Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

http://create.canterbury.ac.uk

In the Midst of Church School Inspection

Margaret James

Canterbury Christ Church University

Thesis submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
2018

Thesis Submission for Doctorate in Education

Author's Declaration

I confirm that this thesis is expressed in my own words and appropriate recognition and credit has been given to the work of others where appropriate. It is copyright material and any quotation from the thesis should only be used with proper acknowledgement.

Signed: Margaret James

Date: 27 September 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dedication

To my late mother, father and grandmother, none of whom will ever read this but who set the course of my life story.

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the influence that the existence and practical outworking of the Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS) has on the actions and decisions of four leaders of two Church of England primary schools. It also critically examines the nature of the knowledge created by SIAMS. Reviewing literature on school inspection and the sociology of education led to a focus on the role of performativity, power, authority, and expertise in the SIAMS process and the subsequent creation of intended and unintended consequences, such as fabrication and image management, through it.

The empirical research took the form of a narrative inquiry. I carried out unstructured life-story interviews with the four participants, approximately nine months before each school's SIAMS inspection. I used the interview data to create profiles of the individuals, out of which I drew foci for non-participant observation on the day of the schools' inspection.

The theoretical lens through which I analysed the data is "three dimensional narrative inquiry space", a theory rooted in the narrative commitment to understanding the connections between a person's life and their experiences. The dimensions of sociality, temporality, and place gave insight into and "thick description" of the way in which the church school leaders acted as a result of past and present experiences, relationships with others and self, and, to a lesser extent, places in response to their experience of SIAMS. Analysis revealed ways in which the school leaders were influenced both consciously and subconsciously by the power relations vested in SIAMS and dealt with dissonance created by internal conflict relating to the nature of knowledge within SIAMS.

The results of this enquiry cannot be generalised as the truth of SIAMS for all church school leaders. However, a number of "narrative threads" emerged which led to the formation of questions which might be worthy of further investigation by those responsible for SIAMS and by my own professional self.

CONTENTS

Number of words: 52,101

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What influence does the Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS) have on individual church school leaders? What is the role of power relations within this?

2. What type of knowledge is created within and by SIAMS? What issues of conflict might arise for church school leaders as a result?

3. What questions might need to be considered to ensure that SIAMS is relevant for and in harmony with the education offered by the Church of England, as well as credible more widely in the English education system?

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Narrative Beginnings

This thesis is about research into possible ways in which Church of England school inspection, carried out under section (s) 48 of the 2005 Education Act (Department for Education, 2005), and known as the Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS), has an influence upon four leaders of two Church of England primary schools (also referred to as church schools).

In order to gain as deep an understanding as possible of the issues which emerge in the inquiry and to consider the impact which I, as an individual, may have upon the research and the participants, it is helpful to, firstly, reflexively explore my own narrative beginnings (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000). Doing so enables me to foreground what I bring to the inquiry in order that I might subsequently be aware of my positionality and of its impact (Cohen et al., 2007; Clandinin, 2013). Whether consciously or unconsciously, everyone is situated within a context which has its own political, gendered, cultural, social, temporal and emotional characteristics (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Denzin and Lincoln, 2013) and this context provides a lens through which each individual perceives the world. Narrative inquiry, the methodology which I employ for this research and which I explore in greater depth in Chapter Three, openly acknowledges this positionality and seeks to enable reflexive examination of it as part of the research process.

Furthermore, no research question, methodology, theory, data gathering or analysis is neutral (Edwards, 2003; Merrill and West, 2009; Silverman, 2005) and analysis of the dynamic which these contextual factors introduce forms a critical part of the validity and reliability of the entire process. There is no question, therefore, in a narrative inquiry that "contamination of the field" (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998, p.38) through the presence of a researcher is negative, despite the connotations of the word 'contamination'. Providing that the researcher's own positionality and agency are recognised and included in the analysis they may even be regarded as an asset, one which enriches and brings an otherwise elusive reality and humanity to the creative relationship between participant and researcher (Loxley and Seery, 2008) and to the new knowledge which the research generates.

The decision to include my own narrative beginnings in my thesis is not easy. Their inclusion speaks to me first and foremost of self-indulgence and retrospection. However, one of the many learning points in my doctoral journey has been that of the importance of

acknowledging who I am as a private person, as a professional and as a researcher; as well as appreciating that an understanding of who I am and what I bring to an inquiry and to its relationships is significant, especially given the ontological and epistemological basis of narrative inquiry methodology (for example, Clandinin, 2007; Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Clandinin and Rosieu, 2007; Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007; Webster and Mertova, 2007). The stories which I choose to tell of the past are highly formative elements in the development and understanding of the story/ies which I choose to tell of the present (Freeman, 2010); and, therefore, also, of the stories which I hear and co-create (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013; Etherington, 2004) with and of an other.

In sharing these narrative beginnings, I am aware of the need for balance which will enable me to trace my signature upon the research (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000). My signature needs to be strong enough to allow me to claim the research as my own - influenced, shaped, crafted and filtered by me - but not so forceful as to deflect the reader's attention away from the individuals whose stories this research is really about. I undertake this task whilst "living on the edge" (ibid., p.147), balancing the expression of my own voice in an inquiry designed to tell the story of an other without transgressing too far in one direction or another. Also involved is "working the hyphen" (Fine, 1994, p.72), the search for a deeper understanding of who I am as a researcher and how my story overlaps and interacts with those of the participants. Through an examination of my narrative beginnings therefore, I explore the space in which I, as researcher, bring my self into productive and dynamic contact with the other whose experience I am seeking to understand, retaining an appropriate balance between insight into my own life and influences and those of the participant.

So, I walk carefully along a precipice of self-indulgence and egocentricity as I seek solely to further illuminate the stories of the participants and how my self and my positionality change those stories at every intersection. With this in mind, I offer the following interpretive and highly selective account of my own narrative beginnings.

Margaret Murphy, Margaret James

I had a childhood steeped in Christian faith and deep sadness and these two themes have prevailed in the formation of my self and the way in which I relate to others at each step between the eight-year-old girl I was in 1974 and the fifty-two-year-old woman I am in 2018.

My family were/are staunch Roman Catholics. My father was the pillar of the parish; headteacher of the local Catholic primary school (my school) by the age of 30; leader amongst men; life and soul of any social gathering; and the person I most wanted to be like in life. And

when I was eight, he died. Suddenly. Torn away from me. Never to be spoken of again in our family. In one afternoon, frozen in time and in my child-like memory, he simply disappeared from my life and I lost my anchor. I became alone.

I spent the rest of my childhood, teenage years, young adulthood, and later still trying to find my way back to being the self-assured individual I believe I had been until that day. At the age of eight, having been deeply let down by the harsh reality of bereavement, I vowed to rely upon myself for happiness, success, and direction in life, rather than giving that power to another person. However, instead of becoming what I perceived as strong and independent, I became dependent upon anyone who appeared to offer me safety and stability. With hindsight, as I look back on these events of the past from the standpoint of the present (Freeman, 2010), I find the reasons obvious. Having lost my stability and sense of place in the world, I sought that comfort and reassurance from elsewhere in attempts to restore the self that I believed I had lost. The need for stability in and clarity about life led me into a fervent and naïve fundamentalist evangelical Christian faith as a teenager. At this time my black-and-white view of what was acceptable and what was not; my adherence to what I was taught about the Bible and the Christian faith; my fear of those who lived a life characterised by freedom and hedonism; and my insistence that all who believed and lived differently from me were destined for an eternity in Hell, predominated my thinking, my beliefs, my time, and my friendships. This immersion into faith provided me, although I was unaware of it at the time, with a return of some of the security that I had lost less than a decade earlier.

By turning my back on the Catholicism of my family and seeking religious certainty elsewhere, I appeared to others to have confidence, tenacity, independence, and a grasp on my own future. However, my view now of those actions is quite different. Far from being the self-possessed and self-assured individual whom others saw, I recognise that I was acting in a way that would bring me into contact with others who would provide me with the greatest amount of safety and demonstrable love. I was drawn to those who conveyed a confidence in their destiny because this resonated with my own insecurity and my need to re-establish a sense of self. Once presented with the possibility of a future which came with an absence of doubt or fear, I seized it and, in so doing and without realising, I relinquished to others the power over myself which I had earlier committed to retaining.

Later, at the age of just 21, my fear of life and freedom, a naïvety about peoples' motives, and my ongoing need for security, of all of which I remained unaware, led me into a relationship which should have remained a transient friendship and which was consequently always destined to fail. It was a relationship of unequal power, mine being the lesser, and it eroded still further my sense of who I was. With little awareness of the power being exercised

over me in my everyday life, I acquiesced to the demands of an other and interpreted this as security. A version of power, a combination of its exercise over me by an other and my ultimate embodiment and perpetuation of it, became my daily life. It subtly made its way into my subconscious, changing my perception of who I was and what I was worth. It was an insidious outworking of power in which I became complicit and which was ultimately destructive.

Both of these elements of my early life seemed to offer me the certainty which I recognise now I had lost as a child. In my search for security, I had become blind to the power which one person can exert over another. The reality of that power, however, its presence in everyday life, and its ability to systematically dismantle self-belief and self-worth, is a lasting influence in my life and has shaped my relationships and my outlook on life, and is a driving force in this research.

As a result of my need for security and my consequent susceptibility to the power of an other, I became a fragile individual. I was in the thrall of the most powerful and prevailing belief, direction or individuals, lacking the courage of my own convictions or the ability to find my own way and know my own mind. Rather than being a vibrant person, protected within a "robust cocoon" (Giddens, 1991, p.40) of affirmation, self-belief and the knowledge of being loved and worthwhile, I became lost, fearful, easily broken by the ordinary obstacles of life and constantly in search of affirmation. Mistaking power for security defined my need and led to me being complicit in power-led relationships and situations.

I trained as a teacher as was the tradition for most of my family members mainly, I see now, because I lacked the ability or confidence to think for myself or to pursue an independent path. I dreaded the school holidays when I would be alone, isolated for weeks on end; experiences which served only to compound my belief that I was unwanted, unlovely, and with little to offer. I made some good friends, both at work and at church, but had no freedom, either from within or without, to live a full life. Instead, I continued to live in fear: in fear of being out of my depth in the world and in life; in fear of being found out for the empty shell that I was inside; in fear of being confronted by my own sense of not knowing who I was and what my life was supposed to be about; in fear of being left on my own again.

But there came a time in my life when this version of who I was began to change.

I worked for a headteacher who appeared to believe in me and who nurtured me.

I began to make my own decisions.

I spread my wings with tentative and emerging confidence.

I became a new person.

Or maybe what I became was the person I had once been at the age of eight, before losing my way in life.

Now, fifteen years on from the most recent of those seminal critical life events (Webster and Mertova, 2007, p.84), this new version of myself still feels very different from the fragile, lost, insecure person with whom I had become familiar over many years, and she is still taking some getting used to. This new person became a SIAMS manager, national trainer of new SIAMS inspectors, national assessor of new inspectors, and a doctoral student. This new person then took a further challenging step in 2016 by becoming a Diocesan Director of Education (DDE). This new person remains painfully aware of how easily she can look to others for strength, belief, and direction and how that could be a step towards once more relinquishing to an other an inappropriate power over her life. This new person knows how easily one individual can be influenced and controlled by an other and is at pains to live with an active awareness of how she might influence others in the way that others previously, inadvertently or deliberately, influenced her. This new person, some would say, has power and authority over others and has the ability to choose how to exert it in ways which will make a difference to the lives of others. This new person lives with a daily commitment to not do unto others that which was done unto her.

Four of those others have agreed to be part of this research project and are trusting me to acknowledge that power and authority, to recognise how it acts as a character in the new stories we co-construct, and to both highlight and limit its effect where appropriate. As DDE, I have the authority to make decisions which will affect some of the participants, either positively or adversely. I have the power to manipulate and through this manipulation, to make a difference to how confident and self-assured, or not, the school leaders feel. In contrast to that former version of my self, I now have the confidence to think for myself, to air my views, to challenge people and be challenged by them, and to live with a degree of uncertainty in life. It feels risky and frightening at times; but it feels real, too.

In working alongside the four participants my primary aim has been to relate to them in ways which will allow them to be themselves, to put them at ease and to enable them to tell their stories. I admit, I need their honesty and openness; without it my research becomes meaningless. I need them to be able to trust me with their stories and with their feelings; and I use these for the purpose of completing my doctorate. But I want to use their stories in order to understand the lives which give rise to them, and I want that understanding to become the

basis of new knowledge and insight which I hope will make a professional, and maybe personal, difference to those who are part of this inquiry and those who read my thesis.

As a narrative inquirer, I have a responsibility to use my personhood, my presence, and the resulting influence consciously, in as full as possible a reflexive knowledge of who I am and what I am doing (Hennink et al., 2007). Whilst not claiming the ability to determine outcomes or the responses which my actions or reactions will create in others I, nonetheless, have a duty to consider possible effects of my presence, role and positionality and to take account of these at all stages of the inquiry. Knowing myself is a key and fundamental element in this narrative knowing of others (Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007) and will, therefore, be a recurring thread throughout my thesis.

My narrative beginnings are my own interpretations of my life and are, therefore, open to contestation and discussion. Yet, they are the truth. At least, they form one truth of the multi-voiced, multi-faceted, multi-perspectival person involved in all aspects of this research and thereby create an ontologically and epistemologically reliable version of my "personal truth" (Atkinson, 1998, p.14). They are my memories of the past, viewed "from the standpoint of the present" (Freeman, 2010, p.175) and, doubtlessly, contain elements of imagining as well as of remembering. However, they are some of my critical life events as I recall them and I expect that they will have a ring of truth to another reader who has experienced something similar. They are plausible because they are real human experiences and, therefore, they have a sense of verisimilitude (Bruner, 1986; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Merrill and West, 2009; Polkinghorne, 1988; Webster and Mertova, 2007). They are events which create one perspective of many, one story of many, one truth of many. It is a personal narrative interpretation of my life which is subsequently influential in all of the data collection, analysis, and knowledge creation which form part of this narrative inquiry research project.

The Research

Church schools in England are subject to inspection under section 48 of the Education Act (Department for Education, 2005); a system entitled the Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS). Under the 2013 Framework (SIAMS, 2013), SIAMS has the role of evaluating the extent to which a school offers an effective education which is distinctively Christian in nature, and its inspectors inspect most church schools on a five-year cycle (ibid.). It is a system which operates by means of a Department for Education (DfE) grant and the system is administered jointly by the Church of England Education Office (CEEO) and the Church of England diocese within which a school is situated. This thesis discusses research into

the influence that the existence and practical outworking of SIAMS has on four Church of England primary school leaders.

The research takes the form of a narrative inquiry (Clandinin and Connelly, 2007; Clandinin, 2013). Interviews similar in nature to life story interviews (Atkinson, 1998), each lasting approximately 90 minutes, were carried out with the headteacher and a key foundation governor from two Church of England primary schools. Both schools had previously been judged by the Statutory Inspection of Anglican Schools (SIAS - the forerunner to SIAMS) as being Outstanding, and both would be inspected by SIAMS within the academic year 2016-2017. The interviews cannot be described as being fully life story according to Atkinson's interpretation due to the parameters introduced by me, as researcher (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000), in order to retain a focus on the context of SIAMS. However, the general principles and my invitation to the participants to freely tell their stories of what had brought them into the leadership of Church of England schools are life story in nature. The purpose of the interviews was to establish and explore the reasons behind the individuals' choices to work in leadership roles in Church of England primary schools; to discuss their motivations for this work; and to examine their initial responses to and relationship with church school inspection. All four participants shared personal and professional stories of their motivation to lead church schools, and their views on educational practice and (church) school leadership.

For reasons which will be explored later, the main focus for this thesis emerged as being one of the two headteachers, (referred to hereafter as H1). However, the stories of the other three participants (referred to hereafter as H2, G1, and G2) have informed my thoughts, discussion, and analysis throughout. The stories which the participants shared all refer to aspects of their lives which are more personal than I had anticipated. Consequently, H1, H2, G1, and G2 are all referred to as 'they' in order to conceal gender so as to further protect their anonymity. The "relational ethics" (Clandinin, 2013, p.198; Webster and Mertova, 2007, p.99) of narrative inquiry suggest that a concern for their wellbeing must permeate research decisions and taking steps to protect them in this way is an element of this.

The thesis examines the individual church school leaders' responses to SIAMS, as well as the issues which arise as a result of one person, an expert (Ball, 2013; Miller and Rose, 1993; Rose, 1996; Stobart, 2008), inspecting the quality and compliance of the work of an other. Issues of the type of education offered by church schools, ways in which SIAMS fits with this, and themes of knowledge and power are explored throughout. The thesis also examines the relationship between researcher and participant and explores the impact which I, as a researcher with my own life story, might have on the research context, particularly on the people involved. Researcher positionality is a thread which is woven throughout, and it is

significant both to the subject matter and to the research methodology. One of the purposes of a narrative inquiry is to enhance personal growth by enabling an individual to relive their lives in a more fulfilling manner having retold their story (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Clandinin and Rosieu, 2007). This idea will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Three.

The thesis also explores the type/s of knowledge which underpin/s SIAMS. It raises questions related to the type of knowledge which SIAMS purports to create based upon the inspection criteria and methodology. It also raises questions of the wider context of professional relationships and expertise, educational and inspection structures, power, and the nature of truth. Furthermore, it considers the ontological and epistemological factors embedded in the methodological decisions (Cohen et al., 2007) involved in the research as well as the nature of truth and its relevance to these decisions (Bridges, 2006; Shipway, 2011).

The knowledge which is created as a result of this inquiry is "co-create[d]" (Etherington, 2004, p.28) by both researcher and participant in specific relational and inspection contexts and is therefore unique. This concept of uniqueness is rooted in the type of knowledge upon which the methodology is based. The presumption of a fluid and transient personal truth leads to the creation of knowledge which depends upon a convincing degree of "plausibility" (Webster and Mertova, 2007, p.99) and "lifelikeness" (Merrill and West, 2009, p.162) for its validity and reliability (Atkinson, 1998; Etherington, 2004; Merrill and West, 2009). It does not rely upon generalisability (Trowler, 2003; Webster and Mertova, 2007), instead valuing the uniqueness of an individual's story. It makes no claims to "scientific objectivity" (Bolton, 2010, p.205; Kohler Riessman, 2003, p.332; Tullis et al., 2009, p.185), instead claiming relevance by means of its interpretive nature.

The inquiry is qualitative (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Denzin and Lincoln, 2013; Hennink et al., 2011; Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007; Quinn and Patton, 2002), relational (Clandinin, 2013; Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007), and interpretive (Atkinson, 2010; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Kohler Riessman, 2003). Interview data are analysed through the theoretical lens of "three dimensional narrative inquiry space" (Clandinin, 2013, p.38-39; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.50) with its focus on the narrative dimensions of temporality, sociality, and place (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.50). This theoretical lens, explored further in Chapter Three, enables a three dimensional insight to and understanding of the lives of the participants and allows for the co-construction of a depth and richness of knowledge of the individual which would otherwise be difficult.

There are two defining characteristics particular to this study which enhance its contribution to knowledge, and both are related to researcher positionality; one has a professional context and one is personal. Professional positionality places me, as researcher, in a unique position to undertake this inquiry. For the last eight years I have been employed in roles related to SIAMS inspection and I am also now a DDE. This, arguably, renders me powerful in the eyes of church school leaders in relation to SIAMS, a factor which requires consideration in any discussion relating to the participants. The second element is the impact which my life story has on methodological decisions and the research methods utilised within this inquiry, as well as on my analysis of the research data and presentation of the findings. This uniqueness renders the inquiry unrepeatable in any other context.

The National Picture of School Inspection

There are national educational issues relevant to this inquiry which contribute to discussions about the influence which SIAMS has within Church of England schools. Under the current leadership of Amanda Spielman, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector, there appears to be consideration of the impact of what can be described as the Office for Standards in Education's (Ofsted) dominant, powerful, and sometimes punitive role in and on schools in England. In September and November 2017, Spielman gave speeches in which she addressed some of Ofsted's previous emphasis on school performance data to the exclusion of other types of evidence and to the detriment of the breadth and richness of the school curriculum and the holistic development of children. Speaking at the Birmingham Education Partnership conference on 22 September 2017, she emphasised that,

> …education has to be the values anchor in a stormy sea…And it is especially important that a rich curriculum helps to anchor British Values within schools. And by the curriculum I don't just mean subject choices and the timetable…but the real substance of what is taught in schools. I have said before that I think this is an area we can too easily lose sight of. But it really matters. (Spielman, 2017a)

There is no place in this thesis for a discussion of the DfE's introduction of British Values to schools. However, Spielman's emphasis on a curriculum which is wider than the teaching of English and Mathematics is one which has resonance with the SIAMS agenda (National Society, 2013).

In November, Spielman followed her comments on the importance of a rich curriculum with more specific reference to what might be interpreted as the national educational

obsession with inspection grades. Speaking at Ark's Teach conference, she expanded on her previously stated hopes for education and inspection in England.

> [G]etting or maintaining an outstanding judgement should never be your main aim: our inspections can only ever be a partial reflection of education quality. If our horizons narrow down to just an Ofsted grade, then something is seriously wrong… (Spielman, 2017b).

The sense of a potential shift in thinking about accountability within education was reinforced in May 2018 by the new Secretary of State for Education, Damian Hinds, in his speech at the Association of School and College Leaders (ASCL) conference. Balancing his belief in the need for accountability with its consequences for teacher, headteacher and governor workload, Hinds sought to reassure school leaders.

> I will also look at the accountability system and how it can drive… unnecessary workload. I know that the current accountability regime can feel very high stakes for school leaders. …I don't think anybody can argue that we should dispense with accountability – it is crucial. And we must continue to hold schools to high standards… But I'm also clear accountability must also lead to the right support – at the right time. I want the default assumption to be firmly and increasingly about effective support for headteachers, so that they can receive the tailored help they need to help turn their schools around and move them further forward. (Whittaker, 2018, no page numbers)

Those in positions of leadership within SIAMS have, arguably, been influenced by the actions and philosophy of Ofsted, as seen, for example, in the potential for an Ofsted judgement to act as a limiting factor in SIAMS (National Society, 2013). This suggests that, in order to remain in line with the dominant hegemonic thinking on school inspection, it is possible that the arguably unchallengeable position and power of the biggest national player in school inspection retains influence over and within SIAMS. It remains to be seen, however, whether the recent changes in emphasis which are emerging from Ofsted and the DfE may, in time, enable changes to SIAMS which might previously have been problematic

In *Deeply Christian, Serving the Common Good* (Church of England Education Office, 2016a), the Chief Education Officer for the Church of England, Rev. Nigel Genders, sets out on behalf of the CEEO the Church's vision for an education which seeks to develop wisdom, hope, community, and dignity. September 2018 sees the implementation of a new SIAMS Schedule (Church of England Education Office, 2018), written with the purpose, in part, of introducing harmony with this vision. Having been conducted between July 2015 and May 2017 under the 2013 SIAMS Schedule, however, this research does not take account of these recent

developments in SIAMS, but reference to them is contextually significant and forms a small part of this thesis.

In focusing on ways in which SIAMS might influence the actions, decisions, and behaviour of four Church of England primary school leaders, awareness of the context within which it operates is important. SIAMS does not exist in an ideological vacuum and developments elsewhere in the sector have an inevitable impact on its nature and purpose. The idea that some changes and emphases within SIAMS might arise in ways which are connected to these other developments provides important context for this inquiry and an exploration into this factor contributes to the justification and relevance of this research.

Research into School Inspection

Research into the influence which SIAMS has on the church school sector and on those working within it is at an early stage, although research into and writing on Christian education in general terms (Astley, 1992; Astley, 1994; Cooling, 1994; Cooling, 2010; Worsley, 2013a), and Church of England education more specifically (for example, Brown, 1993; Elbourne, 2009 and 2012; Francis and Lankshear, 1993; Green, 2015), form a relatively substantial body of work. This includes discussion of what is meant by 'Christian education' and how an academic understanding of it might inform pedagogical practice (Green et al., 2018) and leadership of Church of England schools. It also includes foci on collective worship (Brown, 2017), spirituality (Lumb, 2016), Christian values and character development (Cooling et al., 2016), and Christian character and ethos (Worsley, 2013b). These different studies combine to present a picture of church school education as one which has a distinctive contribution to make to state education in England. In the almost two decades since the publication of *The Way Ahead: Church of England schools in the new millennium*, Dearing's (2001) report on Church of England education, academic interest in the work of the Church in education has grown. Chadwick's (2012) call in *The Church School of the Future Review* to put "faith and spiritual development at the heart of the curriculum" (p.3) renders increasingly mainstream the explicitly Christian nature of a church school education, summed up most recently in the Church of England's vision for education (2016a). To date, however, the research does not include a specific focus on the influence which SIAMS has on school leaders.

Research into the type of inspection carried out by Ofsted and its relatively high stakes counterparts in other countries (for example, Altrichter and Kemethofer, 2015; Courtney, 2016; De Wolf and Janssens, 2007; Ehren et al., 2015; Ehren and Visscher, 2006; Elonga Mboyo, 2017; Hall, 2017; Jeffrey and Woods, 1998; Jones et al., 2017; Lindgren, 2015;

Penninckx et al., 2015a; Penninckx et al., 2015b; Penninckx and Vanhoof, 2015; Ronnberg, 2014; Segerholm and Hult, 2018) is more readily available. This research includes a focus on the consequences which a system of accountability introduces to education and is discussed in relation to the distinctive nature of a church school education in Chapter Five. As part of this, the possibility that inspection is a daily reality for teachers and school leaders, an "absent presence" (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998, p.4) shaping their actions and strategic plans, is taken up and is discussed in terms of power relations. The notion of performativity (Lyotard, 1984) and the potential for its presence in and influence on education as a direct result of high stakes inspection (Ehren et al., 2015), also discussed in Chapter Five, has widespread attention in educational research (Ball, 1998; Ball, 2003; Ball, 2013a; Ball, 2013b; Croft and Jeffrey, 2008; Dent and Whitehead, 2002). Also a dominant theme is the creation of what might be termed a panoptic culture (Foucault, 1977; Hope, 2013; Perryman, 2006; Perryman, 2009), which can be at the heart of school inspection (De Wolf and Janssens, 2007). More recent research into school inspection has shifted the focus to concepts such as post-panopticism (Courtney, 2016), fabrications (Ball, 2003; Lindgren, 2015; Penninckx et al., 2015b), and post-fabrication (Clapham, 2015), all of which are explored later in this thesis, and which highlight the depth and extent of the numerous ways in which power might be at work in the context of high stakes inspection.

