that staff absences will cause. The disruption is not just to the school but is also a matter of having to alter personal plans:

"I feel frustrated because I haven't enough time for that... the MSA situation today means I don't get lunchtime to talk to staff and children...I do talk to children when I'm doing dinner duty but I can't listen to them" (Transcript 35: 016).

In an analysis of the journal entries made during the Autumn term 1989, I concluded that:

"....a greater depth of negative feelings may arise on those occasions when covering for absent staff (Journal 12.12.89, 13.12.89, 15.12.89, 19.12.89)" (Research Diary JN8 20.2.90).

Heads also deal with other school-related problems of one kind or another. Some problems may become crises, in that they involve a heightened sense of responsibility and more intensely felt emotions. Cortazzi (1991) examines crises in teaching, observing that particular 'disasters' can occur such as physical accidents, a lack of discipline or a lesson goes awry. Cortazzi concludes that "the enormous range of unexpected situations that primary teachers often face involve accidents, mistakes and unforeseen incidents...the stressful, dangerous and unpredictable aspects of teachers' work is apparent and often pose a challenge to the teacher's self-image" (1991: 100). Primary headteachers often face similar kinds of unexpected situations. During the span of data-collecting for the current research, several heads were

experiencing crises of one kind or another. One head was preoccupied by a hoax circular on drugs that she had sent in good faith to parents (Transcript 30: 006-024), another by severe problems caused by staff absences (Transcript 32: 001 -016, 034-036, 041 - 044) and one other in dealing with a threatening phone call to a child in the school (Transcript 36: 010, 059).

In the journal, I record details of a number of crises which I dealt with during the year, including a child who took a drug-overdose in the school (Journal, 7.11.89), an assault by a parent on a member of staff (Journal, 28.11.89) and a suicide attempt by the secretary (Journal 25.4.90). Each of these events seems to occupy my waking moments for many days (Journal 13.11.89, 29.11.89, 14.12.89) and into night-time dreams (Journal 7.12.89): My preoccupation is illustrated by a journal entry a week after the drug overdose incident:

"Feel preoccupied about G.B. all the time and school itself seems almost a threatening place to work in - I'm concerned about G.B. and her effect on the school, as well as my lack of understanding of suspension procedures if things should come to a head. Difficult to settle to anything and I feel sure that I'm functioning in a fairly stoney-faced manner in school. Looked through suspension procedures - they seem very technical and detailed - beginning to think I should have involved Chairman earlier. A woman has come into school wanting to book a stall for flea market - wants school to provide her with a clothes rail and also wants a particular position in the hall and extra room allocated for her stall - she wonders if it's been a bad day for me so she's probably picked up on my curtness in dealing with her requests. Talked with A.L. (chairman) - no mention of 'suspension' by him so that doesn't seem an option at the moment. Phoned A.S. (ed.psych.) who helped map out a few priorities: clear stipulations to parents, ease of contact

and possibility of suspension - felt better for having talked with her - went out to try and meet G.B's parents but missed them. I've spent only a minute during the day to see what ch'n in school were doing. Tried unsuccessfully to phone G.B's parents. I'm a little intrigued why I feel 'threatened' today in a way that didn't occur on the day of the incident with G.B. I'm annoyed that the parents didn't make contact and that meeting at social services didn't seem to get anywhere - probably I'm feeling a little isolated in this at a time when a 'hard' decision has to be made (suspend or not) - the messages from A.S. and A.L. seem to be that things have to be talked through with parents first - and I will probably accept that advice and do the best I can to involve parents. I seem to have been almost totally pre-occupied with thinking about how to manage all of this and it seems difficult to 'shake off' this pre-occupation" (Journal, 13.11.89).

The extract raises a number of points about the nature of crises. It seems clear that the crisis described above has emotional effects, in my feelings of uncertainty, anxiety and preoccupation. There is also evidence that these inner feelings have effects on my work, in the curtness towards a visitor and in the neglect of other children in the school. I seem to be particularly isolated and vulnerable in my role as headteacher at such times.

Other heads deal with crises. There seems the same sense of intensity, different in scale from the norm of dealing with other school-related problems. There are also emotions of acute anxiety experienced by these heads, a heightened sense of isolation in their role and feelings of preoccupation:

"And the other thing that I was turning over in my mind.... something currently going on....and that is that on Monday I've been summonsed to appear in court in an 'access' case for a child in this school.....along with a lot of other professionals....lots of other people....and the child is an enormous worry to us anyway....and being statemented.....and

now I've got the additional problem of a very bitter case going on between the original father and the mother over access to this child....and not being asked if I would appear in court.....just being summoned...it arrived by post .....with a cheque for expenses saying that in law if you've been summonsed and given your expenses.....then it's in pain of four hundred pounds if you don't turn up...I do feel anxious about that....and there are a lot of other people involved who ring me up and talk about it....because they're anxious themselves.....so all that's pretty uppermost" (Transcript 30: 024-028).

Crises are invariably unexpected and unique, in which heads feel acutely the obligations of their role. Crises create many anxieties for heads. There seems little to help heads in dealing with them, since heads must face situations alone for which they may lack any formal training or support. I refer again to the last statement in my discussion of issues arising from this study, in chapter 7.

FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS OF PERSONAL WORK

In my analysis in chapter 4 of headteachers' day-to-day work I suggested there were personal aspects in what heads try to do and prefer to do in day-to-day headship. I indicated that heads view their personal work as that of shaping the school. As an illustration of this personally-defined work, I referred to data in the journal to show that my own focus was on making physical improvements to the school. I also suggested that working with children was a consistent aspect of heads' personal work. In the following sections, I argue that personal work also has an affective dimension. I offer evidence in two parts. First, I examine the feelings and

emotions relating to my personal work in shaping the school. Second, I consider the affective component of heads' work with children. In both parts, I indicate that emotional tensions arise because of everyday conflicts between school work and personal work.

The one-year journal illustrates that my day-to-day work in shaping the school is often made piecemeal and fragmented by the day's events. Personal work can often become entangled from the outset with school tasks and with the obligation of keeping the school operating. The entanglement can create some tension, as evidenced in the following extract from the journal:

"8.30 a.m. Message that secretary is absent ill - feel annoyed because I'll have to do routine jobs for a chunk of the morning!

9.00 a.m. Assailed by dinner money, telephone, appointment slips, book club money, swimming money, etc. This is restricting and I can't get on with my own agenda. I would rather be thinking about the 'jobs list' I've made, or the research, or changing the office environment or prune some files, etc. It's restricting because I'm carrying bits of mental luggage all the time e.g. Peter needs change for the £1 coin he brought but I can only give it to him when he's finished P.E. in the Hall.

11.45 a.m. Sorted out accident in P.E. lesson instead - that precluded whatever I was going to do.

11.55 a.m. The school itself (physical) is a reference point for me - I relate at the moment to 'glory-holes', untidy areas as well as appealing areas and I'm seeing anew a need to organise, tidy, approve, etc. I'm aware that it's a big school and a small staff. How does this relate to my vision of the school - or is it personality that says "have a tidier school" - there certainly seems clutter everywhere whatever the origins for those thoughts.

12 noon. Lunchtime - went and praised the class teacher for making a teaching point to the class about the accident;

joked in staffroom about injuries to children (it helps atmosphere); seeded a few ideas (computers in use in everyclass, not just Year 4); gained grudging agreement of caretaker to do some tiling if I show him!

12.30 p.m. Called from staffroom to sort fight between two of the Year 5 girls - seems the families don't get on.

12.30 p.m. Saw Edward and gave him a badge for good behaviour (he didn't thump anyone today!)

1.15 p.m. Went to see how Year 6 children were getting on with their frieze; met them coming to the hall with it so spent ½-hour in putting up friezes up in the hall - visible and highly precarious work. Had to keep coming down to answer phone - whoever heard of running a school from the top of a ladder - must write to the Secretary of State and see if I've got something wrong here.

1.45 p.m. Talked with Maureen the welfare assistant who had volunteered to help tidy up somewhere - bless her. Got involved in a 10-minute spell of influencing, prompting, seeding, charming her and the part-time Art teacher on a plan that's just come to mind on tidying the stock room and Art rooms as perennial glory-holes. This seems part of my vision of the school - or rather the clutter isn't!

2.30 p.m. Still relaying lots of phone messages; tried to type letter to firm about school sweatshirts - think they'll be great as a sort of low-key school uniform

4.00 p.m. Fed up with typing and being telephonist; not sure I achieved that much today because of it".

(Journal, 12/9/89).

The extract illustrates my feelings of irritation that I am spending time undertaking tasks normally done by the school secretary. My school-related tasks and personal work are both restricted because of her absence. Nevertheless, I am able to spend a few minutes during the afternoon, in seeding new ideas about how parts of the school could be physically improved. This provides some encouragement to me on a day which I had found generally frustrating.

The nature of such emotions and tensions appears similar to those that Lortie identifies between 'task' and 'expressive' functions of leadership (1975: 155). Shaping the school is not a matter of designing and implementing a plan of how the school should become. In terms of day-to-day realities, the head's vision of the school is subject to constant intrusion by other tasks. The vision is enacted in a piecemeal and ad hoc fashion, a path littered with hopes and ambitions. Many entries in the journal indicate that personal work is often swamped by other tasks and the here-and-now immediacy of the day's events (Journal, 22.9.89; 7.11.89; 17.11.89; 6.3.90):

"Sec'y not arrived - apparently has gone to the doctor's. Child (W.H.) needs inhaler from home. Husband of teacher (C.P.) phoned to say he's going to Mount Vernon hospital. Sorting mail. Child came to ask about time off for holidays. Advisory caretaker phoned - said he might be able to get shampoo machine to clean carpet but we needed shampoo and it might not work anyway. I'm feeling besieged at the moment - there's too many bits to record. I haven't opened briefcase yet. Phone keeps ringing - that's 3 messages I've now got to relay to different class teachers. Another phone call - another message to relay. Phoned equipment officer - no insurance on stained carpet. Still no sec'y. Tried laying strip of carpet - looks a precision job and I'm not sure I've got the expertise for this - caretaker on hand to give advice. Sec'y back. Lunchtime - made sure that M.W.(1st yr) apologised to Mrs.D.(dinner lady) for losing his temper. Problem with W.H. (1st yr) because he's in asthmatic state and has forgotten his inhaler again - parents can't be contacted - there's an answer machine - feel that school is in vulnerable position in all this and don't feel pleased with the situation - left message on machine for mum to phone me. The pace continues - advisory caretaker arrives with machine - says he wants it back in a few days - sec'y says it will take Co. Supplies 6 weeks to deliver shampoo. Agreed that we'd try and collect it ourselves. Talked to all 4th yrs - there's K.D. (4th yr girl) who's gone home ill and D.H. (4th yr boy) who's been kicked he says 'where it hurts' (his phrase) - during game called 'blackout'. Children in class said the game is about squeezing someone until they 'stop breathing' - told

them it was dangerous and was not to be played and two children were already sick or injured because of the game. Sec'y arranged for me to collect shampoo drove there and back in 45 mins or so. Found that Building Surveyor was in school to look at idea of putting mobile classroom onto school playground for use by play scheme as temporary accommodation. Both agreed that it was not very sensible idea since there were far better alternative sites and mains services would have to be brought in. Lifted various inspection covers and eventually found 'foul' rather than 'storm' channels around the school. Lot of discussion with someone from Borough Council and electrician from Co.Hall - thought the whole exercise was a technical one and the consultation stage had clearly passed. Talked with caretaker who says he'll be the one to have to 'pick up all the pieces' with all this and that he's never been happy about it since he first heard. Reflective comment: this seemed a tough and uncompromising day and I felt under a lot of pressure for much of the time. I seem to 'need' a fairly positive day tomorrow so that I can begin to take a more rational stance. There seem to have been so many negative aspects to the day although I feel I dealt with all of them as well as I could" (Journal, 17.10.89).

On other occasions, the relative lack of interruption from others permits me to undertake personal work, with positive feelings of satisfaction:

"9.15 a.m. Signs seem good in school - relaxed staffroom atmosphere, no parents waiting to see me, playground calm and there's little mail. G & M plumbers came in, said they'd replaced couple of cork tiles but couldn't do much e lse for the moment. Did some clearing out in the stock cupboard - shifting some old shelving units - spent ½-hour there.

10.30 a.m. Wet playtime for first time this term - checked the classes - level of supervision seems fine (2 Welfares and a teacher) and children all getting on with something - the new arrangements look to be working well.

12 noon. Relaxed chat in staffroom at lunchtime - entirely social rather than 'school' chat.

12.30 p.m. No problems in the playground - that's great! Dismantled a fitted cupboard in library - another 7 to go (think I need to get the caretaker to do this). Tried removing some shelving in stockroom - hadn't got a decent screwdriver. Got sec'y to clear out and dump old financial

records in library cupboard - she is spending all afternoon at it. Chatted with caretaker - suggested either of us had a go at library units when we had time (but meant him). Time this afternoon to gird up thoughts for assembly.

2.30 p.m. Assembly - did Scheherezade story. Caretaker cleared most of units during assembly - thanked him.

3.30 p.m. Talked with B.B. for a while at the end of school. We looked at library and reading room and discussed a few ideas about shelving, storage and so on.

4.00 p.m. This seemed a smooth-running and uncluttered day, with few pressures on me. There seemed a clear predominance of positive things at different points during the day - nice staffroom atmosphere, playground quiet, well-behaved children in assembly, caretaker and secretary all helping towards a 'grand clear-out', and so on - as well as a lack of negative aspects - parents complaining, discipline problems to sort out, unwieldy mail, plumbing leaks or whatever. Judge this to be one of the 'best' days this term - may need to examine why I'm saying this" (Journal, 13.10.89).

Part of the day is still spent in keeping wheels turning but there are two main sources for positive feelings about the day. One is a lack of pressure from problems or crises, and the other is the progress I felt was made on improvements to the library. The journal indicates that many satisfactions for me are rooted in achieving these personally-defined changes. There is pleasure in fitting library furniture (Journal, 21.9.89), excitement in planning new changes to the library (Journal, 21.9.89), satisfaction in re-arranging furniture (Journal, 2.11.89), enjoyment in clearing old cupboards (Journal, 1.12.89), laying new carpets (Journal, 13.2.90) or re-arranging classrooms (Journal, 11.7.90).

In the final extract from the journal, I illustrate the main points of this section. These are that my personal work in

day-to-day headship has an affective component, and that the work of shaping the school has satisfactions as well as many frustrations. These frustrations often stem from tensions between other tasks in keeping the school operating. The following extract also suggests there is both satisfaction and frustration in working with others, in implementing a personal view of physical change:

"9.15 a.m. Checked hopefully if Brian was ready to move classroom, organised two recalcitrant Year 6 children to dismantle dexion - they thought it was a great privilege; lifted storage units and carpet from Reading Room to Kate's room.

9.30 a.m. Caretaker mentioned he was having problems locking an outside door - went to check it with him - lock seemed alright but wrote repair form for him; joked with the Year 6 boys - said they'd found a job for life; caretaker came to say there was still no sign of a padlock for gate to field - gave him money to buy a new one; moved furniture in Art Room with group of Year 5 boys that Pat was having problems with.

10.30 a.m. Caretaker came to say he needed, after all, the dexion I'd sent to Maureen from the garden shed - sent child to her to say she couldn't have it after all - got slightly terse reply back; thought that Brian was making very long-winded progress with his moving - children didn't seem to be used very effectively - just sitting doing nothing, waiting for jobs that didn't seem to come. Kate interrupted with a Hitac questionnaire - read it through and told her it seemed really useful; added comments to hers before giving it to secretary to post. Organised two Year 6 boys to transfer coat pegs; told Pat to leave shelving for me to bring down as it was too heavy for her to move from Art Room.

11.00 a.m. Difficult to maintain notes - very many small tasks and decisions - delegated extensively to Maureen, Shirley, caretaker, Carol and groups of children - everyone got on with things very willingly with no moans; new chairs arrived by lorry - great!; new tables arrived soon afterwards by another lorry - even better! Still no skip arrived this is frustrating; got secretary to keep chasing up on it. Brian short-circuiting all our arrangements and making adult helpers really exasperated - won't let them or his class help him move - it means there's a real bottleneck building up - made several mild attempts to explain he was stopping everyone from moving. This seems a real problem.

12 noon. Took over organising Brian's room during lunchtime and suggested to him perhaps he might like to take rounders with some of his class; arranged with Sue for loan of some Year 6 children; asked Pat and the caretaker to base themselves in new Art Room to receive furniture and equipment; cleared old Art room in ¾-hr. - told Brian he could now move to his new classroom - felt my Year 6 group and the adult helpers had worked unstintingly - felt really pleased - asked Shirley to make coffee for adult helpers and some squash for the children.

4.30 p.m. This seems a day entirely taken up with moving classrooms - seemed to be hundreds of small tasks and decisions but really enjoyed it. Think I was able to let people 'get on' once I'd told them what I wanted - felt pleased with my organising ability and the way in which people responded. Brian a problem but perhaps he just doesn't like moving classrooms".

(Journal 17.7.90).

The journal entry illustrates the ways in which the day has become enmeshed in satisfactions and annoyances, both for myself and others. It supports observations made by Nias, Southworth and Yeomans that "as organisations of adults and children these were places infected with feelings" (1989: 287).

AFFECTIVE ASPECTS OF WORKING WITH CHILDREN

Heads also spend time with children and I have already noted in chapter 4 the importance of this work as part of personal headship. The emotional satisfactions of working with children have been explored by several writers, including Lortie on its "psychic rewards" (1975: 121), Pollard on the feelings of 'enjoyment' (1985: 24), Connell on the 'joys' in teaching (1985: 125) and Cortazzi (1992: 124) on its sense of 'worthwhileness'. I examine these studies briefly, since

they offer important reasons why headteachers may choose to spend time with children.

Pollard cites 'enjoyment' as a central 'interest at hand' of teachers. Nias identifies "establishing relationships with children" and "responsibility and concern for children" as important aspects of 'feeling like a teacher' (1989, chapter 9). Nias concludes that in teaching as a job there is "the sensation of belonging; self-esteem; a feeling of control; or of influence over others or a sense of fulfilment arising from self-expression and personal development" (1989: 211). Connell observes that emotions are involved in two aspects of teachers' day-to-day work. The first relates to emotions associated with the exercise of control, such as the use of praise and sarcasm. The second relates to emotions involved in helping children to learn. Connell suggests the latter aspect is linked to pleasures in "being a person with an independent reality" and in the development of "professional sophistication as an instructor" (1985: 126). His argument echoes those of Huberman on "artisanry" (1990: 11) and also by Harper (1987: 55) on 'virtuosity'. Both studies agree with Nias (1989: 197) and Woods (1987: 142) that there is a sense of craft-pride in teaching. Rosenholtz also argues that teachers achieve satisfaction in their work only when "the psychic rewards of teaching outweigh the frustrations from helping students grow and develop - from estimates of their own performance as well as external recognition of

their work" (1989: 140). Rosenholtz introduces an important point that the sense of satisfaction needs to 'outweigh' the elements that may cause dissatisfaction. Nias (1989) argues in the same vein that "successful balancing also brings its own affective rewards, the intrinsic pleasures of skilled performance are complemented by giving and receiving affection" (1989: 199).

The above studies are important in emphasizing the affective dimensions of teaching. It seems clear that primary heads gain many satisfactions from working with children in terms of enjoyment, fulfilment and a sense of craft pride. What is also clear is that school-related work provides little satisfaction for heads. It is plausible that working with children may serve an important function for headteachers in providing emotional satisfaction for them. The sustenance may be fundamental, as part of heads' attempts to outweigh inherent dissatisfactions in their day-to-day work.

The pleasures of working with children seem constant:

"One part of the headteacher's job that I always want to focus on is the 'teacher' part of being a 'headteacher'" (Transcript 10: 024).

"That's something I'm trying to get towards.....all of the time spending time with the children" (Transcript 33: 014).

"Why do I enjoy getting into a class? Well, basically because I'm a teacher.....primarily I'm a teacher and I like to be involved with kids." (Transcript 32: 024).

Assemblies are often seen as an opportunity to be involved with children, to share experiences and to demonstrate craft skills. The following account conveys a sense of pleasure by the head in her professional craft abilities:

"Normally it's my assembly today.....for a Junior or Infant assembly today...I mean both but I do it one after the other .....and it was all beautifully dovetailed for once....and instead of doing it as I intended which was a sort of discussion from me.....I sent them back in their groups with staff to finish it on their own carpet.....because it was worthy stuff" (Transcript 36: 012).

The one-year journal shows that assemblies are a particular source of satisfaction to me. Several entries refer to my feelings of pleasure and enjoyment in taking assemblies with the children (Journal, 15.12.89, 11.5.90, 15.6.90):

"Assembly seemed excellent and I thought the story about Miss Roberts went down a treat - the ch'n seemed 'rapt' and the accents I used for the story went well. There seemed to be two positive events during the day - sponsorship and assembly" (Journal, 10.11.89).

Other headteachers reveal a sense of rapport and sensitivity towards children, sometimes intensely so:

"and I looked at the children's faces...it dawning on them that some people didn't have a tap in their house....and it was that sort of realisation that went all the way round.... and there was that special stillness.....moving and engaging at that level....thinking about children without water and it was very moving.....it was fantastic.....and moving.... and I sat there with great huge tears....looked across at staff at the back and John went like this...[WIPING EYE]... and I had to look away.....can't cope with this....this is terrible ....and the children were static and there wasn't a movement because at that moment they were all engaging in what it really meant to be starving and to have no hope" (Transcript 36: 047).

For other heads, that intensity and rapprochement, whether in assemblies or in the classroom, may no longer be seen as attainable. However, there remains a sense of animation in recounting past exhilarations in working with children:

"..there was a snowball effect...and we had higher standards and a higher quality of work through not knowing what we could achieve.....and then building on what we could do and getting excited by everything....and the same happened with music....we ended up with a tremendous amount of creative music..the kids just making up music in their lunchtimes and during playtime in odd spaces in the school..we had a violin group.....and a sort of mini-orchestra that met after school and with the local comprehensive school as well....you know, kids had gone on to comprehensive school and came in....got off the bus..and there was a guitar group which sang in the local church.....it was a matter of building on achievements and thinking 'Gosh, I could do more'...now I feel in my heart of hearts that that's the way you've got to go but people here are different" (Transcript 4: 30).

These moments of joy in working with children are threaded through teachers' own accounts (Revell 1987a, 1987b, 1988), in informal accounts analysed by Nias (1988, 1989) and in observations by Woods (1993). The emotional sustenance in working with children also seems to remain for headteachers, although its form and realisation varies at different career points. Newly appointed heads feel a sense of loss that their close relationship with children as a class teacher is diminished:

"The contacts I've had are of a different nature...there are the same contacts with children.....but the nature of the contact is different.....it's not as close as the ongoing contact I had as a teacher" (Transcript 2: 006).

The difficulty for heads at all career points is to achieve a balance between working with children and other demands

made on them each day. Several respondents acknowledge the emotional satisfaction of working with children and attempt to create particular times for teaching a group or a class:

"To some extent....so far as contact with the children goes ....which for me is a sort of calming element I do have specific times that I do have allocated....I've said to the staff I am having that particular time for you or for those children.....then I have to as far as is possible adhere to that....and I try and make sure that whatever else intrudes from the day that I try and keep to those as closely as possible...unless they are really critical I can try and defer to some extent" (Transcript 38: 024).

Attempts to achieve a sense of balance are made in different ways and at different career points by primary heads. My evidence suggests that the dilemma is a constant one (Berlak and Berlak, 1981), deeply woven into day-to-day decisions of headteachers. It is often a matter of broken promises to oneself, as well as the children:

"There are some areas which are optional...if it's essential of course it must be done.....it's the optional things that go to the wall....I'll give you an example...this week I was going to make a determined start on setting up two new recorder groups with the children....but other things came up....so it's the children that suffer" (Transcript 1: 023).

"I promised myself at the beginning of this term that by a month into the term I would be spending some time with each age group in the school....that's what I actually want to do ....and I have not....the only thing I have achieved is that twice a week I'm taking the second year class" (Transcript 33: 012).

"My dilemma is that I'm still quite keen on doing classroom teaching....I want to continue with that...I would feel more on top of it if I could sit back and say....."Now, what do I need today...at lunchtime I can do this or that" (Transcript 9: 044).

Some heads retain specialist or selective teaching interests as a means of being involved with children, but underlying tensions and imbalances remain:

"...and I am timetabled to do some teaching....but sometimes that goes by the board because something has happened.... like today.....I was due to do some music today but couldn't do it this morning because I was taking Mrs.S's class" (Transcript 32: 024).

For longer established heads there seem to be fewer signs of tension, as though a kind of balance or reconciliation has been achieved. There is a continuing involvement with the children but without the acute tensions described by newly appointed heads. There is a sense of returning to one's teaching roots as retirement beckons, but in an increasingly phlegmatic and selective manner:

".....you asked what was the most satisfying time in my professional life...and really I'm in the best position...I can pick and choose what I do....I'm keen on recorder groups and organising the school journey" (Transcript 1: 050).

Teaching at all career points clearly provides deep feelings of security, competence and reward for heads, compared with other headship tasks:

"I'm usually an energetic kind of person.....that's how I teach ....it's black or white, there's no grey in me when I'm teaching....the other side of my job is a vagueness, an air of uncertainty.....I feel on my own at last" (Transcript 9: 046).

Indeed, at times, working with children is used as therapy,

as a retreat from the pressures of other headship work:

".....if you look at it in terms of peaks and troughs.....in terms of stress levels.....your problem times in the day.... they are punctuated with other aspects that balance that out ....for instance, I had a session just before lunch with the school....with the children.....singing for Christmas and that is a calm....well, for me.....a calming aspect which gives me time to think about what we're here for....the children themselves....and again sometime during the afternoon I'll get another opportunity to spend time with children to have a session where I can get those sorts of peaks and troughs in balance" (Transcript 38: 022).

In the same way, a headteacher near to retirement expresses satisfaction with a rather dog-eared emergency lesson, based on an eggbox from Sainsbury:

"Yes, there are tendencies to despondency....I think a lot of heads have those feelings nowadays....for the last two or three years perhaps...it's a different ball-game.....there's a despondent feeling but I don't feel despondent with how the day went....because I really did enjoy the morning with the eggbox in the classroom....it put the rest of the day in perspective" (Transcript 32: 054).

Teaching children provides satisfactions for heads that they do not find in their school-related work. There is evidence that heads gain a sense of immediate reward in working with the children. This sense of instant feed-back seems lacking in much of their other work:

"You get very little feedback about how things are going.... we get minimal feedback...we have parents, for example, on Friday afternoons who come in for children's assemblies where we share some work...and I can stand at the front and I can say that's a fantastic bit of work...and I can walk out of that assembly alongside parents and there's no reaction to what they've just seen...and that lack of

response tends to affect everything that you do" (Transcript 12: 046).

Teaching children appears an important part of headteachers' strategies to find a sense of emotional equilibrium in day-to-day work. Cortazzi (1991) argues on similar lines that teachers attempt to restore stability in the face of destabilising events (1991: 128). Nias (1989) also argues that teachers have "the capacity to bring their own emotions and the social systems within which they work into harmony and then refuse to be disrupted, unbalanced, torn asunder, blown off course or put out of step by the....tensions which form the context and backdrop of their work" (1989: 199). My findings indicate that primary heads also seek to achieve emotional stability and 'harmony' in their day-to-day work. There also seems clear evidence that heads sometimes fail to achieve that balance and are constantly 'blown off course' by daily pressures and crises. The satisfactions to be gained from working with children or from the achievement of personally-defined changes to the school are often denied to heads by the pressures of other work.

Heads try to cope (Pollard 1985) with endemic disequilibrium in their work. Wagner (1987) argues that attempts to cope can have emotional effects in which "anger, anxiety, desire, attachment, and aggression result from teachers' attempts in

vain to resolve dilemmas" (1987: 161). Connell (1985) has also pointed out that dilemmas have implications for "moods, personal relationships and sense of self" (1985: 115). These arguments also seem relevant for attempts by primary heads to find emotional balance in the face of their day-to-day dilemmas.

In the following sections, I continue to examine emotions in headship by considering the feelings and emotions of heads' daily encounters, as an aspect of both school-related and personal tasks.

FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS OF DAILY ENCOUNTERS

In chapter 4, I provided evidence that heads' daily work was typified by gaining and sifting information, decision-making and planning. I indicated that many such aspects of heads' daily work involved interactions with other people. In the following section, I consider feelings and emotions embedded in these kinds of daily encounters in primary headship.

Heads spend much of their day with people. Their daily work is heavily invested in relationships with others, reflected extensively in respondents' accounts. Headteachers move around the school in order to talk to others (Mintzberg 1973 Peters and Austin 1985). Much of the variety and intensity of heads' work seems to stem from the pace and frequency of

these kinds of encounters (Transcript 31: 006, Transcript 32 034, Transcript 33: 032 - 040, Transcript 39: 010, 022). Heads also spend moments of time with children although such contact can often be supervisory or disciplinary in nature, sometimes in support of other members of staff. Lieberman and Miller (1984) also identify 'disciplinarian' features of headship (1984: 75).

As suggested by the analysis made in February 1990, my daily encounters with adults and children have affective aspects:

"I am asked to confirm or to approve the actions of others (Journal, 30.10.89, 1.11.89) or facilitate actions of others (Journal, 2.2.90) or act as policy-maker (Journal, 15.1.90), or remedy what others have done (Journal, 11.1.90) or give advice to staff and children (Journal, 14.2.90) or deal with complaints made by ancillary staff (Journal, 30.11.89). I sometimes feel a passive recipient or figurehead for these requests or demands by others (Journal, 1.11.89). This may sometimes create negative feelings of injustice (Journal, 29.11.89) or depersonalization (Journal, 28.11.89) or even a faint sense of martyrdom (Journal 20.12.89)" (Research Diary 20.2.90).

I also professionally manage the emotions of other people. The journal records a number of occasions when my role is that of a peacekeeper in dealing with an angry confrontation between caretaker and cleaners (Journal, 1.5.90) and with tensions between members of staff (Journal, 28.9.89, 9.11.89). Other entries refer to my dealing with angry parents (Journal, 19.3.90, 20.3.90, 30.4.90), with frightened children (Journal 16.11.89, 17.5.90) and with agitated members of staff (Journal, 12.1.90, 28.11.89, 22.5.90):

"B.C.(Cook) came to staffrm. and broke down in tears. She had been trying to listen to secretary who had gone to her for a chat. The cook felt that secretary was about to commit suicide and she didn't feel she could cope with that intensity of emotion. Made cook a cup of tea and sat with her until she seemed calmer. Long session listening to secretary - talked with her for about an hour until she seemed rational enough to do the dinner numbers - made excuse to go with her to kitchen with dinner numbers in case same upsets began again with the cook. Went back to kitchen and had a long talk with cook to calm her down - she cried again but eventually seemed much better - told her a little of secretary's emotional problems and ways of helping/coping - returned to office and had a long conversation with the secretary again. There were several interruptions but I 'fended off' people - these included C.P. with files she wanted to replace in filing cabinet (told her I'd do it), by the caretaker (said I'd talk to him later), by secretary's daughter by phone (told her that her mother was busy and couldn't be disturbed), and by sales representative (told him we had no money and weren't interested). Supervised children in dining room - sat next to secretary with meal so that I could talk with her and see how she was. Secretary then left school because it was a '½-day' for her" (Journal, 25.4.90).

Later that same day, I deal with distressed parents after a road accident outside of the school gates:

"Interrupted by several mothers who said there'd been a road accident - mother of C.G.(4th yr) came in carrying her 4-year old daughter who'd been 'knocked over' by a car - someone said she was alright but needed wiping over - Mrs. L. (MSA) arrived in tearful and agitated state to say she was driving the car. She wanted to see how the girl was but also worrying about her own handicapped son who was due to be collected from another school. Told her to collect her son and return to school. Mrs.L. arrived back but we could see no sign of the girl or her mother. Suggested to Mrs.L. that she contacted the mother by phone (and gave her the number) and that she told the police what had happened" (Journal, 25.4.90).

Cortazzi's (1991) study, using anecdotal evidence, indicates that heads manage other people's emotions, especially in

resolving problems with "awkward parents" (1991: 116). The head may sometimes be in a role of mediator or "referee" in dealing with such parental encounters (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 73):

"Two parents said they were having problems with another family and seemed to want that child 'sorted out' in school. Tried to tiptoe through this one - agreeing that incidents outside of school warranted police involvement but I also wondered whether their child was "telling them what they wanted to hear about the other boy" - said I was pretty sure that there wasn't bullying as I would have been sure to have heard (self-justification comment?) - not sure they were convinced - quite difficult communication problem in all this. Need to go very carefully and yet still present an alternative view" (Journal, 26.9.89).

Encounters with others also create feelings of satisfaction for me, in my professional competence as a headteacher:

"Ed.Psych. arrived by appt. to talk about A.B.(3rd yr) - lot of questions from her about how I was organising classes in September and effects on special needs support - felt 'professionally good' at my confidence and clarity in talking with her (think she is 'astute' and 'caring' - sometimes in the past I've felt I've been 'floundering' slightly in trying to justify what is happening)" (Journal, 4.7.90).

Respondents indicate that interactions with other people are an important feature of their daily work. For some heads, relationships with other people are an especially satisfying part of their work:

"The most positive things would be talking to the parent about what work she had been doing with the children....and talking to the children who'd come to show their work...those were the most positive things...most of the other things were problems...they were all niggley little

worries that needed to be dealt with....some of them are intrinsically satisfying....and are finished business...like the children coming to show me their work and that's pleasure for them and pleasure for me.....it's a small finished 'happening'....whereas a lot of things are on-going or unfinished business...I wouldn't want everything to be small tiny items that I finish....because there wouldn't be any 'feel'.... there wouldn't be any threads through it all..." (Transcript 30: 042-048).

"I suppose the things with the children and the parents are for 'you'.....they are personal contacts....that could be the difference....that I actually find that dealing with people the most instantly satisfying....or not satisfying... it's an immediate response when you deal with children or other people.....whereas if I'm dealing with paperwork it makes it satisfying.....like phone calls....to have got it done but I don't get personal feedback in the same way perhaps...maybe I just generally like people.....and so the other things are satisfying but they lack the contact with people.....if I could do my whole day's work here and never open the door then I wouldn't be happy" (Transcript 31: 020, 026).

Encounters with others seems to have particular significance in heads' daily work as part of what Hammersley (1984: 204), Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989: 90) and Cortazzi (1991: 6) describe in teaching as the sense of 'competence'. It is a crucial part of what Nias (1989: 181) has described in teaching as "feeling like a teacher". Salzberger-Wittenberg et al. (1983) suggest that many of teachers' inner fears and anxieties are linked to their competence and performance in teaching (1983: 47). These arguments seem relevant for the sense of satisfaction, and sometimes dissatisfaction, felt by primary heads in their interactions with others.

In this chapter, I have offered evidence that daily headship has an affective dimension. This dimension is substantially

neglected in the literature on headship. Feelings are shown to relate to periodicity of schools. I indicate too that school-related work offers primary heads few satisfactions. Personal work of heads, especially working with children, is satisfying but is subject to the demands of other tasks. The anomalies and dilemmas between school work and personal work also create many day-to-day tensions and frustrations for headteachers. Heads interact with other people and these daily encounters are often a source of satisfaction or sometimes dissatisfaction in heads' work.

It is perhaps unsurprising that my main findings within this chapter are that daily headship is imbued with feelings. The studies by Lieberman and Miller (1984), Connell (1985), Woods (1986), Huggett (1986), Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989), Huberman (1990) and Cortazzi (1991) remind us that classrooms, staffrooms and schools are deeply immersed in feelings and emotions. Connell (1985) emphasizes that the work of teachers is characterised by "relationships which worsen or improve and others reach impasse; flavour with the odd confrontation; flood of laughter and burst of tears; stir in relationships with the colleagues in the staffroom; and you have some idea of the complexity of the emotional currents flowing through one teacher's week at work" (1985: 116). The emotional context of primary heads' work has a similar flavour to Connell's observations.

In contrast to the findings in the present chapter, there is little acknowledgement either in the existing literature, or by central government, that headship has affective features. I examine implications of this neglect in my discussion of issues arising from the study, in chapter 7.

The examination of feelings and emotions in primary headship offers insights into the psychology of headteachers. This has not been the main purpose of the chapter, since my focus has been to consider the nature of primary headship through an examination of its affective context. Lieberman and Miller (1984) argue convincingly that headship is a context, in which "a school shapes a principal as much as a principal shapes a school" (1984:81). This seems true, although their account lacks evidence that feelings are embedded in what they see as a reciprocal process. Lortie seems nearer to the heart of the matter, in suggesting that in teaching "teacher sentiments represent an adaptation to the work situation" (1975: 106). Penetrating the emotions and feelings of headship provides evidence about headteachers' adaptations to the context of their work, quite as much as it reveals the nature of headteachers.

My examination of emotions in day-to-day primary headship emphasizes still further the distinction I make between work that is school-related and work that is personal. It is also apparent that headteachers are involved in the managing

of others' emotions. This feature of day-to-day headship is not acknowledged within existing literature and I consider such neglect further, in chapter 7. In particular, I argue that there are practical implications in the finding that daily headship is heavily involved with interactions and we are unreasonable to deny that headship entails relationships with others. Interactions are a fundamental source of pressures and satisfactions in daily headship (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 24).

I suggest too that stability and 'balance' in daily headship (Wagner, 1987: 161, Nias 1989: 199, Cortazzi 1991: 128) is not readily achievable by heads. There appears evidence of emotional tensions in heads' daily work, not always remedied by those aspects of headship offering sustenance and reward. In terms used by Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989) primary heads are attempting to cope with endemic "disequilibrium" in their day-to-day work (1989: 239).

My findings suggest that heads too have a range of emotional needs, in a need for balance, a need to be praised, a need for recognition, a need for personal contact with children and a need to achieve personal aims. These emotional needs are not always met in their daily work. The significance of heads' work with children is that it provides sustenance for heads which they do not gain in the work of keeping the show on the road. Heads do not seem to 'feel' in school-related

work what they 'feel' in their teaching.

In my final comments to this chapter, I raise the point that emotional satisfactions are also relevant to our notions of effectiveness in the workplace. Brown and McIntyre (1993) indicate that when there are negative feelings in teaching "it is clear that teachers' states of mind begin to affect their actions" (1993: 82). McLaughlin, Talbert and Bascia (1990: 3)) and Ashton et al. (1983: 123) also point to the crucial relationship between emotions in the workplace and practitioners' effectiveness. Murphy (1991) suggests that understanding such emotions is now "the leading priority for employee assistance programs" (1991: 123). Gold and Roth (1993) point out that in comparison with other occupations, teachers have severe problems of stress but "no preparation or training in their professional education programs to deal with it" (1993: 14). The relevance of the affective aspects of primary headship for the effectiveness of headteachers is at least as important.

CHAPTER 6: THE OCCUPATIONAL LEGACY IN HEADSHIP

In the previous two chapters, I offer insights into the work of primary headteachers and the feelings of heads about what they do each day. A consistent theme in the data is a sense of difference and anomaly between heads' school-related and personal work. On the one hand, these respondents describe a reality of keeping the wheels turning and a daily struggle with problems of paperwork, school buildings, staff absence and pupil behaviour. Although these tasks are a substantial part of what heads do each day, respondents do not view such work as their 'real' work. Running the school is obligatory but not the work that respondents seek to do. School work to these heads is often a matter of irritating obligations.

On the other hand, primary heads undertake personal tasks by preference, not obligation. I defined personal work more closely as tasks that are not transactional and which serve the idiosyncratic and individual purposes of heads, in ways that are often solitary, possessive and independent, usually involving a high investment of self (p.104). In chapter 4, I offer evidence that the personal work of primary heads is to shape the school, in which heads use the school as their working canvas, acting much in a role of independent artist. Respondents resent interference by others in their personal work and use a variety of means to influence other people to accept their vision of the school. Headteachers seem

to exercise their influence in subtle, and not authoritarian or confrontational ways. Choosing to work with children is also part of heads' personal work. Respondents justify the time spent with children on several grounds, but it remains work undertaken by choice, and not obligation.

In chapter 5, I suggest that there is an affective dimension in headship which further emphasises the distinction I make between school work and personal work. Primary heads find particular satisfaction in spending time with children and in achieving progress in shaping the school. The tasks of running the school are often dissatisfying and many tensions exist between school-related work and personal work. Day-to-day headship is also characterised by relationships and encounters with others. Such encounters can sometimes be a source of satisfaction, but not always. Daily headship also involves managing other people's feelings and emotions.

Although these findings offer evidence on the experience and nature of day-to-day headship, there is little that explains why heads see their work as they do. In the present chapter I explore possible reasons why there appears a contradiction in the daily work of headteachers. I pose the question, as conjecture rather than assertion, whether personal work has its origins within the occupation of teaching. I consider this proposition as further examination of the central theme to emerge from the data.

My research question is whether there are reasons within the occupation of teaching to explain the personal dimensions of primary headship. The answers to this question remain hypothetical, since I do not offer an empirical base for the discussion. I do not attempt, for example, to trace origins of respondents' perceptions in any biographical data (Lyons, 1981; Measor, 1985; Sikes, 1985; Ball and Goodson, 1985). I also assume for discussion purposes that the characteristics of teaching have meaning as generalisations. Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1985) query this assumption, in pointing to such variations in a "uniform culture" as social background, age and experience (1985: 505). In contrast to this argument, researchers such as Alexander (1984), Pollard (1985), Nias (1989) and Cortazzi (1991) have accepted a single culture of British primary teachers, where similar variations might be assumed to apply. I make the presupposition therefore that general characteristics exist in the occupation of teaching, not limited to any particular schools (Nias, Southworth and Yeomans 1989) or on grounds of geography. It seems likely, however, that I refer by implication to a Western culture of teaching, since I draw almost exclusively on Australian, British, and North American sources.

The question I raise is not answerable, either in general or specific terms, and the relationship I examine is not causal in nature. And yet, such a link is not simply theoretical, or notional, since heads are self-evidently teachers at some

previous career point. The relationship I explore is self-evident, but is not proved in research terms. My discussion remains as conjecture, in which I pose the question whether the characteristics of teaching create a legacy within day-to-day personal work of primary headship.

I discuss the research question in four parts, each offering related arguments on a relationship between teaching and the personal work of headteachers. In each of the final three parts, I make reference to my definition of heads' personal work (p.104), since this provides a convenient framework for the discussion. First, I preface the discussion with the assertion that teaching like headship takes place within the physical and institutional context of schools. I argue that schools are workplaces that may reinforce characteristics of territoriality and ownership in both teaching and headship. Second, I build on this argument, by indicating that spatial arrangements may also create characteristics in teaching of independence, isolation and insularity. I have already defined the personal work of headteachers, in part, in terms of these characteristics. Third, I refer to a further part of my definition, in suggesting that the characteristics of idiosyncracy and individualism found in heads' personal work may stem from the occupational norms of privacy and autonomy found in teaching. Fourth, I refer to a final element of my definition, in suggesting that headship and teaching are both characterised by the sense of anomaly and contradiction

between personal and transactional work. I suggest also that that an examination of affectivity in teaching and headship indicates tensions created by these anomalies in daily work.

THE INSTITUTIONAL AND PHYSICAL CONTEXT

Teaching and headship take place typically in the setting of schools and classrooms. Doyle (1986) suggests, in his study of teaching, that institutional parameters are the "elements already in place when teachers and students arrive at the classroom door" (1986: 394). The parameters of teaching and headship are institutionally similar and distinctive in turn from other settings. King (1978) observes infant classrooms are **socially** different from, for example, "the social worlds of the pavement or playground" (1978: 10). Teaching and headship are part of an exclusive reality, belonging to what Elbaz (1983) argues is "a world unto itself" (1983: 19). It seems plausible that teaching will have characteristics that endure into headship, since both have the same institutional milieu.

Schools have physical boundaries. The buildings are usually designed in cellular patterns, spatially defined by routes, walls, corridors and pathways. Access may have particular importance for those who work within schools (Revell, 1985). Several studies suggest spatial arrangements shape teachers' perceptions of classroom and school. Connell (1985) argues

that teachers' views are shaped by the "physical and social pace of classrooms" (1985: 73). Lortie (1975) argues that cellular arrangements determine that "primary allegiance is to the classroom" (1975: 164). Doyle (1986) has also argued teachers' loyalties become more strongly bound to classrooms than to the school. The evidence of such studies suggests that physical context determines particular ways of thinking for participants. This suggestion may be simplistic, since Hitchcock (1982) provides evidence that teachers also modify the use of space in open-plan schools. Hitchcock observes spatial arrangements are subject to "practical adaptations" by teachers, who endeavour "to secure control and intimacy characteristic of conventional classrooms" (1982: 81). The findings by Hitchcock seem important, in demonstrating that practitioners are influenced by, but also adapt, any spatial patterns and arrangements. Studies by Taylor et al. (1974) offer such a balanced viewpoint, in pointing to the zones of influence in schools, based upon spatial patterns. Taylor et al. argue these zones reflect "a fair degree of autonomy, especially to teachers in the classroom" (op.cit: 23).

The above studies suggest that spatial arrangements may have particular significance in the occupation of teaching. Some researchers argue that the physical settings of schools may lead to a sense of territoriality. Lieberman and Miller point to the 'power of classroom territoriality" (1984: 9), while Nias et al. (1992) suggest practitioners' "territorial instincts are strong" (1992: 110). King (1978) portrays

the sense of territoriality in some detail, observing that "the classrooms were sometimes called the 'home base', and the teacher made it her own, everything in the classroom belonged to her" (1978: 72). King notes that ownership is also "acknowledged by colleagues who usually stood at the threshold waiting for a signal allowing them to enter" (1978: 72).