Unintended consequences (Ehren et al., 2015) of these accountability systems have been explored in literature on school inspection as has the extent to which such accountability might bring about school improvement or not (Ehren and Visscher, 2006). Research addresses conflict as to whether inspectorates such as Ofsted can be described as quantitative or qualitative (Ronnberg, 2014) and notes that inspectors, too, are human beings with emotions which can affect the site of inspection and the resulting judgements (Elonga Mbayo, 2017) - an uncomfortable concept in the midst of claims to a neutral and disinterested truth produced by expert inspection (Miller and Rose, 1993). Awareness of the stress on school leaders which can be brought about by the predominance and power of inspection in education (Altrichter and Kemethofer, 2015; Penninckx and Vanhoof, 2015) brings into question the ethical nature of high stakes inspection and provides a context for the examination of the extent to which inspection might control schools and their educational offer (Hall, 2017). Whether or not SIAMS can be regarded as 'high stakes' and whether it can be said to have a similar effect on those involved remains uninvestigated. Its absence from research into both church school education and school inspection in general is partly what makes this research project worthwhile and helps to demarcate its contribution to knowledge.

The current climate of accountability in schools and academies, both church and community, forms a powerful backdrop to the questions which have driven this research. Teaching, in general, has become a profession in which it is becoming increasingly difficult to retain practitioners, many of whom leave citing stress and the punitive pressures of accountability as reasons for their departure (Asthana and Boycott-Owen, 2016). Arguably, nowhere in the profession is this pressure more keenly felt than at the levels of headteacher and school governor, the leaders often held accountable upon a school's judgement of Inadequate by Ofsted (Department for Education, 2018). In this thesis, it is argued that the evidence suggests that SIAMS, even if it is regarded as a low-stakes inspection (Penninckx et al., 2015b), does not operate in church schools unaffected, in a vacuum devoid of these influences. The various elements of this education culture and their potential to influence and create stress for the individuals involved must therefore be acknowledged as part of the context of any research into the influence which SIAMS might have on those who lead church schools as they, too, operate within this culture which is often characterised by pressure and accountability.

An inquiry into the way in which all of these influences, pressures, and accountability measures might come together in the person of a church school leader as they seek to lead a learning community characterised by a commitment to human flourishing is, therefore, considered worthwhile. A focus on the *personal narrative* of these school leaders as a means of gaining insight is valid for methodological, epistemological, and ontological reasons, related both to the subject matter and to the life story of the researcher herself. This combination of ontology, epistemology, methodology, and subject matter create the unique position which this inquiry occupies and which this thesis discusses.

In addition to offering a contribution to the gap in the research around church school education and inspection, this particular project has resonance for me because of the potential for power to be present within the site of school inspection. As is evident from the brief glance into my own narrative beginnings, my awareness of and resistance to everyday power at work in relationships as a result of certain critical life events is an intrinsic element of who I am privately, and therefore also professionally. Narrative inquiry methodology enables the coming together of these two strands of life (private and professional), regarded in more positivist approaches to research as being quite separate from each other and a hindrance to the reliability of research, should one contaminate the other (Atkinson and Coffey, 2003). Working as a narrative inquirer enables me to embrace the existence and impact of my positionality as positive (Kohler Riessman, 2003; Loxley and Seery, 2008) and to manage it carefully as an active feature of research. Conducting a narrative inquiry therefore, harnessing the insight

brought about by providing a stage for people's stories, combined with an awareness of ways in which power might influence how these people feel they are able to act, brings paradigmatic harmony to this research.

CHAPTER TWO

The Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS), Christian Education, and the Nature of Knowledge

Background

The Church of England has been a significant partner in the provision of state-funded education in England since 1811 at which time, "[t]he founding of the National Society… set in train a new and extraordinary phase in the history of the engagement of the Church of England with education" (Pritchard, 2011, p.1). Consequently, "by 1861 there were around 12,000 schools 'in union' with the N[ational] S[ociety]. This was a phenomenal achievement. It was the invention of mass education" (ibid., p.2). At the time of the Church's initial involvement and investment in the free provision of schooling, which had a particular focus on making education available to the poor, Joshua Watson, founder of 'The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales' demonstrated his commitment to the belief that "the way out of poverty and ignorance was education, not only to train people in basic skills but also to build character" (ibid., p.1).

Over the last two centuries, however, I suggest that the Church of England has not consistently retained the clarity and focus for education with which its founder originally acted. The creation of the 'dual system', "whereby the Church would work in partnership with the State to provide education for the nation's children" (Chadwick, 2013, p.44), but which brought with it relinquishment by the Church of most of its schools to the government's majority control in return for financial support, was one of the most systemically defining actions taken by the Church of England in education. However, arguably, it was also a system which contributed to a degree of loss of identity with regards to the primary purpose of an Anglican education. As the church school education system became increasingly caught up in the political agendas of successive governments as a result of its position within the dual system, "Anglican schools were confused as to their *domestic* role in nurturing Anglicans and their *service* role to the local community in educating the nation's children" (Chadwick, 2013, p.49).

Despite proving to be problematic and subject to opposition almost since its inception, as seen for example, in Birrell's failed attempt in 1906 to abolish the dual system (ibid., pp45-46), it survives to this day, and continues to be heeded in statutory governance arrangements for Church of England schools on the occasion of academy conversion (Department for Education, 2016).

Successive Education Acts since the nineteenth century have retained, clarified, and reinforced at times the Church's prominent position in the national system of state-funded education, despite frequent opposition from those within both secularist organisations and non-conformist church traditions (for example, Astley, 2013; Chadwick, 2013; Worsley, 2013). However, since the 2010 Academy Act (Department for Education, 2010) and the establishment of an increasingly market-driven culture within education (Ball, 1998; Ball, 2012; Ball, 2013b), the challenge for the Church to have and to communicate a clarity of vision and purpose for its involvement has become more pressing.

> It is too easy in some contexts to forget the difference that Christianity should make to education, and to smooth out the radical disjunction between the wisdom of the cross and the wisdom of the world. But Jesus proclaimed first and foremost a good news for the poor. Whatever else we claim to do 'in his name', we must share *this* mission.
> (Astley, 2013, p.106)

The vision offered by the Rev. Nigel Genders, on behalf of the Church of England (Church of England Education Office, 2016a), takes on this challenge and makes clear the relevance of the Church's particular brand of education for all, regardless of personal faith or belief. This vision seeks to reinforce the validity of the Church's prominent and, some might say unfairly preferential position (Hirst, 1981; Hirst, 1994), alongside the State as a provider of free universal education.

> This is a fresh articulation of the Church of England's vision for education…It is not simply for Church schools but, recognising the Church of England's involvement in education over many centuries, seeks to promote educational excellence everywhere, for everyone. In Church schools the deeply Christian foundation for this vision will be seen explicitly in teaching and learning both in RE and across the curriculum, and also in the authentically Christian worship and ethos of those schools. In other schools which are not rooted in an explicit Christian ethos, our vision for education can still be expressed and promoted as one of human flourishing that can inspire what the school is and does.
>
> The vision is deeply Christian, with the promise by Jesus of 'life in all its fullness' at its heart… Our vision embraces the spiritual, physical, intellectual, emotional, moral and social development of children and young people. We offer a vision of human flourishing for all, one that embraces excellence and academic rigour, but sets them in a wider framework. (Church of England Education Office, 2016a, p.3)

With approximately one million pupils currently being educated in more than 4,700 Church of England schools (Church of England Education Office, 2016a), and with an up-to-date articulation of the Church's vision and purpose for education, the partnership between

Church and State continues to be the most long-lasting and significant within the English education system.

It is not within the scope of this thesis to undertake a detailed history of the place of the Anglican Church in the nation's educational history. What is relevant, however, is:

1. a brief overview of the historical establishment of the Church of England's role and identity within the national system of education (above);

2. a snapshot of the current national statistical picture (above);

3. chronology of the legislation which is the basis for the SIAMS process and the relationship between this and the academic debate on the nature and purpose of a Christian education; and,

4. discussion of the way in which the Church of England sees its educational purpose.

Within English law, education policy is set out by means of Acts of Parliament. The Acts of Parliament which are of most relevance to this research are the Education Act 1944 (Department for Education, 1944) and the Education Act 2005 (Department for Education, 2005). The 1944 Act saw the first legal enactment of the dual system of education between the Church and the State and the establishment of schools with a designated religious character as being either voluntary controlled (VC) or voluntary aided (VA). Voluntary controlled schools are those which have a religious character but which are controlled by the local authority as the employer, the recognised admissions authority and, prior to the Academy Act 2010 (Department for Education, 2010), the conduit of funding. Voluntary aided schools are those designated as having a religious character with the majority of governors appointed by either the Parochial Church Council or the relevant Church of England diocese, and with the governing body also being the employer, the admissions authority, and the body responsible for denominational religious education (Department for Education, 1944, s15:1). The 1944 Act sets out the financial and governance requirements of any religious body assuming either minority or majority responsibility for the running of a school as well as their responsibilities in respect of the maintenance of land and buildings and the provision of religious education (ibid., s15:1-2). In sections (ss) 25–28 of the 1944 Act, the arrangements for collective worship and religious education within aided schools are set out. However, at the time, there was no provision for any evaluation or inspection activity designed to ascertain or monitor the quality and/or impact of the denominational elements of the education provided within voluntary controlled or voluntary aided schools.

Very little changed legally with regard to denominational provision within schools with a religious character over the following 48 years. Then, in the Education Act 1992 (Department for Education, 1992), the legal requirement that denominational education (religious education) and the content of collective worship would be inspected by a person selected by

the governors or foundation governors was introduced (Department for Education, 1992, s13:3-4). An insight to the status given to this inspection by central government, however, is suggested by the insertion into the Act of the statement that the person selected to carry out the inspection need not be a "registered inspector" (ibid., s13:5). Furthermore, a

> … person conducting an inspection under this section may do so with the assistance of such other persons *chosen by him as are in his opinion* (italics mine for emphasis) fit and proper persons for carrying out the inspection. (ibid., s13:8)

This, again, was a stipulation devoid of any means of monitoring or quality assurance.

The Education Act 1996 (Department for Education, 1996) retained the wording and scope of denominational inspection as set out in 1992 (ibid., s23:1-9), with the additional inclusion that the inspector "… may report on the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils at the school" (ibid., s23:8). The implied low status of such denominational inspections remained, as indicated again by the absence of need for registration of the person conducting the inspection (ibid., s23:6) and the option for this person to select another or others to accompany them as seen fit (ibid., s23:9). This conveys, I suggest, the relative lack of importance which Parliament placed on the monitoring of denominational provision in church schools. Furthermore, at this time, the Church of England itself had no uniform structures whereby these inspections might be carried out in its schools, nor any means by which either the quality of statutory inspections or that of the inspectors conducting them might be monitored.

Nine years later, the Education Act 2005 (Department for Education, 2005) retained the expectations set out previously in statute for the inspection of denominational provision in church schools (ibid., s48:1-6) and, this time, set out further detail for the conduct of the inspection itself and for the publication of the inspection report (ibid., s49:1-4). The addition of this detail and of reference to the Secretary of State's involvement in the prescription of timescales indicates an increased interest on the part of Parliament in the new s48 inspections in England. In turn, this factor might be regarded as influential in subsequent steps taken by the National Society and the CEEO to increase the focus upon both the purpose and quality of a Church of England education.

It was in response to s48 of the 2005 Education Act (Department for Education, 2005) that Nick McKemey, then Head of School Improvement for the Church of England, devised the first national framework for the evaluation of the distinctively Christian character of Church of England schools. Entitled the *Statutory Inspection of Anglican Schools* (SIAS) (National Society, 2005), McKemey's work sought to bring a coherence of purpose and identity both to church schools themselves and to the expectations which the National Society might have of itself as a major player in the nation's education system. Prior to this, responsibility for compliance had

remained with individual dioceses and there had been no centralised inspection or evaluation framework and, therefore, no system for monitoring this compliance. McKemey's work from 2004 to 2005 arguably marked the most significant shift in national policy to date by setting out the Church of England's decision to seize the initiative in terms of communicating its agenda for what would be expected in and of its schools across England. It also served to reconnect the Church with the original purposes expressed by Joshua Watson in 1811 and refocused church school leaders and practitioners on the Church's mission to serve the poor through education. McKemey not only set about the task of devising a national framework but also worked to secure agreement on its use by the then 43 dioceses which had previously taken individual responsibility for the fulfilment of the denominational requirements of the Education Acts. In itself, this national agreement was no insignificant achievement.

Despite there being no statutory change to the extent of the remit of s48 inspection, (that is to inspect denominational religious education, the content of collective worship, and to, optionally, report on the spiritual, moral, social, and cultural (SMSC) development of pupils), McKemey successfully petitioned the Secretary of State to allow the expansion of the remit of Church of England s48 inspection to include an inspection of the ways in which the school's distinctively Christian character met the needs of all learners and of the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the school. This was in line with the findings of Dearing (2001) in which he called upon leaders of church schools to openly promote the distinctively Christian nature of the education on offer in their schools. McKemey set out these additional criteria, along with those already described within s48, in what have become accepted in both SIAS and SIAMS, (until the publication of the 2018 revised SIAMS Schedule) as the four church school inspection core questions.

1. How does the school, through its distinctive Christian character, meet the needs of all learners?
2. What is the impact of collective worship on the school community?
3. How effective is the religious education?
4. How effective are the leadership and management of the school as a church school?

The absence of expectation in law that inspectors either be registered with or approved by the National Society, or another body, remained. However, through McKemey's work and a resulting national acceptance of the SIAS process, the National Society began the task of centrally training and approving a list of registered inspectors. This marked a significant step in the professionalisation (Ball, 2013a; Dent and Whitehead, 2002; Hall and Noyes, 2009; Perryman, 2009; Rose, 1996) of the process of church school inspection, one which imbued its inspectors with knowledge-based expertise and authority, and from which there has been no subsequent return. These inspectors, through individual dioceses, were offered to governing

bodies at the time of inspection; governing bodies which, otherwise, would have needed to identify and arrange their own inspector to fulfil the denominational requirements of the Education Act 2005. In this way, the SIAS inspection culture grew into one which enabled dioceses to ensure that all church schools were subject to inspection which was, for the first time, regular in its timing, consistent in its remit, and regulated centrally by the National Society.

In addition, the very existence of a central statutory inspection system, coordinated at diocesan level, enabled the development of specific SIAS-focused training in dioceses. Individual diocesan education teams, subsequently, variously devised training to cover the four inspection core questions; organised additional programmes to share good practice across and between church schools; published specific guidance for headteachers, governors, religious education and collective worship coordinators; introduced certificated programmes approved by their bishops for leaders of church schools; and established Service Level Agreements with their schools to encourage and enable them to access training in a cost effective and mutually beneficial manner (Diocese of Gloucester website; Diocese of Worcester website; Diocese of Worcester, 2018a). Given the content and focus of these initiatives, they appear to have been rooted in and driven by the requirements of the new and centralised SIAS Framework.

In 2012, the 2005 SIAS Framework was reviewed and in April 2013 was replaced by the *Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools* (SIAMS) Framework (National Society, 2013). It was at this time that I became involved at a national level with SIAMS, as a member of the group which was convened to review SIAS and write the new SIAMS Schedule. SIAMS remained rooted in s48 of the Education Act 2005 and, as well as being mindful of the findings of Dearing, also took account of the recommendations made in *The Church School of the Future Review* (Chadwick, 2012). Chadwick exhorted the National Society and leaders of church schools to not only maintain but to increase the focus on the distinctively Christian character of church schools, at the same time as paying attention to the need to ensure that this distinctiveness would lead to effectiveness. Thus, by situating their work within this context, the authors of SIAMS moved inspection-focused thinking within church school education beyond simply a requirement to be distinctively Christian to an expectation that, by means of this distinctiveness, a church school would also be held to account for pupils' learning. This also explicitly reconnected the work of church schools with some of the original intentions expressed by their founder in 1811. Seven years after the creation of its predecessor SIAS, the SIAMS Framework retained the same four core inspection questions and deliberations and review began from this starting point.

SIAMS also appears to have been influenced in its development by *More than Caring and Sharing* (Cox, 2011). Cox argued that no system or provider of education is values-neutral;

that all education has a particular provenance and perspective; and that, in the case of church schools, that source is the Christian faith and the teaching of the Bible. He wrote of a need for church schools to enable and equip pupils in their search for truth and to contextualise life and all learning within the Christian narrative and the person of Christ. His call for this emphasis is summed up in his claim that,

> [i]f we are to discover what is distinctive about the beliefs that underpin the values and ethos of our church schools then we cannot, must not, ignore the story of Jesus. (Cox, 2011, p.45)

Cox urged those connected with the leadership of church schools, as the title of his book suggests, to move beyond merely being caring, sharing, welcoming and kind in their interpretation and application of the Christian Gospel in the context of education. He encouraged them to examine the relevance of the Christian faith to the tasks of learning and teaching and to establish learning communities with Christian values at their heart. Thus the thinking of Cox, combined with that of Dearing and Chadwick and the work of McKemey, extended the debate on and understanding of the purpose of church school education beyond the narrow remit of the legal expectations set out in the Education Acts post-1944, albeit with little practical detail on the means by which church school leaders might achieve this.

Worsley (2013b) took up the theme, encouraging the reader to regard church schools as eschatologically-inspired learning communities; places in which there would be a focus on the growth of the individual and of the community within a culture of Christian grace and love, rather than a focus on inspection-driven compliance and fear in a system of punitive accountability. Worsley encouraged those working in the church school world to dare to be counter-cultural and to live out the Christian Gospel in their deeds as well as in their words and in meeting the statutory obligation to provide a daily act of Christian collective worship. He challenged church school and diocesan leaders of education to think more deeply than the requirements and confines of the Education Act 2005 and to consider the challenge of providing an education which is not driven by accountability. I suggest that responding to such a challenge requires of school leaders not only an understanding of the nature of the Christian faith and its relevance to education but also a commitment and an ability to act with an independent attitude towards and within a system which is designed to publicly judge performance. The relationship between this understanding of the Christian faith and inspection-related issues raises interesting questions of the validity of inspection judgements and these are discussed further later in this chapter.

Worsley and Cox were building on the earlier work of Cooling (1994) in which he argued that a person's educational vision will depend on their own beliefs and value systems and that, therefore, any claims to neutrality in an educational context are misleading. Cooling

explored how supposed neutrality within the 'non-church school' English education system and government policy is, in fact, a mask. He argued that it conceals a secular approach which not only marginalises a religious (be it Christian or otherwise) presence in education, but also portrays it within a discourse which presents religion in public life as being inappropriate.

Debates around the appropriateness of the place of the Church of England in particular, and the Christian faith in general, in state education and the gradual growth of the SIAMS process out of the basic requirements of the Education Acts of 1944 onwards, are significant for this thesis. They form the basis out of which an understanding of what constitutes a Christian education grows and thereby create a context within which all developments within the field of church school education are situated, either intentionally or otherwise. Such debates also presuppose a shared understanding of what constitutes a Christian education; an understanding which can be expected to be taken into consideration in any developments within a Church of England education, including SIAMS.

The Nature of Christian Education

Almost thirty years ago Jeff Astley, the former Director of the Durham-based North of England Institute for Christian Education, proposed three possible interpretations of the term 'Christian education': education into Christianity, education about Christianity, and education in a Christian manner (Astley, 1992; Astley, 1994). Astley's thinking subsequently found resonance, more than twenty years later, in the three categories of religious education put forward by Clarke and Woodhead (2015): instruction, religious education, and formation. Each of Astley's suggestions, and, by extension, also those of Clarke and Woodhead, contributes, with varying degrees of relevance, to an understanding of the education which might be on offer within church schools, the effectiveness of which is evaluated by SIAMS.

As a basic premise, Astley argues that any education put forward as being Christian in nature must

> …be congruent with the ends of Christianity, with the end that *is* Christ…But to qualify as Christian education it must retain some contact with its centre. The enterprise, in its furthest reaches, must somewhere bear the imprint of *his* touch, something of the whorls and configurations of his mark. (Astley, 1992, p.21)

What Astley means by "*his* touch" and "his mark" is best understood, I suggest, in the way proposed by Cooling (2018). Cooling raises the notion of there being a positivist mindset held by some Christians in relation to their faith which, if translated into the field of Christian education, would be incongruent with the critical aims of education.

> Positivism is not, to my mind, a belief system like atheism or Judaism. Rather it is a mindset, a way of holding beliefs that can be manifested by atheists and religious

believers alike. It is a particular approach that people take to the knowledge that they believe they have gained in their life… This values the concept of objectivity and aspires to the notion that true knowledge applies universally irrespective of the vagaries of belief. The role of education then is to pass on the uncontroversial knowledge that is the accumulation of objective academic enquiry over time. Evidence and argument lead decisively to truth. Positivism assumes that education can confidently induct pupils into the universal, established truths that are the reliable products of rational thought and its methods. It assumes consensus. (ibid., p.122)

An understanding of what is meant by a Christian education should, I suggest, as well as informing the work of Church of England schools in general, also underpin the SIAMS criteria; criteria which are ultimately used to make judgements on the impact of the work of church school leaders. This thesis discusses ways in which SIAMS and the Church's interpretation of a Christian education either resonate or come into conflict with each other, as well as with the propositions of Astley, Cooling, and Clarke and Woodhead. It argues for cohesion between the nature of a Christian education and the nature and aims of SIAMS and raises questions as to whether the concept of judgement and grading is an appropriate way of achieving this cohesion.

According to Astley, **Education into Christianity**, which can also be referred to as Christian nurture, is a term which sums up the type of religious or faith education which might take place within Christian families, churches or church groups. It is "offered by Christians to Christians in order to strengthen Christian faith and to develop Christian character" (Hull, 1994, p.257), and can be said to be, "in some sense at least, a matter of making disciples" (Astley and Day, 1992, p.15). It takes as its premise the veracity of the truth claims of the faith itself and uses this as the basis for much of its teaching and practice with the purpose of faith formation, albeit optimally within a framework of critical openness (Hull, 1994, pp.263-272). Clarke and Woodhead also describe such an education, entitling it "instruction" (2015, p.33) and suggest that this type of approach to education typically has an absence of critical thinking or evaluation. In their opinion, this is acceptable within faith communities and families in the interests of preserving religious freedom, a notion which is contested by Cooling. Suggesting that to attribute agency and freedom of thought to any individual within an educational relationship (including within a family or a faith community) is preferable to what might otherwise be described as indoctrination (Cooling, 2018, p.120), Cooling suggests that an attitude of "interpretivist hermeneutics" (ibid., p.125), not contrary to education into Christianity or religious instruction, is more appropriate. This is an attitude which

…assumes pupil agency since hermeneutics recognises the important role of learners and their context in constructing the meaning of the texts… [I]t demands recognition

of diversity because the role of pre-understanding means that diversity of

interpretation rather than consensus is to be expected. (ibid.)

Transposing this view of education from the public to the arguably more private arena

of family or church, introduces the notion that *all* education in any context is offered from a

value-laden perspective and requires critical engagement on behalf of all those involved.

An instructed person thinks what he is told to think, a socialised person thinks what

others think, an indoctrinated person does not really think at all, an educated person

thinks for himself. (Hull, 1990, p.307)

This raises interesting questions for communities of faith, all of which are beyond the scope of

this thesis.

There is a view that an education into Christianity is indoctrination and therefore

unacceptable in any context – either school, church, or family (for example, Hirst 1974; Hirst,

1981; Hirst 1993). However, this fails to recognise Cooling's argument in relation to the

perspective and value-laden approach to education which is offered by and in all educational

establishments, in which interpretation is an unavoidable, albeit for some uncomfortable,

reality.

There is always a subjective process of constructing meaning, which draws on one's

worldview, reflects one's cultural situatedness and often serves one's own interests.

The existence of pre-understanding is simply a fact of life, namely that we all interpret

from somewhere… (Cooling, 2018, p.124).

Regardless of differing views as to the appropriateness in principle of an education into

Christianity and of discussions of the extent to which it might involve critical engagement, and

bearing in mind Cooling's insight into the role played by interpretation in all education, there is

general agreement between Hull, Astley, Hirst, and Clarke and Woodhead that this type of

education does not have a place in a national system of state-funded education.

Although the admissions' policies of some Church of England schools (for example,

Admissions Policy for Tardebigge Church of England Voluntary Aided First School, Diocese of

Worcester), do not always appear to support this inclusive vision for education by including

over-subscription criteria related to church attendance, this is not the case for most and

cannot be said to typify the nature of the Christian education within Church of England schools

more generally (Davies, 2017). In its position of being the state church, the Church of England

has been given the responsibility legally (Department for Education, 1944, s9(2)), along with

the Roman Catholic church and other faith groups, to be partners with the state in educating

the nation's children and young people. Whilst sharing this partnership the Church of England

has also uniquely assumed a duty principally to meet the needs of the children and their

families who live in the locality within which a school is situated, regardless of personal or

family faith allegiance (Chadwick, 2012; Church of England Education Office, 2016a). The interpretation of meeting the needs of the local community as an educator is not limited by the Church of England to the arguably narrower purpose of teaching the traditions and beliefs of the Church of England's version of Christianity with the explicit purpose of faith formation and offering this primarily to the Church community. Instead, it has an inclusive focus on human flourishing and living an abundant life which, in general, it seeks to offer to all.

However, contrary to Astley and Hull's interpretation of education into Christianity and Clarke and Woodhead's category of instruction as being that which is ordinarily confined to the Christian home or church, and in a way which lacks Cooling's focus on critical engagement and interpretivist hermeneutics, I suggest that the culture created in Church of England schools by SIAMS can put church school leaders in a position in which they, possibly unintentionally, can embody a commitment to promote personal Christian faith. As part of their commitment to create learning communities in which faith is a routine matter, one deserving of attention and affirmation (Chadwick, 2012), a culture which contains elements of Astley's education into Christianity and of Clarke and Woodhead's religious instruction can consequently be established. SIAMS criteria such as those which focus upon the spiritual development of children within the parameters of a Christian interpretation of spirituality; the school community's engagement with and living out of distinctively Christian values which are understood as being rooted in biblical teaching and the Christian narrative (Cooling et al., 2016); and the establishment of an all-encompassing Christian vision for the life of the school (SIAMS, 2013) can combine to create a culture of compliance (Green, 2009). When such a discourse of compliance underpins and drives the life of the school, either consciously or unconsciously, a desire to be compliant with the dominant culture can lead students to acquiesce to the hegemonic discourse in order to fit in and be valued as a member of the community. In the case of a school based upon Christian vision and values, such compliance is with the teachings and practices of the Christian faith, suggesting that a degree of education into Christianity/religious instruction might unwittingly take place. Some Christian governors can regard their involvement with their local church school as being part of their Christian mission in which they might be a small link in a child's lifelong journey with the Christian faith, as described by G2 in their life story interview. The Church itself, arguably, encourages this. Indeed, both *The Way Ahead* (Dearing, 2001) and *The Church School of the Future* (Chadwick, 2012) reports set out that church schools are at the heart of the Church's mission to the nation, a mission which is described as the cure of souls (Church of England website).

Consequently, despite being neither the principle nor stated purpose of a church school education, some church schools can become involved to a certain extent in education into Christianity, albeit potentially inadvertently. A deeper exploration of this notion is not,

however, possible within the narrow scope of this thesis. Suffice it to say for the purposes of this inquiry that, in principle, and according to the narrative data provided by the church school leader participants (H1 Interview, pp.4-5; H2 Interview, pp.6, 8, and 11-13), education into Christianity is neither the education described when I refer to a Christian education, nor that which is envisaged by the CEEO as being offered by its schools.