The notion of territoriality underlies what many researchers suggest is a sense of ownership or possessiveness within the occupation. Becher, Eraut and Knight (1981) also indicate that the sense of ownership is extensive, particularly in view of the lack of "departmental constraints" (1981: 123). Alexander (1984) accepts that territoriality creates a sense of ownership, to the extent that "the class becomes the teacher's main pre-occupation and raison d'etre" (1984: 165). Alexander argues further that the head's 'my school' is complementary to "the teacher's 'my class'" (1984: 165). Nias, Southworth and Yeomans (1989) observe that "the close association between head and school appears to be so strong that it is possible to describe the head as the owner of the school" (1989: 99). Southworth further links the sense of ownership to power, in concluding that "on becoming a head it is the scale of the domination which expands: an increase from classroom to school" (1993: 365).

The work of headteachers and teachers takes place within a

context characterised by territoriality, possessiveness and ownership. It is less clear whether the physical setting of schools creates such characteristics or merely supports the conditions to perpetuate them. Fieldnotes of my visits to schools confirm that spatial arrangements of the buildings often serve to emphasise a sense of ownership and to isolate the head from others. Heads were often the only adult in the school to have the exclusive use of a room designated to them. The headteacher was signified as being different from others by the architecture of the school. Respondents also adapted their rooms in idiosyncratic ways. The fieldnotes provide a number of clues about how heads saw themselves, or wished others to see them:

"....the interview took place in the head's office which appeared comfortable and spacious in relation to the ante-rooms. The headteacher's desk was extremely tidy and neatly arranged. There was an octagonal container filled with drawing pins, paper clips, and so on - all carefully arranged. There were several piles of papers and documents also tidily arranged on the desk, often in individual wallet holders. There was a noticeboard on a side wall on which were arranged timetables and duty rotas. Wall shelving held copies of recent L.E.A. and D.E.S. documents on the curriculum - again, carefully sequenced and neatly organised. The room had an overall appearance of tidiness and meticulousness" (Research Diary, 11.2.89).

"The interview was held in the headteacher's office. The room seemed a somewhat cluttered one. Several trophies were displayed on some shelving and the desk was covered with papers, booklets and exercise books. Football boots, a tracksuit and some footballs were strewn on the floor. There were infrequent interruptions during the interview, mostly by telephone. An older boy asked if there was going to be a football lesson and was told: "No football today, lads" (Research Diary, reference TL1, 23.11.23).

This evidence suggests that the work of headteachers remains part of a continuous "rhetoric of space" (Evans 1974: 123). Hitchcock observes too that "the school was the headmaster's territory, he had rights of access and could go anywhere" (1982: 75). Hitchcock's study supports arguments by Thrift (1985) from a symbolic interactionist stance suggesting that our perceptions and practical knowledge are "deeply imbued with geographical specificity, taking its cues from local contexts" (1985: 373). In common with Giddens (1985), I find that schools are organisations in which "bureaucratic traits both influence, and are influenced by, regions they contain" (1985: 286).

ISOLATION, INSULARITY AND INDEPENDENCE

I have defined the personal work of heads, in part, as being independent, isolated and insular. In the following part of the chapter, I suggest that such features are also found in the occupation of teaching. In particular, I indicate that these characteristics seem rooted within the organisational arrangements of schools.

The organisation of schools usually involves a class teacher working independently from other adults. Connell (1985) summarises traditional arrangements, in which "a great deal of teaching is done with one adult and twenty or thirty kids in a fairly bare room together, with the door shut" (1985:

73). A recent survey of seventy four schools by the Office for Standards in Education (1993) indicates that the pattern still remains of class teachers working in isolation. In 80% of schools, the survey found that "teachers were wholly generalists spending virtually all their time with their own classes" (1993: 9).

The pattern of independent working may continue throughout a teacher's career. Nias (1988) points out, in her study of primary teachers, that practitioners "seldom see one another in action" (1988: 142). In a study of five primary schools, Nias and others (1989) observe the potential for inter-staff contact is only 'fleeting' (1989: 23), even in schools where there is willingness to work together. In reaching similar conclusions to early studies undertaken by Hacker (1970) and Zifferblatt (1972), Nias et al. suggest that "organizational arrangements affect interaction by controlling individual opportunities for participation" (1989: 33). Rosenholtz (1989) summarises the position graphically as being a matter of different 'orbits', in which "teachers are isolated from colleagues, as connected pedagogically as commuters waiting briefly in a train station, each bound on a different route" (1989: 18).

A further effect of working in isolation from other adults, is related to what some researchers argue is an occupational

insularity. Desforges and Cockburn (1987) have observed a resistance towards "external pressures" (1987: 67). Huggett (1986) argues that the insularity of teachers is a necessary quality to deal with "ignorance, prejudice and indifference of some parents" (1986: xiv). Other researchers identify insularity in the occupation, sometimes associated with what is termed "conservatism" (Gitlin 1992: 123). Jackson points to the "myopia typifying the class teacher's intellectual vision" (1968, 1990 edition: 148), while Hargreaves (1972: 405) and Cortazzi (1991: 5) both find "anti-intellectualism" in teaching. King observes that "as an occupational group, teachers seemed secure in their professional beliefs and practices" (1978: 14). Pollard has also observed the low intellectual content of staffroom discussion (1987: 105).

There may be reasons underlying the sense of insularity and conservatism in teaching. I have already indicated that the institutional context of teaching may tend to create a sense of territoriality, possessiveness and ownership within the occupation. Doyle (1990) suggests a further reason, arguing that that the work of teachers is concerned more with day-by-day practicalities than with intellectual activity. Doyle argues that teaching is "fundamentally particularistic and situational" (1990: 355). The analysis by Elbaz (1983) is also convincing, indicating that teaching is essentially "practically-oriented" (1983: 3). Holly and McLoughlin (1989) argue in a similar vein that teaching is a matter of "situational perceptions" (1989: 262). These researchers

offer reasons why teaching is conservative and insular, but confirm nevertheless that such characteristics are found in the occupation. Cortazzi (1991) seems to illustrate the defensiveness of some researchers, in arguing that anti-intellectualism may even be essential for teachers' survival within the "great complexity and immediacy of classroom events" (1991: 5).

Teaching is characterised by independence, isolation and insularity. In the following part of the chapter, I suggest that teaching is characterised by norms of autonomy, privacy and individualism. I argue further that these occupational norms do little to prevent personal work of headteachers and teachers taking place. The characteristics of idiosyncracy and individualism in heads' personal work may be rooted in, and sustained by, such occupational norms and values.

AUTONOMY, PRIVACY AND INDIVIDUALITY

There seems broad agreement among researchers that teaching is characterised by a sense of autonomy. King (1978) points to an occupational 'tradition of autonomy', defined in terms of "telling others to mind their own business" (1978: 91). Some commentators argue further that there is an ideological tradition in primary education which may reinforce the sense of occupational autonomy (Smith, 1986; Nias, 1989).

The term 'autonomy' is commonly used in studies of teachers' work, often with connotations of control and hierarchy. In Little's research, she points to the "persistent autonomy of the self-contained classroom" (1990: 195). Hargreaves also argues, in his study of the occupational culture of teaching that "teachers prefer to work alone with a class of pupils, this reflects the professional concern for autonomy" (1980: 141). Pollard's study (1985) identifies autonomy as one of several perspectives of class teachers. Pollard argues that autonomy is closely linked with "the protection of personal independence" (1985: 27). Lortie uses the term 'autonomy' to describe teachers' perceptions of their role as "the key figures in monitoring classroom affairs" (1975: 76). The above studies emphasize the prevalence of autonomous working within the classroom. King's observational study of infant classrooms emphasises that workplace control is fundamental in teachers' autonomy. King observes that "many different arrangements were the outcome of teachers' autonomy in the classroom, and allowed different degrees of autonomy to the children" (1978: 19). Pollard summarises the occupational characteristic in teaching as one of seeking "to control the work situation" (1985: 27).

Autonomy has connotations not only of workplace control, but also of resistance to control or influence by other people. Pollard (1985) observes that parents and the headteacher are particular threats to teachers' autonomy, as evidenced by

staffroom talk (1985: 27). Cortazzi (1990) argues that "the centralised curriculum, national testing and the increasing evaluation of teachers may be seen as additional threats" (1990: 4). Some commentators suggest that the occupational characteristic of autonomy reflects merely a 'cocoon image', or 'defensive palisade' towards others (Alexander 1984:165). This conclusion is not shared by Hargreaves (1980) who finds that autonomy stems less from an occupational defensiveness towards outsiders and more from the anxieties of teachers at peer-evaluation of their 'competence' (1980: 141). Studies of staffroom conversations indicate that individual as well as collective competence are protected by the staff group (Hammersley 1984: Hargreaves and Woods 1984; Pollard 1987; Nias et al. 1989; Cortazzi 1991).

The above studies indicate that teaching is characterised by norms protecting the work of practitioners from control or influence by others. Hargreaves suggests that an effect is that "teaching is seen as an intimate act shrouded in privacy" (1980: 141). Huberman argues convincingly that the norm of "professional privacy" sustains individuality in the occupation (1990: 7). Huberman refers to the studies by Perrenoud (1983), Yinger (1987) and Hatton (1989), in suggesting that "non-interference with core work of others constitutes a sign of professional respect" (1990: 17). The norm of privacy may also have consequences in the failure of the group to provide support when it is needed. Fullan has

argued that teaching remains largely a "private struggle with problems" (1991, 2nd edition: 186). Nevertheless, the tolerance of individual preferences and styles seems at the heart of such norms.

Hargreaves (1980) also concludes that teaching displays "a powerful cult of individualism" (op. cit: 142), which may inhibit the emergence of "co-operative teacher solutions" (ibid: 142). Lortie makes a similar point, suggesting that occupational norms have lead to "a conception of teaching as an individualistic not a collegial enterprise" (1975: 70). Huberman (1990) reaches similar conclusions, in arguing that recent endeavours to introduce 'collegiate management' (Lieberman, 1986; Southworth, 1987; Wallace, 1988; Zahorik, 1987; Holly and Southworth, 1989) and 'collaborative work' (Nias, Southworth and Campbell, 1992) are not likely to be successful within a "professionally individualistic system" (1990: 31).

The above studies are helpful in showing that teaching tends to promote and to sustain autonomous and individualistic ways of working. My argument is that the idiosyncratic and individualistic aspects of primary heads' personal work may stem from an occupation that protects the individualism and autonomy of its members. I also suggest that there seems little to inhibit individualism taking root within teaching or to encourage norms of collaboration. Early studies by

Hannam et al. (1976) and Lortie (1975) for example, indicate that individualism is established from the outset. Lortie suggests that the induction of teachers is a private ordeal that "reinforces individualism" (1975: 74). Nias (1988) has also pointed to a lack of support and the depressing 'rites de passage' of novice teachers (1988: 67). Huberman (1990) argues that novices face the same complexities and dilemmas as experienced teachers but must survive in a 'sink-or-swim' isolation. Huberman concludes that this creates at an early stage a "highly individualistic, experiential conception of one's work" (1990: 16).

Hargreaves (1980) argues the 'cult of individualism' remains a powerful influence within the occupation, in which "each can go his own way in the classroom with relative impunity" (1980: 142). Lortie (1975) analyses data from questionnaire surveys, in examining the influences on teachers' classroom practices. He indicates that practitioners' instructional practices seem impervious, both to external influence and to influence by others. Teachers may sometimes screen ideas of colleagues to suit their own style, but "socialization in teaching remains largely one of self-socialization" (1975: 79). Huberman (1990) points out that "low interdependency between successive levels of influence" (1990: 12) may also help to maintain a world of 'private' enactments (ibid: 13).

Huberman argues that the individualistic nature of teaching inhibits a transfer of knowledge "valid across instructional

situations" (1990: 5). Lortie (1975) also confirms that the absence of any codified practice means that "each individual teacher must laboriously construct ways of perceiving and interpreting what is significant" (1975: 73). Both studies confirm the findings by Hargreaves that teacher learning is mainly a matter of "personal trial and error" (1980: 143).

These studies suggest that there is little in the occupation to encourage norms of collaboration or to inhibit personal work taking place. In the final part of this chapter, I build on this argument by suggesting that the daily tasks of teachers - like headteachers - has personal dimensions. In particular, I suggest that the personal work of teachers has to be reconciled with the daily pressures of other tasks. I argue that teaching, like headship, appears characterised by differences and anomalies between day-to-day transactional work and personal work.

THE DAY-TO-DAY WORK OF TEACHERS

Teaching, like headship, is 'immediate' (Brown and McIntyre, 1993:53) 'unpredictable' (Doyle, 1986: 123) and 'fragmented' (Desforges and Cockburn, 1987: 16). Huberman argues that teaching is typified by "adaptation, reconfiguration, ad hoc responses, improvised decisions and interactiveness" (1990: 5). These characteristics in teaching stem from moment-by-moment work with children, in dealing with the 'kaleidoscope

of student postures' (Jackson 1968; 1987 edition: 16) and the ephemeral nature of 'pupil conditions' (Cortazzi, 1993: 71). Teachers are daily "bombarded with complex, often conflicting demands, and spend much of the day in partial control of pupil behaviour" (Huberman, 1990: 14).

Huberman emphasizes a fundamental aspect of day-to-day work of teachers, in the need to control pupil behaviour in the classroom. Control seems deeply embedded in the social context of teaching. Sellar and Yeatman (1959) write in a sequel to '1066 And All That', "for every person wishing to teach there are thirty not wanting to be taught" (1959: 34). Their comments probably summarise much of the potential for conflict in teaching. Connell (1985) suggests that "the problematic character of discipline is built into the very structure of mass schooling" (1985: 104). Compulsion, non-conformity and conflict seem constantly near to the surface in the classroom, in which an intrinsic 'interest at hand' (Pollard, 1985: 23) is to manage the essential 'voluntarism' of pupils (Lortie, 1975: 137).

Control and managing pupil behaviour are concerns that are also socially legitimated. Nias (1987) argues that "it is generally accepted that those responsible for young people's learning will also regulate their behaviour" (1987: 12). In earlier research, the tendency was to portray control in the classroom in terms of sovereignty, conflict and authority-

role of teachers. Lortie (1975), for example, has pointed to a "universal agreement that teachers must establish and keep sovereignty over classroom affairs" (1975: 151). Becker (1968) and Hughes (1971) agree with this view, in describing the authority-role of classroom teachers. Geer (1979) also accepts the notion of classroom sovereignty, offering a bi-polar conflict model of teaching (1979: 4).

Other research studies indicate the importance for teachers of feeling in control in the classroom (King, 1978; Connell, 1985). Nias (1988) argues "an essential part of 'being' a teacher is to feel in control in the classroom" (1988: 145). Respondents in a later study by Nias (1989), describe a need to feel "in control of oneself, one's pupils and their learning" (1989: 201). Woods (1980) suggests that many such feelings are linked to a sense of professional 'competence' in the management of classroom control (1980:143). Pollard (1985) agrees that control is related to competence, as an important aspect of 'self-image' (1985: 34). Lieberman and Miller (1984) also argue that control is a paramount concern for teachers, since "keeping a class in order is the only visible indication to one's colleagues and principal that one is, in fact, a good teacher; if one loses control, one loses everything" (1984: 14). Brown and McIntyre (1990) observe that teachers strive constantly "to create order and to sustain good working relationships with pupils" (1990: 42). Salzberger-Wittenberg et al. (1983) argue further that

fear of losing control is pervasive for teachers, who "tread a tightrope between being too severe or else too slack, it is often extremely difficult to allow enough freedom and to remain in control" (1983: 47).

Control seems a daily concern in teaching, a concern that is socially legitimated and a fundamental aspect of a teacher's sense of competence. Control is crucial in daily teaching, and yet it remains an obligation made necessary by the social context of classrooms. Keeping control is not a part of teachers' daily work undertaken through preference.

The need to control pupils must be balanced with a need "to get work done by immature, changeful, and divergent persons confined in a small space" (Lortie, 1975: 151). The comment by Lortie raises an important distinction between teaching, relating to day-to-day control of children, and teaching for a purpose. Teaching is sometimes assumed to involve only tasks of the latter kind, for example, as the dissemination of curriculum knowledge (Bennett and Turner-Bissett, 1991; Shulman, 1986). McLaughlin (1990) suggests that the purpose of teaching is "a responsibility for encouraging individual accomplishment and meeting student needs, as opposed to a view primarily custodial and disciplinary" (1990: 3). This view seems to assume that teaching for control, and teaching for a purpose, are alternatives. Carter and Doyle (1987), in a similar vein, acknowledge the centrality of control in

classroom affairs, in suggesting that control has to precede curriculum instruction. They argue "learning in classrooms is deeply imbedded within the complex matrix of events and forces that must be managed first, if students are to be brought into contact with the curriculum" (1987: 157). Both views assume that classroom control and instructional tasks are discrete features and separate alternatives.

A more balanced view is that instruction of children takes place concurrently with, and often as a part of, classroom control. Jackson's argument still seems relevant that there are only two strategies involved for teachers, of which "the first involves the seemingly trivial business of maintaining order in a classroom, and the second involves the seemingly important business of making curricular decisions" (1968, 1990 edition: 103). The relationship between instructional work and control in the classroom, is explored by a number of researchers from a variety of perspectives.

Early research studies suggest control exercised by teachers is subject to a continuous process of 'bargaining' (Geer 1979), and 'negotiation' (Strauss, 1978). More recently, Huggett suggests the survival of teachers in the classroom depends upon a "negotiated contract, either implicit or explicit" (1986: xv). Recent ethnographic studies have helped towards an understanding of this reciprocal process in the classroom. Woods (1987) points to a reciprocity of "friendliness in exchange for good order and work on a

sliding proportional scale" (1987: 122). Desforges and Cockburn (1987) observe that tasks are selected by teachers for children, and this selection "plays a crucial function in the negotiation of co-operation, and hence order" (1987: 18). These studies suggest that the instructional work of teachers is closely related to processes of control in the classroom.

Other studies suggest teaching is a search for routines that may resolve or stabilise the problems of classroom control. Doyle (1986) suggests routines are essential as a means "to increase the manageability of classroom life" (1986: 5). Brown and McIntyre (1993) argue that such routines have a purpose of ensuring pupils act in those ways considered "by the teacher as routinely desirable" (1993: 54). Louden has defined teaching as the "struggle to discover and maintain a settled practice, a set of routines and patterns of action which resolve the problems posed by particular subjects and groups of children" (1991:xi). Other researchers agree that establishing routine and order is a constant strategy in day-to-day teaching (Yinger 1980; Clarke and Peterson 1986). Their view is shared by Pollard (1985) who suggests that the "structural position" in teaching makes necessary various 'rule frames', to cope with situations which are consensual, confrontational or negotiative (1985: 164). Pollard argues that teachers use such strategies to achieve the "working consensus" (ibid: 159). Woods argues that achieving such a

balance is an art, in "combining conflictual elements into a harmonious whole" (1990: 23).

Woods' arguments remind us that teaching is more than daily preoccupations with classroom control. And yet as suggested earlier, neither is teaching simply a fulfilment of teaching purposes. The difference seems at the heart of an anomaly and contradiction in teaching, between a world of 'is' and a world of 'ought' (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 78). For teachers, the purpose of their work is not one of exercising control over pupil behaviour, although control characterises much of their day-to-day work. Teaching seems significantly and sometimes substantially the control of pupil behaviour, whereas the purpose of teaching is often assumed to relate only to instruction (Shulman, 1986; West-Burnham, 1992). Lieberman and Miller (1984) suggest this difference places teachers in a contradictory position, since on the one hand "teachers want to spend time doing what they are trained to do, and that is teach; on the other hand, in order for instruction to take place, order must be maintained" (1984: 41).

Teachers' own views on the purposes of their work seem to be diffuse and idiosyncratic, perpetuating the sense of anomaly between what teachers do, and what they seek to do. A main assumption of teachers is that their personal work makes a difference to children' learning and growth (Ashton et al.

1983; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978). Some researchers refer to this assumption as a sense of 'efficacy' (McLaughlin et al, 1990: 3). One such set of personal beliefs stems from the assumption that teaching helps children to grow as individuals. King (1978) uses 'developmentalism' as a term to describe beliefs of respondents in "helping the children to grow" (1978:72). King also points to a further set of beliefs in respondents' concern for children as individuals, described by King as an ideology of 'individualism' (ibid: 11). Other researchers, including Desforges and Cockburn (1987) and Alexander (1984) also observe a pervasive belief in "the unique nature of individual children" (1987: 39). Connell (1985) analyses teachers' views on the purposes of their work and distinguishes teaching for 'enlightenment', 'individual development', 'transmission of values' and 'the transfer of skills' (1985:180). Connell suggests that such views and principles are subject to a process of "mediation, moderation and survival" within the daily realities of the classroom (ibid: 181).

The above studies indicate that teaching, like headship, is characterised by personal work that serves the diffuse and idiosyncratic purposes of the teacher. As in headship, the day-to-day work of teachers reveals a difference between the transactional tasks of keeping classroom order and work that serves personal purposes. As Woods (1987) notes, teachers cannot escape the need for control "whatever their ideals

and beliefs" (1987: 143). A need for control is inescapable but is not seen by teachers as their 'real' work, while work that serves a 'real' and personal purpose is not achievable without the former.

These kinds of anomaly in teachers' work are considered by Hargreaves (1980), who suggests that many contradictions are "created for schools by contradictions at the societal level" (1980: 137). Berlak and Berlak (1981) have suggested seminally that contradictions are experienced as dilemmas in people's thinking. The Berlaks indicate that dilemmas are "contradictions simultaneously in consciousness and in society" (1981: 124). Many researchers accept this argument and use the notion to describe aspects of teaching. Wagner (1987), for example, uses the term 'dilemma' in arguing that there is "internal conflict in the way consciousness reacts to its perception of the situation-at-hand" (1987: 165). Wagner has described such conflicts as cognitive 'knots' in teachers' thinking.

In terms of the present argument, the ideas of the Berlaks seem relevant in indicating that particular dilemmas exist between control and personal values and beliefs (op.cit: 130-131). Berlak and Berlak do not attempt to explain how the "patterns of resolution are actually constructed by teachers" (ibid:165). One set of explanations is offered by Pollard (1985) and Woods (1987), in outlining the strategies

of teachers for coping and survival. Connell (1985) finds that the main strategy for teachers "is to survive, with the pressure coming from below; in the other conformity with the pressure coming from above" (1985: 115). Lieberman and Miller agree that control is part of a "universal tension" in teachers' work (1984: 21). Nias (1989) suggests that primary teachers "continually live and work with paradox, the very nature of teaching is contradictory" (1989: 196). Nias argues that to adopt the identity of an English school teacher is to accept the paradoxical nature of the task and inexorably to live with tension" (ibid: 197). The arguments of Nias are important in confirming that teaching is not only a matter of survival but is a daily attempt to achieve balance in the face of endemic contradiction.