Education about Christianity, or "…a secular, scholarly elucidation and evaluation of the Christian religion" (Astley and Day, 1992, p.15) is the type of education, according to Astley, which it would be reasonable to expect to encounter within a systematic and academic religious education curriculum designed to enable learning about the beliefs, teachings, principles and practices of the Christian faith. (See, for example, Blaylock et al., 2016). This type of education, referred to by Clarke and Woodhead as "religious education", is also advocated by them as an important feature of a state-funded education.

> Such religious education is critical, outward looking, and dialogical. It recognises diversity, and encourages students to learn 'about' and 'from' religious and nonreligious worldviews. It involves both 'understanding religions' and 'religious understanding.' It develops knowledge about a range of beliefs and values, an ability to articulate and develop one's own values and commitments, and the capacity to debate and engage with others. These are essential skills in a multi-faith society and a diverse but connected world. (Clarke and Woodhead, 2015, p.34)

Such an education does not aim to form personal faith and cannot be said to be a Christian education either in the terms assumed by the criteria set out within Core Questions One, Two, and Four of the SIAMS Evaluation Schedule or by the exhortations of Dearing and Chadwick to put faith at the heart of the curriculum. Although high quality teaching about Christianity might lead to a greater interest in it, or in religious faith more widely, it is not the remit of an education about Christianity to share the good news of the Christian gospel with the intention of individuals' conversion into faith. It is not unreasonable to assume that education about Christianity would be expected to be an aspect of a church school's religious education curriculum which has a high priority and status due to the Christian foundation of the school (SIAMS, 2013; Church of England Education Office, 2016b). Furthermore, an inspection of the effectiveness of the religious education forms one quarter of the SIAMS inspection of a VA school (SIAMS, 2013) indicating the level of prominence and quality expected by the CEEO. However, education about Christianity is not the entirety of the Christian education of which SIAMS seeks to evaluate the impact.

Astley's **Education in a Christian Manner** is, I suggest, the type of education which might be expected to be carried out in church schools, that on which SIAMS seeks to make judgements, and can be described as being "…characteristic of Christianity rather than distinctively Christian" (Astley and Day, 1992, p.16). It is in relation to this interpretation of education that Astley and Cooling, and Clarke and Woodhouse part company. Clarke and Woodhouse differentiate between what they call formation and what they consider qualifies as 'education'; whilst Cooling and Astley propose to differing extents that all education involves some degree of formation. Astley retains what Cooling calls the "the tripartite distinction between instruction, formation and education" (Cooling, 2018, p.125), a phrase which he uses specifically to characterise the thinking of Clarke and Woodhead. This tripartite delineation distinguishes completely between instruction/education into Christianity, education/education about Christianity, and formation/education in a Christian manner. In contrast, Cooling suggests that there is an element of formation in *all* education. He contests that

> there is a choice only between instruction, based on a positivist paradigm, and
> formation, based on an interpretivist paradigm (2018, p.125).

The distinction, therefore, according to Cooling, is one of mindset rather than of content, of operating from a basis of "responsible hermeneutics" (ibid., p.124) rather than from within the positivist paradigm.

Nonetheless, the overlap between Astley's education in a Christian manner and Cooling's formation within the interpretivist paradigm, enables an understanding of the education on offer within Church of England schools. This is an education which is in line with the discourse of grace of the Christian narrative (Worsley, 2013b) and with the teaching of Jesus to love one another (John 13 vs 34-35); to care for those in society who might otherwise be neglected (Luke 10 vs 25-37); to forgive (Matthew 6 vs 15); and to offer all who stumble and make mistakes the opportunity of redemption (Romans 5 vs 6-15). It is an approach to education, summed up in *Deeply Christian, Serving the Common Good* (Church of England Education Office, 2016a), which is rooted in the biblical exhortation to enable all to live an abundant life (John 10 vs 10) and to flourish as unique individuals made in the image of God (Genesis 1 vs 27). This Christian vision for education denotes the Church's engagement in depth with academic and theological communities, and makes the Church of England's educational philosophy known and available to *all* those involved in education, not just to those involved in church school education. It is not dependent upon legislation for its existence and provenance, nor is it criteria-based for the purpose of evaluation and judgement. It breaks its visionary intent down into four main strands:

  i.   Educating for Wisdom, Knowledge and Skills

<div align="right">(Church of England Education Office, 2016a, pp.9-10)</div>

It is not the purpose of this thesis to explore the depth of meaning and the breadth of potential application of this vision but merely to refer to it as the most recent and coherent articulation of what the Church understands to be the main purpose of education. As, arguably, the most significant document produced by the National Society and/or CEEO since the SIAS Framework of 2005, its expectations must form at least part of the backdrop to any discussion of the education on offer within church schools which is evaluated and reported on by SIAMS.

The education in a Christian manner which Church of England schools might offer to their communities has at its core an inherent love for and belief in the value of the individual regardless of faith, culture, ability or aptitude, as a result of the belief that each is made in the image of God (SIAMS, 2013), and that all deserve to flourish. Such an education, in contrast to the educational narrative of Ofsted and the DfE which is rooted in the centrality of individual pupils' academic performance (Department for Education, 2016; Ofsted, 2017b), does not depend upon what the individual pupil will 'put out' as a result of that which is 'put in'. It is a counter-cultural form of education which values the individual simply for who they are and the gifts they have, and which does not essentially define itself as an input/output equation (Ball, 2013; Lyotard, 1984) with life and learning reduced to economic commodities (Ball, 1994). It is an education modelled upon the example of Christ in its focus upon the needs of the individual and its desire to be part of the individual's journey to flourishing; an education as *praxis* (Patton, 2002), the moral imperative which regards the education of both self and other as a worthy and far reaching endeavour.

It is upon the outworking in individual church school contexts of this definition of a Christian education that SIAMS purports to make judgements. This thesis argues that the introduction of the concept of inspection to the field of education in a Christian manner raises questions related to the nature of knowledge (further explored on pp. 41-46), as well as creating conflict for leaders of church schools (further explored on pp. 91-93 and p.129).

Summary

In summary therefore, in the context of this research it is this third understanding of a Christian education, education in a Christian manner rooted in the interpretivist paradigm, which provides the basis for thought because it is this definition which resonates with the Church's stated philosophy for education and with the criteria of the SIAMS Evaluation

Schedule (SIAMS, 2013). Developed almost in parallel conceptually with the writings of Astley, Day, Hull, Cooling, and Worsley, yet in the absence of direct reference to them, SIAMS was developed between 2011 and 2013. No longer simply driven by the relatively narrow requirements of the most recent Education Act, the centralised system of church school inspection, which began with McKemey's work in 2004 and 2005, has now enabled the Church of England to go some way towards defining the type of Christian education offered by its schools. Whether SIAMS and this definition of a Christian education operate in ideological, epistemological, and ontological harmony with each other remains a question to be discussed.

The SIAMS Inspection

A SIAMS inspection of a Church of England primary school is conducted by one inspector, in one day, approximately once every five years. School leaders are notified of the date of the inspection one week ahead of time. They are expected to carry out ongoing self-evaluation against the inspection criteria and to share this self-evaluation with the inspector during the week before the inspection. The inspector uses this, along with other publicly available information (such as the school website and policies), as well as documents provided by the headteacher, (for example, the school development plan), as preliminary evidence in the creation of a pre-inspection plan (PIP). The PIP sets out for the school the evidence trails which will shape the inspection day and is sent to the headteacher usually 24 hours before the start of the inspection.

The purpose of a SIAMS inspection conducted under the 2013 Framework is to evaluate the distinctiveness and effectiveness of a church school, in order to fulfil the statutory requirement of s48 of the Education Act 2005, by gathering evidence to answer the four inspection Core Questions. Fine-grading using the criteria set out in the Grade Descriptors enables an inspector to reach an overall judgement of Outstanding (1), Good (2), Satisfactory (3), or Inadequate (4), a process of categorisation against an accepted norm (Youdell, 2011).

The Nature of Knowledge Generated in SIAMS

SIAMS is routinely referred to as a system of church school *inspection* (italics for emphasis) largely because of its purpose of making judgements against criteria and of categorising schools by means of these judgements. However, I will argue that it might more accurately be described as an interactive process which is subjective in nature due in large part to the nature of the evidence which is sought and the methods used to gather it. These aspects of SIAMS are central to the nature of the knowledge which is ultimately created. Evidence which is deemed

to be valid within a SIAMS inspection is often narrative, subjective, and interpretive in nature and includes that which is created through, for example:

- discussions with the headteacher, governors, academy trustees, parents, and children about spiritual development, the impact of Christian values on learning, the quality of religious education provision, and the impact of acts of collective worship;

- observations of children's behaviour and the relationships between different members of the school community;

- learning walks focusing on the quality of religious education, the impact of Christian values, and the relevance of the school's vision to its daily life and work;

- scrutiny of paperwork relating to religious education, collective worship, the strategic work of governors, and the development and implementation of school policies; and,

- the inspector's evaluation of the nature in which all of this evidence can be regarded as being "distinctively Christian" (SIAMS 2013, p.5, p.17, and further mentions).

This thesis argues that these methods of evidence-gathering, as well as the nature of the evidence which is being gathered, render the SIAMS process an interpretive one (Clandinin and Connelly, 1998; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Holstein and Gubrium, 1997; Merrill and West, 2009). At all of the stages of inspection, interpretation is a key feature. School leaders interpret the SIAMS criteria and present evidence which they believe shows the life of their school in a, usually, positive light based upon this interpretation. The inspector also has his or her own interpretation of the inspection criteria and of the quality of the evidence with which they are presented prior to the inspection and which they see on the day itself. However, the inspector's judgement of the school as Outstanding (1), Good (2), Satisfactory (3), or Inadequate (4) is subsequently imbued with the status of being reliable objective knowledge (Penninckx et al., 2015). This quantitative summary of the interpretive SIAMS inspection process introduces the notion of dissonance between the nature of the SIAMS process (subjective) and the nature of the knowledge which is subsequently created (objective), and this will be explored later in this thesis.

The introduction of the concepts of inspector quality and reliability raises further questions about the nature and validity (Ball, 2013; Foucault, 1977; Polkinghorne, 1988; Stobart, 2008) of the knowledge which is produced. Factors to be taken into account in considering this include:

1. **The skill and ability of the inspector to ask questions** which allow members of the school community to discuss issues in appropriate depth and in ways which convey the

impact that the work of the school has on them and on others. Inspectors' variable ability to do this effectively, along with the degrees of interpretation of which the process consists, ultimately become concealed in the process of communicating the judgements and writing the report. This is an example of the way in which the nature of the process and the ultimate nature of the knowledge can be at odds with each other and reveals a conflict which could undermine the stability, reliability, and validity with which the final judgement is regarded.

2. **The relationship established between the inspector and members of the school community** both before and during the day of the inspection itself as an important element of the SIAMS process. This relationship, if good, can enable those in the school community to relax and share information in depth. Conversely, it can be a relationship which is shaped and constrained by the power conferred by the system onto the inspector and might subsequently be characterised by the inspector's use of this power (Ball, 2012; Perryman, 2009). The manner of the relationship, therefore, is an important element of the inspection process. Information sharing, affected by the relationship with the inspector, in turn forms a significant part of the evidence base which is the basis of the judgement made. However, this too becomes a hidden subjective aspect of the final judgement.

3. **The ease with which key school leaders, such as the headteacher and foundation governors, are able to use theological terminology which is required as part of discussions about Christian vision and values**. If done with ease due, for example, to a school leader's own personal religious faith and/or churchmanship, it is possible to conceal a shallowness of understanding of the theological basis of the school's work and the quality of its impact. Conversely, for the same reasons, if this communication lacks fluidity, eloquence, or the use of certain Christian jargon this lack of ease of communication could prevent a school leader from expressing the theological basis of their work and its impact in terms easily understood by the inspector. This potential ostensible failure may, in turn, belie the effectiveness of the Christian education offered by the school. The interpretation of this knowledge comes back to the skill and insight of the individual inspector to evaluate and to question appropriately in order to elicit what will be accepted as the truth of the individual's work as the leader of a distinctive and effective church school.

The participants in this research could be described as being well-prepared for SIAMS. All had attended relevant diocesan training for up to three years before inspection and had, in addition, sought bespoke diocesan advice and support in specific aspects of the SIAMS agenda.

Both headteachers and one of the governors recounted the importance with which they regard favourable judgements by SIAMS (for example, H1 Interview, p.15), even describing it as more important than Ofsted:

> …in some ways, the SIAMS system is of a greater value than the Ofsted because what I do like about it is that there is a recognition that there is more to a child than just what literacy level and what Maths level they get and that's what I like about it that it does recognise this y'know more holistic approach to education. (H2 Interview, p.14-15)

Furthermore, all were prepared to comply fully with the requirements of the system and to accept its demands for evidence of their work and of its impact. However, they regard SIAMS as being more difficult than Ofsted because of the nature of the evidence sought by SIAMS inspectors.

> [I]t's way harder than Ofsted (H2 Interview, p.15),

and,

> I definitely think that this is harder and this is much more difficult to make it properly work than just getting the kids to be able to read and write. (G1 Interview, p.27)

They also, prior to the inspection, had concerns about the subjective interpretation which an inspector would make of their school's evidence and the manner in which ostensibly objective, secure, and authoritative judgements would subsequently be made (Perryman, 2009; Stobart, 2008).

> Ofsted in a sense is quite straightforward… You have your data, there's my data, y'know, and I can tweak my data to show you this. If I take out that child because of this issue it looks a bit better. If I show you this group it proves that… It's all very neat and quantifiable…. I can put a spreadsheet in front of you. Job done. The SIAMS stuff I think is much much harder to quantify and therefore much harder to evidence. It is a lot more anecdotal um and one of the things I'm learning through talking to other heads is, one of the things I need to get on with is um using case studies and using photographs and stuff like that to evidence what we do. Um and that may just be for me because of how I prefer to work in terms of having hard data as a quantifiable source rather than the more qualitative stuff… (H2 Interview, p.15).

This inherent difference between the subjective nature of the content and process of SIAMS, and the objective knowledge which is said to be ultimately created can be exemplified by means of a brief look at one of the many requirements in order for a school to be judged as outstanding within Core Question One.

> In order to be able to reach a conclusion on whether there is a "…highly developed interpretation of spirituality shared across the school community…" (SIAMS, 2013, p.7), an inspector is required to make a number of independent decisions and make use of a range of

approaches. An inspector must firstly decide whether the school has an interpretation of spirituality. Some schools will have, in the form of a written policy, unarguable objective evidence of the existence of an interpretation of spirituality. Whether or not this interpretation can be described as being "highly developed", however, and the extent to which it might be "shared across the school community" is reliant, for example, upon the inspector's own understanding of spirituality, their experience of personal spirituality, their ability to enable members of the school community to discuss the matter in depth, as well as their experience and judgement of other schools' work on spirituality and spiritual development. This, thereby, immediately creates a need for an inspector to interpret such a piece of ostensibly objective evidence in a subjective manner. Other schools may not have an objective, written piece of evidence in the form of an interpretation of or policy on spirituality but will claim that the school does have an interpretation of spirituality and that it is known and understood by members of the school community. This must then be tested by the inspector, relying upon their own experience and interpretation of spirituality and upon their interpersonal, investigative and evaluative skills, for example, through discussions, interviews, and scrutiny of teachers' lesson planning across the curriculum. Again, this process consists of a combination of objective and subjective characteristics of the nature and validity of the evidence and the methods of its acquisition, as well as of the interpretation of that evidence.

Furthermore, in order to be deemed acceptable, the school's interpretation of spirituality is expected to be within the bounds of a Christian spirituality; a requirement assumed by school leaders and by inspectors because the SIAMS Framework itself does not make such an expectation explicit. However, given that the premise of SIAMS is the school's provision of a distinctive and effective *Christian* education, it is reasonable to assume that any reference to spirituality within it would be to a Christian spirituality. This leads an inspector to the question of what constitutes a Christian spirituality; who has the authority to make this decision; and what would be accepted as being the essential features of such a spirituality. In addition, the inspector is faced with questions such as how they would know whether the interpretation of spirituality is "highly effective" (Outstanding) (SIAMS, 2013, p.6) or merely "clear" (Good) (ibid., p.7). Much of the evidence needed for an inspector to make a judgement on this criterion would be subjective in nature, emanating from discussions with school staff, leaders and children as well as from reference to the school's written documentation and, critically, the inspector's interpretation of this evidence.

In reaching these first two decisions which form the basis of the inspector's judgement on the first sentence of a three-sentence-long Grade Descriptor within Outstanding for Core Question One, an inspector has already had to draw upon and interpret either, or both, sources of evidence which can be regarded as subjective and objective in nature. Both types of

evidence are subsequently subject to the inspector's interpretation, thereby inserting an additional interpretive element to the reliability and validity of the judgements which are made.

It is reasonable, therefore, to describe the knowledge created about a school by a SIAMS inspector as interpretive. As illustrated by this reference to spirituality, the areas of school life encompassed within and judged by SIAMS are those related to the impact which Christian vision and values have, primarily on the pupils but also on the wider school community. Further examples of the subjective and interpretive nature of the evidence and the process which are at the heart of a SIAMS inspection are the:

- focus on the impact of the school's Christian vision and values on children's learning and behaviour;
- interpretation of the difference which collective worship makes to the way that children view life and make decisions;
- interpretation of the ways in which effective learning in religious education enables children to develop a worldview which is accepting and understanding of people's differences; and,
- the extent to which leaders' understanding of the school's Christian character has an impact on developments and initiatives.

These elements form a significant part of the inspection and cannot be described as being objective, either in terms of the nature of the evidence itself or the manner of its collection.

The Significance of Relationships

In addition to the role played by subjective interpretation at various stages of the SIAMS process, the impact of relationships is also significant. The relationships between the people themselves (Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007); the relationship between the individuals and the inspection process (Josselson, 2007); the relative power accorded to different players within the process (Besley and Peters, 2007; Merrill and West, 2009); and the impact which these degrees of power have upon ways in which people relate to each other (Olssen, 1999) all contribute to the creation of knowledge within SIAMS. Therefore it is also possible, at least partially, to describe the means of gathering evidence, the nature of the evidence, and the type of knowledge which the SIAMS process creates as relational.

Relational knowledge is created as a result of interaction between people in relationship with each other (Clandinin, 2013). This type of knowledge is prevalent in narrative inquiry methodology and will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Three. However, a brief overview is helpful at this point.

Relational knowledge is rooted in the perspective that knowledge does not exist separately from the context of its creation (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Hennink et al., 2011) and that it is not awaiting discovery in an objective, impersonal manner (Atkinson, 2007; Woozley, 1949). The coming together of two or more people in relationship for any period of time enables the creation, or the co-creation (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013; Etherington, 2004), of knowledge. The context of its creation is unique and the knowledge itself is consequently also regarded as unique. Relational knowledge cannot be described as fixed, stable, or replicable (Bolton, 2010; Clandinin, 2013; Silverman, 1997); rather, it is fluid in nature, subject to change or development at a different point in time and/or with the involvement of different people in relationship. The story of the life of a school shared with a SIAMS inspector might differ from that shared with an Ofsted inspector, for example, or with a prospective new member of staff. Depending on the relational context, the person might foreground certain events and omit others whilst retaining the truth of the story which they choose to tell (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Goffman, 1956). The knowledge, therefore, which would be created in these different contexts would be dependent, at least in part, upon the relationship within which it was created and this is an important consideration in any research conducted within the context of an inspection relationship.

Subjective or Objective Knowledge

On the basis of the subjective, narrative, relational and interpretive process described above, the outcome of the inspection – the judgement – is summed up in one word, also expressed as a number. This *Summary Judgement* (SIAMS, 2013) becomes a shorthand term for describing the performance of the school and takes on the status of being the objective truth about the school, according to SIAMS. In this way the complex relational, narrative and interpretive process is disregarded. In its place is an uncontested and seemingly objective truth; one word, one number. The objective nature of this truth is, arguably, at odds with the subjective nature of both the process and the knowledge which gave rise to it and yet it is the truth which is lasting and consequently influential in the life of the school.

The above consideration of the process of evidence gathering, the nature of the evidence gathered, and the nature of the knowledge subsequently created questions the appropriateness of regarding as *objective* a system which gathers and assesses evidence which is subjective, narrative, relational, and interpretive in nature and which subsequently leads to the creation of knowledge which is also subjective, narrative, relational, and interpretive in nature. This thesis suggests that there exists a conflict which is created by the possibly

unintentional coalescence of the nature of the SIAMS process, the nature of the knowledge which is generated, and the nature of the truth which the inspection judgement appears to create and communicate about a school. This conflict requires an examination of what is meant by the term *inspection*.

The Concept of Inspection

The introduction of *inspection* to Church of England education can be said to have the effect of translating the field of knowledge (Besley and Peters, 2007; Peters, 2003) into a field of judgement (Ball, 2003; Ball, 2013b). Inherent within this field of judgement is a field of power (Butler, 1990) in which dialogue takes place between two unequal actors (Elonga Mboyo, 2017), a concept which will be considered in more depth in the context of the research findings in Chapter Five. Inspection of any type is typified by inspectors who act as institutional agents (Hall, 2017) with the responsibility to collect evidence (Elonga Mboyo, 2017); to measure it against standards imposed within the field of judgement by experts who create the boundaries of legitimacy (Ehren et al., 2015); and to publish its findings in the form of a report. A *school* inspector has the additional remit to monitor compliance with centrally imposed education policies and regulations (Ehren et al., 2015; Hall, 2017), thereby acting as a bridge between the centre (the DfE and CEEO in the case of SIAMS) and those in individual contexts (dioceses and church schools). The conducting of a SIAMS inspection by a supposed disinterested expert is, I suggest, intended in part to root the process in a discourse of rationality and objectivity, thereby adding to its credibility for all stakeholders. However, the assumed objective nature of this disregards the fact that inspectors are also human beings, with their own emotions (Elonga Mboyo, 2017), values (Segerholm and Hult, 2018), and judgements (Ronnberg, 2014) which are brought to the inspection context and which have an impact on the way in which the task is carried out. These factors have an impact on the judgements that an inspector ultimately makes. Therefore, despite efforts to ensure consistency of practice, the leaders of SIAMS in the CEEO are constantly facing variances in quality and emphasis in the work of individual inspectors; a factor which, in turn, has an impact on both the reliability and objectivity able to be attributed to the system. It is possible that the impact which SIAMS *inspection* (italics for emphasis) has on church schools has the potential to fundamentally change the agenda and consequently the experience of church school education. As a field of judgement, it may be that inspection creates a performative culture in which "[v]alue displaces values" (Ball, 2013a, p.139) and in which compliance becomes a key feature.

Potential Consequences of School Inspection

Consequences (both intended and unintended) for school leaders of the pressure of the accountability culture of school inspection are numerous (Ehren et al., 2015; Jones et al., 2017), especially for those who are sensitive and attentive to expectations put on them by others (Altrichter and Kemethofer, 2015). Amongst the intended consequences is the notion of "gaming" (De Wolf and Janssens, 2007, p.382 and p.389) in which school leaders partake in "window dressing" (ibid., p.382) in order to ensure that the image of the school presented to the inspector is of such quality and compliance (Segerholm and Hult, 2018) as to secure a positive inspection outcome. There is a balance to be struck here between a school community presenting an image of self which is representative of everyday practice yet condensed into the day of inspection in order to share as full a picture as possible of the reality of the breadth of school life, and a school community which alters the fabric of the 'stage' (Goffman, 1956). Such alterations might include those to the physical appearance, documentation, and classroom practice, in order to present to an inspector the image which is understood to be acceptable according to the inspection criteria. In the context of Ofsted, there is evidence that a small percentage of headteachers (7%) are prepared to misrepresent school performance in an attempt to manage the inspection process and the inspector's findings (Jones et al., 2017), although this relates principally to performance data and so is unlikely to be of such high incidence in SIAMS inspection. Resonance here with the thinking of Goffman as far back as 1956 on the manipulation and careful presentation of image reveals how long-established such practices are.

As well as deliberate stage management in an attempt to influence the outcome of an inspection, which can be described as an intended consequence of school inspection, there are consequences which can be described as being *un*intended. These include the following.

- **Tunnel vision** (Ehren and Visschler, 2006, p.63) and **Myopia** (De Wolf and Janssens, 2007, p.389; Ehren and Visschler, 2006, p.63), describe a disproportionate focus on the elements of school life and performance which an inspector will examine rather than on those which the school leaders themselves value. This can lead to "measure fixation" (Ehren and Visschler, 2006, p.63; Jones et al., 2017, p.805) and a potential loss of professional identity for school leaders (Penninckx and Vanhoof, 2015). In SIAMS, the impact on school leaders of what can become a box-ticking focus on the trinitarian nature of God and the display of Christian symbols (see H2 Interview, p.10) can be interpreted as examples of this.

- **Proceduralisation** (De Wolf and Janssens, 2007, p.382), in other words, a preoccupation with ensuring that all inspection paperwork and documentation are completed and kept up-to-date, despite the burden which this puts onto school

leaders, is an unintended consequence of inspection and appears to be characteristic of the headteachers in this study (H1 Interview, p.17; H2 Interview, p.14). Within the education culture which includes inspection and accountability, adherence to rules and expectations related to paperwork is noteworthy. Self-evaluation and development planning documentation is routinely requested by SIAMS inspectors and, in part, school leaders are judged on the quality, extent, and accuracy of this. They are time-consuming documents to create and there are questions around the direct impact on improvement which they bring to school life. Depending on the manner of their creation and subsequent use, it is possible that a self-evaluation document is written almost exclusively for use by an inspector as part of inspection preparation and the value of this to the school might be regarded as questionable.

- **Isomorphism** (De Wolf and Janssens, 2007, p.383; Ehren and Visschler, 2006, p.64), or "mimetic isomorphism" as it is termed by Ehren et al. (2015, p.383), is seen in the narrowing of the types of provision which are acceptable to those with the power to make judgements. This homogenisation, and the culture of legitimacy which is created by inspection expectations, has links with the categorisation against accepted norms upon which inspection is based. Within the church school world, the impact of the Church of England's vision for education combined with the requirements of SIAMS can possibly be said to have this effect, especially currently in relation to Christian values but also with regard to school collective worship practices, such as leadership of worship by children. The impact of these consequences is not necessarily negative and yet, if occurring in an unintended manner, the phenomenon possibly requires some attention.

Together, these intended and unintended consequences of SIAMS can have the effect of creating a "performance paradox" (Ehren and Visschler, 2006, p.64) in church schools in which performance in areas that are measured through inspection might improve (according to the criteria used for judgement), whilst what some might call 'actual' performance might not.

It appears that inspections have these intended and unintended consequences for schools regardless of whether the inspection is regarded as being high or low stakes (Jones et al., 2017; Penninckx et al., 2015b). SIAMS inspection can be described as being relatively low stakes compared with the high stakes of Ofsted. Yet this thinking suggests that church school leaders might succumb to such inspection-driven behaviours in order to receive a favourable judgement, despite the system's inability to significantly or adversely affect the future of the school or of the school leaders themselves. Interview data (H1 Interview, p.19; H2 Interview, p.20) reveal that the headteachers in this inquiry had no intention of engaging in any such fabrication. Yet the degree to which misrecognition (Courtney, 2016) of this kind might be

embedded in church school leadership raises questions of the impact which SIAMS has on church school leaders in the context of a Christian education.