Woods (1987) suggests that a balance between control and the 'child-centred part' is achieved by means of 'omniscience' and 'orchestration' (1987: 133). Nias (1989) concludes that teaching is a 'composite skill' in which balance is not only achieved, but achieved "in the face of unremitting pressures towards disequilibrium" (1989: 199). Woods (1990) argues relevantly that balance is not always achievable, suggesting that teaching is a continuum, in which "towards one end, the constraints diminish and teaching interests take precedence and at the other extreme, constraints obliterate teaching interests to the extent of forcing attention on a more basic need" (1990: 24). This argument seems plausible, as an explanation of individual differences in achieving balance.

Some evidence suggests that experienced teachers are better able to achieve a balance in day-to-day work than novice teachers (Housner and Griffey, 1985: 45-53; Clark, 1988) but it is perhaps unwise to generalise. Teaching seems more a matter of practitioners attempting to achieve a balance each day in their teaching. Sometimes virtuosity is achieved, and sometimes not. Stenhouse's warning seems apposite that "teaching must not to be regarded as a static accomplishment like riding a bicycle or keeping a ledger: it is like all arts of high ambition, a strategy in the face of an impossible task" (1985: 124). Lortie (1975) suggests that balance is a matter of personal conscience, observing that "teachers seem lonely, they fight battles alone with their consciences and, it seems, frequently they lose" (1975: 159). His suggestion seems near to the inherent fragility and contradiction of teachers' work.

My research question in this chapter is whether there may be a relationship between teaching and the personal work of heads. In both occupations, there is a central difference between what practitioners do, and what they seek to do, or prefer to do. The difference is also a contradiction, since practitioners tend to disclaim a world that 'is' as not their 'real' work. My argument has parallels with Lortie's comment on a contradiction between "task" and "expressive" functions in teaching (1975: 155). My own conclusion is in similar terms, in arguing that teaching and headship are

characterised by personal and transactional features. In teaching, the work that 'is' involves a need for classroom control, while in headship the need is to run the school. This sense of anomaly may have effects for practitioners in cognitive and affective tensions, in practitioners' attempts to find a sense of balance with the inherent contradictions of their daily work.

I also argue that the roots of personal work are found in an occupation, sustaining norms of independence, individuality and privacy. I conclude that headteachers' perceptions and feelings about their day-to-day work has a history as well as a present. Several researchers and commentators suggest that what we observe in the present has origins in the past. Salzberger-Wittenberg (1983) observe that in teaching "the phenomenon of the past is constantly revived in the present" (1983: 33). Other researchers use terms such as 'cultural templates' (Bowers 1990: 19), 'practical constructs' (Carr and Kemmis, 1983: 123), 'traditions' (Louden 1991: 123), and 'schemata' (Nias 1987:123), in arguing that our perceptions have a history. Using different terms, the above studies reinforce arguments made by Becker (1961) which suggest that 'perceptual frames of reference' are "an established part of a person's way of dealing with the world" (Becker, 1961: 34).

Throughout this chapter I argue that the 'perceptual frames'

of heads is also a phenomenon of the past. I argue that the central anomaly in headteachers' work may have origins in an occupation that emphasises personal work. I suggest as a possibility that the perceptions of teachers and heads may be shaped within a context that promotes territoriality and ownership, and by a culture sustaining norms of independence and individuality before 'public arrangements' (Huberman, 1990: 13). Teaching and headship are "personal activities" (Nias 1988: 147), riven by anomalies that involve day-by-day struggles to achieve a sense of balance with irreconcilable contradictions. This argument is not made in the existing literature which treats teachers and heads as if they belong to different cultures and occupations. What seems lacking in the literature is an acknowledgement that characteristics of the teaching occupation may have an inheritance, as well as a history and an immediate present. The child is father to the man, but so too is teaching to headship.

CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY, ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS:

No study undertaken into headship in the late 1980's and the early 1990's can disregard the legislative and political climate of the previous few years. This study is written at a time of upheaval in every sector of Education in this country. It is a period in which the entire educational community appears daily beleaguered by the scale and effects of externally directed reforms.

These events are real to practitioners, and seem real to me. And yet, it is not easy to discern the full implications of the Education Act 1988 as an historical event. My evidence spans only the initial stages of the reform programme. The last date of interviews with heads is January 1991, and the last entry in the one-year journal is July 1990. There is therefore a gap of three years between data-collecting and the writing of this study. The purpose of the study, in any case, has not been to plot the course of contemporary reform in primary education. I believe the study has served a more important purpose, in describing a world that 'is', and not a world of 'ought'. The present study does not attempt to describe the unfolding of legislative changes, as perceived by practitioners. This might have been a valuable focus for the current study but, as pointed out in earlier comments, such an emphasis would have provided insights into the nature of change rather than on the nature of primary headship. Our knowledge of the latter is sparse whereas our

understanding of the processes of change is much enlightened by studies undertaken by Schon (1987), Fullan and Hargreaves (1991), Fullan (1985, 1992), Pollard (1992), Rizvi (1989), Campbell et al. (1992), Hargreaves (1992), Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991) and Hopkins and Ainscow (1993). I feel that a focus upon current reforms would not add substantially to what is already known about the processes of change. I feel too that such a study might already be dated by the rapidity of recent changes.

This does not diminish the significance or effect of current reform upon the lives and work of those who experience it. Among the insights offered in the studies mentioned above is that change is frequently a painful business. Apple (1986) points to several effects of reforms, in the increasing time pressures, de-professionalisation, routinisation of work and restraints to autonomous working. For practitioners at the present time, there may appear no respite from the tensions that current reforms may bring to their daily lives. Laar (1992) cites the opening lines of 'A Tale of Two Cities', in attempting to summarise the extent of these concerns:

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times. It was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light, it was the season of darkness. It was the Spring of hope, it was the Winter of despair. We had everything before us, we had nothing before us." (Dickens 1859).

I suspect Laar may over-dramatise the present situation but,

in examining issues and implications of my findings it seems inevitable that I acknowledge the depth of these anxieties. My consideration of main issues therefore focuses upon the contemporary debate in education which I discuss in relation to the study's findings. This discussion falls naturally into three related parts. In the first part, I summarise my research findings, as a means of prefacing the discussion in later sections. A summary also seems helpful at this stage, in order to draw together some of the central themes emerging from the study. In the second part, I discuss some general concerns arising from current legislative changes. I also refer briefly in this second part to my findings from the interviews held in 1988, since these provide historical evidence relevant to the discussion. The discussion in this second part leads to specific issues which I consider more fully in the third part of the chapter. In this third part, I examine some expectations and assumptions made by central government about the nature of headship. The government is involved in setting an agenda for centrally directed reform. As part of its agenda for implementation of its reforms, the government makes several suppositions about the executive nature of headship, as a central medium for achieving change in schools. In the fourth part, I contrast such assumptions with my research findings on the nature of headship.

Following these contrasts, I turn to an examination of some

of the implications of my research findings. My discussion is in two main sections, each relating to my central theme that being a headteacher has personal aspects. First, I examine the implications of an affective dimension within primary headship. Second, I consider the implication that headship is the personal work of headteachers and that these personal aspects are enduring in character. I ask whether the ascribed role of headteachers may need to be changed and not headteachers themselves.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The portrait of headship to emerge from this study reveals a world of some complexity. The day-to-day work of heads is experienced as a melee of interactions and events, occurring at unremitting pace and intensity. Respondents, as well as researchers, have difficulties in capturing its totality for others. Practitioners often resort to affective statements, metaphorical language and anecdote when trying to convey its complexities. These difficulties stem largely from the nature of headship, as a phenomenon of immediacy, intensity and dislocation. Respondents also seem consumed by their work, often using time outside of school for involuntary, as well as voluntary reflection, and for short-term planning.

However, there are differences between headteachers' school-related work and personal work. There seems an anomaly in

daily headship based on these differences in heads' work. On the one hand, accounts of respondents convey headship as a here-and-now reality. Heads say that they are constantly involved in trying to keep the ship afloat, in dealing with day-to-day problems of paperwork, staffing, buildings and the behaviour of pupils. This description seems consistent and valid in the accounts of respondents. Daily headship from the viewpoint of the researcher and practitioners seems mostly concerned with school-related work, as the tasks that enable the school to function.

On the other hand, respondents' accounts seem to contradict this portrait. Heads view their work in running the school as unnecessary, banal, inconsequential but obligatory. They trivialise their school-related work, on the grounds that it is not part of real headship. There is a different kind of work, often occluded by day-to-day events, which seems to be personal to headteachers. This work involves choices and preferences, serves purposes which are idiosyncratic and is carried out in ways that seem possessive, independent and solitary. The central purpose of this work is to shape the school by creating a world in the head's image. Heads see the school as a canvas for this work. A subjective warrant for shaping the school seems established early, and remains throughout heads' careers. The head is initiator, arbiter, agent and advocate of a personal view of the school. This view is egocentric, self-centred and autonomous, and guarded

jealously from intrusion or interference by others. Heads also choose to spend time with children. This feature of personal work is satisfying and rewarding to respondents, although it is often justified by them on the basis that it serves school-related purposes.

Headship also involves what headteachers actually do in both their school work and personal work each day. Many tasks involve information-gathering about individual people and about the school as a whole. There is often a monitoring purpose to this work. Other tasks seem part of a process of sifting, interpreting, designating and controlling the flow of information. The working-lists of respondents show that heads are often unsuccessful in dealing with the volume of information they receive.

Headteachers also make decisions each day, often of a minor nature. Decisions involve judgements about priorities in respondents' work. These judgements may relate to time-priorities or to decision-priorities. Heads have particular dilemmas in deciding on their use of time. In making these judgements, heads seem more influenced by obligation than by personal preferences, and by tactical rather than strategic decisions.

The day-to-day planning of headteachers appears less linear and less proactive, than assumed in the literature. Plans are often made at odd moments of time, and may be short-term

or reactive in nature. Planning, in any case, often seems nullified by the unpredictability and discontinuity of daily events. The working lists of heads are often a record of tasks anticipated, rather than work accomplished.

A substantial theme in accounts of these respondents is the affective dimension in day-to-day work. There are feelings and moods that relate to the passage of the school year and to the periodicity of school life. Moment-by-moment events and interactions also give rise to feelings. Such emotions, like the nature of the work itself, are varied and short-term. During the course of the day, there may be periods of stress, satisfaction, loneliness, joyfulness, frustration, success, pride and anxiety. School-related work seems a particular source of annoyance and dissatisfaction to heads. Heads often experience feelings of resentment and injustice when carrying out this work. They also feel a heightened sense of uncertainty, isolation and stress when dealing with crises.

The work of heads takes place in a social context, involving them in relationships with other people. This particular aspect of heads' work also has affective dimensions. Some feelings and emotions are professionally stage-managed for particular people and occasions.

Heads feel pleased when they manage to achieve something in

their personal work, but the work itself is also subject to considerable interruption and fragmentation. The sense of dislocation can create numerous irritations for respondents. Heads often express feelings of frustration at their failure to achieve progress in their personal work. Working with children, on the other hand, provides a constant source of emotional sustenance to heads. They enjoy working with children. Teaching provides heads with emotional rewards, and with feelings of professional competence, seldom felt in school-related work. Working with children may even provide therapy for heads from tensions and uncertainties of other work.

There seem several parallels between the emotional, personal and experiential characteristics of headship, and what is already known about the nature of teaching as an occupation. Both occupations appear similar in being fragmented, intense and immediate. Both activities seem territorial, possessive and isolated, and both reflect independent, individualistic, idiosyncratic and autonomous ways of working. Both have a a pervasive affective dimension.

There are other parallels. Teaching is also characterised by endemic contradiction and anomaly. There is a difference between teaching as personal work serving the idiosyncratic purposes of the teacher, and teaching as a daily obligation in coping with pupil behaviour and with the context of life

in the classroom. Teaching necessarily involves a daily concern with classroom control, while in headship the daily obligations are of a different kind, in keeping the wheels turning. In other words, both teaching and headship seem to limit what practitioners can achieve or may seek to achieve, because of the nature of the context in which these occupations take place. Teaching is not just a matter of instruction, and headship is not just a matter of effective management of schools. Both occupations involve coping with a day-to-day reality that has a sense of both antithesis and contradiction - between what practitioners must do and what they seek to achieve.

The study's findings offer an empirical base that I now use to contrast with government assumptions made on headship at the present time. Before making these contrasts, I begin by considering briefly the nature of general concerns raised by the recent legislation.

CURRENT CONCERNS AND LEGISLATIVE REFORMS

The extent of present concerns is perhaps understandable, in view of the scope and radical nature of current educational reform. There have been seven major Education Acts since 1979, each with far-reaching potential to change how schools operate, and to affect the practice of those who work in our schools. Terms such as annual reporting, staff appraisal,

national curriculum, grant maintained status, directed time and keystage testing are now part of education's vocabulary. The scale and pace of the government's proposals for reform are without precedent in this country, and I summarise these legislative changes as appendix to this study (Appendix C). Merrick (1993) also offers a synopsis of the legislation.

It seems unproductive to speculate whether the present study might have been different, if data had been gathered earlier or later in the reform programme. I believe the features I identify in heads' daily work remain consistent and endemic. It is a matter of speculation, although an issue I address in this chapter, whether the nature of primary headship will be made irrevocably different by effects of current reforms. Initial interviews for the present study took place in 1988, when discussion nationally was focussed on initial proposals of the Education Reform Act 1988. These proposals were only just beginning to have significance in schools, and the one-year journal has scant mention of them. Proposals included the arrangements for sex education (Circular 11/87) and for collective worship (Circular 3/89), as well as arrangements to consider complaints (Circular 1/89) and the proposals for curriculum testing and assessment. The legal definitions of foundation subjects, and key stages (Sections 2 and 3, ERA 1988) were not statutory at that time. A number of LEA initiatives were taking place including, in my own LEA, some procedures to meet special educational needs in schools and

to establish school review and development arrangements.

The initial interviews to which I refer were held during the Autumn term 1988 and the Spring term 1989. I have already described my research methods for these interviews (p.49). I interviewed an opportunity sample of fifteen heads, employed in four different LEA's. I asked each of these respondents: What changes are you involved in? What do you feel about those changes? By the end of these initial interviews, it was apparent that respondents had many anxieties about the impending reforms (Research Diary 15.3.89; 22.3.89). These interviews also indicated that the reforms cut across heads' personal work in shaping the school. Respondents saw the government reforms as extraneous to their own views about the school's needs, supplanting their own initiatives and time-scale. These heads saw themselves as embodiments of their schools, as the principal initiators and owners of the internal changes that should occur. They saw the proposals for a National Curriculum, local management of schools and review and development work as superfluous to their personal views of the needs of the school (Research Diary 22.3.89). Change of any kind was an endemic feature of their work but a feature that they felt should remain within their province and control (Research Diary 22.3.89). Respondents also used various tactics to ensure that their personal agenda of change was agreed by others, including a use of negotiation, coercion and a manipulation of staff opinion. Formal staff meetings were only outwardly democratic. Heads had a role

of 'gatekeeper' (Alexander, 1984: 123), in deciding which aspects of internal or external change to promote, and which to adapt.

These initial interviews have some historical interest, in indicating that initial stages of the reform programme were subject at that time to adaptation, resistance and even rejection by respondents. Osborne and Broadfoot (1992) have made a similar point in arguing that reforms are subject to co-operation, retreatism, resistance or incorporation (1992: 148), of which the latter appears to be the most frequent response. Their comments suggest external change, defined as legislative reform, is moderated by the practice of heads and teachers. Woods (1993) uses the term 'appropriation' in suggesting that practitioners modify reforms to their own personal purposes (1993: 3). Vulliamy and Webb (1993) also argue that reforms are adapted and 'translated' in ways that depend on "prior beliefs and practices" (1993: 21).

These observations indicate that legislative reforms are not implanted without modification into practitioners' work. It seems plausible that implementation of the reform programme is not as rational, linear or sequential as supposed by some commentators and central government. Woods (1993) suggests, as I do, that "running through these adaptations at an individual level is another factor to do with 'self'" (1993: 14). Nias (1989) defines 'self' in terms of "personal and

professional identity" (1989: 208), in predicting that the effects of the Education Act 1988, may be to "reduce teachers' motivation and with it their self-investment in their work". Woods is more optimistic, suggesting that the 'self' in the work of 'creative' practitioners is maintained by appropriation and through a process of 'self-realisation' (1993: 18). I also argue (Revell, 1987) that appropriation of prescriptive formulas and pre-formulated objectives is necessary in order to maintain a personal style of teaching that is creative, exploratory and "Baedeker-less" (1987: 146). A central issue in the current debate is the extent that practitioners can modify current legislation.

Legislation may also have an influence on practice. Campbell et al. (1991), for example, conclude that teachers' use of time at Key Stage I is restricted by the effects of recent reforms. Hargreaves (1990) also observes the "colonisation" of teachers' time by new administrative demands (1990: 318). Both studies indicate an increasing intensification within teachers' work, although there is less evidence of influence upon ideology or pedagogy. Pollard (1992) has discussed the issue of ideology, suggesting that child-centred commitments continue to provide the "bedrock", on which primary teachers judge contemporary changes (1992: 119). Pollard cites Nias (1991), in arguing the commitment is such that there is some sense of bereavement as teachers grieve "as for a lost self" (1991: 119). Pollard suggests that "one tangible result is

an unprecedented number of teachers taking early retirement, morale across the profession is very low" (1992: 120). Pollard's argument on early retirement does not seem wholly conclusive. The most recent report of the School Teachers' Review Body (1993) indicates a substantial rise in numbers leaving the profession, to 10.3% of the work force (1993: 12). However, the committee does not see this as evidence that morale is low, concluding that "morale and motivation appear to be satisfactory" (ibid:15). The committee notes, in particular, that "the pay increases of the last two years have offset the possibly demotivating effects of pressures which teachers may have faced" (ibid: 30). The committee agrees that statistical evidence shows 78% of retirements are 'early' but, unlike Pollard, link this trend to "falling school rolls" (ibid: 12). A further issue in the current debate is therefore the extent to which current reforms have effects on practitioners, in terms of colonisation of time, intensification of work and morale.

ASSUMPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS ON HEADSHIP

It is an assumption on my part that the main expectations of central government can be succinctly summarised, as if they were expressed by a single person. In reality, policies and statements on education may be compiled by many individuals, working in collaboration with others. Statistical evidence in publications, such as Dod's Whitehall Companion (1993),

may provide data to reveal the thinking of some of these anonymous writers. Dod's, for example, shows that more than half of the most senior 1150 civil service post-holders have been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, and over two-thirds of the eighteen permanent secretaries were educated there. Richards (1987) argues that the reform programme has roots in a civil service, for which "the long-established subject-based framework for the curriculum is alive and well, the result in part of their own primary and secondary education (1987: 187). However, this kind of link is speculative.

An alternative line of enquiry is to consider the statements made by politicians themselves. Such statements may reflect different emphases of the moment, although there does seem a consistency in the assumptions made about headship. One assumption is that headship fulfils a central role within schools. The Minister of State for Education and Science in a parliamentary reply, affirms "the effective functioning of schools depends on leadership, commitment and judgement of Head Teachers" (Hansard, 12th November 1987). Kenneth Baker's address to the annual conference of the NAHT in 1988 clarifies the nature of that centrality. The Minister of State emphasizes government's expectations that heads are instrumental in implementing a National Curriculum. Heads are to be "the cutting edge of the reform programme" (1988: 26), to enable "reforms to come on stream led, managed and inspired by yourselves" (1988: 27). These comments summarise

several assumptions made by the government on the nature of headship. Firstly, headship is associated closely with leadership, although the purpose of that leadership is one of fulfilling a second assumption. The second assumption is that headship is responsive to government's central policy. A third assumption in Kenneth Baker's remarks are that the purpose of headship is to deliver a curriculum and, in this case, to implement a national curriculum.

These assumptions are closely inter-related, and continue to underpin political comment by Ministers of State during the next five years. A letter from John Patten (1993) to all headteachers contains similar assumptions and expectations. The letter emphasizes that headteachers have a key role "as curriculum leaders, and as managers of how the curriculum is taught" (op. cit.). The letter further states headteachers are making "great strides", but there is "still some way to go". Campbell, Emery and Stone (1993) point out that the letter emphasizes a "statutory charge" upon headteachers, in delivering what the authors believe to be an "undeliverable curriculum" (1993: 13). The authors further point out that heads and governors "will be inspected upon the basis that it is deliverable" (ibid). These comments may or may not be prophetic. My argument is that the government continues to make a number of assumptions about headship, seeing it as a leadership that is both responsive to central directives and is responsible for National Curriculum delivery by schools.

Further evidence of these assumptions is found in a variety of publications, for example, in those concerning pay and conditions of teachers and in reports of the relevant review bodies (School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document, DES; Interim Advisory Committee on School Teachers' Pay and Conditions, HMSO; School Teachers' Review Body, HMSO). Such documents refer in specific terms to statutory requirements of headship, and also include reference to oral and written evidence presented to such bodies by the DFE and by the Secretary of State for Education. The reports of the review bodies are often produced annually, and so allow comparisons to be made on any similarities or changes in government's interpretation of headship. These reports seem to reveal a consistent set of assumptions on the nature and purpose of headteachers' work.

The report of the Advisory Committee on School Teachers' Pay and Conditions in 1989, for example, illustrates many of the assumptions already indicated. Pay awards are recommended for heads, on the grounds that they are "centrally involved in preparatory work for LMS", and have a responsibility "to secure the implementation in the school of the National Curriculum and the associated testing arrangements" (1989: 21). The Committee advises "if primary heads had to spend less time on routine administrative tasks they would be able to have more time to deal with changes flowing from the Education Reform Act" (1989: 44). On the point raised by

Pollard (1993) on morale, the report concludes that the high resignation levels are acceptable, since it allows "infusion of new blood" (1989: 17).

The report seems to illustrate the continued assumption that headship is responsive to the directives of the government, and remunerated accordingly. There is an added prescription on how headship should be managed, in order that heads are able to respond more efficiently to legislative reforms. Several recommendations from this report are incorporated into the 'School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 1990' (D.E.S. 1990). This publication specifies the duties and responsibilities of headteachers in implementing "provisions of the Education Acts 1944 to 1988". I have already referred to these duties and regulations and these are attached as an appendix to this study (Appendix A).

In 1992 the School Teachers' Review Body published its first report (HMSO 1992). The specific remit of the committee was to report on matters relating to cost-effectiveness, and the quality of teachers. The committee in its reply accepts the principle of performance-related pay as being "a significant motivator towards improvement for teachers in all schools" (ibid: 13). The notions of 'quality' and 'effectiveness' seem to underlie the D.E.S. publication, later in the year, by Alexander, Rose and Woodhead (1992). Headship is still viewed as leadership, but it is now a "leadership in quality

assessment and assurance", a role which will assume "greater importance as the National Curriculum and Parents' Charter take full effect" (Alexander et al. 1992:46). Effectiveness in headship is linked to the head's sense of vision but this is assumed by the authors to be an "articulated view of what constitutes the school curriculum including its relationship to the National Curriculum" (ibid: 47). Significantly, the head's effectiveness is linked with the ability to ensure "a consistency of approach among teachers" (ibid: 47).