CHAPTER THREE

Narrative Inquiry Methodology

Introduction

The methodology used in this research is narrative inquiry and it gives rise to knowledge which is narrative in nature (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007). Narrative inquiry is rooted in the belief that "[p]eople live stories, and in the telling of these stories, reaffirm them, modify them, and create new ones" (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.xxvi). Narrative inquiry itself is said to be "…stories lived and stories told" (ibid., p.20) and posits that the experience of life contained in these stories provides an effective, albeit filtered, gaze into reality for individuals (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013). An inquiry focused upon the story of a person's life enables a researcher to focus in depth upon that individual in an attempt to understand their experience. In doing so, it makes use of concepts such as verisimilitude, plausibility, and lifelikeness to establish reliability and validity (Bruner, 1986; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Merrill and West, 2009; Webster and Mertova, 2007).

Once a person is involved in a narrative inquiry, the stories of their life, which have up until that time been lived and told in an everyday manner, take on two new features.

1. As part of a narrative inquiry, a participant agrees to "re-tell" (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.xxvi; Clandinin and Connelly, 2013, p.34) their stories to a researcher, and these re-told stories form the basis of the research data. The telling of stories alone cannot be regarded as research and it is therefore necessary for a researcher to come alongside a participant to analyse the story or stories which the participant chooses to retell. It is out of this analysis that new knowledge and understanding for and about the individual emerge.

2. As a result of this process of re-telling and researcher analysis, a further aspect of narrative inquiry is to enable the participant to "re-live" (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.85) the story of their life in a way which brings benefit to them and to those around them; in other words, to enhance both personal and social growth.

Narrative inquiry determines that the story of the individual matters and that the learning and new knowledge which emerge as a result of the research do not rely for their value on their ability to be generalised across many people or contexts (Cooling et al., 2016). It makes an asset of imagination, wonderings, and incompleteness (Clandinin and Connelly, 2013) and honours detail and the small things (Bruner, 1986; Merrill and West, 2009). Because of this

explicit focus on the experience of the individual and the resulting lack of intent to generalise, narrative inquiry methodology does not prescribe how things ought to be (Webster and Mertova, 2007). Instead, a narrative inquirer listens carefully for the unexpected detail of experience and searches for uniqueness (Atkinson, 1998), and the individual's interpretation of reality.

Ethical Approach

A narrative inquiry which intends to reach deep into the experience of individuals requires a clear ethical foundation and approach at all stages (Josselson, 2007). In order for this research project to receive ethical approval by the Christ Church Canterbury University Ethics Committee, it was necessary to demonstrate that adequate measures had been taken to ensure the anonymity and well-being of the participants, and that their informed consent was and would continue to be an active consideration within the inquiry. To that end, I fulfilled all requirements of the Research Ethics Review panel and responded to two additional questions relating to the impact of my presence on members of staff other than the research participants themselves. Before beginning the research, I met with the full governing bodies of both schools to present my ideas for the inquiry and to seek their corporate consent for me to work with the schools. I was questioned about various issues including anonymity, researcher confidentiality, the extent of my involvement in the life of the school, and the potential impact of my pre-existing relationship with them.

Having gained the agreement of governors for their schools' involvement, I gave each participant a Participant Information document in which I outlined the aims of the inquiry and the methods that I would be employing, as well as a Consent Form in which I reiterated the intended research methods and detailed the participants' freedom to withdraw from the inquiry at any time. I repeated this option to the participants at all active research stages throughout the inquiry, such as before the interviews and on the day of the schools' SIAMS inspections, and all participants repeated their willingness to remain involved.

Issues relating to research ethics included my relative and perceived power within the SIAMS 'world' nationally and how this might have a negative impact on the school leaders and other members of staff; my role as a diocesan SIAMS Manager and subsequently as DDE, my proximity in these roles to both schools, and the possibility of contamination (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998) as a result; the potential for 'backstage' information (Goffman, 1956) that I gained as a researcher to have an impact on how the two schools and their leaders might be regarded; and the risk that the school leaders might seek to use my involvement to improve

their performance in SIAMS. I also considered the additional pressure that my presence and involvement as a researcher might introduce to the schools at a time of inspection that is already characterised by stress and additional workload. I discussed these issues with the participants and all remained committed to the inquiry, describing their willingness and eagerness to be involved in a project that intended to introduce some deeper insight into SIAMS for the church school world.

"[R]elational ethics" (Clandinin, 2013, p.198; Webster and Mertova, 2007, p.99) are a foundational element of narrative inquiry which has at its core a commitment to enabling participants to "relive" (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000) life in a more positive way than they were able to before their involvement in the research. The relational ethics of this particular inquiry were enhanced by the existing professional relationship between me and the participants/schools as there was already a basis of mutual trust and respect, both of which continued into and throughout the inquiry. My admission to being a fledgling researcher served as an appropriate and effective counter-balance to my perceived expertise with SIAMS, a dynamic which was further mitigated by the methodological and epistemological commitment to the participant as the expert in the story of their own life.

Experience

An understanding of experience, which can be said to be at the heart of narrative inquiry, suggests that experiences of the present grow out of those of the past and, in so doing, they create "… a continuous spiral… [t]he inescapable linkage of the present with the past…" (Dewey 1939, p.97), "… [w]holly independent of desire or intent" (ibid., p.16). The continuity created by this ongoing and repetitive spiral is fundamental to the very concept of experience, its potential absence even interpreted as "…disloyalty to the principle of experience itself" (ibid., p.32). The dynamic presence of experience within narrative inquiry - a sense of forward motion through the story of one's life – can be seen in the ongoing influence of past experiences on the present and the expectation that both will help to shape the future. All experiences, thus, are seen to be influenced by those which have preceded them and to contribute to those which follow, thereby together creating the narrative of life.

This suggestion that life and experience are unavoidably interconnected gives rise to the possibility that research into one might enhance understanding of the other. Therefore, when considering research into the impact which the experience of SIAMS has on the actions and decisions - the life - of church school leaders, I decided to carry out an exploration into the life stories of four of the people who are on the receiving end of SIAMS, seeking insight into

their motivations for their choice to work in church school education, to understand some of their experiences of the past so as to gain an understanding of their experiences of SIAMS in the present.

I made the decision to focus that gaze upon school leaders. A similar narrative inquiry into the stories of inspectors would be interesting but that is beyond the scope of this research project. Acknowledgement of the existence of the "silent presence of feelings" (Elonga Mboyo, 2017, p.284) by inspectors introduces an additional dimension to school inspection despite the tradition of seeking to suppress such emotions for the sake of rationality, objectivity, and reliability. This inquiry into the impact of SIAMS on school leaders takes account of the *un*suppressed emotions on the part of the school leaders and also notes the claims by the inspectorate to be objective and reliable in its creation of knowledge which is "supported by quantitative information" (Church of England Education Office, 2017a, p.16). Whether such objectivity can be validly claimed due to the nature of the inspection process itself, including the presence of individuals' emotions and feelings, is discussed in Chapter Two.

The narratives which emerge from the life stories and experiences of four church school leaders cannot be generalised to establish a truth of SIAMS for all school leaders; but they may create a narrative which resonates with others. Experience in this conceptualisation is both personal (Atkinson, 1998) and social (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000); it is the truth of the experience for the school leader sharing it, yet it is a truth to which others might also relate, recognising elements of their own experience. However, regardless of any wider relevance, it is hoped that involvement in the inquiry has value for the individual participant.

Truth and Validity

Narrative inquiry has at its core a personal, subjective, and interpretive comprehension of the nature of truth (Webster and Mertova, 2007) inasmuch as it accepts that what is perceived as the truth of an experience for one person would not necessarily correlate with that of another (Hennink et al., 2011). It relies upon an individual's perception of reality, their personal truth (Atkinson, 1998), and the belief that there is no one single and fixed interpretation of truth (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998). All research is positioned within assumptions about ontology (the nature of reality) and epistemology (the nature of knowledge) (Etherington, 2004; Olson, 2011). One test of the validity of the research is to shine a light upon these assumptions, thereby ensuring that methodological considerations are aligned with the underlying ontology and epistemology (Cohen et al., 2007).

Both ontologically and epistemologically, narrative inquiry is transactional, relational and interpretive (Clandinin, 2013). Consequently, the knowledge which such methodologically-driven research creates is also relational and interpretive in nature. This knowledge, in turn, gives rise to a version of truth which is subjective and interpretive in nature, commensurate with the knowledge paradigm itself. Bringing together my own positionality and critical life events as researcher; my resulting worldview which imbues each individual with value and worth and which has a heightened awareness of everyday power; the interpretive and relational nature of the knowledge which is created by SIAMS; and the narrative nature of truth created by life stories, a narrative inquiry methodology, within which interpretation is a key feature, has paradigmatic harmony in this instance and is appropriate.

Discourse

Discourse (discussed in more depth in Chapter Five) is a powerful productive force which sets the parameters for what can be said, done, and even thought, described as "… the conditions under which certain statements are considered to be the truth…" (Ball, 2013a, p.19). The discourse which both contains and is contained within narrative inquiry is characterised by four "turns" or "assumptions" (Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007, pp.29-30).

1. **The turn from quantitative reliability**. The discourse of narrative inquiry accepts as reliable the subjective, personal, narrative truth which is shared by the participant within the researcher and participant relationship. It is a discourse which has no claims to a reliability dependent on statistical or numerical data and, in this respect, it marks a significant departure from the discourse of reliability which characterises the quantitative research favoured by the DfE. Goldacre's (2013) positivist research and its influence on education policy stands in sharp contrast to this view. Outlining the perceived benefits to education of introducing research methods similar to those used routinely in medicine, Goldacre suggests that predictable input/output research would enable reliable generalisability in educational research, consequently leading to predictable improvements.

   > Medicine has leapt forward with evidence based practice, because it's only by conducting "randomised trials" - fair tests, comparing one treatment against another - that we've been able to find out what works best. (Goldacre, 2013, no page numbers)

   This suggests that research conducted by means of a narrative inquiry methodology would have little credence in the face of current DfE policy and in the context of

educational developments led by central government. As generalisability is less important within narrative inquiry than are the benefits to the participants and the insights provided by the "thick description" (Denzin, 1994, p.505) to which it gives rise, this lack of political favour does little to diminish the value of a narrative inquiry project.

2. **The turn from objectivity.** The type of objectivity required within quantitative research is notably absent from research carried out within the interpretive paradigm, in which a degree of what could be called subjective objectivity might be achieved by means of reflexive and reflective practice. Rather than denying "human connectedness and growth" (Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007, p.29), the discourse of narrative inquiry privileges the subjectivity which the positionality of those involved brings to the context (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000). Narrative inquiry embraces this subjectivity as a feature which adds a depth of human understanding and agency to a research context and has particular resonance within this inquiry. My own life story has a bearing on all aspects of the research, demonstrating how subjectivity and humanness shape an inquiry. Furthermore, from the perspective of the participants, details of their life experience shared, for example by H1 (H1 Interview, pp.3-4) and H2 (H2 Interview, pp.1-3), reveal the manner in which wider human experience has an impact upon actions and attitudes within the professional context. The individuals' subjective awareness and interpretation of these experiences, and my subsequent interpretation of them, according to the ontological and epistemological basis of narrative inquiry, brings a depth of understanding to the research context itself. It is at least a "double hermeneutic" (Miller, 2000, p.131), an interpretation of an interpretation (of an interpretation, possibly) and it makes no claims to be what might be traditionally understood as objective.

3. **The turn from generalisability.** The discourse of narrative inquiry is such that the knowledge which is created within it cannot be generalised, setting it apart from objective scientific research (Clandinin, 2013; Cooling et al., 2016; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Denzin and Lincoln, 2013; Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007; Webster and Mertova, 2007) with its claims to validity through generalisability. In contrast to this, narrative inquiry is rooted in a discourse which prioritises the truth as understood by and applicable to the individual who is at the heart of its creation. This suggests a degree of relativism, specific to an individual, which may in turn have resonance and therefore truthfulness, albeit through a filtered gaze, for others. It is possible within narrative inquiry that "narrative threads" (Clandinin, 2013, p.132; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.70) will emerge to which others in similar circumstances might be able to relate

because of their verisimilitude and lifelikeness, but the existence of these threads is not essential for the research to have meaning, relevance, or rigour.

4.   **The turn from scientific validity.** The final turn to narrative is the validity of the knowledge which is co-created through a qualitative narrative inquiry. The discourse of the interpretive paradigm, within which narrative inquiry is situated, accepts as valid a variety of means of knowing rather than insisting on one single truth. It thereby allows for the creation of personal truth as valid knowledge through a discourse imbued with the concepts of plausibility, lifelikeness and verisimilitude, as mentioned earlier. In this way, and by means of the three turns described above, narrative inquiry turns away from the requirements for scientifically valid research and claims validity through its own internally consistent standards.

An understanding of the "Hawthorne effect" (Cohen et al., 2007, p.189) would suggest that the introduction of a researcher into any context immediately and irreversibly changes that situation for all involved (Clandinin and Connelly, 1998). As I am now involved through my research in the life of the two participant schools, I will inevitably have changed the experience of inspection for them in some ways which I am able to identify as well as in ways of which both I and the participants remain unaware. My story has intersected with their story and this fact means that both of our stories are now evolving differently than they would have without this coming together (Clandinin, 2013). It has created a new truth, a new version of events, and is a significant factor in the narrative inquiry itself and in the knowledge which it has created.

The Inquiry

1.   **The Schools**

Both participant schools have voluntary aided status and both had their most recent SIAMS inspection in the academic year 2016 – 2017, the inspections upon which this research is focused. The schools were carefully chosen for pragmatic and methodological reasons. They are schools with whose staff and leaders I have previously worked and both are situated within dioceses with which I am familiar. Through these working relationships, I have established pre-existing trust with the two headteachers, a factor which is important for the openness and honesty required within a narrative inquiry (Webster and Mertova, 2007).

Among the benefits of working with the leaders of these two schools is that we have a degree of shared history and that they are familiar with aspects of my own professional story. My work with them in the past means that they have experience of my confidentiality and it

has enabled us to have a relationship which, although not deep, is positive and reasonably relaxed. This proved to be the case when I conducted the initial interviews with the headteachers, as neither appeared to feel ill at ease and both appeared to be able to talk freely (H1 Interview, p.3-4; H2 Interview, pp.1-3). Issues of trust did not appear to be significant and, in negotiating entry to the schools, the headteachers and the schools' governing bodies willingly gave informed consent to be involved in the research.

2. The Interviews

I conducted an unstructured interview with each of the four school leaders between April and June 2016, the latter part of the school year before that in which the schools' SIAMS inspections were scheduled to take place. The purpose of these interviews was to establish and explore the reasons behind each individual's choices to work in leadership roles in Church of England primary schools; to discuss their motivations for this work; and to examine their initial responses to the role assumed by SIAMS in the life of a church school. The interviews cannot be described as being fully life story according to Atkinson's interpretation (Atkinson, 1998; Atkinson, 2007) due to the parameters introduced by the researcher in order to retain a focus on the context of SIAMS inspection. This was the only limitation requested. It was required in order to ensure that the participants understood the parameters and aims of the research, so that their life stories could contribute to answering the research questions (Atkinson, 2007, p.41). This introduction of researcher-guided limitation is in line with Clandinin and Connelly's (1998) suggestion that it is the researcher's intentionality which creates the context for the participant's storytelling. Researcher intervention such as this, as well as the process of writing, are finely balanced aspects of narrative inquiry (Clandinin and Connelly, 1998). Too close an intervention in the narrative would compromise the signature of the life story (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000), that first interpretation of which should belong to the teller (Atkinson, 2007). However, should the researcher's signature on the analysis and writing be too weak or hesitant, then the authorship and the voice of the researcher becomes compromised and lacks the authority of the one sharing their analysis (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000).

I gave each participant the freedom to choose where they would like their interview to take place so that they would have control over the choice of place and feel as comfortable as possible with the process. I asked them to allow approximately two hours for their interview, although most lasted no longer than 90 minutes. Both headteachers elected to conduct the interviews in their offices in school; one governor chose the school; the second governor requested that the interview be carried out in their home.

I began the sessions, before starting to record, by chatting with each participant in order to help to create a relaxed atmosphere, thanking them for agreeing to be involved, and then I reminded them of the focus of my research. I repeated the principle of informed consent and reiterated their freedom to withdraw at any stage should they choose to. All participants repeated their willingness to be involved and their interest in the subject matter. I explained that I would be recording the interviews on my iPhone and that we would both do well to try to forget that it was on. I explained that I would not be asking a set of questions but, instead, would like them to talk to me about why they had chosen to become leaders of Church of England schools, starting wherever in the story of their life they believed to be relevant. Two participants began their stories in childhood; one started with their early years as a teacher; one began with a focus on the impact which their mother had had on them and how this had shaped some of their later life decisions. The four participants differed in the extent to which they looked to me for affirmation that they were giving me what I wanted. Consequently, I responded differently with each person, with the intention of appropriately supporting them to feel at ease (compare interview transcripts from H1 and H2 for a sense of these differences).

One over-riding and common feature of all four interviews was the honesty and trust which the participants offered me. They shared personal events, feelings, and experiences and were open about their emotions and struggles at different times of life, all of which have had a discernible impact on their current roles as leaders of church schools. It was a humbling experience for me and one which remained with me as I analysed the interview data and wrote my thesis. The relational ethics of narrative inquiry (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Clandinin and Rosieu, 2007; Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007; Webster and Mertova, 2007), which began as a theoretical concept and which I believed I had understood, took on new depth in human form as I listened to the school leaders reflect on their lives and entrust their narratives to me.

I assured each participant that I would transcribe their interview data myself. I have included three coded transcripts of H1's interview as examples (Appendix 3, Appendix 4, Appendix 5). The recording of the fourth interview failed approximately halfway through and, although I can recall themes and detail of this interview and have taken them into account as part of my considerations, I decided not to include the part transcription. Taking the decision to transcribe the data myself was important due to the personal nature of much of the information that the participants had shared and my desire to capture the pauses and hesitations at certain points, particularly in the case of H1. These transient silences revealed what I interpreted as a certain nervousness in bringing into the present events of the past and,

in so doing, sharing them with an outsider. Some of the memories shared were deeply personal and emotive and an element of hesitation in allowing them to be used as part of a research project was understandable. This commitment to transcribe the data myself rather than introducing a third person to each of the research relationships, continued into my decision to code, and subsequently analyse, the data by hand. I considered using NVivo but concluded that its use would mean relinquishing elements of that process to a disinterested third character which had not been present in the interview setting and which would have had the potential to prevent me from being fully immersed in the data.

3. Secret, Sacred, and Cover Stories

During the process of transcribing the interview data, I identified three particular themes within the stories of each of the participants, albeit present to differing degrees. Emerging from the literature on narrative inquiry and subsequently identified in the participants' life stories, these themes are "secret, sacred, and cover stories" (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995, p.4).

Secret story describes the parts of our personal narratives which, either consciously or unconsciously, we keep hidden from others. These stories might form the backstage of our lives to which others are not privy; our secret motivations, hidden intentions, or deeply held beliefs about ourselves or others which for one reason or another cannot be easily shared, or even acknowledged. A secret story suggests that it is personal and individual in nature but has resonance with the idea of "dark secrets" (Goffman, 1956, p.87) which can relate to the information kept private within an organisation, such as a school, by members of the team. Secret, or dark, stories resonate with the back stage operations of inspection and carry with them an imperative to retain distance and separation from the front of stage where the public performance of inspection takes place.

Sacred story. The power of discourse gives rise to "taken-for-granted assumptions about the world" (Etherington, 2004, p.27); assumptions which resonate with the concept of "sacred stories" (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995, p.4). Left unchallenged these assumptions, or sacred stories, can shape and control significant and formative elements of a person's life and beliefs in both personal and professional contexts. They consist of aspects of life which are so well-embedded in the thought processes and expectations of individuals and organisations that they can exist unnoticed, even once the possibility of their existence has been highlighted (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995; Wright Mills, 1959). The importance of forging strong family relationships is an example of what might be a personal sacred story for some; or the need for extensive accountability to ensure high standards within a professional context. Highlighting

such hidden beliefs in order for them to be looked at anew and re-evaluated is a feature of narrative inquiry, which seeks to make the familiar strange (Bruner, 2001) in its narrative search for personal truth. It does this by means of a balance between acceptance of and belief in the story of the individual and a questioning approach characterised by curiosity and interest. The twelve "touchstones" (Clandinin, 2013, p.212) for narrative inquiry indicate the depth with which a narrative inquiry needs to address sacred stories of relationships, research context, and audience rather than accepting at face value what is shared, or analysing data in a less than three-dimensional manner. Acceptance and challenge are not necessarily mutually exclusive within a narrative inquiry, and both are aspects of the "commitment to understanding lives in motion" (ibid.) which enriches narrative data.

Cover stories can be described as the pragmatic way in which we manage the dilemmas which are created when there is a conflict between our values (what we believe, how we think we should or might act), and the reality of the situation which we face. They can be described as the bridge between our internal secret stories and the external sacred stories which impose a form upon life and can be brought into the light as part of a searching narrative inquiry. We might tell ourselves a cover story in order to make a particular decision or action more palatable, such as the way in which a church school leader might deal with the pressures and expectations of SIAMS. We might construct actions around the portrayal of a cover story in order to convince others of the integrity of our words or actions and these might be at odds with our secret stories but in line with a larger sacred story. This notion has direct relevance to performance and impression management (Goffman, 1956) and contains within it the necessity of fabrications in order to persuade and convince.

Theoretical Underpinnings

No research, data collection, or analysis can be said to be conducted in a vacuum. All observations and suppositions, far from being neutral, are "theory-impregnated" (Heikkinen et al., 2001, p.11) and their analyses are partly dependent on the ontological and epistemological perspectives of the researcher (Smyth and Holian, 2008). As discussed, this research takes the form of a narrative inquiry partly due to the nature of the subject matter and with the intention of creating rich personal knowledge which is interpretive in nature, and partly because of the personal ontology and epistemology of the researcher. It offers an insight into the impact of SIAMS from the perspective of four Church of England primary school leaders, a perspective which is additionally mediated at all points through the researcher's own lens. This coalescence of subject matter, methodology, and researcher ontology, epistemology, and

positionality creates the need for clarity about the lens through which all of these elements will be brought into focus, viewed, and analysed. That lens is theory and the theoretical lens needs to be appropriate to the type of knowledge which the researcher intends to generate and in paradigmatic harmony with the nature of the research and of the researcher. It provides a position within a worldview from which to make sense of the manner in which the research has been conducted and of the findings which emerge from that research, as well as of the subsequent discussion of these findings. The theoretical lens through which this research project is conducted and the data viewed is "three dimensional narrative inquiry space" (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.50; Clandinin, 2013, pp.38-39).

Within the theory of three-dimensional narrative inquiry space, developed by Clandinin and Connelly from the thinking of Dewey (1939) on experience, three "commonplaces" (Clandinin, 2013, pp.38-39), or dimensions, establish a framework for one's interpretation and understanding of the world. These dimensions are *temporality, sociality, and place* (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.50), and the theory presupposes that the experience of life is most fully understood when considered through these three dimensions.

Temporality. Individuals live the story of their life over time and are subject to experiences, all of which have their own provenance, genesis, and forward momentum (Dewey, 1939), and which bring a continuity to the overarching meta-experience of life. Each story begins at a point in time, the time which the storyteller him or herself deems to be the appropriate and relevant moment. It might be a "critical event" (Webster and Mertova, 2007, p.73) which heralds the beginning of the story, an event which had no apparent meaning in the lead up to it or possibly even in its unfolding, yet, on reflection, was the point in time at which life changed in some significant way for the teller of the story. Looking at a story from the perspective of its temporality, it is possible to see how past experiences live on in all present and future experiences (Dewey, 1939). They shape the way that these present and future experiences unfold, along with individuals' perceptions of and reactions to them. Therefore, when seeking to understand the story of an individual church school leader and their present day responses to the experience of SIAMS, using a structure which would enable insight into and analysis of their past experiences was an important consideration. In relation to my own life story, for example, awareness of the reasons for my sensitivity to the existence of potential power imbalance in relationships is enriched by looking back to and making sense of a time at which I was subject to such an imbalance. The continuity of experience over time thereby brought a sense of cohesion and integrity to the analysis of data in this inquiry as it considered the participants in an holistic manner, bearing in mind that past has an impact upon present which, in turn, makes a difference to future (Freeman, 2010).

Sociality. Human beings live life in relationship with self and with others. As such they are, simultaneously and continuously, living lives which are both personal and social in nature (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000). Consequently, the stories which make up the everyday reality of life have characters; sometimes a cast of hundreds and sometimes of very few people, possibly even just the individual themselves. However, regardless of the numbers involved, the characters all have significance, to a greater or a lesser degree, in the way that that the story of the person's life plays out. People choose carefully those of whom they tell, either consciously or sub-consciously, and there will always be a reason within the story itself for the inclusion of particular characters. People seldom choose to tell stories of or include characters who mean nothing to them and who have had no particular impact upon their lives. The chosen characters may be loved ones, people without whom the person themselves cannot imagine a life. They may be individuals or groups of individuals with whom the person works or has worked, people who take up space in their daily lives, who help to form their sense of self or their professional selves and who change their everyday experience of what it means to be. They may be characters whose influence in the story of life the person would like to minimise, if not remove altogether; and yet they remain, at least for a time, and they perform their part, thereby having an impact upon how the individual in turn plays out their own. The character in my story may simply be me. If so, I am important and I shape the life which I live and of which I tell stories. All of these characters have an ongoing influence on the experiences of life as well as on individuals' own interpretation of them. One description of narrative inquiry is that it is "…people in relation studying people in relation" (Clandinin, 2013, p.23), and so any theoretically driven analysis of human experience should be mindful of its social dimensions. The theory of three-dimensional narrative inquiry space suggests that, at the heart of living life, is the experience of telling stories of it to ourselves and to the other characters; and that this act of telling enhances and gives structure to the experience of living (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin and Connelly, 1998; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000). For a church school leader who is experiencing SIAMS, part of the experience is the message which the individual tells themselves about the process; and part of it is the telling of that experience, and the thoughts connected with it, to others, including, critically, to an inspector. It is in this social telling that the experience develops a fullness which it would otherwise lack. Furthermore, the wider social context of that experience adds meaning and significance to it. The outcome of a SIAMS inspection is publicised and seen by others in professional roles in Church of England education. Issues of reputation, social opinion, and the power of some players in the field to make use of the information and judgements contained within the report imbue this social dimension of experience with further significance in this particular inquiry. Therefore, use of a

theoretical framework for analysis which fails to take this social dimension into account would result in an understanding which lacked a certain richness, depth and breadth.