The assumption seems a persistent one by central government that headship is responsive to government directive and will ensure that staff achieve "quality of curriculum provision" (ibid: 46). The procedures for heads to achieve this are specified as being a regular monitoring of teachers' "plans, teaching methods, work in progress and work completed" and then to test progress against National Curriculum attainment targets and programmes of study" (ibid). The recent OFSTED report (1993) also assumes that the "essential elements of the head's role" are curriculum management and deployment of staff (1993: 19). The report warns that these aspects will require "even greater attention if the National Curriculum is to be implemented fully" (1993:19). The most recent documentation available to me is the second report by the School Teachers' Review Body (1993). It confirms that government expectation has not substantially altered during the span of the current study. I cite briefly from this

report in order to summarise my main points about government assumptions.

First, headship is central to the quality of schools. The report sees it as being "the pre-eminent factor underlying the differences in educational outcomes between otherwise similar schools" (ibid: 38). Secondly, headship involves leadership, although the nature of that leadership seems one of ensuring others implement the requirements of a national curriculum. Characteristics of leadership are specified in the report, and include "breadth of vision; a positive ethos; ability to motivate others; clear aims, objectives and standards, and regular evaluation of progress against these; effective and efficient use of staffing; and to manage change as a matter of course" (ibid:38). Thirdly, headship is assumed to be responsive to government direction and to central policies. On this point, the report states that in the face of new reforms, and despite the "spur" of LMS and better training for heads, the overwhelming response of headteachers remains "very patchy" (ibid:38). This point raises issues about training that I consider briefly in this chapter. Fourthly, government assumes headship has the purpose of delivering the national curriculum in schools. On this point, the report assumes simply that the function of headship is to ensure a "successful implementation of new arrangements" (ibid: 3).

In the above sections, I suggest that the government makes a number of assumptions about headship. The government's view is consistent, in seeing headship as fundamental in ensuring quality of curriculum provision in schools. Its centrality involves directing the work of others but must itself remain responsive to central directives. The principal function of headship is delivery of the national curriculum. In the following sections, I contrast these assumptions with some of the main findings of the present study.

GOVERNMENT ASSUMPTIONS AND STUDY FINDINGS

Although government, researchers and commentators agree that headship is central in school affairs, there seems far less consensus on the purposes served by that centrality. The government views headship as part of a line management, with executive responsibility to implement curriculum reform in schools and to lead others to do the same. The findings from the current study offer a number of contrasts with such assumptions.

In the following sections, I discuss the contrasts that seem the most fundamental. In my first section, I consider the notion of leadership, since this appears central both to the government suppositions and the study's evidence about the nature of what heads do each day. In the second section, I discuss the responsiveness of headship to external influence since there seem important contrasts between government's

expectations and my findings on heads' subjective warrant in shaping the school. In the third section, I consider the notion of curriculum delivery, since there are important contrasts between government assumptions and the study's main conclusions about the nature of primary headship.

a) HEADSHIP AS LEADERSHIP

Government's assumptions on the function of headship seem to be inseparable from its assumptions on the nature of schools as organisations. Headship is management of schools and is linked closely with the school's effectiveness in achieving pre-ordained goals. The School Teachers' Review Body (1993) assumes the role of headteachers is chiefly one of effective management. The report deplores any other work, especially administration, since this leads to "insufficient attention to those aspects concerned with more strategic and less immediate tasks" (1993: 39). The Review Body supports the publication of performance indicators and four-yearly inspections, since this will help prevent "insularity" and encourages heads to use "appropriate benchmarks" to improve their management skills (ibid: 39). The report recommends the introduction of performance-related pay, on the grounds that it is widely acknowledged that "PRP can form part of an overall culture for driving an organisation towards its goals" (ibid: 36).

This view of headship seems structured and rational. Bush (1986) describes it as a model that is hierarchical, in which headteachers are assumed to use "rational means" in achieving the organisation's prescribed goals. Rizvi (1989) argues that the model not only creates, but also sustains a "bureaucratic rationality". The head has a pivotal role within the hierarchy but the role is primarily to ensure the organisation achieves its externally prescribed goals.

This model of schools and headship role is criticised by a number of researchers, including Bottery (1992), Southworth (1993) and Evers and Lakomski (1991). The findings of the present study also raise several reservations on applying this model to the work of headteachers. First, the work of heads does not seem to fit readily into any rational or sequential set of procedures. My evidence shows a day-to-day reality characterised by a constant fragmentation and discontinuity. Planning is often piecemeal and short-term, taking place in moments of available time. Plans, in any case, seem subject to constant interruption and here-and-now concerns. Headship does not seem to lend itself readily to a rational model, since it does not have the key ingredients of discreteness and linearity. The work of my respondents appears more a response to immediate concerns. Headship does not seem rational and planned, but "ad hoc, responsive and realistic, within the cracks and around the edges of the job" (Lieberman and Miller, 1984: 76). Headship is much more

pragmatic than is assumed by a rational management model. It remains opportunistic rather than deliberative, reactive not proactive, and unsystematic not ordered. The concerns of day-to-day headship are more about keeping the ship afloat than with designing a better vessel, and more a matter of avoiding immediate reefs than with plotting future routes or maintaining an efficient log.

Second, heads do not easily fulfil the role assigned to them in a model emphasizing bureaucratic rationality. Heads come from a different kind of occupation, in which a particular value is placed on the quality and nature of relationships. My findings confirm the importance of relationships in day-to-day headship and supports the conclusions of a number of ethnographic studies into teaching. These studies emphasize that teaching is an inherently caring occupation, involving satisfactions and "psychic rewards" in working with children (Lortie 1975: 103). Cortazzi (1991) agrees that the quality of relationships with others is central to the "rewards and worthwhileness" of teaching (1991: 124). Connell (1985) has also agreed with Lortie's views, arguing that at the heart of teaching are relationships with colleagues and "changing, growing adolescents" (1985: 116). Cortazzi concludes that there is "widespread dedication and deep satisfaction inside the classroom, in doing something that is worthwhile with children" (1991: 125). Pollard (1985) has cited evidence to indicate that teachers "are people who enjoy working with

children and who experience a sense of fulfilment from teaching" (1985: 24). Connell concludes that "the capacity to care remains a fact and a real presence in teachers' work in the classroom" (1985: 121).

My findings suggest that headship also has such an affective component. Heads are products of an occupation that places a high value on relationships. The study's evidence suggests that relationships are also fundamental for respondents, and that the quality of these relationships is a source of both positive and negative feelings and emotions in headship. Heads place a value on relationships and it is an important part of heads' feelings of competence, or what Lortie terms in teaching as "craft pride" (1975: 103). The study further suggests that relationships with children remain as a legacy in heads' personal work and a source of emotional sustenance for my respondents.

These occupational values seem constant and enduring, but do not fit readily into a rationalist perspective, particularly models emphasising cost effectiveness and efficiency. It seems apparent that the model promoted by government has different values. The rewards for its members are assumed to be extrinsic and not intrinsic, often linked closely with remuneration. In a letter from John Patten to the School Teachers' Review Body (1993), the Minister of State makes a direct link between "an individual teacher's contribution to

the education of pupils and his or her reward" (1993: 47). The report of this committee recommends accordingly that the remuneration of the profession should be performance-related on the grounds that "these arrangements operate widely in the private sector" (ibid: 36). It is perhaps significant that the report recommends headteachers should be trained in appropriate management techniques drawn from industry. The report makes a specific suggestion, for example, that newly appointed heads should have "mentors" who are managers in local industrial or commercial concerns (ibid: 39).

The values represented by LMS and accountancy in the work of heads also seem incongruent, in comparison with occupational values and norms that centre upon relationships. Laughlin (1992) Shearn (1992) and Broadbent (1992) argue persuasively that LMS represents values which are at variance with norms in teaching. Broadbent (1992) points out that the values of 'accountancy' centre on "money measurement, quantification and reason" (1992:16). This shift in values may have a number of outcomes in heads' work. At a practical level, heads may now make judgements based on financial priorities, rather than educational ones. Broadbent suggests that "the act of budgeting is based upon an impersonal and objective decision process based on reason, expressed in financial terms" (1992: 17). It is perhaps significant that the new arrangements for the inspection of schools requires reports, not only on the quality of education, but also an assessment on "whether financial resources made available to the school

are being managed efficiently" (Education Act [Schools] 1992 9, 4c, HMSO).

b) HEADSHIP AS RESPONSIVE LINE MANAGEMENT

The recent report of the School Teachers' Review Body (1993) suggests government disquiet at headteachers' apparent lack of responsiveness to legislative reform. The report argues that "the challenges have increased significantly and the quality of response remains very patchy" (1993: 38). The Review Body suggests an urgent need for improved training, including "establishment of a management training college" (1993: 39). Rowe (1993) argues that the need for training is crucial, since "children are being delivered to institutions run by people who, very often, through lack of appropriate training, are unaware of some of the key skills vital to the successful running of our schools" (1992: 20). Yates (1992) argues there is an urgent need for the training of "those who lead if an organisation wants to function effectively" (1992: 1). This need has been supported for several years by the professional unions. The NAHT made proposals to the government in 1988, that heads should be systematically trained "in management of people, the management of time, the management of resources and finances, the management of administration, setting goals and targets, team building and motivation, and curriculum development" (1988: 123). The literature proliferates on ways to create effective schools,

through better training and the use of management techniques (Paisey and Paisey 1987, Preedy 1989, Sanday 1990, Donnelly 1992). The main problem is assumed by government and others to be a lack of adequate training, a matter of disseminating appropriate techniques in order to ensure that heads manage their schools effectively. There seems broad consensus that training is the panacea for an inadequate implementation of the reform programme.

There are, however, contrasting arguments raised by findings in the present study. First, the study suggests that heads do not respond readily to external direction of their work. Heads see the purpose of their personal work as shaping the school and they resist interference from others in carrying out this work. Second, the study indicates that origins of this subjective warrant are to be found in the occupation of teaching and that, once established, there seems little to prevent its reinforcement within the occupation. The profession appears to maintain and perpetuate a world of 'private' enactments (Huberman, 1990: 13). Norms of privacy persist in headship including, amongst other manifestations, a resistance by heads to interference by others.

My findings may also indicate that primary heads might be more responsive to external direction than conveyed by the above comments. I indicate in the study that heads have a strong sense of responsibility and duty. Heads see their

work in running the school as trivial and time wasted. In carrying out this work, my respondents seem impelled more by a sense of obligation, than by their own preferences. In decisions about how to spend time between competing demands, school-related work often has a higher priority. Running the school offers few satisfactions for headteachers, but it is nevertheless obligatory. This evidence might appear to support arguments that the profession is "deferential to authority" (Campbell 1993: 13) and that heads may feel under an obligation to implement external directives. Such an interpretation may overlook the fundamental importance of relationships in heads' work, since the obligations felt by my respondents are often those that meet the needs of other people within the school. There may be immediate effects or consequences for others in the school if the head disregards such duties. In other words, the obligations felt by heads seem to be 'top-down' rather than 'bottom-up'.

There is other evidence that heads do not view themselves as part of responsive line management. Woods (1993) argues that heads are "appropriating" reforms so that these conform to the concerns of the school (1993: 6). Woods summarises the current situation in terms of "a site of struggle, with changing fortunes as the battle continues" (1993:4). Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) suggest that for practitioners, the fight is now joined to protect what they most value in their work. The authors argue strongly that new solutions need

to be found by teachers and heads themselves, which focus on the needs of "the teacher as total person and the total school" (1992: 23). I discuss their comment in more detail in my final conclusions.

c) HEADSHIP AS CURRICULUM DELIVERY

Government statements on heads' responsibility in delivering a national curriculum follow logically from its assumptions about the work of headteachers. If headship is an executive line management, responsive to central directive, then it follows that headship's function is to implement the legally prescribed arrangements. Such assumptions bear only a scant resemblance to day-to-day realities. Headship is far more immediate, fragmented and complex than government assumes. Headteachers do not focus narrowly, exclusively and single-mindedly on delivery of the curriculum, neither does the nature of their work allow them to do. Curriculum delivery in any case is only part of the spectrum of external changes remitted to schools, and overseeing curriculum matters seems only part of the broad pattern of tasks undertaken by heads.

The evidence in this study suggests that within their broad range of tasks, heads see a fundamental difference between school work and personal work. The difference is especially important if heads see their responsibilities for curriculum delivery as additions to their school-related work, and not

as part of their personal work. There is some evidence to indicate that curriculum delivery, in common with current reforms in general, are felt mostly by headteachers in terms of their administrative work. My own respondents tended to see paperwork and external reforms as synonymous (p.97). Burgess, Southworth and Webb (1993) also point to the extent that ERA has resulted in "documentation to read, forms to be filled in, meetings to be attended, decisions to be made and policies to be drawn up" (1993: 4). Wallace (1991) also observes the heightened administrative pressures in trying to manage "multiple innovations" (1992). Primary heads see an intensification in their administrative work (Stone 1989, Hayes, 1993). Headteachers face increasing demands for new financial procedures, property auditing, policy-making, management reviews, health and safety legislation, energy conservation measures, micro-technology processing, local management strategies, employment regulations, reporting to governors and parents, record-keeping, co-ordination of assessment procedures and budget monitoring.

Curriculum matters seem part of the major intensification in heads' administrative work, not a separate or even a crucial aspect of headship as assumed by government. The effects of reform, including delivery of the curriculum, may merely intensify what Golby (1989) terms the 'instrumentality' of practitioners' roles (1989: 171). Burgess, Southworth and Webb (1993) also argue that an effect of current reforms may

be to limit, rather than enhance, heads' involvement in the curriculum. The authors argue that because of the pressures on heads' time, "involvement was limited, many curricular responsibilities were delegated to other staff, and those [heads] who no longer had any regular teaching commitment owing to the demands of ERA felt deskilled and were worried that they were no longer exemplary teachers" (1993: 4). The demands of ERA are also observed by Haigh (1993) to have led to many heads becoming less involved in curriculum matters. In terms of my own study, the current reforms may intensify heads' administrative work but at a cost to heads' personal work in shaping the school and in working with the children. Delivery of the curriculum may become part of the day-to-day obligations and dissatisfactions of school-related work.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the light of the above discussion, I examine two further implications of this study and make several recommendations for policy. Both parts of the examination relate closely to points raised earlier in the study. First, I consider the implications of an affective dimension in primary headship. Second, I discuss implications of my central finding that headship is the personal work of headteachers, as reflected in values, emotions, histories and a high investment of self in the job.

a) PRIMARY HEADSHIP AS AFFECTIVE WORK

I have argued consistently in this study that headship has a strong affective component. Emotions are threaded through the data of the one-year journal and of interviews held with respondents. The work is affective in character. Headship is a felt experience, as a moment-by-moment perceptual world of anxieties (Transcript 34: 16), interspersed with feelings of achievement and positive accomplishment (Transcript 33: 046). The brief moments of joy (Transcript 37: 022) can be quickly followed by deep frustrations (Transcript 39: 022). A momentary surge of excitement and 'adrenalin' (Transcript 38: 18) becomes superceded by feelings of disappointment and despondency (Transcript 34: 016). Headteachers also feel apprehensive or anxious (Transcript 35: 24). Heads may try to sustain and lead their colleagues but they also need some sustenance in turn (Transcript 37: 031). Headship seems an an isolated and a lonely job (Transcript 37: 002). It seems stressful work (Transcript 39: 022). In brief, the work of primary headteachers is a daily experience of 'troughs and peaks' (Transcript 38: 022). It is an exhausting and wearing profession (Transcript 37: 030).

The emotional dimension of primary headship is unrecognised in government assumptions, and it is neglected still further by the existing literature. Affectivities seem to have no place in what seems a rationalist and positivist explanation

of primary headship. Those studies which examine emotions in the profession tend to lay emphasis only on occupational stress. Many of these researchers and commentators assume that origins and remedies for stress lie with practitioners themselves. Gold and Roth (1993), as an example, provide strategies and techniques for use by teachers to manage and avoid stress-related problems. Their argument assumes that it is stress in the person which needs to be recognised and dealt with. Studies by Schonfeld (1990) and Forman (1982) make similar assumptions, in their provision of "cognitive restructuring techniques" to alter practitioners' perception of 'stressor' factors (Schonfeld 1990: 141; Forman 1982: 181). The Education Service Advisory Committee (1990) has advised practitioners to use coping strategies in order "to reduce the unpleasant emotional states associated with stress" (1990: 20). Ostell and Oakland (1992) also focus on techniques for headteachers to use in coping with stress and health problems. Most of these studies tend to assume that stress is a characteristic of practitioners, rather than a characteristic of practitioners' work.

In a social research tradition, a number of writers examine the nature of stress in the workplace. Jayaratne, Chess and Kunkel (1984) and Zedeck et al. (1989) investigate feelings of dissatisfaction at work and point to the impact of these upon work itself and family life. Other studies, relying on correlational methods, make links between stress and job

performance (Nowack and Hanson 1983). The study by Maslach (1982) points to the particular vulnerability of workers in service professions to emotional exhaustion.

My study offers empirical data that daily headship is indeed stressful, but can also be joyful, sustaining, rewarding and positive for practitioners. This affective component in headship is often overlooked in training and support offered to headteachers. As pointed out earlier in the chapter, the training envisaged by central government for headteachers is designed to improve deficiencies in their managerial skills. The moments of 'joy' described by one of my respondents in interview (Transcript 37: 022) appear to have no counterpart in a report by the School Teachers' Review Body (1993). The committee refers instead to "a failure to focus sufficiently on pupils' achievements, on outcomes as well as processes" (1993: 39). The headteacher who weeps with the children, in an assembly about the Third World, seems to me to be sharing with pupils in a mutual process of learning (Transcript 36: 47). This kind of shared experience does not seem valued or recognised in the Review Body's recommendations on training. Instead, the committee focuses narrowly on the need to train headteachers to view learning as testing pupil achievements and learning 'outcomes', as part of a headteacher's "regular evaluation of progress" (op.cit: 38).

There seems a danger that training programmes for heads will

be designed increasingly within a management framework. The importance of an affective dimension in the work of primary heads may be unrecognised. And yet, the importance of understanding people's perceptions and feelings within the workplace is acknowledged by studies from management as well as from sociological traditions. A number of influential ideas within a management paradigm are developed by writers such as Kanter (1983). Kanter criticises commentators such as Peters and Austin (1985) for a narrow preoccupation with organisational excellence and efficiency. Kanter has argued instead for the importance of understanding the personal dimension in the workplace, as a means of 'empowering' the individual within organisations. Robinson and Alston (1988) also point to the need to understand subjective feelings in the workplace, as a means to improve the quality of work-lives. Clutterbuck and Hill (1981) argue forcefully against dehumanizing workplaces and the assumption that "statistical tables are more important than personal satisfactions" (1981: 21).

My recommendations for policy are two-fold. Firstly, an acknowledgement is needed that the work of headteachers has an affective dimension. Training programmes are required to support the skills of headteachers in meeting the emotional needs of staff, children and others. In common with Fullan and Hargreaves (1992), I see particular importance in heads' work in supporting and sustaining relationships with others within the school. Fullan and Hargreaves argue that heads

are important for the culture of the school, since "heads who control all the decisions, who obstruct initiative, who choose blame before praise, who see only problems where others see possibilities, are heads who create discouraged and dispirited teachers" (1992: 111). The authors recommend instead that teachers and heads work towards a collaborative culture, in which there are "pervasive qualities, attitudes, and behaviours that run through staff relationships on a moment-by-moment day-to-day basis" (ibid: 65). Relationships with people are central within headteachers' work and the development of inter-personal skills should be recognised as fundamental aims in headship training.

Secondly, it should be recognised that heads have emotional needs too. Counselling and advice should be available to support and train headteachers in the workplace to manage tensions and stress in their daily work. These needs are beginning to be acknowledged in teachers, and some writers such as Bridges (1992) and Rogers (1992) recommend the introduction of workplace counselling into schools. Murphy (1991) suggests that "stress management is now the leading priority for employee assistance programs" (1991: 23). This sense of priority is not established in primary education in this country. Gold and Roth (1993) have indicated that teachers find themselves under increasing pressures in which "new and varied expectations are accompanied by a sense of role ambiguity and a decreased personal and professional

satisfaction" (1993: 2). Haigh (1993) and Stone (1989) have observed the increasing levels of ambiguity and tensions in headship. And yet, despite the wide recognition of stress in the caring professions (Farber, 1991), it seems clear that practitioners "have no preparation or training in their professional education programs to deal with it" (Gold and Roth, 1993: 14). Some LEA's acknowledge the existence of stress, only so far as recommending mutual support groups for primary heads and a use of selection techniques to gauge emotional "hardiness" of candidates (Hertfordshire Education Service, 1993). At the present time, there seems a lack of recognition that headship has an affective dimension, even a dimension restricted narrowly to stress.

The introduction of counselling into the workplace may help to reduce a sense of tension, incongruence and anomaly that primary headteachers reveal in their feelings towards their work. Counselling is already established in several large organisations, such as the police force and commercial organisations (McLeod 1990), where it is used to support the 'human resources' of the organisation. The mode of delivery for the counselling may include one-to-one meetings (Howard et al. 1986), group counselling (Forsyth, 1990), self-help groups (Robinson, 1981) or even telephone counselling (Young, 1989). There are two approaches that counselling can take, one based upon cognitive-behavioural approaches (Meichenbaum, 1986) and the other upon person-centred

perspectives (Lietaer et al, 1990). The latter owes much to the pioneering work by Rogers (1961, 1963, 1980), who adopts phenomenological perspectives towards therapy-counselling. In relation to my present argument, the form of counselling has seemed less important to establish than the principle.

b) PRIMARY HEADSHIP AS PERSONAL WORK

In the final sections of this study, I consider implications of headship as the personal work of heads. I discuss in particular the proposal whether there should now be separate non-teacher administrators instead of the present head teacher. There are a number of reasons underlying such a proposal, some based on evidence from my research findings and others based on government expectations and assumptions about headship.

First, the government does not see administrative work as a substantial part of heads' work, despite research findings that reforms have led to increased colonisation of time. My own research suggests that reforms may well intensify heads' school-related work. These effects seem the opposite of government intentions. As early as 1989, the government's advisory committee on teachers' pay and conditions suggested that "if primary heads had to spend less time on routine administrative tasks they would be able to have more contact with pupils, as well as having more time to deal with the

changes flowing from the Education Reform Act" (1989: 44). It seems unanticipated by the goverment, and by researchers into headship in the late 1980's (Clerkin, 1985; Paisey and Paisey; Kent 1989; Harris and Clark, 1989; Stone, 1989) that reforms would accentuate the administrative work of heads.

I agree with government, although on different grounds, that administrative work is not the central function of headship. The report of the School Teachers' Review Body (1993) argues there is "confusion between administration and management", and recommends less emphasis by heads on "efficient despatch of the former". The report echoes many of the reservations expressed in the OFSTED report (1993) that "the demands of LMS administration, though particularly onerous in the early stages of its introduction, were subordinate to the leadership task" (1993: 14). The report by Alexander, Rose and Whitehead (1992) also strongly rejects a view that "the primary head must become administrator, or chief executive" (1992: 46). The authors add that "the task of implementing the National Curriculum and its assessment arrangements requires headteachers, more than ever, to retain and develop the role of educational leader" (1992: 46). It seems ironic that effects of reform appear to be devaluing those aspects of headship that the government seeks to promote, while intensifying those it wishes to devalue. The separation of headship into two posts, one of administrator and the other of head teacher, would meet the government's expectations on

headship as line management and headship as a leadership in delivering a national curriculum.

Second, the study's evidence indicates that much of heads' day-to-day work is running the school, including what now seems to be an increasing workload of administrative tasks. This does not seem the most cost-beneficial use of heads' time, although heads believe that such work is incumbent on them. The reasons for the sense of obligation may stem from the centrality of heads' role in school affairs or from what has been termed 'decision-centralisation' in headship (Yukl, 1975; Lloyd, 1985; Nias, Southworth and Yeomans, 1989). There may be a simpler reason, in the fact that headteachers are often the sole full-time person available, in keeping the wheels turning each day, including administrative wheels. Schools do not have a personnel department to comfort the distraught member of staff, no public relations team to deal with the angry parent. There are no security officers to cope with intruders on the site. Schools lack a finance department with an overview of the budget or a department to deal with stock control. There is no project manager for fund-raising and no technical department, no research team, no maintenance department and no hierarchy of administrators. Headship is often a bureaucracy of one person.

Third, the study suggests that many of the satisfactions in heads' work stem from working with children and from

relationships with colleagues. Kirkpatrick (1990) asks if in the light of LMS, a head is a teacher who manages or a manager who teaches. Throughout this study, it has seemed clear that headteachers remain teachers, in their commitment to children and in the quality of relationships they seek to sustain with colleagues. Such personal values seem enduring in the occupation and to remain unaltered by headship. On the other hand, administrative work offers little emotional nourishment to primary headteachers and often eclipses those personal aspects of their work that do. Running the school is not at the spiritual heart of primary headship, but it remains the functional core of heads' daily work.

Government reform is likely to founder, unless there is also a reformulation of what heads are expected to do, and can achieve. If the purpose of heads' work is a collaboration with others with the aim of achieving a sustained quality of learning, then heads might be appropriate leaders for such a charge. If the purpose of headship is what heads spend most of their time doing, in keeping the show on the road, then this is unlikely to satisfy either government's ambitions or headteachers in their commitment towards their work and their schools. There is increasing argument, to which this study offers empirical support, that heads may now be in an untenable position. Stone reflects that headship has now become only "ambivalence" (1989: 4), while Haigh argues that heads have become "trapped by trivia" (1993:7). Laws and

Dennison (1991) further question whether primary heads can simultaneously be "leading professional and chief executive" (1991:47). Heads do not seem moulded by an occupation that enables them to achieve in a satisfying way the duties of a chief executive. Alexander (1984) touches on this issue, in querying whether being "a sound class teacher" is sufficient preparation for being a primary headteacher "given the scope of responsibilities" (1984: 164). In one sense, the current study contains similar implications, but reaches different conclusions from Alexander. Being a 'sound' teacher may be excellent preparation to undertake headship of a particular kind, based on leadership of the curriculum work of schools.

The study has a further implication and a more important one than Alexander's query. It is that primary headship is the daily work of persons who are headteachers. As Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) argue, teaching is "bound up with teachers lives, their biographies, with the kinds of people they have become" (1992: 36). The present study has offered evidence to support a similar claim about primary headship, in the personal values that heads bring to their day-to-day tasks, in their personal histories and in feelings revealed about their day-to-day work. Primary headship involves a major investment of the person in the job (McLaughlin et al, 1990: 3). It is work, as Nias has pointed out, that "has a bottomless appetite for the investment of scarce personal resources, such as time, interest and energy" (Nias, 1989:

208). The study indicates that in undertaking this work, heads must live with daily problems, contradictions and set-backs in their attempts to shape the school. The notion of balance seems appropriate as a means to summarise the daily endeavours of primary headteachers to reconcile the constant tensions, dissatisfactions and anomalies of their work. My respondents also conclude it is a matter of moment-by-moment balancing, of a never-ending virtuosity - and sometimes of a failure - in keeping plates spinning (Transcript 13: 013).

These tensions seem endemic in the work of primary heads but appear likely to be accentuated by the government's efforts to impose educational reforms upon schools (Nias, Southworth and Yeomans 1989: 353). One of the main difficulties at the present time is that headship continues to be unacknowledged as being different from its portrayal in much of the current management theory and as assumed by the central government. The prevailing portrait of primary headship assumes that it is impersonal, ordered, rationalist, unemotional, sequential and linear. Such a portrait seems two-dimensional, lacking in the essential personal ingredients of daily headship. The reforms seem based on assumptions about headship that appear very different from its realities, as experienced by my own respondents. As pointed out by Sarason (1990), reforms are unlikely to succeed unless there is also an understanding of the meanings held by participants. The reforms seem likely to alienate those on whom success or failure of such reforms

may depend. It would become a foolish exercise indeed that caused our schools to be led by those with little remaining motivation or satisfaction in their work. In a study that is qualitative in its research origins, it is appropriate to conclude that day-to-day headship also seems qualitative, in the personal work of heads and in its potential contribution to primary schools.

Conditions of employment of head teachers

Overriding requirements

A head teacher shall carry out his professional duties in accordance with and subject to –

(1) the provisions of the *Education Acts 1944* to *1991*;

(2) any orders and regulations having effect thereunder;

(3) the articles of government of the school of which he is head teacher, to the extent to which their content is prescribed by statute;

(4) where the school is a voluntary school or a grant-maintained school which was formerly a voluntary school, any trust deed applying in relation thereto;

(5) any scheme of local management approved or imposed by the Secretary of State under section 34 of the *Education Reform Act 1988*[a];

and, to the extent to which they are not inconsistent with these conditions –

(a) provisions of the articles of government the content of which is not so prescribed;

(b) in the case of a school which has a delegated budget,

(i) any rules, regulations or policies laid down by the governing body under their powers as derived from any of the sources specified in sub-paragraphs (1) to (5) and (a) above; and

(ii) any rules, regulations or policies laid down by his employers with respect to matters for which the governing body is not so responsible;

(c) in any other case, any rules, regulations or policies laid down by his employers; and

(d) the terms of his appointment.

a) 1988 c.40.

General functions

28. Subject to paragraph 27 above, the head teacher shall be responsible for the internal organisation, management and control of the school.

Consultation

29. In carrying out his duties the head teacher shall consult, where this is appropriate, with the authority, the governing body, the staff of the school and the parents of its pupils.

Professional duties

30. The professional duties of a head teacher shall include –

School aims

(1) formulating the overall aims and objectives of the school and policies for their implementation;

Appointment of staff

(2) participating in the selection and appointment of the teaching and non-teaching staff of the school;

Management of staff

(3) (a) deploying and managing all teaching and non-teaching staff of the school and allocating particular duties to them (including such duties of the head teacher as may properly be delegated to the deputy head teacher or other members of the staff) in a manner consistent with their conditions of employment, maintaining a reasonable balance for each teacher between work carried out in school and work carried out elsewhere;

(b) ensuring that the duty of providing cover for absent teachers is shared equitably among all teachers in the school (including the head teacher), taking account of their teaching and other duties;

Liaison with staff unions and associations

(4) maintaining relationships with organisations representing teachers and other persons on the staff of the school;

Curriculum

(5) (a) determining, organising and implementing an appropriate curriculum for the school, having regard to the needs, experience, interests, aptitudes and stage of development of

the pupils and the resources available to the school; and his duty under sections 1(1) and 10(1)(b) and (2) of the *Education Reform Act 1988*[a];

(b) securing that all pupils in attendance at the school take part in daily collective worship in pursuance of his duty under section 10(1)(a) of the *Education Reform Act 1988*;

Review

(6) keeping under review the work and organisation of the school;

Standards of teaching and learning

(7) evaluating the standards of teaching and learning in the school, and ensuring that proper standards of professional performance are established and maintained;

Appraisal, training and development of staff

(8) (a) supervising and participating in arrangements made in accordance with the *Education (School Teacher Appraisal) Regulations 1991*[b] for the appraisal of the performance of teachers in the school; participating in arrangements made for the appraisal of his performance as head teacher, and that of other head teachers who are the responsibility of the same appraising body in accordance with such regulations; participating in the identification of areas in which he would benefit from further training and undergoing such training;

(b) ensuring that all staff in the school have access to advice and training appropriate to their needs, in accordance with the policies of the maintaining authority or, in the case of a grant-maintained school, of the governing body, for the development of staff;

Management information

(9) providing information about the work and performance of the staff employed at the school where this is relevant to their future employment;

Pupil progress

(10) ensuring that the progress of the pupils of the school is monitored and recorded;

Pastoral care

(11) determining and ensuring the implementation of a policy for the pastoral care of the pupils;

a) 1988 c.40.

b) S.I. 1991/1511.

Discipline

(12) determining, in accordance with any written statement of general principles provided for him by the governing body, measures to be taken with a view to promoting, among the pupils, self-discipline and proper regard for authority, encouraging good behaviour on the part of the pupils, securing that the standard of behaviour of the pupils is acceptable and otherwise regulating the conduct of the pupils; making such measures generally known within the school, and ensuring that they are implemented;

(13) ensuring the maintenance of good order and discipline at all times during the school day (including the midday break) when pupils are present on the school premises and whenever the pupils are engaged in authorised school activities, whether on the school premises or elsewhere;

Relations with parents

(14) making arrangements for parents to be given regular information about the school curriculum, the progress of their children and other matters affecting the school, so as to promote common understanding of its aims;

Relations with other bodies

(15) promoting effective relationships with persons and bodies outside the school;

Relations with governing body

(16) advising and assisting the governing body of the school in the exercise of its functions, including (without prejudice to any rights he may have as a governor of the school) attending meetings of the governing body and making such reports to it in connection with the discharge of his functions as it may properly require either on a regular basis or from time to time;

Relations with authority

(17) except in the case of grant-maintained schools) providing for liaison and co-operation with the officers of the maintaining authority; making such reports to the authority in connection with the discharge of his functions as it may properly require, either on a regular basis or from time to time;

Relations with other educational establishments

(18) maintaining liaison with other schools and further education establishments with which the school has a relationship;

Resources

(19) allocating, controlling and accounting for those financial and material resources of the school which are under the control of the head teacher;

Premises

(20) making arrangements, if so required by the maintaining authority or the governing body of a grant-maintained school (as appropriate), for the security and effective supervision of the school buildings and their contents and of the school grounds; and ensuring (if so required) that any lack of maintenance is promptly reported to the maintaining authority or, if appropriate, the governing body;

Absence

(21) arranging for a deputy head teacher or other suitable person to assume responsibility for the discharge of his functions as head teacher at any time when he is absent from the school;

Teaching

(22) participating, to such extent as may be appropriate having regard to his other duties, in the teaching of pupils at the school, including the provision of cover for absent teachers.

Daily break

31. A head teacher shall be entitled to a break of reasonable length in the course of each school day, and shall arrange for a suitable person to assume responsibility for the discharge of his functions as head teacher during that break.

Appendix B

CODE OF ETHICS

A final report on my research is being presented at a future date for assessment purposes. A copy of the report will be placed in the university library and access to the report is made 'open', 'restricted' or 'closed'. The recommendation on access is usually made by the researcher, when the report is finally submitted.

It would be helpful to me if I could include in the research submission a transcript of spoken comments made by you, as a participant. This would allow me to illustrate particular points in support of my research findings. If you agree, I should like to tape-record the interview, with the following conditions:-

a) a transcript of the interview will be sent to you. Any additional comments you wish to make will be attached to the transcripted text. Any alterations or deletions to the text will need to be agreed by ourselves and a comment confirming this made in the text,

b) after you have 'cleared' the transcript, the recording of the interview will be erased,

c) transcripts not used as part of the report are destroyed at the end of the period of study,

d) names of participants and any other assignable references will be made anonymous,

e) confidentiality will be respected at all times.

If there are comments or queries on this code of practice, then please feel welcome to raise them at our meeting.

Roger Revell

Reference 880906 ET 6/9/88

Appendix C

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN EDUCATIONAL REFORM LEGISLATION TAKING EFFECT FROM SEPTEMBER 1988 TO JANUARY 1994

July 1988: Duties with Respect to the Curriculum (Section 1 ERA 1988)

July 1988: Definition of the Main Components of the National Curriculum (Section 2, ERA 1988)

July 1988: Definition of Foundation Subjects and Key Stages (Section 3, ERA 1988)

July 1988: Provision of Information (Section 22, ERA 1988)

September 1988: Basic Curriculum to Include Religious Education (Section 2, ERA 1988)

September 1988: Collective Worship (Section 6, ERA 1988)

September 1988: Duties of LEA's, Governing Bodies and Head Teachers (Section 10, ERA 1988)

October 1988: Admission of Pupils to County and Voluntary Schools, D.E.S. Circular No. 11/88, 20th October 1988

November 1988: Pupils with Statements of SEN (Section 18, ERA 1988)

January 1989: Local Arrangements for the Consideration of Complaints (D.E.S. Circular 1/89, 9 January 1989)

January 1989: Charges for School Activities (D.E.S. Circular 2/89, January 1989)

January 1989: The Education Reform Act 1988: Religious Education & Collective Worship (D.E.S. Circular 3/89, 20 January 1989)

February 1989: The Education Reform Act 1988: The School Curriculum and Assessment (D.E.S. Circular 5/89 22nd February 1989)

May 1989: The School Day (Section 115, ERA 1988)

July 1989: Education Reform Act 1988: Temporary Exceptions from the National Curriculum, D.E.S. Circular No. 15/89, 11th July 1989.

August 1989: Provision for Foundation Subjects to be Taught for a Reasonable Time (Section 10, ERA 1988)

September 1989: Complaints Procedure (Section 23, ERA 1988)

July 1990: Management of the School Day (D.E.S. Circular 7/90 4th July 1990)

August 1990: Records of Achievement (D.E.S. Circular 8/90, August 1990).

September 1990: The Education (National Curriculum) (Assessment Arrangements for English, Mathematics and Science) Order 1990, HMSO.

October 1990: Financial Information (Section 51, ERA 1988)

November 1990: Grant-Maintained Schools: What It Means for Staff (D.E.S. publication, November 1990)

March 1991: Implementation of More Open Enrolment in Primary Schools, D.E.S. Circular No. 6/91, 21st March 1991

April 1991: Local Management of Schools: Further Guidance, D.E.S. Circular No. 7/91, 22nd April 1991

July 1991: The Education (Pupil Attendance Records) Regulations 1991, D.E.S. Circular No. 11/91, 11th July 1991

July 1991: The Education (School Teacher Appraisal) Regulations 1991, HMSO

October 1991: The Education (National Curriculum) (Assessment Arrangements in English, Mathematics and Science) (Key Stage 1) Order 1991, D.E.S.

October 1991: The Education (National Curriculum) (Assessment Arrangements in Technology) (Key Stage 1) Order 1991, D.E.S.

March 1992: The Education (School Inspection) Regulations 1992

July 1992: Choice and Diversity, Government White Paper

August 1992: Education Into the Next Century: The Government's Proposals for Education Explained: a summary of 'Choice & Diversity', D.E.S. publication, August 1992

December 1992: Reports on Individual Pupils' Achievements, D.F.E. Circular No. 14/92, 11th December 1992

December 1992: Technology for Ages 5 to 16 (1992): Proposals of the Secretary of State for Education and the Secretary of State for Wales (D.F.E. publication)

June 1993: The Parents' Charter: publication of information about primary school performance in 1993, D.F.E. Circular No. 5/93, 18th June 1993

October 1993: Protection of Children: disclosure of criminal background of those with access to children, D.F.E. Circular No. 9/93, 18th October 1993

November 1993: Initial Training of Primary School Teachers: new criteria for courses, D.F.E. Circular No. 14/93, 23rd November 1993

December 1993: Reports on Pupils' Achievements, D.F.E. Circular No. 16/93, 17th December 1993

January 1994: Religious Education and Collective Worship, D.F.E. Circular No. 1/94, 31st January, 1994

LIST OF REFERENCES

Acker, S. (1987), 'Primary school teaching as an occupation' in Delamont, S. (ed), **The Primary School Teacher**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp. 83-99.

Adler, P. and Adler, P. (1987), **Membership Roles in Field Research**, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.

Alexander, R. (1984), **Primary Teaching**, London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Alexander, R., Rose, J. and Woodhead, C. (1992), **Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools: A discussion paper**, London, DES.

Altrichter, H., Posch, P. and Somekh, B. (1993), **Teachers Investigate Their Work**, London and New York, Routledge.

Anderson, M. and Iwanicki, E. (1984), 'Teacher Motivation and its Relationship to Burnout', **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 20 (2), pp.94-132.

Anning, A. (1986), 'Curriculum in Action' in Hustler, D., Cassidy, T. and Cuff, T. (eds), **Action Research in Classrooms and Schools**, London, Allen and Unwin.

Anning, A. (1988), 'Teachers' Theories about Children's Learning' in Calderhead, J. (ed), **Teachers' Professional Learning**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp. 128-145.

Apple, M. (1986), **Teachers and Texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education**, New York, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ashton, P. and Webb, R. (1986), **Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement**, New York, Longman.

Aspin, D. (1984), 'Metaphor and Meaning in Educational Discourse' in Taylor, W. (1984), **Metaphors of Education**, London, Heinemann, pp. 21-37.

Athens, L. (1984), 'Scientific criteria for evaluating qualitative studies' in Denzin, N. (ed), **Studies in Symbolic Interaction, Volume 5**, Greenwich, JAI Press.

Atkinson, P. (1990), **The Ethnographic Imagination**, London, Routledge.

Atkinson, P. and Delamont, S. (1990), 'Writing about teachers', **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 6 (2), pp.111-125

Atkinson, P., Delamont, S. and Hammersley, M. (1988), 'Qualitative research traditions: A British response', **Review of Educational Research**, 58 (2), pp.231-250.

Baker, K. (1988), address to the annual conference of the National Association of Head Teachers, 1988, **Head Teachers Review**, 1988 (2), pp.23-27.

Ball, S. (1985), 'Participant observation with pupils' in Burgess, R. (ed), **Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.23-54.

Ball, S. (1987), **The Micro-politics of the School**, London, Methuen.

Ball, S. and Goodson, I. (1985), **Teachers' Lives and Careers**, Lewes, The Falmer Press.

Barth, R. (1990), **Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals Can Make the Difference**, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Bassey, M. (1981), 'Pedagogic research: On the relative merits of search for generalization and study of single events', **Oxford Review of Education**, 7, pp.73-94.

Bassey, M. (1983), 'Pedagogic research: Case studies, probes and curriculum innovations', **Oxford Review of Education**, 9, pp.109-121.

Beare, H., Caldwell, B. and Millikan, R. (1989), **Creating an Excellent School: Some new management techniques**, London, Routledge.

Becher, T., Eraut, M. and Knight, J. (1981), **Policies for Educational Accountability**, London, Heineman.

Becker, H. (1958), 'Problems of inference and proof in participant observation', **American Sociological Review**, 23, pp.682-690.

Becker, H. (1961), **Boys in White**, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes, E. and Strauss, A. (1968), **Making the Grade**, New York, John Wiley.

Bell, G. (1985), 'Can schools develop knowledge of their practice?', **School Organization**, 5, pp.175-184.

Bennett, S. and Turner-Bissett, R. (1991), **Subject Matter Knowledge and Teaching Performance**, Exeter, University of Exeter Press.

Benson, D. and Hughes, J. (1983), **The Perspective of Ethnomethodology**, London and New York, Longman.

BERA, (1992), **Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research**, Edinburgh, British Educational Research Association and Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Berger, B. (1981), **The Survival of a Counterculture**, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Berger, P. (1969), **The Social Reality of Religion**, London, Faber and Faber.

Berger, P. and Kellner, K. (1981), **Sociology Re-Interpreted**, New York, Anchor Press.

Berger, P. and Luckman, T. (1967), **The Social Construction of Reality**, Harmondsworth, The Penguin Press.

Berlak, A. and Berlak, H. (1981), **Dilemmas of Schooling**, London and New York, Methuen.

Bernstein, B. (1971), 'On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge' in Young, M. (ed), **Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Knowledge**, London, Collier-Macmillan, pp.47-69.

Blanchard, T., Lovell, B. and Ville, N. (1989), **Managing Finance in Schools**, London, Cassell Limited.

Blase, J. (1986), 'A Qualitative Analysis of Sources of Teacher Stress: consequences for performance', **American Educational Research Journal**, 23, pp. 13-40.

Blease, D. and Lever, D. (1992), 'What Do Primary Headteachers Really Do?', **Educational Studies**, 18 (2), pp.185-199.

Blum, A (1971), 'The Corpus of Knowledge as a Normative Order: Intellectual Critiques of the Social Order of Knowledge and Commonsense Features of Bodies of Knowledge' in Young, M. (ed), **Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Knowledge**, London, Collier-Macmillan, pp.117-132.

Blumer, H. (1969), **Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method**, Englewood-Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Blyth, A. (ed) (1988), **Informal Primary Education Today**, London and New York, The Falmer Press.

Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Weindling, D. and Pockington, K. (1993), **Effective Management in Schools**, London, HMSO.

Bottery, M. (1992), **The Ethics of Educational Management**, London, Cassell Limited.

Bowers, C. and Flinders, D. (1990), **Responsive Teaching: an ecological approach to classroom patterns of language, culture and thought**, New York, Teachers College Press.

Briault, E. and West, N. (1990), **Primary School Management: case studies by primary and middle school headteachers**, London and New York, Routledge.

Bridges, E. (1992), **The Incompetent Teacher: Managerial Responses**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Broadbent, J. (1992), **The Values of Accounting and Education: some implications of the creation of visibilities and invisibilities in schools**, Sheffield University Discussion Paper No.41, Sheffield University.

Brown, S. and McIntyre, D. (1993), **Making Sense of Teaching**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Bulmer, M. (ed) (1982), **Social Research Ethics**, London, Macmillan.

Burdin, J. (ed) (1989), **School Leadership: a contemporary reader**, Newbury Park, CA, Sage.

Burgess, R. (1984a), **In the Field**, London, Allen and Unwin.

Burgess, R. (ed) (1984b), **The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Burgess, R. (1985), **Field Methods in the Study of Education**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Burgess, R. (1989), **The Ethics of Educational Research**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Burgess, H., Southworth, G. and Webb, R. (1993), 'Whole School Planning', paper presented at the BERA annual conference, Liverpool University 1993.

Burke, R. and Greenglass, E. (1989), 'Psychological Burnout Among Men and Women in Teaching: an Examination of the Cherniss Model', **Human Relations**, 42 (3), pp.261-273.