Place, the third dimension of three-dimensional narrative inquiry space, suggests that, when analysing data a narrative researcher should do so through the lens of the physical context in which the life stories and experiences of the participants play out (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000). These settings can have a significant impact upon how the various characters in the story of life interact, how they feel when they do so and how they conduct themselves and move in terms of their own proprioception (both literal and metaphorical); that is, spatial awareness as it relates to a person's own body and movement and where and how they consequently locate themselves in the world. The settings of stories also have their own history; they have a past with their particular casts of characters and they have a present. They, usually, will continue to exist into the future, their very existence being evocative in terms of sensory memory and its impact upon the characters. It is not uncommon for people to attach significance, memories, and nostalgic reminiscence to the places in which experiences have taken place, especially in the past, maybe in childhood. Sometimes these recollections cause a place to be regarded as a positive dimension of experience; sometimes as a painful one. Regardless of the nature of this association for the participant, including the dimension of place in data analysis provides the analytical space for a participant's experience to be as fully understood as possible. As discussed in Chapter Four this dimension did not appear to be particularly significant for the participants in this inquiry, although interview data were analysed in such a way as to bring it to the fore should it have been relevant.

Individuals are unlikely to be aware of this three-dimensional space within which they are moving forward, living life, experiencing experiences and performing their preferred identities and stories; but it is there nonetheless.

Creation and Performance

Unlike the somewhat rigid properties of a containing discourse which creates the boundaries of what may be said and even thought (Ball, 2013a; Foucault, 1991), the three dimensions of narrative inquiry space are fluid in terms of what may be permitted within them (Miller, 2000). They form the context for the telling of the story and have the ability and freedom to move and take on a new shape, with even the detail of the stories changing as they are recalled, reviewed, and shared (Atkinson, 1998; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Miller, 2000). In a person's story, any one of the dimensions may be more or less prevalent and it is only by means of reflexive analysis (Bolton, 2010; Hennink et al., 2007) and reflective hindsight

(Freeman, 2010; Tullis Owen et al., 2009) that the form created by the respective dimensions will take shape. It is the experience, the story, first and foremost which possesses the dynamic qualities of creation and formation, and the three-dimensional narrative inquiry space settles into place around it as it is played out and, later, subsequently told, re-told and re-lived.

As part of the process of selecting which details of their story to foreground and highlight in order to sustain a "…particular kind of reality…" (Goffman, 1956, p.61), a participant does not access a pre-formed and objective monologue (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013). Instead, they choose which personal truths to include (Atkinson, 1998) and they communicate events cloaked with their own emotions and opinions (Holstein and Gubrium, 2003), thereby creating a story told from their own perspective (Webster and Mertova, 2007). This is all that any personal storyteller can do (Bolton, 2010) as even the liver and teller of the story has no neutral access to the events or to objective facts (Heikkinen et al., 2001; Kohler Riessman, 2003). With echoes of Dewey's thinking on the ways in which past experiences live on in present and future experiences, the participants in this narrative inquiry, either knowingly or unknowingly, drew together the threads which form the picture of who they are on a particular day in particular conditions. In so doing, they presented a version of self of their own choosing for a particular audience (Goffman, 1956), which is rooted in their own perspective on their life story.

In reviewing the events of one's own life, it is necessary to adopt a reflexive stance which is in some ways that of an observer, an onlooker, to the events which have taken place in the past and which carry on into the present. This process results in the collation of a range of personal perspectives and truths on one's own life which can be characterised by an unexpected objectivity and which can be compared in some ways to the creation of a documentary (Winter et al., 1999). In this process of creation, the participant/storyteller has the opportunity to see aspects of oneself as others do (Etherington, 2004). As a result strengths, weaknesses, mistakes, wisdom, hurts, successes and failures take on an additional layer of depth as one draws on the familiar emotions and perspectives connected with events, looking at them afresh as if through the eyes of a stranger, in order to speak them aloud to make sense of them to a researcher (Bolton, 2010).

The process of narrative inquiry contains at least three key elements, each of which relies upon the concept of individuals performing a preferred identity (Kohler Riessman, 2003). This concept of performativity, discussed in Chapter Five, grew out of Foucault's writings on power and suggests that such power ultimately "produce[s] the subjects [it] consequently come[s] to represent" (Butler, 1990). The impact of the words, actions, and discourse of this operation of power is such that it moves beyond the ability to have external influence to that

of being a force of internal creation. Butler's suggestion was that "there need not be a 'doer' behind the deed, but that the 'doer' is variably constructed in and through the deed" (ibid., p.195). In the context of a narrative inquiry, regarding the 'doer' as the participant, the 'deed' which ultimately comes to construct the doer is the telling of the story and the co-creation with the researcher of new knowledge. This concept of doer and deed is aligned with the suggestion that narrative inquiry is both methodology and phenomenon itself; one creates, and ultimately becomes, the other in a relationship of circularity (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000).

There are three characters in which this circularity is evident within a narrative inquiry context, each of which is brought into being by means of a performance.

The person performed by the participant brings to the research relationship their personal and professional history, their contingency, their interpretation of the research scenario, the image of self that they choose to present, their reading of the wishes of the researcher, and their response to this understanding. They have the freedom of independent agency and yet, with their agreement, they are bound by the parameters of the inquiry. They are at liberty to select what information about themselves they choose to foreground and what they choose to omit either because they consider it to be irrelevant or because they do not wish to share it. They make these decisions and have, at all times, the freedom to withdraw from an inquiry. However, it is ultimately the story itself which becomes the creating force, the doer, and the identity of the participant is created by means of the story which they choose to tell.

The person performed by the researcher, also brings to the inquiry their own personal and professional history, their contingency, the version of self which they choose to present, their positionality, their intended as well as their unconscious effect upon the research scenario and the participant, their interpretation of the story/ies they hear, and their hopes for the research project. This person may appear to an outsider to be the one in control of the research setting as it is their project and they have established the parameters. However, a researcher is fully dependent upon the willingness of the participant to be involved, to remain involved, and to share their story. The person performed by the researcher, therefore, is also dependent upon the creative force of the story which the participant chooses to tell and in time, to a certain extent, they too become defined by this deed, this story.

The dynamic space in which these two come together and the precise borderland (Clandinin and Rosieu, 2007) at which their two separate stories meet, react, interact and create new knowledge is potentially the most significant 'character' present in an inquiry. This space only exists because of the decision of the researcher and participant to come together

and yet it is here, in this unrepeatable space, that the knowledge which forms the basis of an inquiry is co-created. It is a once in a lifetime dynamic space and its meaning and significance are constructed by the deed of the re-telling of the story of the participant.

This circular context of relationships in which one performance both creates and is created by another and vice versa is unique, unrepeatable and dynamic. It is the one and only time and place in which these three precise elements will be present; the only moment in which the ensuing words, phrases, emphases, detail which is foregrounded, as well as that which remains unspoken, will come together. In this way, the life story interviews which form the basis of this narrative inquiry enable the creation of once-in-a-lifetime stories which could not be created by any other two people at any other point in time. It is therefore new knowledge, a new personal truth, and a unique insight into experience lived and experience told.

Interview Data: Process of Analysis

Working with an awareness of the three dimensions of experience, and being mindful to ask questions and examine experiences looking at all three, provides the researcher with an insightful, dynamic, relational and interpretive theoretical framework for both the gathering and analysis of data. To analyse the interview data in this inquiry, I looked at various templates for narrative data analysis, such as that created by West (Merrill and West, 2009, p.138) but did not find one which allowed for an in-depth focus on the three dimensions of three dimensional narrative inquiry space. Therefore, I used these dimensions as headings to develop my own template (Appendix 2) which created a three-lensed telescope through which I would view the data and subsequently analyse their meaning. I then created three versions of each transcript (one for each dimension) and coded each in line with my template for analysis (for example, H1 coded transcripts: Appendix 3, Appendix 4, Appendix 5).

Having coded the data using the three dimensions, I then translated that coded data into three further analytical documents, one for each of the dimensions, samples of which are included as appendices (for example, Appendix 6 H1 Temporality Analysis Sample, Appendix 7 H1 Sociality Analysis Sample, Appendix 8 H1 Place Analysis Sample). In these documents I systematically examined all of the coded data and analysed them further via the concepts of secret, sacred, and cover stories when I became aware of their significance in the narratives. I then used the resulting three dimensional analysis of three of the life stories to create individual profiles based around the concepts of secret, sacred, and cover stories (for example, Appendix 9 H1 Profile). In turn, the profiles provided me with a basis, rooted in the narrative of the individuals' life story interview and in their own interpretations and expectations of

themselves, for key themes to use in observing and analysing their actions and behaviours on the day of the inspection (for example, Appendix 10 H1 Key Themes). In effect, I took a funnel approach (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995) to data analysis, narrowing the scope of focus at each step, within the parameters of the theoretical lens and remaining true to narrative inquiry methodology. This enabled me to sharpen my understanding and interpretation of the stories shared by the participants whilst retaining ontological, epistemological, and methodological integrity with the narrative and interpretive paradigm.

Critical Incident

As the research progressed, I made the decision to focus my analysis principally on the experience of H1. This choice was based upon a critical event (Webster and Mertova, 2007) which occurred on the day of the school's SIAMS inspection. H1 had been open and honest during their life story interview, sharing details of both their private and professional life which rendered them potentially vulnerable. They opened up about their personal motivation and drive as a school leader and contextualised this within obstacles which they have faced in the past.

During the week between notification of the inspection and the inspection itself, I made contact with H1 to give them the opportunity to review my involvement on the day if they so wished and to make arrangements for me to be present in school on the day of the inspection. H1 requested that I not be present at the first interview of the day, (see Appendix 11 Email from H1), a meeting which would be between them and the inspector to discuss the initial findings of the pre-inspection plan and to explore the evidence trails which would make up the remainder of the inspection day. H1 explained that they would prefer to have this meeting without me present in order for them to establish themselves with the inspector.

> I will be embarrassed if I slip up in any way, or say a silly thing. I know there is so much beyond the 4 areas she is looking at going on here I just hope I get that across… Can I have the first meeting with her on my own, just need that time I think…? (Appendix 11 Email from H1)

Given the relational ethics of this research project, I agreed and made arrangements to arrive at the school after this meeting. On my arrival, I met with H1 to find out how they thought the inspection was going so far and they sounded cautiously positive. They then gave me a copy of the inspection timetable so that I would be able to navigate my presence and plan which meetings to attend as a non-participant observer. This was helpful and revelatory as it was at this point that it became obvious that the meeting from which I had been excluded

66

was the only scheduled meeting between them and the inspector until feedback at the end of the day. Despite initially filling me with disappointment and fears for the validity of my research, this critical incident provided me with greater insight into the impact which SIAMS has upon H1 as a church school leader and brought an unexpected and additional richness to the narrative. The incident and its contribution to the knowledge and truth explored within this thesis are analysed in more depth in Chapter Five.

Researcher Positionality and Reflexivity

The fact that I had previous professional involvement with the two schools resulted in a determination to create a new, separate yet interwoven, research relationship with the participants. My complex positionality, created by a combination of my various professional roles and my experience of power relations in my own life story, had the potential to bring greater depth and richness to my research, as long as I remained reflexively aware (Atkinson and Coffey, 2003; Bolton, 2010; Cohen et al., 2007; Etherington, 2004; Gough, 2003; Hennink et al., 2011; Quinn Patton, 2002). Differing from the ability to be reflective (Bolton, 2010), reflexivity allows the individual to review experience from the inside whilst it remains ongoing or live, thinking, reviewing, and reshaping from within it. The reflexive person, as well as being able to reflectively assess a situation with its inherent strengths and weaknesses after the event in a way which enables a summary and future changes to be made, almost suspends the forward momentum of life and of experience whilst it is still being played out, stepping outside of it to consider. Such reflexivity means that an individual is able to assess the efficacy and impact of their actions, reactions, and relationships in the moment and to be aware of a dynamic process of interaction "within and between our selves" (Etherington, 2004, p.36). Being a reflexive researcher is an important aspect of narrative inquiry as it places importance on listening to both self and others. It thereby enhances the researcher's awareness of the impact of their own positionality upon the research context (Clandinin and Connelly, 1998) and upon the knowledge which is being co-created within it. My reaction to being excluded from the meeting between H1 and the inspector is an example of the benefits of active, reflexive practice during this inquiry, highlighting my need, on the ground, to consider my own feelings, those of H1, the implications of the incident for my research, and the impact that I was having on H1.

The subjectivity of my narrative beginnings has resonance with and relevance to the nature of the stories which the participants chose to share with me. In the life story interview setting, our stories came together in the co-creation of a new truth which only we can have created on the days on which we met and talked; a unique narrative understanding in a unique

narrative setting (Webster and Mertova, 2007). The participants trusted me with their stories and in this thesis I present analysis of these stories which is intended to offer the reader a sense of verisimilitude, lifelikeness and plausibility of lives which have been lived, told, re-told and now might be re-lived (Clandinin, 2013, p.34). Each participant selected which events, feelings and thoughts to foreground in the telling of their stories. They kept other details and events to themselves, remaining silent on matters of potential significance to them but which they considered to be outside the realm of importance in the context of this inquiry into church school inspection. They may have been correct in doing so, they may not; they may have shaped the detail of their story to match the purposes which they detected in me as researcher. I may have had a different opinion on the impact that SIAMS has on them as church school leaders had I known what they chose to omit. But it is their story, they are the expert not me, and it is therefore their choice of what image of self to portray to the outside world, including me. I only have the stories which they shared with which to work because this is their truth as they see it and which they have chosen to portray. My responsibility as researcher lies in the portrayal of these stories and their analysis with reference to academic literature, paying attention both to my own deliberate silences as I shape my signature, my voice, within and through this writing as well as being mindful of the possible silences in the voices of the participants. Their silences, as well as their words, are ones which I must respectfully probe but without compromising the version of self which they have chosen to perform and to present to me.

In the Midst

Given that the "ultimate aim of narrative inquiry is the interpretation of experience" (Atkinson, 2007, p.239) it behoves me as the person with the power of interpretation through writing, to interpret and communicate that experience with as much insight, respect, persuasiveness, and lifelikeness as I am able. In the context of this research, I joined the participants "in the midst" (Clandinin, 2013, p.43-51; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.62-68) of their leadership of a church school and I left them in the midst. This concept of individuals always being in the midst of their stories resonates with Dewey's notion that experience is a phenomenon which is continuously moving forward (Dewey, 1939). It suggests that narrative inquirers have no option other than to join their participants in the midst of experience if they wish to observe, analyse and understand. In addition, it proposes that any narrative inquiry will only ever explore a part of an individual's story, and that this will remain an interpretation of an interpretation of part of the life of an individual. This double hermeneutic at the heart of

narrative research is doubly uncertain for an observer. It is not only a participant's understanding of what they think a researcher wants from them in an interview context (Miller, 2000); it is also the researcher's interpretation of the participant's interpretation of their life story (Loxley and Seery, 2008).

In this inquiry, the participants were living out their lives in school before my arrival and they continued after my departure; the inspection will have had more or less of an impact upon their work and lives. My interaction with them will have changed their story in more or less significant ways. They will have re-told their stories and subsequently had them analysed in a way which is accurate in part and entirely truthful in intent. The extent to which being part of this narrative inquiry enables them to re-live their stories differently going forward relies upon the relationship which was created, the faithful persuasiveness of the narrative, and the mind-set of the participants. This is one story of many possible stories.

My intention as a narrative inquirer into the experience of SIAMS for four Church of England primary school leaders, and an intense focus on the experience of one, is, therefore, to listen carefully, to hear, accept, analyse, and make public my interpretation of a part of their interpretation of their individual story. In doing so, I hope to present a credible version of one person's journey through one of life's many experiences and, rooted in their own interview data and for their benefit, offer my interpretation of one way of coping, one way of seeing, and one way of being. If this one way has a convincing degree of plausibility and verisimilitude and enables another person for whom some circumstances are similar to identify with it, then it is possible that the life of an other will be enriched by the experiences of one person whose story is made visible and given a voice in this thesis. Remaining mindful of some of the key purposes of narrative inquiry when joining another person in the midst, that is to enable growth within individuals and consequently within society more widely (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000), and to describe the way that some people make sense of their experiences (Clandinin and Rosieu, 2007), provides a context and a purpose for this project.

CHAPTER FOUR

Research Findings

Profile of a Church of England Primary School Headteacher

I decided to make H1 the main focus of this inquiry as a result of a critical incident on the day of the school's inspection. Consequently, the majority of the discussion of the research findings centre on H1, although reference is made also to H2 and G1 in order to add depth and richness to the discussion.

Introducing H1: An Overview

H1 has been a qualified educationalist for 30 years and, despite not setting out with this intention, has spent the majority of their years in education in Church of England schools. Very early in their career as a class teacher, they realised that their heart was in school leadership and they devoted what, according to their own up-to-date interpretation of their story, appears to be a sacrificial amount of energy and time into securing a post as a headteacher, despite the personal cost of doing so.

> [E]ducation was moving forward and forward and forward you know and in the next 18 months I put everything into it, too much if you like because at the end of 18 months when a new head came I had er…my breakdown…I had…nine months off…um…I think through exhaustion…um and it just left…you know the whole effort of you know trying to put the school right…and it was successful…I look back very proud of that time and um…[i]t took its toll. And I didn't realise how much… (H1 Interview, p.4).

H1 fought back from this, returning to church school leadership, the very activity which had brought about their ill health in the first place. The drive that they found, which enabled them to return to school leadership, is rooted in their secretly held sacred belief that they are a born leader, "…with a vision more so than the average person has got…" (ibid., p.5), who deserves the recognition which comes from success, including success in school inspection.

> MJ: What made you keep going then when it was draining so much out of you? What was in you do you think?
>
> H1: I was…I still felt I could do the job really well. I believed. That was what I wanted to do. (H1 Interview, p.3)

For H1, success as a leader appears to compensate adequately for the stress which working in a continuously accountable context brings. It has always been important for them to be at the heart of decision-making rather than being subject to decisions made by others, and they believe that they have values-based qualities to offer which will bring benefit not only

to their school/s but also to themselves, both personally and professionally. They are and have been driven by their desire to make a difference to children and their families, and by their determination to inhabit a role in which they will have a voice which will be heard, thereby giving them the ability to exercise authority and control over events.

> There was something in me that I had never really recognised that I want…I just want to be um at the heart of things… I don't want to be told how to do things... (ibid., p.5).

Whether or not being a church school headteacher under the authority of both Ofsted and SIAMS enables such an exercise of authority is questionable.

H1 first became a headteacher as a result of a critical incident during an Ofsted inspection which resulted in the then headteacher being dismissed and replaced by themselves as the then deputy headteacher. They endured "quite a learning curve" (ibid., p.2) in this acting headship but did what they could to learn from what was otherwise an unfortunate experience. It was an experience which demonstrated to H1 the extent of the power of the inspection system and possibly highlighted the need for a headteacher to be on the right side of the inspection 'game', shaping their actions and attitudes towards inspection ever since; a secret story which H1 holds onto carefully and privately but which drives them simultaneously to protect themselves and to succeed professionally. A further critical incident, H1's application for the headship of a community rather than a church school (ibid., p. 4), cemented their belief that, ideologically and philosophically, they belong in Church of England education and this set the trajectory for the rest of their career to date.

H1 believes that a Church of England education is a highly beneficial type of education for children and that leaders of church schools should take their position of being a role model seriously. They believe that access to Bible teaching and the daily inclusion of spirituality and spiritual development within school life are important for children, as are adult role models who adhere to these principles.

> I began using literally reading from the Bible then and I think that's a good role model you know… Children need to be able to see adults…standing up and using the Bible…and I speak to the children and there are times in education we try to make it all singing and dancing for them, to entertain them, but I feel… they need to be told… (H1 Interview, p.8).

For H1, SIAMS encapsulates these features of a good education and they regard it therefore as being in harmony with their own educational philosophy. For this reason SIAMS does not, according to H1, create significant dissonance for them. Rather, it is an inconvenience with which they are confident to work and the outcome of which they feel able to manage (ibid., p.13).

However, as H1 is now a headteacher for whom being a publicly acknowledged successful leader is a significant driving force, this thesis suggests that the culture of inspection, both SIAMS and Ofsted, has the potential to create a degree of internal conflict, stress, and additional work for them, despite their expectations of success.

> D'you know I must be mad because as a church school head you actually get hit with two whammies don't you? … and you spend all your time um going into a classroom, walking around the school thinking about Ofsted on one side and you do things SIAMSy the other side…so there's impact there…um... it's understanding the Ofsted or understanding the SIAMS ….er...you've got to have belief that you understand it better than the average person… (ibid., p.7).

This pressure might be created by the existence of potential challenge to their leadership and the possibility of them having to 'play the game', which the drive for success in inspection can bring about. This potentially leads to a need for H1 to live out a cover story, should there be any disconnect between their own sacred, and possibly secret, beliefs and the demands created by inspection.

> H1: …I try to guide [the staff] a lot...to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms…
>
> MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them?
>
> H1: I…I ... try not to. (H1 Interview, pp.10-11)

In my analysis I noted in relation to this comment:

> **Cover [story]** – first time there is any suggestion of H1's value system being compromised is with regard to the expectations of an inspector and what they will therefore do and say to the staff. Indication of the level of performativity here and the impact it has regardless of the strength of the head in other areas. (H1 Sociality Analysis, p.9)

This analysis led to my decision to be aware of the following theme during my observations on the day of the inspection.

> H1 played the game by making sure that they had as much knowledge of the system well enough ahead of the inspection to make it appear that everything was done at their behest and according to their own vision, philosophy etc. They played the game so well that they won ie they got a judgement of Outstanding. *But did they really win?* (italics from the original) (H1 Key Themes, p.3)

The suggestion that H1 might feel that they had no option other than to live out a cover story provides an insight into the reaction they have to the demands of inspection. H1 is happy to make decisions and to take actions which make them unpopular with members of staff and recognises the need for a headteacher to have a "thick skin" (H1 Interview, p. 14) in

their leadership role. However, inspection appears to alter H1's resolve and ability to lead purely from their own convictions and beliefs in what is right for the school. The questions which arise as a result of this observation form the basis for deeper analysis in Chapter Five.

H1 asserts (H1 Interview, p. 14) that, should a situation arise in which there were to be conflict between their own values-driven leadership decisions and the demands of an inspector, they would explain their views rather than acquiesce and make changes. They do also, however, admit that a degree of compromise can be a necessary part of achieving one's ultimate goals, suggesting that a compromise of some sort might be deemed by them to be acceptable if it leads to an inspection judgement which they believe is deserved. My analysis of their comments sums up as follows:

> Personal compromise is necessary in order to appease the system. Changing the system is not an option. It has too much power and authority...SIAMS is already aligned to H1's own philosophy for education so any compromise for them is limited. (H1 Profile, p.3)

In, arguably, an attempt to take control of the inspection context, H1 has taken steps to ensure that they are as well prepared as possible for SIAMS. They have accessed diocesan training, read all of the latest SIAMS updates and information, and made changes to the culture and practices of the school up to three years before the anticipated date of SIAMS so that they and the school community are ready for the demands of an inspection. H1 believes that they have gained, in this way, an in-depth appreciation of the requirements of SIAMS so that they can be situated as a fellow expert alongside the inspector and possibly be in a situation in which they are able to manage the inspector from below in order to secure a favourable outcome. Changing the system is not an option (they regard such a task as being too great a one to tackle), so knowledge-based management of it is, for H1, the best course of action.

As an experienced headteacher, H1 accepts the presence of inspection in schools and lives in an inspection-ready manner (Clapham, 2015.) despite the stress, and possibly the fear of unfavourable judgement, that this brings.

> MJ: And how do you feel about them coming in and measuring you on all of these things...on how you lead the school, how good a church school you are?
>
> H1: Um... oh that's the pressure, I s'ppose...That is always with me...That's why I push to do this, why I push to do that... In the same way I push...and I'm talking about SIAMS quite a lot...I'm...there's a big push within that...so we're always ready.... It's always there... back of my mind...
>
> MJ: And is that a stress for you?

H1: Um...it's a stress that you learn to live with. (H1 Interview, p.16)

H1 refers back to their previous breakdown and details ways in which they work to ensure that this will not happen again. The very existence of SIAMS, with its ever present yet invisible gaze, appears to create an ongoing tension in which such defensive action is necessary but H1 appears to accept this as part of the game which church school leaders have to play in order to be judged favourably. One of the rules of that game for H1 is that the headteacher should absorb as much of the external pressure as possible so as to protect the rest of the school staff (ibid., p. 12), and they accept this as an inherent and unavoidable aspect of the role which they have chosen.

H1 believes that they are ready to have their school and their work inspected by SIAMS and they anticipate a favourable outcome. They believe that this outcome will be achieved with the minimum of compromise on their part, or possibly no compromise at all, and that they will successfully and with integrity retain power, authority, and control of their school throughout the process.

Three Dimensional Analysis

As an example of three dimensional discussion of an individual, and before embarking upon analysis of H1, I offer the following analysis of my self, based on my own recollections of my life and my interpretation of them. I include this analysis as, whilst not being one of the research participants, making myself vulnerable in this way aids my sensitive analysis of H1, in particular, and contributes to my understanding, as researcher, of the extent to which the participants have put their trust in me. In turn, this understanding adds richness to the paradigmatic coherence of the inquiry.

Margaret James and Temporality

The passage of time and the changes which I have experienced are significant in the formation of who I am today. I grew up slowly; the fragility of the cocoon of my life preventing me from experiencing the fullness of life in a way that I wish I had, as I look back on the past from the standpoint of the present. A consolation, however, is that time passes and growth is always possible. Time has allowed me to become the person I believe I was meant to be, and undertaking this doctorate is a central element of that growth over time.

In and of itself, hindsight has no value for me other than to condemn, and it is only through my willingness to learn from it that hindsight has brought value to my life. Over time I have, paradoxically, become stronger yet more vulnerable; more cautious in relation to others, yet more daring in my actions and decisions; more aware of the damage which power can

cause, yet more willing to be powerful; more aware of my own needs, yet more aware of the needs of others. Examining my life through the lens of temporality reveals to me that it is not necessary to beat time and to become whole before experience enables that wholeness to have its very own shape, in the fullness of time. Personal embarrassment of the failings of my younger self has thereby been replaced over time by an acceptance of the place that temporality must have in growth, experience and life.

Earlier life experiences have shaped the person I have become today and for that I am grateful to the temporal dimension of life. I am grateful that time passes and does not prevent forward momentum through the story of my life. Yet the passage of time also prevents me from holding on to people and times gone by without whom and which my present feels empty in certain parts every day. But temporality is its own master and one against which fighting is pointless. I am the person I am today because of who I was in the past and time has taught me to accept that and to keep moving forward.

Margaret James and Sociality

People play a significant part in my life story, both personally and professionally. Bereavement at an early age and subsequent entanglement in a power-laden relationship led to almost 40 years of living as a fragile, disempowered girl and then woman, who looked to others for her sense of security and self. Paradoxically, this resulted in me simultaneously turning to others for affirmation whilst also regarding them with suspicion. Psycho-analysis of my self is beyond the scope of this thesis as well as being beyond my ability and expertise. However, it has become clear to me in recent years that I allowed people to have too much influence on my sense of self and that this resulted in a diminution of who I was. I became too small and insignificant to matter, or even to be seen, because of the significance I gave away to others. It was only in freeing myself from certain people that I was able to be reborn as a valid person, a rebirth that is ongoing and incremental.