Bush, T. (1981), 'Key Roles in School Management' in **Policy-Making, Organization and Leadership in Schools**, Block 4 E323, Management and the School, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Bush, T. (1986), **Theories of Educational Management**, London, Harper and Row.

Bush, T. (ed) (1989), **Managing Education: Theory and Practice**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Calderhead, J. (ed) (1987), **Exploring Teachers' Thinking**, London, Cassell Educational Limited.

Campbell, J. (1992), 'The National Curriculum in Primary Schools: a Dream at Conception, a Nightmare at Delivery', keynote address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science conference, Southampton University, August 1992.

Campbell, J., Emery, H. and Stone, C. (1993), 'The Broad and Balanced Curriculum at Key Stage 2: some limitations on reform', paper presented at the annual BERA conference, University of Liverpool, 1993.

Campbell, J., Evans, L., Neill, S. St.J. and Packwood, S. (1991), **Workloads, Achievement and Stress: two follow-up studies of teacher time in Key Stage 1**, Policy Analysis Unit, Department of Education, University of Warwick..

Caplan, R. and Jones, K. (1975), 'Effects of Workload, Role Ambiguity, and Type A Personality on Anxiety, Depression and Heart Rate', **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 60, pp.713-719.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1983), **Becoming Critical: Knowing Through Action Research**, Australia, Deakin University Press.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986), **Becoming Critical: education, knowledge and action research**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Carter, K. and Doyle, W. (1987),'Teachers' Knowledge and Comprehension Processes' in Calderhead, J. (ed), **Exploring Teachers' Thinking**, London, Cassell Educational Limited, pp.147-160.

Cave, E. and Wilkinson, C. (1990), **Local Management of Schools: some practical issues**, London, Routledge.

Christensen, J., Burke, P. and Fessler, R. (1983), 'Teacher life-span development: a summary and synthesis of the literature', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference in Montreal, 1983.

Cicourel, A, (1973), 'Interpretative Procedures and Normative Rules: Negotiation of Status and Role' in Cicourel, A. (ed), **Cognitive Sociology**, Harmondsworth, Penguin Press.

Clark, C. (1988), 'Asking the Right Questions About Teacher Preparation', **Educational Researcher**, 17 (1), pp. 5-12.

Clark, C. and Peterson, P. (1986), 'Teachers' Thought Processes' in Wittrock, M. (ed), **Handbook of Research in Teaching**, New York, Macmillan, pp.255-296.

Clerkin, C. (1985), 'What Do Primary Heads Actually Do All Day?', **School Organization**, 5 (4), pp. 287-300.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. (1986), **Writing Culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography**, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Clutterbuck, D. and Hill, R. (1981), **The Re-Making of Work: Changing Work Patterns and How to Capitalize on Them**, London, Grant McIntyre.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1980, 1986 3rd edition), **Research Methods in Education**, London, Croom Helm.

Cole, M. and Walker, S. (eds.) (1989), **Teaching and Stress**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Connell, R. (1985), **Teachers' Work**, Sydney, Allen & Unwin.

Connelly, W. (1981), **Appearance and Reality in Politics**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Connor, C. (ed) (1988), **Topic and Thematic Work in the Primary and Middle Years**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Institute of Education.

Cortazzi, M. (1991), **Primary Teaching How It Is: a Narrative Account**, London, David Fulton Publishers.

Cortazzi, M. (1992), **Narrative Analysis**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Coulson, A. (1976), 'The Role of the Primary Head' in Bush, T., Glatter, R., Goodey, J. and Riches, C. (eds), **Approaches to School Management**, London, Harper & Row, London, pp. 274-292.

Coulson, A. (1986), **The Managerial Work of Primary School Headteachers**, Sheffield Papers in Education Management No.48, Department of Education Management, Sheffield City Polytechnic.

Coulson, A. (1990), 'Primary School Headship: A review of research' in Saran, R. and Trafford, V. (eds), **Research in Education Management and Policy**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.253-276.

Craig, I. (ed) (1987), **Primary School Management in Action**, London, Longman.

Davies, L. (1987), 'The Role of the Primary School Head', **Educational Management and Administration**, 15, pp.43-47.

Day, C., Johnston, D. and Whitaker, P. (1986), **Managing Primary Schools: a Professional Development Approach**, London, Harper and Row.

Delamont (1983), **Interaction in the Classroom**, London, Methuen.

Delamont, S. (1992), **Fieldwork in Educational Settings: Methods, Pitfalls and Perspectives**, London and Washington, The Falmer Press.

DES (1989), **School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 1989**, London, HMSO.

DES (1990), **School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 1990**, London, HMSO.

DES (1990), **Standards in Education 1988-89: The Annual Report of HM Senior Chief Inspector of Schools**, London, HMSO.

DES (1991), **Fourth Report of the Interim Advisory Committee on School Teachers' Pay and Conditions**, London, HMSO.

DES (1992), **School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document 1992**, London, HMSO.

Desforges, C. and Cockburn, A. (1987), **Understanding the Mathematics Teacher: a Study of Practice in First Schools**, London and New York, Falmer Press.

Dickens, C. (1859, 1989 edition), **A Tale of Two Cities**, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Dickinson, N. (1986), 'The Head Teacher as Innovator: A Study of an English School District' in Reid, W. and Walker, D. (eds), **Case Studies in Curriculum Change**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp.136-178.

Dobbert, M. (1984), **Ethonographic Research: theory and application for modern schools and societies**, New York, Praeger Press.

Dod's Publishing Company (1993), **Whitehall Companion 1993**, London, Dod's Publishing Company.

Dominelli, L. (1991), Race, Gender and Social Work, in Davies, M. (ed), **The Sociology of Social Work**, London, Routledge.

Donnelly, J. (1992), **The School Management Handbook**, London, Kogan Page.

Doyle, W. (1986), 'Classroom Organization and Management' in Wittrock, M. (ed) (1986), **Handbook of Research on Teaching**, New York, Macmillan.

Doyle, W. (1990), 'Classroom Knowledge as a Foundation for Teaching', **Teachers' College Record**, 91 (3), pp. 347-359

Duignan, P. and Macpherson, R. (1992), **Educative Leadership**, London and Washington, The Falmer Press.

Education Service Advisory Committee (1990), **Managing Occupational Stress: a guide for managers and teachers in the schools sector**, London, HMSO.

Edwards, A. and Westgate, D. (1987), **Investigating Classroom Talk**, London and Philadelphia, Falmer Press

Elbaz, F. (1983), **Teacher Thinking: A Study of Practical Knowledge**, London and Canberra, Croom Helm.

Elliott, J. (1989), 'Teacher Evaluation and Teaching as a Moral Science' in Holly, M. and McLoughlin, C. (eds), **Perspectives on Teacher Professional Development**, London and New York, Falmer Press.

Esp, D. (1993), **Competences for School Managers**, London, Kogan Page.

Evans, K. (1974), 'The Head and his Territory', **New Society**, October 24, 1974, pp.408-411.

Everard, K. (1986), **Developing Management in Schools**, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Everard, K and Morris, G. (1985), **Effective School Management**, London, Harper and Row.

Evers, C. and Lakomski, G. (1991), **Knowing Educational Administration**, Oxford, Pergamon Press.

Farber, B. (1991), **Crisis in Education: Stress and Burnout in the American Teacher**, San Francisco, Josey-Bass.

Faris, R. (1967), **Chicago Sociology, 1920-32**, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. and Floden, R. (1985), 'The Cultures of Teaching' in Wittrock, M. (ed), **Handbook of Research in Research in Teaching**, New York, Macmillan, pp. 505-525.

Festinger, L., Riecken, H. and Schacter, S. (1956), **When Prophecy Fails**, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Fetterman, D. (ed) (1984), **Ethnography in Educational Evaluation**, Beverley Hills, Sage.

Finch, J. (1986), **Research and Policy: The Uses of Qualitative Methods in Social and Educational Research**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Flanders, N. (1970), **Analysing Teaching Behaviour**, New York, Addison Wesley.

Foddy, W. (1993), **Constructing Questions for Interviews and Questionnaires: Theory and Practice in Social Research**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Forman, S. (1982), 'Stress Management for Teachers: A Cognitive-Behavioral Program', **Journal of School Psychology**, 20 (3), pp.180-187.

Forsyth, D. (1990), **Group Dynamics**, Pacific Grove, CA, Brooks/Cole.

Foster, P. (1990), 'Cases not proven: an evaluation of two studies of teacher racism', **British Educational Research Journal**, 16: 4.

Freeman, D. (1984), **Margaret Mead and Samoa**, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Fullan, M. (1982), **The Meaning of Educational Change**, Ontario, OISE Press.

Fullan, M. (1985), 'Change processes and strategies at the local level', **Elementary School Journal**, 85 (3), pp.394-421

Fullan, M. (1991), **The New Meaning of Educational Change**, New York, Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1992), **What's Worth Fighting For in Headship?**, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. (1991), **What's Worth Fighting For? Working Together for Your School**, Ontario, Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Gabriel, J. (1957), **An Analysis of the Emotional Problems of the Teacher in the Classroom**, London, Angus & Robertson.

Garfinkel, H. (1964), 'Studies of the Routine Grounds of Everyday Activities', **Social Problems**, 11 (Winter 1964), pp. 225-250.

Geer, B. (1971), 'Teaching' in Cosin, B., Dale, I, Esland, G. and Swift, D. (eds), **School and Society: A sociological reader**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp.3-8.

Giddens, A, (1977), 'Positivism and its Critics', in Giddens, A. (ed), **Studies in Social and Political Theory**, London, Hutchinson.

Giddens, A. (1985), Time, Space and Regionalisation" in Gregory, D. and Urry, J. (eds), **Social Relations and Spatial Structures**, London, Macmillan, pp.265-295.

Gitlin, A. (1992), **Teachers' Voices for School Change: an introduction to educative research**, London, Routledge.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967), **The Discovery of Grounded Theory**, Chicago, Aldine.

Goffman, E. (1961), **Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates**, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Golby, M. (1989), 'Teachers and their Research' in Carr, W. (ed), **Quality in Teaching**, Lewes, The Falmer Press, pp.163-172.

Gold, Y. and Roth, R. (1993), **Teachers Managing Stress and Preventing Burnout: the Professional Health Solution**, London and Washington, The Falmer Press.

Goodson, I. (1991), 'Sponsoring the teacher's voice: teachers lives and teacher development', **Cambridge Journal of Education**, 21 (1), pp.35-45.

Gough, B. and James, D. (1987), **Planning Professional Training Days**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Gray, H. and Freeman, A. (1988), **Teaching Without Stress**, London, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Green, H. (1993), **Management and Leadership in Education**, London, Kogan Paul.

Greenfield, W. (1987), **Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies**, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Haaken, J. and Adams, R. (1983), 'Pathology as "Personal Growth"', **Psychiatry**, 46 (3), pp. 270-280.

Habermas, J. (1973), **Theory and Practice**, Boston, Beacon Press.

Hacker, M. (1970), 'U.S.A. Visit - Design Note 7', Department of Education and Science, Architects and Buildings Branch, London, HMSO.

Haigh, G. (1993), 'Trapped by Trivia', article in Times Educational Supplement, January 14th, 1993, p.7.

Hall, V., Mackay, H. and Morgan, C. (1986), **Headteachers At Work**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Halpin, G., Harris, K. and Halpin, G. (1985), 'Teacher Stress as Related to Locus of Control, Sex and Age', **Journal of Experimental Education**, 53 (3), pp.136-140.

Hammersley, M. (1977), **Teacher Perspectives**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. (1984), 'Staffroom News' in Hargreaves, A and Woods, P. (eds), **Classrooms and Staffrooms: the Sociology of Teachers and Teaching**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, pp. 203-214.

Hammersley, M. (1990a), 'A myth of a myth? an assessment of two studies of option choice in secondary schools', **British Journal of Sociology**, 41, 2, pp.123-126.

Hammersley, M. (1990b), **Reading Ethnographic Research**, London and New York, Longmans.

Hammersley, M. (1993), **Controversies in Classroom Research**, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983), **Ethnography: Principles in Practice**, London, Tavistock.

Handy, C. and Aitken, R. (1986), **Understanding Schools as Organisations**, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Hannam, C., Smyth, P. and Stephenson, N. (1976), **The First Year of Teaching**, University of Bristol, Bristol Classical Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1990), 'Teachers' work and the politics of time and space', **International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education**, 3 (4), pp.303-320.

Hargreaves, A. (1992), **Realities of Teaching**, New York, Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A and Woods, P. (eds) (1984), **Classrooms and Staffrooms: the Sociology of Teachers and Teaching**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, pp.203-214.

Hargreaves, D. (1972), **Interpersonal Relations and Education**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hargreaves, D. (1980), 'The Occupational Culture of Teachers' in Woods, P. (ed), **Teacher Strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the School**, London, Croom Helm, pp.125-148.

Hargreaves, D. and Hopkins, D. (1991), **The Empowered School: the Management and Practice of Development Planning**, London, Cassell Limited.

Harling, P. (1984), **New Directions in Educational Leadership**, Lewes, The Falmer Press.

Harre, R. (1979), **Social Being**, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Harris, N. and Clark, A. (1989), 'The Role of the Headteacher', **International Journal of Educational Management**, 3 (3), pp.19-24.

Hart, J. (1987), **How Does a School Run? A practical guide**, Lewes, The Book Guild Limited.

Harvey, C. (1986), 'How Primary Heads Spend Their Time', **Educational Management and Administration**, 14 (1), pp.60-68.

Hatton, E. (1989), 'Levi-Strauss' Bricolage and Theorizing Teachers' Work', **Anthropology and Education Quarterly**, 20 (2), pp.74-86.

Hayes, D. (1993), 'The Primary Head's Tale: learning to use collaborative relationships in times of rapid change', paper presented at the BERA annual conference, Liverpool, 1993.

Hellawell, D. (1991), 'The Changing Role of the Head in the Primary School in England', **School Organization**, 11 (3), pp.321-337.

Heller, M. (1983), **Coping With Stress**, Springfield Cooperative Enterprises, Teeside.

Herbert, M. (1990), **Planning a Research Project: A guide for practitioners and trainees in the helping professions**, London, Cassell.

Hertfordshire Education Service (1994), 'Job Analysis of Headteachers in Hertfordshire', Report of Consultative Group, Hertford, January 1994.

Hilsum, S. and Cane, B. (1971), **The Teacher's Day**, National Foundation for Educational Research.

Hitchcock, G. (1982), 'The Social Organization of Space and Place in an Urban Open-Plan Primary School' in Payne, G. and Cuff, E. (eds), **Doing Teaching: the Practical Management of Classrooms**, London, Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd, pp.60-89.

Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. (1989), **Research and the Teacher**, London, Routledge.

Holly, M. (1989), **Teacher Inquiry: Keeping a Personal-Professional Journal**, Portsmouth, NH, Heinemann.

Holly, M. and McLoughlin, C. (1989), 'Professional Development and Journal Writing' in Holly, M. and McLoughlin, C. (eds), **Perspectives on Teacher Professional Development**, London and New York, The Falmer Press.

Holly, P. and Southworth, G. (1989), **The Developing School**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Holmes, G. (1993), **Essential School Leadership**, London, Kogan Paul.

Holtom, V. (1988), 'Primary School Headteachers' Conceptions of Their Professional Responsibility in England and France: Change and its Implications', unpublished M.Phil. thesis, Department of Education, University of Bristol.

Hopkins, D. (1985), **A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Hopkins, D. and Ainscow, M. (1993), **School Improvement in an Era of Change**, London, Cassell Limited.

Horbury, A. (1990), Procedural Rules in the Management of Pupils in the Primary School' in Webb, R. (ed), **Practitioner Research in the Primary School**, London and New York, The Falmer Press, pp.222-243.

Housner, L. and Griffey, D. (1985), 'Teacher Cognition: Differences in Planning and Interactive Decision-Making Between Experienced and Inexperienced Teachers', **Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport**, 56, pp. 45-53.

Howard, K., Kopta, S., Krause, M. and Orlinsky, D. (1986), The dose-effect relationship in psychotherapy, **American Psychologist**, 41, pp.159-164.

Hoyle, E. (1986), **The Politics of School Management**, London, Hodder and Stoughton.

Huberman, M. (1990), 'The Social Context of Instruction in Schools', paper presented at the symposium on 'Tensions in Teachers' Culture, Career and Context' at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meetings, Boston, MA, April 1990.

Huberman, M. (1992), 'Linking the Practitioner and Researcher Communities for School Improvement', address at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, 1992.

Hubert, J. et al. (1983), 'The unit of analysis in the study of the relationship of teacher stress to school variables', paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Ellenville, New York, pp.26-28.

Huggett, F.(1986), **Teachers: First-Hand Views of the Classroom Crisis**, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Hughes, E., Becker, H. and Geer, B. (1971), 'Student Culture and Academic Effort' in **School and Society**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp.51-55.

Hughes, J. (1980), **The Philosophy of Social Research**, London, Longman.

Hughes, M. (1985), 'Leadership in Professionally Staffed Organizations' in Hughes, M. et al. (eds), **Managing Education: the System and the Institution**, London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.262-290.

Hughes, T. et al. (1987), 'The prediction of teacher burnout through personality type, critical thinking, and self-concept', paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, Alabama, pp.11-13.

Hunt, D. (1992), **The Personal Renewal of Energy**, Toronto, OISE Press.

Hustler, D., Cassidy, T. and Cuff, T. (eds) (1986), **Action Research in Classrooms and Schools**, London, Allen and Unwin.

Hutchinson, S. (1988), 'Education and Grounded Theory' in Sherman, R. and Webb, R. (eds), **Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and Methods**, London and New York, The Falmer Press, pp.123-140.

ILEA (1985), **Improving Primary Schools**, London, ILEA.

Jackson, P. (1968: 1990 edition), **Life in Classrooms**, Teachers College Press, University of Chicago.

Jackson, J. (1990), 'The liminal qualities of anthropological fieldnotes', **Journal of Contemporary Ethnography**, 19 (1): pp.8-43.

Jacob, E. (1987), 'Qualitative Research Traditions: A Review', **Review of Educational Research**, 57 (1), pp.1-50.

Jayaratne, S., Chess, W. and Kunkel, D. (1984), 'Burnout: its impact on child welfare workers and their spouses', **Social Work**, 31, pp.53-59.

Jenkins, H. (1989), 'Educational Managers - Paradigms Lost', **Studies in Educational Administration**, 51, pp.3-27.

Johnston, J. (1986), 'Gender Differences in Teachers' Preferences for Primary School Leadership', **Educational Management and Administration**, 14, pp.219-226.

Jorgenson, D. (1989), **Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies**, London, Sage Publications.

Kanter, R. (1989), **When Giants Learn to Dance**, New York and London, Simon and Schuster.

Kelly, A. (1986), **Knowledge and Curriculum Planning**, London, Harper Row.

Kelly, M. (1989), **The Manchester Survey of Occupational Stress Among Headteachers and Principals in the United Kingdom**, Education Management Centre, Department of Educational Studies, Manchester Polytechnic.

Kent, G. (1989), **The Modern Primary School Headteacher**, London, Kogan Page.

King, R. (1978), **All Things Bright and Beautiful: A Sociological Study of Infants' Classrooms**, Chichester and New York, John Wiley & Sons.

Kirk, J. and Miller, M. (1986), **Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research**, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.

Kirkpatrick, G. (1990), 'L.M.S.: Preparing for Practice: Is a Headteacher a Teacher Who Manages or a Manager Who Teaches', **Head Teachers' Review**, Spring Term 1990, pp.12-14.

Kmetz, J. and Willower, D. (1982), 'Elementary School Principals' Work Behaviour', **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 19 (4), pp.62-78.

Krieger, S. (1985), 'Beyond Subjectivity', **Qualitative Sociology**, 8: 309-324.

Kuhn, T. (1970, 2nd edition), **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kuper, A. and Kuper, J. (1985), **The Social Science Encyclopedia**, London and New York, Longman.

Laar, W. (1992), 'Hopes', keynote address to the Conference of Hertfordshire Primary Headteachers, University of East Anglia, September 1992.

Lang, T. (1977), 'School Experience: More Sociological Ambiguities?' in Woods, P. and Hammersley, M. (ed), **School Experience**, London, Croom Helm.

Laughlin, R. (1992), **Accounting Control and Controlling Accounting: the Battle for the Public Sector?**, Discussion Paper No.29, School of Management, Sheffield University.

Laws, J. and Dennison, W. (1991), 'Researching the Role of the Primary School Head: a limited base for promoting managerial self-development', **Educational Studies**, 16 (3), pp.269-280.

LeCompte, M. and Goetz, J. (1982), 'Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research,' **Review of Educational Research**, 52 (1), pp.31-60.

Leithwood, K., Begley, P. and Cousins, J. (1992), **Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Lieberman, A. (1986), 'Collaborative Work', **Educational Leadership**, 43 (3), pp.123-130.

Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (1984), **Teachers, their World and their Work**, Alexandria, VI, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lietaer, G., Rombauts, J. and Van Balen, R. (1990), **Client-Centered and Experiential Therapy in the Nineties**, Leuven, Leuven University Press.

Leighton, P. (1992), **Schools and Employment Law**, London, Cassell Limited.

Leinhardt, G. and Smith, D. (1985), 'Expertise in mathematics instruction: subject matter knowledge', **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 77 (3), pp.247-271.

Levacic, R. (ed) (1989), **Financial Management in Education**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Lewin, K. (1948), **Resolving Social Conflicts**, New York, Harper & Brothers.

Lewis, I and Munn, P. (1987), **So You Want To Do Research**, Edinburgh, The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985), **Naturalistic Inquiry**, Beverley Hills, Sage.

Little, J. (1989), 'The Persistence of Privacy: Autonomy and Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association meetings, San Francisco, 1989.

Little, J. (1990), 'Conditions of Professional Development in Secondary Schools' in McLaughlin, M., Talbert, J. and Bascia, N. (eds), **The Contexts of Teaching in Secondary Schools**, New York and London, Columbia University, Teachers College Press, pp.187-223.

Lloyd, K. (1985), 'Management and Leadership in the Primary School' in Hughes, M. et al. (eds), **Managing Education: the System and the Institution**, London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.291-307.

Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. (1984), **Analysing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis**, Belmont, Wadsworth.

Lortie, D. (1975), **Schoolteacher: a sociological study**, London and Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Louden, W. (1991), **Understanding Teaching: Continuity and Change in Teachers' Knowledge**, London, Cassell Educational Limited.

Luckmann, T. (1978), **Phenomenology and Sociology**, Harmondsworth, Penguin Press.

Lyons, G. (1981), **Teacher Careers and Career Perceptions**, London, N.F.E.R./Nelson.

McKeganey, N. and Cunningham-Burley, S. (1987), **Enter the Sociologist: Reflections on the Practice of Sociology**, Aldershot, Avebury.

McLaughlin, M. and Marsh, D. (1978), 'Staff Development and School Change', **Teachers College Record**, 80 (1), pp.69-94.