People continue to have an influence on me and I continue to be easily shaped by the opinions of others. However, my doctoral journey has opened my eyes to that reality and has equipped me to fight for myself, sometimes even against myself, to have an identity in which I believe; and to also do this for others. Being loved and approved of by others remains a driving force and dealing with anything negative takes consistent effort; effort of which I am now capable and the need for which I am aware.

The concept of removing certain people from the sphere of influence over me is relatively new but one in which I consciously invest time, with an active awareness of the impact that power-led relationships have. Conversely, knowingly allowing myself to be vulnerable with people in whom I trust is also a new, yet empowering, notion, and one which I

constantly strive to develop. The richness which this brings to the relationships which I choose and in which I invest is an antidote to the negativity to which I too easily can still fall prey. Professionally, people matter. I work with people and I work on behalf of people, with the intention of enriching lives and life chances for those involved in church school education. Without these people, the daily grind of being a DDE has no meaning. Because of the strengthening I have undergone personally and socially, I believe I am better able to serve the needs of others in my professional capacity.

Margaret James and Place

Certain places have always held an almost mystical quality for me. Places are largely divided into 'before' and 'after' the death of my father: those from before taking on an ethereal glow which bears little resemblance to the reality which I have subsequently experienced on revisiting them; and those connected with the immediate aftermath of his death remaining dark places. In later life, places continued to be imbued with the emotions connected with my own sense of flourishing, or its lack, thereby having an influence on how I regard them and their importance in my life story. Places where I have felt affirmed, loved, safe, and empowered (for example, my grammar school where I was head-girl) have become places which I regard as being affirming, loving, safe, and empowering. In turn, this has led to a desire in me to recreate such places and to share this benefit with others. This apparent conflation of place and emotion is akin to a personification of place, with the potential for places to have their own active power over me. Awareness of this is not sufficient for me to dismiss it, however, and my sensitivity to place remains.

Three Dimensions of H1

H1 and Temporality

The timeline of H1's story in this inquiry is one which reveals significant early professional and performative influences which have had a formative impact upon their work in church school education. Their early ambition to secure a permanent teaching post and, soon after this, their frustration at seeing others whose abilities they questioned being promoted ahead of them, strengthened their resolve to become a leader whose qualities would be recognised publicly (H1 Interview, p.1). I commented on this drive as follows:

> Secret - private reasons for being driven to be a leader. Sense of needing to prove themselves …
>
> Sacred - professional recognition and reward by others is a driving force and something to be sought. (H1 Temporality Analysis, pp.1-2)

H1's actions and determination to become a headteacher, beginning early in their career and remaining consistent thereafter (H1 Interview, pp.4-5), appear to embody the sacred story that success is all the more worthwhile when it is lauded by those within the system who have power to take influential action (see above quote), including to remove a headteacher from post (H1 Interview, p.9). This, and the belief that they were born to lead ("I felt there was something in me that I could turn things around," ibid., p.5) caused them, from the start of their teaching career, to value the approval of individuals involved in school inspection and the advisory services (ibid., p.2). This appears to have set the course of future influence by external professional agents, which in turn spilled over to negatively impact upon H1's private life. This influence continues to remain an element of being a church school leader of which H1 is constantly aware.

[S]o we're always ready…It's always there… back of my mind... (H1 Interview, p.16).

However, the intrinsic and powerful nature of this driving sacred story, (the deeply rooted sacred story of validated success within an accountability-driven education culture which appears to have created within H1 a secret desire to be recognised by those in authority as an effective and trustworthy leader), has potentially led to the creation in H1, the church school leader, of various secret stories. Such stories are the aspects of H1 which they seem determined, throughout the timeline of their professional story to date, to keep from others, to hide within themselves, possibly at times unknown even to themselves. These include stories such as, potentially, the fear of further ill-health, or the horror of public humiliation similar to that to which their former headteacher was subjected when summarily removed from post.

[A]nd Ofsted came along and had him removed during Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week… (H1 Interview, p.2).

Over time, H1 has kept the story of their early illness as a secret; but it is a story which consistently appears to have led to a routine living out of a cover story to conceal the secret stories of pain and setbacks. The existence of this secret story led to the following comments and questions as part of my analysis through the lens of temporality.

Secret - I can't imagine that this is a story which H1 shares lightly. And yet they carry it with them daily as they continue to work in the same profession in the same role which caused them to break down. Says something about their determination and sense of pride in leading successfully. Interesting to note that this occurred very early in their career and yet they went on to take on several headships. Consistent and powerful motivation from within I suspect.

Cover - do they feel that every day they are living a cover story?

Sacred - success in one's career is worth sacrificing one's health for. For the external validation and reward? Is this what a performative culture within education does to school leaders? (H1 Temporality Analysis, pp.3-4)

As a church school leader, it appears that H1 feels they cannot share this secret story with members of their team and yet it can be said to significantly impact on their ongoing work. Having suffered a breakdown early in their career, H1 has subsequently gone on to lead a number of church schools in the knowledge that this role, to which they are devoting their life, is the very thing which temporarily robbed them of their professional standing and their health; and which might return and cause them suffering again, many years later. In carrying this knowledge secretly throughout the timeline of their working life, it is possible that H1 has little choice other than to keep living out a cover story to prevent others from learning about this truth which is hidden within. Their consequent cover story, embedded over time, appears to be one rooted in a narrative of hard work, success, and resilience with no outward sign of giving in to what they might perceive as weakness. Throughout H1's career, the desire to be publicly recognised as a successful leader is a constant and, although its genesis can be traced to that early critical incident and the subsequent creation of both secret and cover stories, it is a thread which connects their practice today with that of the fledgling teacher at the start of their career. It is also one which the culture of inspection seems to exacerbate.

The need within H1 for these painful events to become part of the secret story of their life is strong. Despite this, however, they took the decision to share them with me as part of this narrative inquiry. The trust which they placed in me as researcher in doing so is humbling and reinforces the need for this inquiry to be conducted ethically in order to bring about positive outcomes for the participants whose stories it relies upon. My own previous life story events which have involved pain and, at times, the publication of personal information which had been shared in trust, puts me in a position of understanding the need for H1's story to be treated with sensitivity. To have carefully constructed a version of self which works and which empowers, only to have private details exposed, is a catastrophic experience. It humiliates, destroys trust, disempowers, and makes a person vulnerable against their wishes. Having experienced this myself in the past, I am at pains to treat the secret stories of H1's life with respect and care, preserving their anonymity, personhood, and dignity. This not only resonates with my own life experience, but is also methodologically aligned with narrative inquiry.

H1 and Sociality

People are a significant feature of H1's story of being a church school headteacher and analysing their story through the lens of sociality reveals the extent to which this dimension has an impact upon the way that they act and lead.

Colleagues/peers. H1 has confidence in their own abilities as an educationalist and as a church school leader. Experience has enabled them to see themselves as a leader who has integrity and is strong, resilient, knowledgeable, hard-working, well-informed, strategic, values-driven, and able to make the right decisions for the good of their school. They say, for example,

> I have a vision more so than the average person has got... (H1 Interview, p.11);
>
> ...leadership is much about how you influence...it's your influence on … an establishment and if you haven't got ideas then you're not a good leader in many ways... (ibid., p.7); and,
>
> I try to guide them a lot...to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for… (ibid., p.10).

Experience of community schools has taught H1 that the right place for them as a school leader is in a Church of England school, as there is a good fit with their own educational philosophy. Reflection as a result of being part of this narrative inquiry led H1 to comment,

> I had that feeling of ethos of a Church of England school right early on... now I er I reflect on it because I didn't really realise it at the time... (ibid., p.4).

They acknowledge and accept that colleagues often have different views and approaches from theirs and, when these colleagues are from other schools, they quietly listen to others' thoughts and opinions and retain their own perspective and course of action. When the colleagues in question are members of staff over whom H1 has authority within their own school, they deal with opposing views and perspectives differently (ibid., pp.14-15). Within the context, and with their knowledge, of the demands of the accountability culture of SIAMS, H1's response to those who disagree with them is to take strong and decisive action when they believe that their knowledge and experience lead to them being better informed (ibid., pp. 8-9). Taking, on balance, the pressure which they would face when dealing with staff opposition compared to the pressure which they would be under were they to act in a way which they know would be unwise in the context of inspection, H1 acts in line with the requirements of inspection.

Inspectors/those in authority. The decision to take action in this way appears to be relatively straightforward for H1, as one who has had experience of the sacred story of how inspectors deal with those whom they regard as being unfit to lead schools in a way which complies with the narrative of the power and authority of inspection. H1 leads, therefore, constantly mindful of the evidence-based requirements of inspection and ensures that their staff are also prepared to account for themselves to an inspectorate which has power and authority. For example, when discussing the impact which SIAMS has on daily practice in school, H1 refers to the ongoing gathering of evidence to support the SIAMS criteria.

And so I've always sort of done that and it's just a part of my…of my... nature you

know to have that…I don't use the term 'evidence' you know but I want to show that

we're doing a lot more than we can do on the day or the week that the inspector's in…

(H1 Interview, p.11).

My analysis of this comment explores whether there might be a cover story at play in this

regard:

H1 is at pains to explain that gathering evidence is something they have always done

and it is therefore not a reaction to an inspector. I'm not sure about this though as

inspection is the only area discussed in which H1 talks about taking action which

compromises their value system in any way. (H1 Sociality Analysis, p.9)

Although their previous significant experience in this regard was with Ofsted rather than with

SIAMS, H1 appears to conflate the two systems of inspection and to attribute to both the

sacred story of the punitive power to make decisions which can be life changing for

headteachers.

Researcher. H1's relationship with me, the researcher, is possibly the aspect of the

sociality dimension which is the most revealing. In all of my interactions with them, H1 was

open, helpful, honest, trusting, interested, and engaged. We discussed the potential role of

this narrative inquiry in the development of SIAMS and H1, at all times, was pleased to be

involved. As is evident from the life story interview, H1 was prepared to share deeply personal

truths with me and trusted me to treat this information with dignity and respect. We talked

about my need to analyse this information in my thesis and H1 was happy for me to do so. I

frequently reminded them of their right to withdraw from the research and they reassured me

that this would not be necessary. I believe that we had a mutually respectful and trusting

relationship and I remain humbled by the extent to which they allowed me access to one of

the most painful experiences of their life.

However, as was their right, H1 requested that I absent myself from their first meeting

with the inspector in order that they might relax into the day without being observed. That

request resulted in me being excluded from a crucial interview and ultimately, unexpectedly,

provided me with insight to which I would otherwise not have had access. My subsequent

analysis explored this as follows:

H1 didn't want me to be in the first meeting of the day with the inspector. This would

have been their main interaction with the inspector and they were very clear that they

wanted to establish themselves and take control of the day/situation without my

presence. *Possibly I would have been a distraction…a competitor for superiority in*

terms of power and knowledge…possibly they were too nervous and needed to calm

themselves without an audience… This is a shame for me from a data gathering point

of view but gives me an insight into the level of their nerves and their desire/need to retain control at all costs. They had been very willing for me to be part of the inspection, do my research etc but then denied me the main source of evidence of their interaction with the inspector. Were there things they wanted to say without me being present? Would the fact that I had had access to the backstage preparation but that they were not able to prepare me and control me before the inspection mean that I would be an unwelcome 'loose cannon' on the day? My presence could have undermined their absolute authority and power in a way that they could not cope with or risk. (H1 Key Themes, p.3)

As a potential central source of evidence and being a critical incident within my research, this is discussed further in Chapter Five.

H1 and Place

Using the theory of three-dimensional narrative inquiry space as a lens through which to view the research data involves analysis through the third dimension of Place. In this narrative inquiry, the dimensions of Temporality and Sociality have proven to be informative and insightful in enabling me to read the data; analysis through the dimension of Place has been less fruitful. Home appears to be a place of safety and security for H1; a place where they are cared for without having to live out a cover story of success and management; a place where they can be understood and thrive. H1 recounted, for example,

My [spouse] said 'Look you've got to go and see a doctor because you're um x, y and z and I hadn't noticed… (H1 Interview, p.4).

Examining H1's life story interview data through this lens has also revealed that they are at ease in church schools; that the time they spend in school is largely positive, ("I'm more comfortable as head of a church school", H1 Interview, p.6), and important as a contributory factor in their success as a headteacher, despite being the place which was the cause of their breakdown.

Analysis also reveals that it is an environment over which they now feel that they have control or can manage to gain control:

…here's the evidence…I …because I've got that behind me I feel that they …they…they can see that we're a good…a good church school in that sense. (H1 Interview, p.17)

In addition, the extent to which they now feel at home in a Church of England school leads them to personify school:

…you just get a feel for the school… and there were some…some schools you would go in and just feel …felt the anxiety of the school. (H1 Interview, p.6)

This, in turn, leads to my analysis:

> **Sacred** – automatic alignment of the type of school with the levels of anxiety they
> could detect. Assessment of place based on previous emotional experiences. A
> personification of the place (H1 Place analysis, p.6),

signifying H1's ability to attribute to it emotions and moods which are in tune with their own. School appears to be the place in which their success is evident and can be celebrated, albeit in a modest manner. It is a place where H1 has managed to feel at ease, and where their leadership skills are evident. Analysis of H1's story through the dimension of Place, however, does not indicate that places themselves are of particular significance. They form the backdrop for both the routine and critical events of H1's life and career but they cannot be said to be significant in and of themselves. Therefore, analysis through this dimension will not be discussed further in Chapter Five.

Conflict created by the Nature of Knowledge in SIAMS

This inquiry suggests that SIAMS appears to contain an inherent and fundamental conflict between the subjective, interpretive, and relational nature of the process and the objective nature of the judgements which emerge as a result of that process (see discussion on pp.36-46). These epistemological inconsistencies create operational difficulties for the research participants, as they wrestle with the type of evidence which will be accepted as valid, and they remain uncertain as to how an individual inspector will interpret that evidence.

> I definitely think that this [SIAMS] is harder… (G1 Interview, p.27).
>
> [SIAMS] fits my philosophy … and also the culture we have here… Um having said that,
> it's way harder than Ofsted (laughs). (H2 Interview, p.15)

> This dissonance for the school leaders, as well as that created by the process of

evidence-gathering, stands in stark contrast to the stable, fixed, and objective nature of the knowledge and truth with which the final judgement is imbued. As a result of the uncertainty created by this internal conflict within SIAMS, the participants approached the inspection day with additional trepidation and uncertainty.

> MJ: ...do you think about…that preparation…time?
>
> H1: I try not to (laughs)... because um that's what causes the stress… you get wound
> up and that… and I've been there and... and…and it shouldn't do that… (H1 Interview,
> p.19).

> Not only does this internal conflict associated with the nature of knowledge mean that

the participants felt that they were playing a game of trying to read the mind of an inspector; it also meant that they invested a considerable amount of time and energy into gathering an extensive evidence base *just in case* (italics for emphasis) the inspector would ask for it.

The SIAMS stuff I think is much much harder to quantify and therefore much harder to evidence. It is a lot more anecdotal… and one of the things I'm learning through talking to other heads is, one of the things I need to get on with is um using case studies and using photographs and stuff like that to evidence what we do. (H2 Interview, p.15)

[W]e've got so much in place for SIAMS that we're just fine tuning really…. the work was done perhaps two or three years ago you know... from the day I came in I've got a file in there…I kept it as a record...pictures…things we've done for SIAMS…I want to give it to the SIAMS inspector when he or she comes…to say 'it's not just about what we've done for the last six months it's about what we've been doing for the last three, four, five years… (H1 Interview, p.17).

[A]nother way that SIAMS has decided what we are going to do…we took each of the questions each of the four questions, and used that as way to analyse what we were doing both as a committee and as a [governing body] but also as school. So the bits talking about you know what the school was doing we would ask H1 to go and find out and show us evidence of what collective worship was doing, how they planned it, what was going on. (G1 interview, p.16)

The question arises as to the appropriateness of such an investment of time in proceduralisation (De Wolf and Janssens, 2007, p.382), and attempts to second-guess the agendas and interpretation of an inspector when dealing with subjective evidence, as an inherent aspect of an education in a Christian manner which the participants attempt to lead. A move towards greater paradigmatic harmony within SIAMS might mitigate this conflict over the nature of knowledge and questions related to this are raised in Chapter Six. It could also lead to a situation in which church school leaders are able to put more time into leading the type of education which both they and the Church of England espouse whilst retaining an emphasis on high standards and quality of provision. These suggestions, too, are explored in greater depth in Chapter Six.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion of Research Findings in the Context of Power Relations

Power

Through analysing the interview data, it became apparent that elements of power, the ability to influence people or events by means of authority which is vested in a person or body due to position or status, appear to be embedded at the heart of the SIAMS. H1, H2, and G1 all recounted their understanding that, in order to influence events in a school they need to be in positions of power. For example:

> When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? Why can't the headteacher see that?'...and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only way of answering that I suppose is to become the head and...stand by...what I thought...what my beliefs were... (H1 Interview, p.8);

> H2: ...the things that upset me when I was in school and young and I just want to...I would hope that y'know children in my school have a better experience of school than I did.

> MJ: And being in charge is the best way to make sure that happens...

> H2: Yes yeah I suppose so. And that sort of...that children are met with empathy and understanding um and that's modelled from the top... (H2 Interview, p.11);

> ...being able to understand the school, understand how it works and I guess in a bit of a selfish way the fact that that might have an impact on my children's education, the fact that I understand how it works I can therefore help my children when they're at school but also the bigger picture I guess of helping other people's children as well and making sure it's the best it can be um... (G1 Interview, p.3).

However, having achieved the position of headteacher, H1 seemed to realise that a further layer of power exists – that of inspector. The power vested in a SIAMS inspector to make public and lasting judgements on church schools and their leaders appears to lead to the creation of a relationship in which those leaders feel they have no option other than to compromise in some way/s in order to appease the system and achieve success. This relationship of power, balanced in favour of the inspector (Perryman, 2009), is a significant factor in the way in which the actors involved in SIAMS play their parts.

Yet, despite the participants' recognition of it, they considered that the influence that an inspector's power would have on their behaviour would be minimal and for reasons of expedience.

> [E]ven though there are certain criteria which SIAMS has… um I feel that it is my role to take that and adapt it my way… (H1 Interview, p.11);

> And there are…I mean I did agonise… over the SIAMS framework and how we make that work for XXXX over the trinity… (H2 Interview, p.21);

> [B]ut we don't do them because it says in here 'you must…' But I think we do them because this [SIAMS] has shaped some of the way that we think we should do things. (G1 Interview, p.29)

Although school leaders, arguably principally the headteacher, are the source of the majority of the information during a SIAMS inspection, once this information has been shared or access to it has been gained, the power to transform it into a fixed, stable and lasting inspection judgement lies with the inspector (Perryman, 2009). Similarly within a research relationship, once the detail of a life story has been shared with the researcher and the relational knowledge has been co-created, the participant relinquishes the power of interpretation and analysis to the researcher (Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007; Quinn Patton, 2002). The researcher then has the responsibility to use these stories as "translucent windows" (Quinn Patton, 2002, p.116) to the inner self of the participants as a basis for respectful, faithful yet interpretive analysis. My interpretation of H1's story led to the following pondering:

> Did they really have the power or had the system embedded itself deep within them to the extent that it was the one doing the controlling without the subject even being aware of this? H1 doesn't feel at all compromised. They see it as a game, a power struggle, and they deem themselves the victor. Is this all that matters? Does it matter that they might be being controlled without recognising it? Would knowing this, having it pointed out to them through this research, undermine them? H1 might not accept my perspective. The story is theirs to tell; the analysis is mine. (H1 Key Themes, pp.3-4)

Nonetheless, the participants themselves also have power within the life story interview and narrative inquiry research relationship. They decide what details of their story they wish to foreground (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000) as well as those on which they decide to keep silent (Clandinin and Connelly, 1998), the events which will remain hidden in the background so as not to affect the image which is being presented (Goffman, 1956). The participants in this

narrative inquiry, therefore, had several different means by which they could wield power. They had the power to decide, for example:

- the manner in which they were, either consciously or unconsciously, performing a preferred identity (Kohler Riessman, 2003), possibly to impress me as researcher;

- the extent to which they would allow me access to the back stage (Goffman, 1956) of their own life and that of the school as it relates to SIAMS; and,

- how much of what they presented to me would remain at the performance level of "front of stage" (ibid., p.66).

These different manifestations of power, and other elements of the creation of the personal truth, or truths (Kohler Riessman, 2003), which the participants shared, combine to demonstrate the complex and multi-layered nature of the individuals involved in this inquiry (Hennink et al., 2011; Josselson, 2007).

Sovereign Power and SIAMS

Within SIAMS, on the one hand is the inspector - the perceived expert in the field in terms of their knowledge and experience; the one with the ability to make judgements which are lasting in their influence on the opinions of others. On the other hand is the school leader who is being inspected, or judged, and these school leaders, arguably the experts in the life of their school, yet subject to the power of the inspector are, in many ways, at the mercy of the decisions and judgements which will be made about them. The inspector's power emerges from a combination of their position, their knowledge, their experience and their assumed expertise (Miller and Rose, 1983). It is a form of power which is handed down to the inspector by the system and which creates an impenetrable circularity.

The system itself has created the concept of educational categorisation through expert inspection and it is the same system which hands power to the inspector to make binding judgements on those who are caught within that very system. It has created and established criteria by which schools will be judged; created the experts who will make the judgements; given these experts the power to make judgements; and reified the judgements made by the experts against the criteria which the system created in the first place.

In this way, it can be described as a type of power which is sovereign, or juridicial, in nature (Dean, 1999). Sovereign power is a highly visible, top-down type of power which relies upon statute and protocol for its effectiveness through the compliance of subjects. It is created, strengthened and perpetuated by those at the heart of the system (in the case of

SIAMS, officers of the CEEO and dioceses) who, in turn, exercise it over those who are subject to the system; and it renders its subjects subservient to and dominated by the power vested in that very system. Those with positions of sovereign power in SIAMS establish the criteria to be used in judging schools; oversee and moderate the process of categorisation; and exert control over church school leaders.

In addition to being the exercise of an imposed power, juridicial sovereign power can also be described as being a means of the *production* of the individual subjects themselves (Butler, 1990). Such power defines the parameters for the professional lives which can be lived by individuals and establishes the boundaries beyond which they may not extend, a concept which some of the participants welcome. For example,

I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding… which wasn't there 20 years ago (H1 Interview, p.15);

I kind of think it's a good thing. I know that sounds a weird thing to say but I do kind of think it's a good thing 'cos it is important and because that accountability is there it makes me do it. (H2 Interview, p.18); and,

I think it's good that it's measured because it… y'know… if it's worth measuring then it must be valuable… (ibid., p.27).

In the context of SIAMS, this type of sovereign power can be said to dictate the type of activities which are undertaken by the participant church school leaders, even when they are regarded as being rather comical, for example;

… there seemed to be a lot of having strange [religious] statues around to be passed from one school to another…(laughs)…Special prayers…And they were like …have you got the statue or have I got it? Ah no you've got it….ah no so and so's got it…when are you bringing it over? (H2 Interview, p.10)

Such power can be said to shape the narrative which some of the school leaders believe must be adhered to in order for their school to be judged favourably within SIAMS. The formative strength and impact of this top-down model of power thereby, arguably, renders the relatively powerless church school leader unable to successfully operate or even exist outside of it.

Disciplinary Power and SIAMS

However, the concept of power which is at work in the field of SIAMS is not necessarily as straightforward as this simple explanation might suggest. As part of the strategic power games (Besley and Peters, 2007) which are inherent within SIAMS, all players have the opportunity and ability to exert themselves and their intentions, even though those within the remit of the inspector are, arguably, the more apparent (SIAMS, 2013, p.28).

H2 was clear about their intention to not shape their practice to fit the demands of SIAMS.

> MJ: … as it gets closer and closer ….do you anticipate it will change what you do, how you do it?
>
> H2: No. Not at this stage. No. (H2 Interview, p.20)

G1 also was clear that SIAMS would not have such an impact:

> So I think it's shaped what we've done and I think that obviously the fact that we've got an inspection… next year is is we are thinking about it. It's on our mind. But I'm not saying that I'm shaping my agenda…because we've got an inspection … We're doing what we're doing because we believe it's the right thing (G1 Interview, p.25).

The alternative and somewhat subtler and more nuanced power which I suggest is at work within SIAMS, or indeed in any system of inspection or any relationship which is predicated upon imbalance, is disciplinary power (Foucault, 1980). Too simplistic to be understood as merely the dominance of one person over another because of their respective positions in society and all that this brings in terms of status, knowledge, control and expertise (sovereign power), the power at work within a SIAMS inspection relationship relies upon the compliance of all involved for its ability to be effectively exercised. This power is often invisible in its outworking and extends itself through a "net-like organization" (Foucault, 1980, p.98). It discreetly brings about control in line with the wishes and intentions of the dominant agent, but with the subjects as active and willing participants. Due to the subtle nature of this exercise of power within SIAMS, church school leaders' lives, possibly unconsciously, undergo colonisation (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998) as the individuals concerned internalise the narrative which is established and subsequently perpetuated by the system and by themselves. H1's comment –

> I've taken time out to look at … what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can… adapt in my way to … ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here… (H1 Interview, p.11)

- resonates with this notion, as does that of G1,

> So for the last … two years we've been pushing this. Pushing and pushing this agenda. Pushing things forward and trying to make it happen really. (G1 Interview, p.10)

The governors of one of the schools freely enacted disciplinary power to the extent that they recruited a headteacher with the needs of the SIAMS agenda as a priority:

> [T]hey knew it [SIAMS preparation] was lacking... So for them part of the recruitment process was…finding a head that would y'know… drive that in a way they were happy with… (H2 Interview, p.17).

Compliance within a Low-Stakes Inspection Culture

In contrast to Ofsted, SIAMS can be said to be a relatively low-stakes inspection system (Penninckx et al., 2015). It has no power to precipitate structural change, such as directive academisation of a school, and therefore has no ability to bring an end to the career of a headteacher in the way that its Ofsted counterpart has. Nonetheless, the participant church school leaders are seen to comply with the expectations and requirements of SIAMS. They even go further than mere compliance, speaking of ways in which success in SIAMS means more to them than success in Ofsted due to its focus on the holistic needs of children.

> [F]or me the educational side of school is important but as important is the holistic side of school and I think that the ethos, the child that we turn out the who they are and the awareness of who they are is as important as the fact that they can read and write. (G1 Interview, p.21)

In making this and similar comments I suggest that the school leaders demonstrate the effect which the disciplinary power vested in SIAMS has on them; power which is perpetuated by diocesan training and exhortations to do as well as possible in SIAMS, achieving the higher grades.