McLaughlin, M., Talbert, J. and Bascia, N. (eds) (1990), **The Contexts of Teaching in Secondary Schools**, New York and London, Teachers College Press.

McLeod, J. (1990), 'The client's experience of counselling: a review of the research literature' in Mearns, D. and Dryden, W. (eds), **Experiences of Counselling in Action**, London, Sage.

McNamara, D. (1980), 'The Outsider's Arrogance: the Failure of Participant Observers to Understand Classroom Events', **British Educational Research Journal**, 6, pp.113-125.

McNamara, D. (1991), 'Subject Knowledge and its Application: Problems and Possibilities for Teacher Educators' in **Journal of Education for Teaching**, 17 (2), p.65.

McNiff, J. (1988), **Action Research: Principles and Practice**, London, Macmillan Education.

McTaggart, R. (1989), 'Bureaucratic Rationality and the self-educating profession: the problem of teacher privatism', **Journal of Curriculum Studies**, 2 (4), pp.345-361

Manasse, A. (1985), 'Improving Conditions for Principal Effectiveness: Policy Implications of Research', **The Elementary School Journal**, 85 (3), pp. 439-463.

Maslack, C. (1982), **The Cost of Caring**, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

Mead, G. (1934), **Mind, Self and Society**, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Measor, L. (1985), 'Critical Incidents in the Classroom: Identities, Choices and Careers' in Ball, S. and Goodson, I. (eds), **Teachers' Lives and Careers**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.61-77.

Measor, L. (1985), 'Interviewing: A strategy in qualitative research', in Burgess, R. (ed), **Strategies of Educational Research**, London and Philadelphia, Falmer Press, pp.55-78.

Mehan, H. and Wood, H. (1975), **The Reality of Ethnomethodology**, New York, Wiley.

Meichenbaum, D. (1986), 'Cognitive-behavior modification' in Kanfer, A. and Goldstein, A. (eds), **Helping People Change**, New York, Pergamon.

Merrick, N. (1993), 'The Classroom War of Attrition', article in **Times Educational Supplement**, 16 May 1993, pp. 16-17.

Merton, R. (1957), **Social Theory and Social Structure**, Glencoe, Free Press.

Miles, M. and Huberman, M. (1983), **Qualitative Data Analysis**, Beverley Hills, Sage.

Mintzberg, H. (1973), **The Nature of Managerial Work**, New York, Harper and Row.

Morgan, C., Hall, V. and Mackay, M. (1983), **The Selection of Secondary School Headteachers**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1990), 'To Think Like a Teacher', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association in Boston, 1990.

Morris, J. and Meltzer, B. (eds) (1967), **Symbolic Interaction**, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Morrison, K. and Ridley, K. (1988), **Curriculum Planning and the Primary School**, London, Croom Helm.

Mortimore, P. and Mortimore, J. (1991), **The Primary Head: Roles, Responsibilities and Reflections**, London, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Murgatroyd, S. (1986), **Counselling and Help**, London, Methuen.

Murgatroyd, S. and Morgan, C. (1993), **Total Quality Management and the School**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Murphy, L. (1991), 'Organisational stress interventions', **Business**, 9, pp.8-11.

NAHT (1988), **Development and Training for Senior Management of Schools**, Haywards Heath, NAHT Publications.

NFER (1989), **The Recruitment and Retention of Headteachers**, Slough, National Foundation for Educational Research.

Nias, J. (1987), **Seeing Anew: Teachers' Theories of Action**, Australia, Deakin University.

Nias, J. (1988), 'Informal Primary Education in Action: Teachers' Accounts' in Blyth, A. (ed), **Informal Primary Education Today**, London, New York and Philadelphia, The Falmer Press, pp.123-147.

Nias, J. (1989), **Primary Teachers Talking: a study of teaching as work**, London, Routledge.

Nias, J. (1991), 'Changing times, changing identities: grieving for a lost self' in Burgess, R. (ed), **Educational Research and Evaluation**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Nias, J., Southworth, G. and Yeomans, R. (1989), **Staff Relationships in the Primary School: a Study of Organisational Cultures**, London, Cassell.

Nias, J., Southworth, G. and Campbell, P. (1992), **Whole School Curriculum Development in the Primary School**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Noblitt, G. and Hare, R. (1988), **Meta-Ethnography: synthesizing qualitative studies**, Newbury Park, Sage.

Nowack, K. and Hanson, A. (1983), 'The Relationship between stress, job performance, and burnout in college student resident assistants', **Journal of College Student Personnel**, 24, pp. 545-550.

Oberg, A. and McCutcheon, G. (1989), 'Teachers' experience doing action research', **Peabody Journal of Education**, 64 (2), pp. 116-127.

OFSTED (1993), **Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools: a follow-up report**, London, DFE Publications Centre.

Oja, S. and Pine, G. (1989), 'Collaborative action research: teachers' stages of development and school contexts', **Peabody Journal of Education**, 64 (2), pp. 96-113.

Olsen, J. and Eaton, S. (1987), 'Curriculum Change and the Classroom Order' in Calderhead, J. (ed), **Exploring Teachers' Thinking**, London, Cassell Educational Limited, pp.179-194.

Osborn, M. and Broadfoot, P. (1992), 'A lesson in progress? Primary classrooms observed in England and France', **Oxford Review of Education**, 18 (1), pp.3-16.

Ostell, A. and Oakland, S. (1992), **Headteacher Stress, Coping and Health**, Bradford, University of Bradford Management Centre.

Owens, R. (1982), 'Methodological Rigor in naturalistic inquiry', **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 18 (2), pp.1-21.

Paisey, A. (1984), **School Management - a Case Approach**, London, Harper and Row.

Paisey, A. and Paisey, A. (1987), **Effective Management in Primary Schools**, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Perrenoud, P. (1983), 'La Pratique Pedagogique Entre l'Improvisation Reglee et le Bricolage', **Education et Recherche**, 5 (2), pp. 198-220.

Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982), **In Search of Excellence**, New York, Harper and Row.

Peters, T. and Austin, N. (1985), **A Passion for Excellence: the Leadership Difference**, London, Collins.

Peterson, K. (1981), 'Making Sense of Principals' Work', paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA, April 1981.

Pilcher, J. et al. (1989), 'Evaluating a women's careers convention: Methods, results and implications', **Research Papers in Education**, 4 (1), pp.57-76.

Plummer, K. (1983), **Documents of Life**, London, Allen and Unwin.

Pollard, A. (1985), **The Social World of the Primary School**, London, Cassell Educational Limited.

Pollard, A. (1987), 'Primary School Teachers and their Colleagues' in Delamont, S. (ed), **The Primary School Teacher**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.100-119.

Pollard, A. (1992), 'Teachers' Responses to the Reshaping of Primary Education' in Arnot, M. and Barton, L. (eds), **Voicing Concerns: sociological perspectives on contemporary educational reforms**, Wallingford, Triangle Books, pp. 104-124.

Pollard, A. and Tann, S. (1987), **Reflective Teaching in the Primary School**, London, Cassell Educational Limited.

Pountney, G. (1993), **Primary School Management**, London, Cassell Limited.

Powney, J. and Watts, M. (1987), **Interviewing in Educational Research**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Preedy, M. (ed) (1989), **Approaches to Curriculum Management**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Pugh, D., Hickson, D. and Hinings, C. (1983), **Writers on Organisations**, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Reid, K., Hopkins, D. and Holly, P. (1987), **Towards the Effective School**, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Revell, R. (1985), 'Open Education, Closed Doors', unpublished dissertation for M.A. in Applied Research in Education, Cambridge Institute of Education/University of East Anglia.

Revell, R. (1987), 'Travelling Baedeker-less', **Cambridge Journal of Education**, 17 (3), pp.144-146.

Revell, R. (1988), 'Where Goldie Sleeps' in Connor, C. (ed), **Topic and Thematic Work in the Primary and Middle Years**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Institute of Education, pp.4-8.

Revell, R. (1993), 'Do We Not Bleed?: The Affective Nature of Primary Headship', paper presented at the annual BERA Conference, Liverpool, 1993.

Reynolds, D. and Cuttance, P. (eds) (1992), **School Effectiveness: Evaluation, Improvement and Development**, London, Cassell Limited.

Richards, C (1987), 'Primary Education in England: an analysis of some recent issues and developments' in Delamont, S. (ed), **The Primary School Teacher**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Richardson, J. (1973), **The Teacher, the Task and the School**, London, Methuen.

Riches, C. and Morgan, C. (eds) (1989), **Human Resource Management in Education**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Riseborough. G. (1984), 'Teacher careers and comprehensive schooling' in Hargreaves, A. and Woods, P. (eds), **Classrooms and Staffrooms: The sociology of teachers and teaching**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, pp. 245-257.

Riseborough, G. (1985), 'Pupils, teachers' careers and schooling: an empirical study' in Ball, S. and Goodson, I. (eds), **Teachers' Lives and Careers**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Rivzi, F. (1989), 'Bureaucratic rationality and the promise of democratic schooling' in Carr, W. (ed), **Quality in Teaching: arguments for a reflective profession**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.55-78.

Robinson, D. (1980), 'Self-Help Health Groups' in Smith, P. (ed), **Small Groups and Personal Change**, London, Methuen.

Robinson, P. and Alston, R. (1988), 'The Quality of Working Life' in Heller, R. (ed), **Modern Management**, London, Harrap, pp.256-260.

Rock, P. (1979), **The Making of Symbolic Interactionism**, London, Macmillan.

Rogers, C. (1961), **On Becoming a Person**, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C. (1963), 'The concept of the fully functioning person', **Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice**, 1, pp.17-26.

Rogers, C. (1980), **A Way of Being**, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, W. (1992), **Supporting Teachers in the Workplace**, Queensland, Jacaranda.

Rosario, J. (1986), 'Excellence, school culture, and lessons in futility', **Journal of Curriculum Studies**, 18 (1), pp.31-44.

Rose, A. (ed) (1962), **Human Behaviour and Social Processes**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rose, G. (1982), **Deciphering Sociological Research**, London, Macmillan.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985), 'Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence', **American Journal of Education**, 95 (4), pp.352-388.

Roth, J. (1963), **Timetables: Structuring the Passage of Time in Hospital Treatment and Other Careers**, Indianapolis, Bobbs Merrril.

Roth, J. (1971), 'The Study of Career Timetables' in Cosin, B., Dale, I., Esland, G. and Swift, D. (eds), **School and Society: A sociological reader**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul/Open University Press, pp.136-140.

Roth, R. (1990), 'Communication Skills for Mentors: New Perspectives', paper presented at the State of California mentor teacher conference, Long Beach, California, December 1990.

Rowe, A. (1993), 'No Training, No Head', article in **The Guardian**, 20th July 1993, p. 20.

Rowland, S. (1986), 'Classroom enquiry: An approach to understanding children' in Hustler, D., Cassidy, T. and Cuff, T. (eds), **Action Research in Classrooms and Schools**, London, Allen and Unwin.

Rudduck, J. (1984), 'A study in the dissemination of action research' in Burgess, E. (ed), **The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.187-210.

Rudduck, J. (1985), 'Teacher research and research-based teacher education', **Journal of Education for Teaching**, 11 (3), pp.281-289.

Russell, L. (1990), 'Writing in the Infant Classroom' in Webb, R. (ed), **Practitioner Research in the Primary Classroom**, London and New York, The Falmer Press, pp.77-95.

Sallis, E. (1992), **Total Quality Management in Education**, London, Kogan Page.

Salzberger-Wittenberg, I., Henry, G. and Osborne, E. (1983), **The Emotional Experience of Learning and Teaching**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sanday, A. (1990), **Making Schools More Effective**, Centre for Educational Development, University of Warwick.

Sarason, B. (1971, 1982 revised edition), **The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change**, Boston, MA, Allyn and Bacon.

Sarason, S. (1990), **The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform**, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. (1973), **Field Research: strategies for a natural sociology**, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

School Teachers' Review Body (1992), **School Teachers' Review Body: first report**, London, HMSO.

School Teachers' Review Body (1993), **School Teachers' Review Body: second report**, London, HMSO.

Schon, D. (1971), **Beyond the Stable State**, London, Temple Smith.

Schon, D. (1983), **The Reflective Practitioner**, London, Temple Smith.

Schon, D. (1987), **Educating the Reflective Practitioner**, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

Schonfeld, I. (1990), 'Coping with Job-Related Stress: the Case of Teachers', **Journal of Occupational Psychology**, 63, pp.141-149.

Schutz, A. (1962), **Collected Papers, Vol.1**, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.

Schwab, R. and Iwanicki, E. (1982), 'Perceived Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, and Teacher Burnout', **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 18, pp.60-74.

Sedgwick, F. (1989), **Here Comes the Assembly Man: a year in the life of a school**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Sellar, P. and Yeatman, S. (1959), **And Now All That**, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books Ltd.

Sharrock, W. and Anderson, R. (1986), **The Ethnomethodologists**, London, Tavistock.

Shearn, D., Broadbent, J., Laughlin, R. and Willig-Atherton, H. (1992), **LMS and School Culture: the Perceptions of Teachers, Heads and Chairs of Governors**, Sheffield University Management School Discussion Paper No.40, 1992.

Sherman, R. and Webb, R. (1988), **Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and Methods**, London and New York, Falmer Press.

Shulman, L. (1986), 'Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching', **Education Researcher**, 15 (2), pp.123-5.

Sikes, P. (1984), 'Teacher careers in the comprehensive school' in Ball, S. (ed), **Comprehensive Schooling: A reader**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp. 247-271.

Sikes, P. (1985) 'The Life-Cycle of the Teacher' in Ball, S. and Goodson, I. (eds) **Teachers' Lives and Careers**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.27-60.

Sikes, P., Measor, L. and Woods, P. (1985), **Teacher Careers**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Silverman, D. (1985), **Qualitative Methodology and Sociology: Describing the Social World**, Aldershot, Gower.

Skelton, M., Playfoot, D. and Reeves, G. (1991), **Development Planning for Primary Schools**, London, Routledge.

Smith, J. and Heshusius, L. (1986), 'Closing down the conversation: the end of the quantitative-qualitative debate among educational inquirers', **Educational Researcher**, 15 (1), pp.4-12.

Smith, L. (1982), 'Ethnography' in Mitzel, H. (ed), **The Encyclopaedia of Educational Research**, 5th edition, New York, Macmillan.

Smith, L., Kleine, P., Prunty, J. and Dwyer, D. (1986), **Educational Innovators: Then and Now**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Smyth, W.J. (1981), 'Research on Teaching: What's in It for me?', **The Australian Administrator**, 2 (1), pp.2-8.

Southworth, G. (1987), 'Primary School Headteachers and Collegiality' in Southworth, G. (ed), **Readings in Primary School Management**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.61-75.

Southworth, G. (1993), 'A Closer Look: An ethnographic study of a primary teacher', paper presented at the BERA conference, Liverpool, September 1993.

Southworth, G. (1993), 'Primary School Headship: an analysis derived from an ethnographic case study of one headteacher's work', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of East Anglia.

Spindler, G. and Spindler, L. (1987), **Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad**, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum Associates.

Stanley, J. (1989), **Marks on the Memory**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Stenhouse, L. (1975), **An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development**, London, Heinemann.

Stenhouse, L. (1985), **Research as a Basis for Teaching**, London, Heinemann.

Stone, C. (1989), 'All That Remains is Ambivalence: a headteacher's reflections', **Education 3-13**, 17 (3), pp.4-9.

Strauss, A. (1978), **Negotiations: Varieties, Contexts, Processes and Social Order**, London, Josey-Bass.

Strauss, A. (1987), **Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Strong, P. (1988), 'Qualitative sociology in the UK', **Qualitative Sociology**, 11 (1), pp.13-28.

Sutcliffe, J. (1989), 'Heads' Vacancy Rates', article in **The Times Educational Supplement**, May 26th 1989, p.6.

Talcott-Parsons, T. (1949), **The Structure of Social Action**, Glencoe, The Free Press.

Talcott-Parsons, T. (1952), **The Social System**, London, Tavistock.

Taylor, W. (1984), 'Metaphors of Educational Discourse' in Taylor, W. (ed), **Metaphors of Education**, London, Heinemann,. pp.4-20.

Tesch, R. (1990), **Qualitative Research: Analysis, Types and Software Tools**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Thomas, H. (1990), **Education Costs and Performance: a Cost-Effectiveness Analysis**, London, Cassell Limited.

Thomas, H., Kirkpatrick, G. and Nicholson, E. (1989), **Financial Delegation and the Local Management of Schools**, London, Cassell Limited.

Thorndike, R. and Hagen, E. (1989, 7th edition), **Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education**, New York and London, Wiley and Sons.

Thrift, N. (1985), 'Flies and Germs: A Geography of Knowledge' in Gregory, D. and Urry, J. (eds), **Social Relations and Spatial Structures**, London, Macmillan, pp.366-403.

Tomlinson, H. (1992), **Performance-Related Pay in Education**, London, Routledge.

Tripp, D. (1985), 'From autopilot to critical consciousness: Problematizing successful teaching', paper presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theorizing, Dayton, 1985.

Valli, S. (1986), **Becoming Clerical Workers**, London, Routledge.

Vulliamy, G. and Webb, R. (1993), 'Progressive education and the National Curriculum: findings from a global education research project', **Educational Review**, 45 (1), pp. 21-41.

Wagner, A. (1987), 'Knots in Teachers' Thinking' in Calderhead, J. (ed), **Exploring Teachers' Thinking**, London, Cassell Educational Limited, pp.161-178.

Walford, G. (1987), **Doing Sociology of Education**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Walford, G. (1990), **Doing Educational Research**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Walker, R. (1985), **Doing Research: A Handbook for Teachers**, London. Methuen.

Wallace, M. (1988), 'Towards a Collegiate Approach to Curriculum Management in Primary and Middle Schools', **School Organization**, 8, pp. 123-127.

Wallace, M. (1991), 'Coping With Multiple Innovations: an exploratory study', **School Organization**, 11 (2), pp.187-209.

Wallace, M. (1992), 'Flexible Planning: a key to the management of multiple innovations' in Bennett, N., Crawford, M., Riches, C. (eds), **Managing Change in Education**, London, Paul Chapman/Open University.

Warner, D. and Kelly, G. (1993), **Managing Educational Property**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Waters, D. (1979), **Management and Headship in the Primary School**, London, Heinemann.

Webb, R. (1990), **Practitioner Research in the Primary School**, London and New York, The Falmer Press.

Weindling, D. and Earley, P. (1987), **Secondary Headship: the first years**, Windsor, N.F.E.R./Nelson.

Weiner, G. (1989), 'Professional self-knowledge versus social justice: A critical analysis of the teacher-researcher movement', **British Educational Research Journal**, 15, pp.41-51.

West, S. (1993), **Educational Values for School Leadership**, London, Kogan Paul.

West-Burnham, J. (1992), **Managing Quality in Schools: a TQM Approach**, Harlow, Longman.

Westoby, A. (1987), **Culture and Power in Educational Organizations**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Whitaker, P. (1983), **The Primary Head**, London, Heinemann.

Whitaker, P. (1993), **Managing Change in Schools**, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Whorf, B. (1956), 'The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behaviour to Language' in Carrol, J. (ed), **Language, Thought and Reality: The Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf**, MIT Press.

Willms, J. (1992), **Monitoring School Performance: a guide for educators**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Winkley, D. (1983), 'An Analytical View of Primary School Leadership', **School Organization**, 3 (1), pp.15-26.

Winter, R. (1989), **Learning from Experience: Principles and Practice in Action-Research**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Winter, V. (1990), 'A Process Approach to Science' in Webb, R. (ed), **Practitioner Research in the Primary Classroom**, London and New York, The Falmer Press, pp.153-182.

Wolcott, H. (1973, 1984 edition), **The Man in the Principal's Office: an Ethnography**, Prospect Heights, IL, Waveland Press.

Wolcott, H. (1981), 'Confessions of a 'trained' observer', in Popkewitz, T and Tabachnick, B. (ed), **The Study of Schooling**, New York, Praeger.

Wolcott, H. (1990), **Writing Up Qualitative Research**, Beverley Hills, Sage.

Woods, P. (1983), **Sociology and the School: an interactionist viewpoint**, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Woods, P. (1985), 'Sociology, ethnography and teacher practice', **Teaching and Teacher Education**, 1, pp.51-62.

Woods, P. (1986), **Inside Schools**, London, Routledge.

Woods, P. (1987), 'Managing the Primary Teacher's Role' in Delamont, S. (ed), **The Primary School Teacher**, Lewes, Falmer Press, pp.120-143.

Woods, P. (1987), 'Life-histories and teacher knowledge' in Smyth, W. (ed), **'Educating Teachers: Changing the Nature of Pedagogical Knowledge**, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Woods, P. (1990), **Teacher Skills and Strategies**, London and New York, The Falmer Press.

Woods, P. (1993), 'Topical Triumphs', **Times Educational Supplement**, Review Section, Feb 12 1993, p.5.

Woods, P. (1993), 'Self-Determination in the National Curriculum', paper presented at the annual BERA conference, Liverpool, 1993.

Wright, S. (1990), 'Language Counts in the Teaching of Mathematics' in Webb, R. (ed), **Practitioner Research** in the **Primary Classroom**, Lewes, The Falmer Press, pp.126-152.

Yates, J. (1992), 'Getting it together at school level', **Head Teachers Review**, Spring 1992, pp.1-2.

Yates, P. (1987), 'Figure and section: Ethnography and education in the multicultural state' in Spindler, G. and Spindler, L. (eds), **Interpretive Ethnography of Education Education: At Home and Abroad**, London, Erlbaum Associates.

Yin, R. (1984), **Case Study Research: Design and Methods**, London, Sage Publications.

Yinger, R. (1987), By the Seat of Your Pants': an Inquiry into Improvisation and Teaching', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, Washington DC, 1987.

Young, M. (1971), 'An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organized Knowledge' in Young, M. (ed), **Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Knowledge**, London, Collier-Macmillan, pp.19-46.

Young, R. (1989), 'Helpful Behaviors in the Crisis Center Call', **Journal of Community Psychology**, 17, pp.70-77.

Yukl, G. (1975), 'Towards a Behavioural Theory of Leadership' in Houghton, V. et al. (eds), **The Management of Organizations and Individuals**, London, Ward Lock.

Zahorik, J. (1987), 'Teachers' Collegial Interaction: an Exploratory Study', **Elementary School Journal**, 87 (4), pp.385-396.

Zedeck, S., Maslach, C., Mosier, K. and Skitka, L. (1989), 'Affective Response to Work and Quality of Family Life' in Goldsmith, E. (ed), **Work and Family: Theory, Research and Applications**, Newbury, Sage Publications, pp.135-157.

Zifferblatt, S. (1972), **Architecture and Human Behaviour: Some Suggestions for Future Curriculum Implementation**, Stanford, School of Education, Stanford University.

IN MEMORIAM:

In memory of B.J. who died suddenly at work, some of whose inner thoughts and feelings are recorded in this volume.