> Whilst recognising the impact which the existence of SIAMS has on their actions - I think it does shape…if I'm honest…I think I'd still be doing those things but…. but…I've been to [SIAMS] courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as best I can so…so... I s'ppose it does shape if I'm honest… (H1 Interview, p.18) -

the school leaders also consider that such SIAMS-related actions are an outworking of their own educational philosophy or their personal faith.

> I am a Christian and that's an important part of the…way… that I lead and the way that I do things as a school and the way that I'm pushing the school I suppose. (G1 Interview, p.17)

The participants consistently regard the occasion of a SIAMS inspection as an opportunity to share with an inspector that which they say they would have done, regardless of the existence of SIAMS (for example, H1 Interview, pp.17-18), because of their desire to share the love of Christ with the children in their care.

> [I]t just sounds so much of a cliché but I really do think [a church school education] should be about demonstrating Christ's love to the children, their families, our community. You know, that strong sense of inclusion that I hope you get at XXXX that's one of the things that I really strive for…that we…that everyone is valuable, everyone has a place and it doesn't matter if you're a brilliant academic or not a brilliant

academic you know none of that matters because we all have something valuable to give in some shape or form. (H2 Interview, p.12)

This internalisation by the school leaders of the disciplinary power of SIAMS to judge their work, and their compliance with it despite the strength of their personal motivation, can be interpreted as an example of the phenomenon of educationalists being "given birth" (Dent and Whitehead, 2002, p.3) to by the system which ushers them into being. In other words, the system itself has become an integral part of the way in which some school leaders think and act such that they cease to attribute their behaviour to the source of power. Instead, they become complicit in a way which renders them compliant and even unaware of the extent of the control which is being exerted upon them.

It is possible that the consequences of the prevalence of the inspection discourse of quality assurance, self-management, judgement, and expertise are of such magnitude that the competing church school discourse of individual flourishing in Christ is in danger of being heard but not listened to. The power imbalance which is inherent in the inspection relationship can therefore be said to potentially pervert the discourse of flourishing into a focus on collating evidence in order to satisfy inspectors who are imbued with power by the very system which creates them. The recent vision for education (Church of England Education Office, 2016a) provides the Church with the opportunity to strengthen the discourse of its counter-cultural philosophy of flourishing, as long as it is not subsequently undermined by a competing discourse of inspection, rooted in relationships of power. The vision provides an opportunity to bring together the authoritative voice of the CEEO and the 'on the ground' voice of those with relatively less power - church school leaders who have a clear sense of their vocation and mission.

[M]y mum was a governor …and so I have always understood what being a governor means and understood that actually, and I think …because she'd been a governor I'd always known I would be a governor in some way, shape or form, um because it had always been part of my life… (G1 Interview, p.2).

I still think that that is kind of a part of why I'm here…because I have a real passion for working with children with additional needs and their families... (H2 Interview, p.6).

However, such an investigation is beyond the scope of this research project.

Benefits of Disciplinary Power

Disciplinary power, exercised continuously within and throughout a system such as SIAMS, is not necessarily entirely negative (Foucault, 1980). Within education, it can bring about empowerment for individuals and it can therefore be difficult to argue against; for example, when seen as a means of accountability which results in school leaders focusing on the needs

of the most vulnerable in their communities. H2 is clear about their motivation for leading their church school, reasons which include personal Christian faith, negative childhood experiences of school, and a desire to enable the most vulnerable to flourish. Their commitment has evolved, in their opinion, from a culmination of these factors. These reasons, ostensibly, have nothing to do with external judgement or inspection and H2 says that they are not driven by a need for affirmation from any source of authority. However, the fact that a SIAMS inspector takes such factors into account arguably reinforces H2's ability to lead out of the commitment which they have from within.

One of the intentions and effects of disciplinary power is to produce efficient and well-ordered organisations made up of individuals who are self-disciplined and committed to the central vision (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998); an intent which might be widely supported by church school leaders and officers of the CEEO. It does this through its subtle, discreet, and invisible operation, partly by establishing accepted standards within a culture or a system, and this can be seen in the disciplinary power which is evident within SIAMS for these two church schools. For example, the nationwide diocesan acceptance of SIAMS has brought into existence a virtually unchallenged system of both inspection and regulation of that which is deemed to be acceptable under the banner of a Church of England education, with its inspectors trained and quality assured according to national and centralised protocols.

As previously discussed, the statutory basis for the operation of SIAMS is limited to the inspection of denominational religious education and collective worship with the option of an inspector reporting on the SMSC development of pupils. The work carried out by McKemey between 2004 and 2005 brought about nationwide voluntary compliance with the expansion of this statutory remit to include what is accepted as SIAMS. This extensive compliance with a system which goes beyond that which is expected juridicially by statute is an indication of the Foucauldian disciplinary nature of the SIAMS process. It is furthered in practice by the actions of individual dioceses in establishing programmes of training and support for schools to enable them to develop their understanding of the system and of its expectations and to assist them in being well-prepared for their SIAMS inspection. The 2018-2019 Diocese of Worcester Training and Support Service Level Agreement, with 87% buy-in from schools is an example of this (Diocese of Worcester, 2018). The church school leaders welcome such training opportunities:

When we looked at spirituality last year you know when it was one of the things that I definitely particularly wanted to get in … (G1 Interview, p.27);

I've been to your courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church

school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as best I can… (H1

Interview, p.18).

In addition, they take opportunities to share children's work and achievements,

I'm always taking photographs…going right back to when I was a deputy… I was always

taking photographs… and now people call it evidence but looking back…on things…you

know… And so I've always sort of done that … (H1 Interview, pp.17-18),

possibly in the knowledge that these are means by which they will be better able to meet the

demands of the inspection system and consequently perform favourably when judged against

the inspection criteria. This engagement with training and support can be interpreted as being

indicative of a desire by some leaders of church schools to 'do well' in SIAMS.

I actually spend more time thinking about this than I do about Ofsted (G1 Interview,

p.28);

Well I kind of think [SIAMS is] a good thing. I know that sounds a weird thing to say but

I do kind of think it's a good thing 'cos it is important… (H2 Interview p.18).

Inherent within these arguably positive moves for Church of England education in

general in terms of consistency and training is the notion that the disciplinary power of the

system is resulting in a norm being established and subsequently continually reified, as the

processes themselves develop and become more refined. This norm has, not unexpectedly, a

normalising effect (O'Malley, 1996; Perryman, 2006) on the practice and culture seen in the

two participant church schools.

Disciplinary power is only able to operate when the majority of those connected within

the system play their part and assume their role, as it is this widespread compliance and

subsequent normalisation which perpetuate it. In the context of SIAMS, therefore, disciplinary

power is only possible if the inspector performs the role of the knowledgeable expert with the

ability to make judgements and bring about certain outcomes by means of doing so; and if the

headteacher or governor performs the role of one who accepts the power of the inspector to

make valid judgements and acts accordingly in terms of their presentation of self (Goffman,

1956), the creation and offering of evidence, and compliance with the expectations which the

inspection system assumes.

In this way the church school leaders, those who are on first examination the

powerless subjects of the sovereign power of SIAMS, can be redefined as being the vehicles by

which the disciplinary power of the system is articulated and applied (Foucault, 1980) in their

schools and subsequently across the system, complicit with the operation of power. However,

with its contingent public reporting of outcomes and judgements, it is arguable whether those

on the receiving end of SIAMS do, in practice, have any ability to resist performing the role

which the system expects of them, action which in turn perpetuates the system. Yet, the definition of them as active vehicles and participants within a culture of disciplinary power is difficult to fully counteract.

Panoptic Power

A further aspect of the disciplinary nature of SIAMS can be seen in the comparison between a SIAMS inspection and the metaphor drawn by Foucault with reference to Jeremy Bentham's design of the Panopticon (Foucault, 1977). Bentham's Panopticon, the prison design consisting of individual cells all potentially visible from a central tower manned by one official, ensured that "… each actor is alone, perfectly individualized and constantly visible" (ibid., p.200). Such a prison design, although no true examples were ever actually constructed, provided for the physical enactment of disciplinary power on a large scale. The principle was that individuals, aware of the potential for them to be under constant surveillance, would modify their behaviour in order to comply with regulations, thereby transforming themselves into self-monitoring subjects. The power vested in the single invisible source of authority to ensure compliance would thereby become transferred to each visible and trapped individual. In turn, these individuals would perpetuate the system through their compliance and the adjustments which they would make to their own behaviour as a direct result of the possibility of being observed, judged and punished. The Panopticon provides an appropriate analogy for the outworking of SIAMS as a means of disciplinary power and control which renders the perpetual gaze (the inspectorate) invisible, and the subject (the school leader) visible and consequently self-regulating.

      SIAMS inspectors know the identity of the schools which they inspect in advance of the headteacher receiving notification. Once in possession of this information, the inspector is able to look at the school website and begin the process of gathering evidence of how the school measures up against the inspection criteria, and preparing lines of enquiry based on perceived strengths and weaknesses of the school. School leaders know this and are aware that they will be under the watchful gaze of an inspector who will ask for a range of different types of evidence and whose demands must be satisfied:

      ...I try to guide them a lot...to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector

      might look for… (H1 Interview, p.16).

      As a result, in order to be judged favourably, headteachers are under pressure to maintain a regulation of self which means that they are constantly in line with the requirements of the system.

[T]here are things that I feel that we still need to do which… um over the next 12 months I'll make sure are in place ... perhaps ramping it up to a certain extent. (H1 Interview, p.21)

MJ: [I]s that a pressure on you to compile an evidence base?

H2: Oh yeah

MJ: to prove what you already know is there?

H2: Yes. And I started that last September. (H2 Interview, p.16)

Due to such pre-emptive action, particularly in the case of H1, the subsequent initiatives implemented in school can be seen as attempts to subvert the system, beating it at its own game of ostensibly controlling and directing the actions of church school leaders. Three years in advance of an inspection, the timeline for the work undertaken by H1 (H1 Interview, p.18) is, arguably, sufficient time for a headteacher to be able to claim that any changes made to the running of the school were embedded as their own interpretation of what is meant by a church school education and not specifically designed as inspection preparation.

[L]ike the direction I give to the teachers...the ideas I throw in... um it's because I have that higher level of understanding… that's that's not boasting…it's I like to think that that I've taken…I do a lot of reading…I've taken time out to look at things um what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can…I can…I can adapt in my way to um to ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here…and even though there are certain criteria which SIAMS has…um I feel that it is my role to take that and adapt it my way... My influence you know and I very much… you know…leadership is much about how you influence...it's your influence on a building on on on an establishment … (H1 Interview, p.11).

The panoptic disciplinary power of SIAMS could therefore be regarded as having been negated by the foresight of the headteacher who is able to present a strong argument to have acted on their own volition, moulding SIAMS to fit with their own intentions with no fear of an impending inspection. However, closer scrutiny suggests that it is possible to view these actions somewhat differently.

A system which is able to control and shape the thinking, strategic planning, and actions of a school leader three years before the day of an inspection, and which convinces both the school leader themselves and others of the independence of this compliance from the expectations of the system, is an influential system of power indeed and one which is difficult to interpret outside the context of disciplinary power. Far from beating SIAMS at its own game, such actions can be seen as an indication of the extent to which compliance with the system of disciplinary power has become an integral and defining part of this church school headteacher's professional life with the result that they have no option other than to

capitulate to the system and allow it to take control in this extensive, invasive and all-consuming manner if they want to be judged as being successful.

The influential extent of disciplinary power of and within SIAMS in turn gives rise to the emergence, in the daily life of the two church schools, of factors such as governmentality (for example, Besley and Peters, 2007; Dean, 1999; Foucault, 1991; Gane and Johnson, 1993; Miller and Rose, 1993; Youdell, 2011), performativity (for example, Ball, 2013a; Ball, 2013b; Dent and Whitehead, 2002; Green, 2016; Lyotard, 1984; Perryman, 2006), and fabrications (for example, Ball, 2003; Clapham, 2015).

Governmentality

Governmentality, a term coined originally by Foucault (1991) and subsequently explored by others (for example, Ball, 2013; Besley and Peters, 2007; Dean, 1999; Edwards, 2003; Gane and Johnson, 1993; Miller and Rose, 1993; O'Malley, 1996; Olssen, 1999; Youdell, 2011), refers to the political mechanisms of government which provide a context for the enabling of individual freedom to manage self (Edwards, 2003). It is possible to go further, aligning governmentality completely with the notion of disciplinary power, describing its ability to reach "…into the smallest moments…" (Youdell, 2011, p.36) to influence individual freedom and behaviour; a notion which has resonance with the world of SIAMS through its power-laden pursuit of evidence for the purpose of making judgements. By means of the ability to shape a person's actions through its power, governmentality can also, arguably more insidiously, be described as shaping freedom (Dean, 1999) and possibly even giving rise to the "unfreedom" (ibid., p.34) of an individual.

Through this shaping and forming of an individual's actions, governmentality has the potential to shape and form wider society, such as the church school 'world'. The suggestion that every "…programme of governmentality presupposes an end…the type of person, community, organization, society or even world which is to be achieved" (ibid., p.32) indicates the power and pervasive intent of governmentality as a virtual or conceptual form of social engineering. Its interconnection with disciplinary power, of which it can be said to be one of the effects as well as the source of production, reinforces its ability to infiltrate the very thinking, self-regulation, and intent of individuals and consequently of society.

However, similar to disciplinary power as a form of power over and by the individual, governmentality is not entirely negative (ibid., p.12). When enacted as a moral endeavour of those in positions of authority, it has the potential to empower individuals to manage themselves and their freedoms (Edwards, 2003), and therefore to enable them to thrive and be successful within a dominant hegemonic discourse, such as SIAMS. In itself, compliance can be interpreted negatively as capitulation, unknowing or otherwise, to an all-powerful discourse

with individuals having no alternative for freedom and success other than to submit to and accept the constraints which the power of the system imposes upon them in order to find a form of freedom and success within it. Yet the consequences can be positive and productive as, arguably, the current emphasis in church schools on the concept of individual flourishing indicates.

Within the metaphorical Panopticon created by SIAMS, the church school leaders in this inquiry are simultaneously controlled by the disciplinary power of the invisible inspectorial gaze, and empowered by the disciplinary power of governmentality which gives them agency to act in the context of perceived individual freedom. H1's insistence that explaining their actions and interpretation of SIAMS would be sufficient for an inspector provides an example of this.

> MJ: So what would you say, if you did that on an inspection day, if it was that's what you were going to do anyway and they came in and you said 'Right I'm going to do what I would have always done' and if they criticised you … then how would you deal with that?
>
> H1: I think I'd explain… that if you're getting the message across, if you're illustrating the value and it's having an impact on the children and you know, over time I believe it does… (H1 Interview, p.14).

The numerous "capillaries of power" (Ball, 2013, p.60) at work through and within governmentality thereby work simultaneously to illuminate and to conceal; to empower and to constrain; to provide strategic direction and to close down any alternative paths for action. In this way, they ensure that the desired outcome is brought to fruition by those with power in and those subject to the system, their actions dictated *sotto voce* by the disciplinary power of governmentality.

I suggest that the school leaders in this inquiry regulate their performance to accord with that which they know is expected of them. In other words, in an outworking of governmentality, they enact disciplinary power with the result that those with the potential to act with its sovereign counterpart have no need to invoke such power (Carabine, 1998).

Performativity

One of the ways in which this system of governmentality is enabled to become established and perpetuated is through the prevalence of performativity within SIAMS. Performativity is,

> … a culture or a system of 'terror'. It is a regime of accountability that employs judgements, comparisons and displays as means of control, attrition and change…These performances stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgement. (Ball, 2013b, p.57)

96

This can be seen as being at the heart of the governmentality which, this thesis suggests, shapes the inspection and quality assurance enacted by SIAMS, in the experience of four church school leaders, and by the experts who perpetuate it. As a system of inspection, SIAMS relies upon the creation and accumulation of evidence, the validity of which is determined by the very system which defines both its need and its acceptability, thereby also increasing the ability of the system to define what is right (Sarup, 1993).

This conception of performativity builds upon the thinking of Austin in relation to the socially imbued performative power of speech utterances to bring about a change in a person's state of being, for example, through the words of the marriage ceremony (Austin, 1962). Ball's thinking (Ball, 2003, Ball, 2013, Ball, 2013a, Ball, 2013b) marks a shift from Austin's emphasis on the individual's ability to harness that performative power through their choice of words and other speech utterances, to the power of the system itself to control, determine, and dominate the actions and state of being of the individual. Such performativity can even cause individuals to consider compromising their own values and belief systems in order to be judged favourably by the system which has the disciplinary power to shape culture (Ball, 2013b). This phenomenon was hinted at by some of the research participants, as they wrestled with bringing their practice in line with the expectations of SIAMS.

> …18 months ago it was...you saw with the SIAMS schedule…which we've all had to adapt to… understand first of all and… then make sure it's working in that way… so that way it's been positive… and the children and… the staff…feel positive working in that…there are aspects of that SIAMS that I feel we are working towards…which er we will have in place in the next 6 months… (H1 Interview, p.21).

> [I] started to go on the SIAMS training courses and tried to start to understand the new expectations of that and the changes that were occurring…so, at the time where we were working out our strategic plan for… the [governing body] it became apparent … that the SIAMS um requirement of a vision…was to have the headteacher's vision from their heart as the vision for the school. So as a governing body we were trying to work out how we were strategically driving the school in terms of moving forward and the SIAMS was requiring that the headteacher had a vision from their heart… (G1 Interview, p.9).

This thesis explores the possibility that SIAMS has this performative power over the church school leaders, potentially inadvertently, and that, through it, there exists the possibility that it might render them compromised in terms of their ability to act and be successful outside of the boundaries of the culture which it creates.

The form of performativity put forward by Ball has its roots in that defined by Lyotard as "the optimization of the global relationship between input and output" (Lyotard, 1984,

p.11). It is in this conceptualisation, different from that of Austin in the way in which it places emphasis on structural procedures which both create and measure performance according to criteria imposed from without, that we can see the direct relevance of performativity to SIAMS. The notion that that which educational experts decide will be 'put into' children will result in positive and measurable outcomes, and the concept of these outcomes being evaluated, used as success criteria, and presented in the form of reports and statistics has resonance with the culture which SIAMS has, I suggest inadvertently, created in church schools. It is seen in the link between the inspection criteria and the role played by the expert inspectors which provides a framework of judgement and categorisation, and which subsequently appears to shape and drive some of the work of the church school leaders. This narrative of what is acceptable in SIAMS, created at the point at which the knowledge of the expert meets the power of the system (Ball, 2012), has established for them a performative culture of evaluation, judgement and normalisation. Playing its part in Lyotard's "mercantilization of knowledge" (Lyotard, 1984, p.51), the performative culture of SIAMS has thereby established its own truth for the school leaders, as well as the validity of the means by which this truth is reified in the form of what they and the inspector portray as seemingly objective evidence and reports. In other words, as discussed in Chapter Two in relation to the nature of the knowledge created within SIAMS, the performativity at the heart of SIAMS suggests that the system has the power to convey truth to the church school leaders as a concept which is fixed, stable, and objective. The use of the term *inspection*, combined with the format of reporting the judgements, serves to reify this still further and raises questions of its appropriateness in this interpretive and relational context. The relationship between the nature of knowledge in SIAMS, power, and the Church of England's vision for education is discussed further in Chapter Six.

The individual's acceptance that those in the highest positions of church school leadership and their agents are vested with knowledge and expertise which justify them holding the balance of power, provides the system with its momentum and the ability to continue virtually unchallenged.

I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding… (H1 Interview, p.15).

This comment led to me making the following notes which demonstrate the impact that the performative nature of SIAMS appears to have on the church school leaders who have a sense of vocation for their work and a belief in their own leadership.

Personal compromise is necessary in order to appease the system. Changing the system is not an option. It has too much power and authority. Success in inspection brings stress but it is necessary and manageable. The alternative is even more stressful ie to be 'condemned' by the inspectorate. This is not an option H1 is willing to countenance.

SIAMS inspection is a scene for two experts to decide who is pre-eminent: the head or the inspector? Where is the locus of power in this aspect of education? (H1 Profile, p.3)

[T]he existence of measurement by an external authority focuses the mind in a way which would not happen without it. Therefore, SIAMS is a positive influence on church schools despite bringing extra work and the pressure of being judged. The system, the performative beast, must be appeased but this can be done cleverly through careful management from below. (H2 Profile, p.1)

The notion that the expectation enables the performance of power (Butler, 1990) can be seen thus in the means by which the SIAMS process is operated and accepted. Focusing on the impact which this expectation has on the understanding and performance of gender, Butler built on Lyotard's previous insights into performativity. Almost thirty years ago, she challenged thinking which accepted gender as a natural, internally-existing state and suggested instead that it is a state which is created by means of a repeated set of actions performed within a social context, governed and controlled by disciplinary power. Her insight brought together the linguistic nature of Austin's performativity with the power aspects of Lyotard's thinking, and introduced a theatrical concept of performing a preferred identity or set of preferred cultural characteristics, thereby challenging what was hitherto accepted as a natural state of being (Butler, 1990, p.3). In this way, Butler's work resonated with that of Foucault (Foucault, 1980) in her discussion about ways in which "…systems of power produce the subjects which they subsequently come to represent" (Butler 1990, p.2,), ideas which we also see in Lyotard's theory of performativity and which can be related to the means by which SIAMS maintains its power in the two participant church schools.

Despite the culture of control which can be established through disciplinary power and governmentality, and which appears to be evident in the relationship between the church school leaders and SIAMS, the impact of performativity is, again, not universally negative and can lead to what is perceived as an improvement in standards and practice in church schools.

MJ: If [SIAMS] didn't exist… do you think you would have done or would do anything differently?

H2: Hmm..hmm…

MJ: Yes so do you think that was quite an easy question to answer?

H2: Yeah..um.. I don't…if it didn't exist…I think it's an accountability thing really. Um because there are things in SIAMS…I mean the spirituality thing is the big thing that we're working on at the moment…I don't think our spirituality is as good as it could be... and I want to work on it. Um...if there wasn't an accountability measure, I would probably not be pushing it as hard as I am. I would probably still y'know…yeah we do prayers in assembly and they do lots of different prayer activities but it's inconsistent… and that probably wouldn't bother me so much if it wasn't for that accountability measure...

MJ: So is that a nuisance for you then because you could be doing something else that you think is more valuable or do you think it's a good thing?

H2: Well I kind of think it's a good thing. I know that sounds a weird thing to say but I do kind of think it's a good thing 'cos it is important and because that accountability is there it makes me do it. (H2 Interview, pp.17-18)

Yet, those who already have power and authority in SIAMS are able to acquire further knowledge as a consequence of their apparent right of entry into decision-making and policy-discussion groups. This thereby increases their power to influence how judgements on schools are made, to categorise them, to establish norms, and to perpetuate control. In this way, the power of a few is established, exercised and internalised both within the individual and the system and the supposed objective nature of SIAMS is reified further. It is:

- power which perpetuates expert status and the consequent influence of knowledge;
- knowledge which perpetuates the status and power of the expert; and,
- expertise which perpetuates and increases the power and sacred status of the knowledge of those at the centre – those with knowledge and power, that is, the experts.

Thus, a performative circularity is created, outside of which it is difficult to adopt any position of influence. In the context of the judgements made on the church schools in this inquiry, the expert in the performative equation is the SIAMS inspector who had a key role in determining how the church school leaders decided upon and subsequently performed their professional identities.

The Power of Discourse

The inseparable relationship between knowledge and power, the pervasive and powerful culture of governmentality and performativity, and the subsequent parameters which have a constraining effect on behaviour, discussion, and even thought can be encapsulated within the notion of discourse (Ball, 2012; Foucault, 1991). Discourse, the point at which knowledge meets power and they become two sides of the same process, sets the boundaries for actions, words and even thought. In the context of SIAMS, those with the ability to speak with a voice which will be heard, those to whom the prevailing discourse has given birth (Ball, 2013a), are those whose intertwined positions of knowledge and power are largely integrated with the discourse of inspection, self-management, expertise, and quality assurance. These combined voices can be seen as having the effect of perpetuating the circular discourse of knowledge, power and expertise which is embedded at the heart of the culture of inspection. Yet, again, as with other elements of governmentality and disciplinary power, the impact of this discourse is not necessarily always negative.

The school leaders within this research did not acknowledge any intention to allow the culture of SIAMS to shape their work and practice. They readily discussed their views of education and their motivations, often passionate, for involvement in the leadership of church school education, none of which had any reference to performing well in inspection.

> "When I think about perhaps why I became a governor it was more about the way that my children's school worked and the kind of child it makes them as opposed to whether they're going to get you know... I'm not really that interested in what results she gets. What I'm more interested in is the kind of child that she will become and how ready she is to take the next stage of her life, and who she is as a person…" (G2 Interview, p.23).

> [Y]ou know being here in a school that has a reputation for you know working very closely with special needs children and their families…I still think that that is kind of a part of why I'm here... (H2 Interview, p.6).

Both headteachers told stories of incidents early in their lives and careers which drove them to take on leadership roles in church schools, and both have overcome obstacles in life in order to do so (H1 Interview, pp.1-4; H2 Interview, p.1-4). Yet, the omnipresent and omnipotent nature of discourse suggests that operating outside of these expectations might not be possible within a particular field of knowledge, such as Church of England education, despite unawareness, or misrecognition, of its pervasiveness by church school leaders. The inspection-day critical incident involving H1 is significant in this regard as it demonstrates the

almost involuntary nature of the way in which the prevailing discourse of SIAMS shapes and controls actions, a possible example of the way in which value replaces values.

This thesis argues that the discourse of SIAMS is the powerful force which acts imperceptibly within church schools to create and subsequently control the parameters of what can be thought, said, and done (Ball, 1990; Ball, 2012; Ball, 2013a; Ball, 2013b). It establishes its position in the system by means of its embeddedness in the normalised expectations put upon schools by the CEEO and diocesan education teams through, and as a direct result of, SIAMS. In turn, this is perpetuated and legitimised by the compliance-driven actions of the school leaders themselves, such as attending training and making inspection-related changes to school culture. In order for this and the subsequent reinforcement of power to be effective, the discourse creates and then legitimates boundaries and divisions (Bernstein, 1996) between schools and school leaders through individualisation and competition (Ball, 2013a). It does this by establishing regimes of truth (Edwards, 2003; Hall and Noyes, 2009; Jeffrey and Woods, 1998) which are specific to the discourse of SIAMS, which become reified, and which encourage conformity and isomorphism in the field of knowledge. In turn, this conformity has the effect of embedding concepts of normalisation (Hope, 2013, Perryman, 2009) which work to categorise and to create the possibility of deviants (Carter, 1998; O'Malley, 1996) in the system. The discourse of SIAMS sets the boundaries of possibility for human agency and truth (Hall and Noyes, 2009; Miller, 1997) in the two church schools and, by means of its pervasive nature, ensures that its effect is felt at every level as the powerful creator of hegemonic truth and reality. Acceptance of the normalised expectations is thereby established. It is then perpetuated by the imperceptible working of the invisible controlling force of the discourse which creates the boundaries of possibility for people's thoughts, often without their knowledge or awareness. In this way, the agendas and interests of those with power are established as truth and are perpetuated, often by the very people whom the discourse seeks to control and contain (Prior, 1997) by means of disciplinary power. Church of England education in general, and SIAMS in particular, albeit I suggest inadvertently, appears to be no different in this respect than any other organisation or group of individuals. However, whether the perpetuation of a culture which has disciplinary power at its heart is at odds with the education in a Christian manner offered by church schools is an interesting question.

The Church of England's interpretation of education in a Christian manner is rooted in its 2016 vision to offer an education based on hope, wisdom, community, and dignity. The stories of the school leaders in this inquiry suggest that their enactment of this vision is curtailed by a culture of judgement, embodied by inspection requirements, with some actions taken and decisions made purely to satisfy the demands of SIAMS.

I try to guide them a lot...to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for… because the pressure on them of having an inspector… (H1 Interview, p.16).

Expectations of these experienced and well-qualified church school leaders have become shaped by the demands of inspection to the extent that they attribute their inspection-related actions to the essence of Christian education as *praxis* – an interesting interpretation.

Furthermore, the performative system can be seen to go further to the establishment of individuals' reliance upon inspection judgements to establish their value and worth in their church school communities. At the same time as according intrinsic respect and dignity to individual children, and describing how they are unique individuals made in the image of God and thereby worthy in their own right as human beings, the system judges the church school leaders and attributes to them and their work a grade depending on the performative success of their actions, as subjectively judged by an inspector.

On the other hand, it is possible to argue that the increasing dominance of the discourse of inspection, quality assurance and accountability has led to a rise in standards over time in the church schools according to a measurement established by the system itself.

[W]hen I think about when I went to F and then I went to B I don't think those 3 heads um...were as in tune …. I suppose with the spiritual side...with the spiritual element… understanding worship...understanding RE… understanding in that sense …even though they were church school leaders….um... of course the intensity wasn't there then…on church schools as it is now… (H1 Interview, p.18).

In this way, the dominance of the discourse can be seen to have prevailed with positive consequences, and to have silenced those who might position themselves outside of it by challenging their credibility (Ball, 2013a). The church school discourse is one largely of wellbeing, spirituality, flourishing, high standards, and attention to the needs of the individual. Through its focus on such matters, and with its imperative that each person is a unique individual, made in the image of God (Genesis 1 vs 27) who deserves to be treated with love and respect (Matthew 22 vs 36-40) in order that they might live life in all its fullness (John 10 vs 10), SIAMS seeks to highlight the work that Church of England schools do to make this love a daily reality. For example, in the participant schools, work on increasing the school community's understanding of spirituality (G1 Interview, p.27), or a focus on children with special educational needs and their families (H2 Interview, p.6) are both important educational foci and ones which are acknowledged and rewarded within SIAMS. However, SIAMS also makes a judgement on such work and gives it a grade.

Identifying the hegemonic discourse of SIAMS, recognising the intended and unintended negative consequences which it has on the culture of the system, and highlighting the positive effects which it has on the quality of a Church of England education in the two

participant schools might be first steps towards encouraging an alternative discourse characterised by an intent which has harmony with an education in a Christian manner. To date, the possibility of a discourse contrary to quality assurance through inspection within education in England is not a reality due to the strength of the hegemonic discourse. However, the recent words of Amanda Spielman and Damian Hinds in this regard are encouraging and may in time permeate the wider discourse of inspection in education (see pp.19-20) and release the Church from some of the ties which appear to bind it at present. This point will be taken up in greater depth in Chapter Six.

Fabrication

Embedded within the performative discourse of school inspection, including SIAMS, is the concept of fabrication. According to Clapham,

[f]abrications are the production of representations or versions of an organisation or individual for the purpose of inspection" (Clapham, 2015, p.616).

Despite being considered by some as not standing outside the truth (Hall and Noyes, 2009), they are suggested by others as not needing to be rooted in the notion of truthfulness as much as in the successful communication of the chosen image of the organisation (Ball, 2003). Although it is possible that these perspectives and definitions are not entirely at odds with each other, in that it is possible that a notion might be rooted in truthfulness whilst not fully and faithfully representing that truth, they do present differing views of what might be considered to be morally acceptable. Given the nature of the education in a Christian manner which can be said to underpin the church school system, it is reasonable to expect that its leaders would want to work within a system which encourages them to take a position fully within the truth as they see it when considering what image and information to present to an inspector.

Integral to the concept of fabrication is an intention to conceal aspects of the life and work of a school which are considered as potentially detrimental to the judgement that an inspector will make. The intention is thus for fabrications to conceal as much as they reveal. Consequently, they are immanent in the careful performance staged by school leaders on the occasion of inspection and are central to "impression management" (Goffman, 1956, p.70). Notions of "backstage" (ibid., p.69), where performance details are agreed and some facts are suppressed, and the "front region" (ibid., p.66) where the careful performance is enacted, are recognisable in relation to the schools' SIAMS preparation and to the carefully managed performance staged on the day of the inspection itself. The discussion of the actions of H1 provide an illustration of the impact which fabrications can have on a SIAMS inspection.

It is reasonable to expect that school-based actors prepare for inspection. Sometimes, scripts are rehearsed and lessons are written and practised (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998); the physical environment is tidied up and often changed, an example of "fabrication of stage" (Penninckx et al., 2015, p.4); and decisions on which facts are to be over communicated and which are to be under communicated in order to sustain "…a particular kind of reality…" (Goffman, 1956, p.61) are made and shared amongst the school team. This carefully constructed preparation for inspection is an example of how the terrors of performativity can take hold of the leaders of a church school, causing them to act in the way which they believe is expected of them (Ehren et al., 2015), even if this is at odds with the principles upon which their work is based (Penninckx and Vanhoof, 2015), possibly resulting in them "…doing things "right," compared to doing the right things…" (Segerholm and Hult, 2018, p.136). (H2's comedic recount of headteachers sharing religious statues for s48 inspection is an example of this - H2 Interview, p.10). I was not sufficiently party to the back stage preparation carried out by the two participant schools to recount the extent to which such fabrications might have been prevalent, but elements of it were evident as I observed the inspections. For example, in one of the schools, a senior member of staff removed another from the staffroom when they began talking freely in my presence about preparations which had been carried out.

Thus a spectrum of potential exists for SIAMS to turn principled and dedicated church school leaders into "merchants of morality" (Goffman, 1956, p.162). At one end of the spectrum is work by the school leaders to highlight relevant 'evidence', bringing it to the fore whilst leaving in the background elements of the life of the school which have little relevance for a SIAMS inspection. Further along the spectrum can be seen the deliberate suppression of undesirable 'evidence' for the sake of a favourable inspection judgement; and finally, there can be the potential for active and considered intervention with the express purpose of covering up and concealing what might be called the truth of the school. The creation of a church school fabrication culture might call into question the appropriateness of the *inspection* of the Christian nature of a Church of England school.

Post-Fabrication

The church school leaders involved in this inquiry insisted that they would not be swayed in their presentation of the truth as they see it by the power of an inspector to make judgements. For example:

> MJ: … as it gets closer and closer….do you anticipate it will change what you do, how you do it?
> H2: No. Not at this stage. No. (H2 Interview, p.20)

This insistence has resonance with the concept of "post-fabrication" (Clapham, 2015, p.613), which suggests that the culture of performativity and fabrication has become embedded to the extent that practitioners and school leaders are no longer aware of being driven by a need to comply with external accountability. This raises the possibility that readiness for SIAMS is an inherent characteristic of those involved such that the version of the truth which they present to an inspector is not a fabrication but rather a representation of their daily routine as they work in an inspection-facing culture, in which inspectors are an "absent presence" (Jeffrey and Woods, 1998, p.4).

The idea that the participants had any option other than to conform and to comply with the requirements which the panoptic performativity of SIAMS imposes, however, is arguable. The power of the discourse appears to leave them with little choice other than to run a completely panoptic regime internally and to stage manage events in order to impress a SIAMS inspector, thereby appeasing the performative beast (Perryman, 2009). The question as to the appropriateness of a system which forces such compliance and performance upon leaders of Church of England schools remains.

Discussion of Findings about H1

H1 and Temporality

The role of hindsight in H1's retelling of the story of their journey as a church school leader is an interesting one. Re-imagining the past from the vantage point of the present (Freeman, 2010) leads H1 to critically regard some early practice of headteachers as unacceptable according to today's performative conceptualisation of successful headship and to view success through the lens of inspector validation.

> I knew the head wasn't moving forward…He was a great head for children but he wasn't a paperwork person… (H1 Interview, p.3).

The punitive action of an Ofsted inspector which led to H1 becoming acting headteacher in unusual and understandably stressful circumstances appears to be unquestioningly right now for H1 despite what, at the time, would likely have involved some conflict of loyalties for them, as they were put in a position of replacing a headteacher for whom they had had respect, fondness, and admiration (ibid.). The temporal lens through which this memory, with its early place on the timeline of their career, is now viewed by H1 has the effect of smoothing (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000) this conflict away and giving priority to the necessary (for H1) validity of the performative and judgemental culture which has provided the context for their subsequent career as a headteacher. Looking back with hindsight on that critical incident enables them to create a harmonious narrative of the events,

to reify the performative, post-fabrication culture within which they have learned to succeed, and to interpret it in a way which brings coherence to their journey through time.

> [W]hen I look back on what had happened…we had turned things around…we had had a good church inspection as well and I was a part of that… (H1 Interview, p.5).

As is the nature of narrative recollection, the version of events shared with me as part of this inquiry may be different in its detail to that which H1 might have told closer to the events themselves. They may, in talking to me many years after being installed as acting headteacher at very short notice and consequently suffering their breakdown, have glossed over some incidents, feelings, and reactions in their emphasis now on others. Notions of personal truth and concepts such as verisimilitude and plausibility are resonant here as the worldview within which narrative inquiry is situated, with its embracing of personal and narrative truth, accepts H1's more recent telling of the story of this time of their life as no less truthful than that which they might have told were they to have shared it differently earlier in their career.

The hindsight inherent within telling stories of the past also appears to provide a place of safety from which H1 is able to revisit the painful events of early in their career. The time which has lapsed since their occurrence, during which H1 has proven their ability to lead successfully, enables them to assess those events as one who ultimately was more powerful than previous pain and, therefore, potentially also more powerful than the performative culture which led to it. The temporal lens through which H1 is now retelling their story provides them with the confidence that time has proven that they are a survivor, one who has strength to keep going and to be judged as successful. They are thereby enabled, by looking back and retelling, to relive the story of their life possibly with greater confidence in the belief that the performative demands of leading a church school are ones which they are able to manage.

H1's retelling of formative stories from years ago brings to the fore important issues of truth, especially in relation to cover stories. When looking back to an earlier point in time and re-evaluating events in order to retell stories with the aid of hindsight, the outcome of decisions and actions are known. For H1, the belief that they were destined to be a church school leader was a sacred story and a driving force in some of what might be regarded as high-risk decisions which they made early in their career. The decision to continue pursuing church school leadership, despite the personal cost of their first experience of acting headship, is now reified by H1 as being something which they knew that they had to do.

> When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? …and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only way of answering that I suppose

is to become the head and...and stand by … what I thought...what my beliefs were… that's why I needed to lead a school… (H1 Interview, p.9).

This led to my analysis, as follows:

Sacred - the way to effect change in the way you believe to be right is to be the leader yourself. H1 attributes the same philosophy to their former self as they do to their present self.

Sacred/cover - they need to believe this as it is the story which decided the next steps they took and which led at the time to illness and breakdown. If that was the wrong decision at the time, then H1 was culpable for what happened to them and it could have been avoided. We tell ourselves the version of the past which best serves our purposes often with no intention of misrepresenting events. Big issues of truth surrounding Cover Stories. (H1 Temporality Analysis, p.11)

At the time, however, H1 would not have had the benefit of the knowledge of decades of successful headship and this arguably performative-driven decision, therefore, could have been more high-risk than they now convey. Had a successful career not ensued, then the decision/s to take on further headships could have resulted in more health issues for H1 and the story they would have had to tell would have been a very different one. Hindsight and the lens of temporality, by means of the careful and reductionist selection of what have come to be key factors and incidents, enable a different truth to become established without the story itself straying into the realm of untruthfulness.

The timeline of H1's story also reveals changes which have been brought about within themselves as a person simply by the passing of time. For example, the experience which comes with many years of being a school leader has enabled H1 to develop somewhat of a "thick skin" (H1 Interview, p.14) which, in turn, has enabled them to challenge what others hold as being sacred stories. H1's ability to overturn the sacred stories of their current school and to replace them with new stories has meant that they have brought about what they regard as positive changes to school culture, despite being opposed by some members of staff (ibid., pp.7-9).

All of this for H1 is done, it appears, with an awareness of the need to be regarded favourably by those with the power to make judgements, based on their witness of the treatment of those who were not viewed as successful.

[T]he county when I got the job county warned me that they were watching him …J took me aside and said that er she gave me her phone number in case I ever needed her you know… (H1 Interview, p.3).

The passage of time, and decisions made and actions taken by H1 during this time, has led to them being in a position which they believe is a strong one in the face of an inspection-driven

school culture. H1's determination, throughout their career, has variously driven them, caused them to be unwell, set them against colleagues' sacred stories, and provided them with a place of safety. Time has proven to H1 that their strategies in leadership work; that thorough and well-timed preparation and up-to-date knowledge enable them to be a match for an inspector; and that safety in a performative and judgemental culture can be secured as long as one acquiesces to the inevitable game and plays it better than anyone else. This is an interesting mind-set to be deemed necessary by one in a leadership role in a Church of England education in a Christian manner.

The question remains, however, as to whether H1 has in fact played the game of inspection better than anyone else and whether they have gained the upper hand over the system; or whether the system itself has managed to have the final word and retain the upper hand by shaping H1's behaviour and actions over time. Analysing H1's story via the temporal lens reveals the impact of their early experiences on their later (and current) actions as a headteacher. Being so deeply embedded within education's performative inspection culture, H1 appears to have had no choice other than to play by the rules. The fact that they prepared so far ahead of the inspection, possibly so as to be the one in control, serves to demonstrate still more emphatically the disciplinary power wielded by the system, with its panoptic echoes and ability to create a post-fabrication leader who is inspection-ready at all times and in all things.

Analysing H1's interview data through the lens of temporality also gives rise to the question of the appropriateness of SIAMS, a Christian inspection system established to evaluate the effectiveness of an education in a Christian manner, which perpetuates this performative culture, rooted in power relationships and unchallenged conformity. Whilst being regarded by H1 as not being as bad in this way as Ofsted, my analysis suggests that the reality of the impact of SIAMS as a performative culture remains.

> **Sacred** – SIAMS is not as bad in the performativity stakes as Ofsted but must be listened to nonetheless because it will still judge you. Not as bad for H1 because they believe it is more aligned to their own educational philosophy than Ofsted is.
>
> **Cover** – H1 has been gathering 'evidence' for the forthcoming inspection for years now. Does this enable them to say that it is not in fact reactive evidence gathering for a performative culture but more of a way of life within the school? (H1 Temporality Analysis, p.41)

The early and ongoing actions taken by H1 in order to ensure that they would be regarded as successful in and by SIAMS do not appear to have roots in a commitment *per se* to an education in a Christian manner as much as in a desire to survive and to succeed. Yet it is

questionable whether the existence of SIAMS in its current state allows any real alternative course of action for church school leaders.

H1 and Sociality

When analysing H1's life story through the lens of sociality, it becomes apparent how much of an influence those with power and authority have had and continue to have on H1 in a way which they appear to regard as being beyond challenge. The fact that these powerful individuals embody the system's ability to control and direct means that H1 cannot ignore either them or their contingent demands, even when this might create some internal conflict.

> H1: I try to guide them a lot...to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms…
>
> MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them?
>
> H1: I…I … try not to. (H1 Interview, p.16)

This gave rise to my analysis, as follows:

> Cover – first time there is any suggestion of H1's value system being compromised is with regard to the expectations of an inspector and what they will therefore do and say to the staff. Indication of the level of performativity here and the impact it has regardless of the strength of the head in other areas. (H1 Sociality Analysis, p.9)

The unchallengeable sacred story is that of the power which inspectors wield by means of their ability to make judgements. Because of this power, they cannot be defied during inspection regardless of any prior intentions to not be influenced by their demands. My sociality lens analysis of H1's immediate denial of the ability of SIAMS to dictate their actions includes:

> Sacred or Cover story? H1 is immediately adamant that they will not be changing what they do in school because of the impending inspection. But then immediately describes how they will be refining things ready for SIAMS. Does SIAMS leave any other option for heads? Does it thereby compromise the integrity of otherwise very strong leaders? (H1 Sociality Analysis, p.31)

SIAMS appears to have the power to influence what H1 does as headteacher, regardless of personal beliefs, either secretly held or openly shared, and it cannot therefore be ignored. Its very existence creates a panoptic context for H1 and has resonance with the compliant prisoners which that system envisaged creating. We see some of this in the way that H1 describes their relationship with SIAMS and their reaction to it (for example, the resistance cited above). The need to mount a degree of ostensible resistance to this controlling culture can be linked to H1 taking ownership of decisions and crediting these to their own educational philosophy which happens to be commensurate with that of the Church of England – "I'm

more comfortable as head of a church school" (H1 Interview, p.6). In so doing, H1 can appear to be a headteacher who has no need to compromise their own ideology in order to appease the performativity introduced by the existence of SIAMS. Nonetheless, the inspector remains the person with the ability to judge and so must be carefully managed, even if this means taking action several years in advance of an inspection itself.

Despite, or maybe because of, H1's earlier openness with me, having me present at their meeting with the inspector, their only opportunity to shine in person as the headteacher and to influence the outcome of the inspection with their own words, was ultimately too much of a risk. My presence at that initial meeting would have brought together in the person of someone who was not a controllable member of their staff, both the front and back stage operations of the inspection and was possibly, understandably, deemed to be too risky. It is possible that H1 wanted to omit or include evidence as part of that meeting, which my presence would have made difficult or embarrassing for them, given their earlier openness with me. There are many possible reasons for my exclusion but it is reasonable to surmise that my presence was a risk which was too great for H1 to face after all of the years of work undertaken to ensure a positive inspection outcome.

My assurances of being a silent observer were not enough for H1 possibly because, had I been present, I would have witnessed image management. As a professional already dealing with the potential internal conflicts and compromises inherent within a performative culture, it is possible that a further compromise, made in discussion with the inspector and made public by my presence, would have been an additional complex element which, understandably, H1 would prefer to not have to consider. Resonance with Goffman's (1956) reflections on image presentation and performance and the concept of cover stories (Clandinin and Connelly, 1995) are notable here and the risks involved for H1 in potentially tarnishing the carefully constructed image of both self and the school were too great.

As an additional source of data, despite my initial dismay, being excluded from that key inspection meeting ultimately proved invaluable. It gave me insight into the pressures faced by H1 in their role as a church school headteacher facing SIAMS whilst managing other people. Despite their trust in me, it appears that, once the previously hypothetical concept of performative inspection judgement became a reality, H1 felt they could not retain the power to control unfolding events by presenting their front stage image to the inspector with me present, given my previous access to the back stage. Consequently, the question once again arises as to whether there is a disconnect between the nature of an inspection system which is unavoidably imbued with disciplinary power and the multi-layered complexities of performativity, post-performativity, governmentality, fabrication, post-fabrication, expertise

and quality assurance, and the vision, values, and ethos expected of a leader of education in a Christian manner on which it sets out to make judgements.

H1 – Summary of Findings

Over recent years, H1 appears to have made somewhat of an art form of seeking ways in which to outplay SIAMS at its own game. They have done so by ensuring that they attend all relevant training and are well-versed in the demands and expectations that will be made at the time of SIAMS inspection. As a result, H1 has successfully (the judgement of the 2017 SIAMS inspection was Outstanding in all four Core Questions) portrayed to an inspector that all changes, initiatives and visionary work for the school have provenance in their own personal vision, philosophy, and ideology for education. This personal ideology has resonance with the requirements of the 2013 SIAMS Framework and echoes the 2016 call of the Church of England to be deeply Christian and to serve the common good by developing a focus on wisdom, hope, dignity, and living well together.

It appears that H1 has played the system at its own game and has beaten it.

However, a closer examination of the findings suggests that the situation might be more nuanced and complex. The very existence of SIAMS seems to have shaped both the pressures and the motivations which have driven H1 as an educational professional, almost since their time as a newly qualified young teacher; and these pressures have established the professional expectations of which H1 has a constant awareness. In many ways, H1 appears to have understood the ostensibly untameable nature of the power of inspection and so has sought ways in which they could imperceptibly exert their own power over it. H1 did this by gaining their own extensive body of knowledge, in the understanding that knowledge and power are intrinsically linked. Seeking power in this way can be seen as being a subtle way for H1 to elevate themselves to a position of being a credible expert alongside the inspector.

However, rather than H1's actions having the effect of neutralising the performative power of SIAMS, an alternative interpretation is that they have given more power than ever into the hands of that controlling force. One of the principal causes of this possible reversal is H1's all-consuming investment and belief in the power that SIAMS has to make judgements, which will have an impact upon how the public view them as a church school leader. This belief has shaped and driven H1's work for at least three years prior to the most recent SIAMS inspection; an example of the disciplinary power of SIAMS at work and of a headteacher who is immersed, possibly against their will, in the (post)performative and (post)fabrication culture of education. This successful inspection-ready educational professional appears to tacitly concede that the system holds the balance of power and that the only means of securing any

personal publicly acknowledged professional status and its concomitant limited power is to acquiesce to the system's demands.

The greater the degree of H1's acquiescence, the more extensive their preparation for inspection.

The more extensive their preparation for inspection, the more favourable the inspection judgement.

The more favourable the inspection judgement, the greater the praise bestowed upon H1.

The greater the praise bestowed upon H1, the more fully they appear to be in harmony with the system.

The more fully they appear to be in harmony with the system, the more the power of the system is perpetuated.

The more the power of the system is perpetuated, the greater the degree of H1's acquiescence.

And so it continues.

The question arises as to the appropriateness of such an inspection system, which sets out to be Christian in principle and practice and to make judgements on what Astley describes as education in a Christian manner, to be both embedded within and to actively benefit from a worldview which relies extensively upon relationships of power and the embodiment of disciplinary power in order to control a church school leader.

CHAPTER SIX

What next for SIAMS and the Church of England in Education?

Summary Analysis

In this inquiry, the four participants shared their visions for education, visions which appear to align with the official Church of England vision but which predate its publication and connect the purpose of their work with Joshua Watson's 1811 vision for the Church of England's involvement in state-funded education. As part of this, they also share a commitment to the holistic wellbeing of children and their families. They seek to understand the needs of each individual in their school community and they vow that they will continue to do so regardless of the opinion of an inspector or the impact of such priorities on inspection judgements. As a result of their belief that each person is a child of God, they consider that each one deserves to flourish and be happy. Consequently, they devote time to understanding, for example, why some children might be reluctant to come to school, and effort to making the experience better for them (H2 Interview, p.1 and p.13). They share both a commitment to enabling children of different faith backgrounds to explore and develop their personal spirituality, and a belief that Bible teaching has a contribution to make to the education and development of children in the twenty-first century (H1 Interview, p.13). As a result, they ensure that the culture and practice of their schools allow time for this and, although this compliance and the quality of the provision form part of the SIAMS criteria, the four church school leaders agree on its importance and on its inclusion in the school curriculum, regardless of inspection requirements.

They also agree that SIAMS is a system of judgement by which they want to be regarded favourably. This, I suggest, inevitably refocuses the attention of committed and driven church school leaders not only to fulfil their own Christian, or Christian-inspired, beliefs and vision to improve the lives of those in their school communities, but also to provide evidence for an inspector on a range of criteria, criteria over which they have no control. Many of these seem to fit seamlessly with what they say they are already seeking to achieve in their schools, but there are a few which do not (for example, some criteria related to children's knowledge of the trinity, H2 Interview, pp.22-24). These, consequently, become additional burdens for which evidence has to be sought and collated. This takes time and attention from what the school leaders regard as their main purpose and mission, in order to appease an inspector. There appears to be, in their view, no apparent gain for the school community other than a 'tick in a box' and praise from the system which is responsible for creating the need for compliance in the first place.

This thesis argues that, within and as a result of the apparent (post)performative culture of fabrication and compliance, the act of being judged and publicly reported upon can be said to constrain the freedom of the participants with regard to the narrative evidence that they present and the image that they work hard to put forward during inspection. As a result, a clear delineation is established between front and back stage operations. Furthermore, despite intentions to the contrary, the church school leaders appear, at times, to be overtaken by the expectations of SIAMS and to succumb to the enactment of fabrications and cover stories for the sake of appeasement and success. This raises issues of personal and professional integrity in relation to the way in which they feel they need to (or are made to) portray their work in order to secure successful judgements in SIAMS. Whether this consequence is intended by the CEEO is open to question.

Also inherent within this culture can be seen what can be interpreted as misrecognition on the part of the church school leaders of the impact which the inspection culture has on them, once the potential of inspection becomes a reality. The focus, common to both participant schools, on a biblically-inspired commitment to enable individuals to flourish in their potential as unique children of God, and the resulting culture which is characterised by compassion, forgiveness, acceptance, grace, mercy, and dynamic growth are commensurate with the Christian teaching which underpins the Church of England's vision for education and what appears to be its interpretation of education in a Christian manner. However, there seems to be for the participants a conflict, created by SIAMS, between the type of education to which they are committed and the consequences for their work of the hegemonic performative expectations.

This inquiry also suggests that there appears to be a further conflict within SIAMS, with dissonance in relation to the type of knowledge which it creates. If this suggestion of dissonance resonates with others, it is possible that questions will persist as to the validity of SIAMS judgements and the status which they enjoy. It is also possible that the seemingly objective status of the inspection judgement will continue to mask the relational and interpretive nature of the process and of the knowledge that it generates. These are characteristics which help to make SIAMS distinctive from its Ofsted counterpart and which openly value the voice and contribution of church school leaders and the wisdom and experience of SIAMS inspectors.

Despite the ongoing discomfort for the school leaders which is created by this dissonance, and by the personal and professional compromises involved with seeking success in SIAMS, all four participants say that they would still rather have a system that holds them to account. They have a shared belief that this accountability keeps them focused on issues which they believe to be important and which, without that accountability, would ultimately be

disregarded due to the pressures of other agendas, such as that of Ofsted, with its own performative systems and expectations. This mind-set has resonance with the Macnamara Fallacy:

> The first step is to measure whatever can be easily measured. This is ok as far as it goes. The second step is to disregard that which can't be easily measured or to give it an arbitrary quantitative value. This is artificial and misleading. The third step is to presume that what can't be measured easily really isn't important. This is blindness. The fourth step is to say that what can't be easily measured really doesn't exist. This is suicide. (Handy, 1994, p.219)

The potential to disregard that which is not easily measured, such as children's spiritual development, or to reduce it to "an arbitrary quantitative value", or even the prospect of disregarding it were it not to be measured or judged, is enough of a reality for these church school leaders to eschew any suggestion of a removal of SIAMS or a reduction in its power to hold them to account. As an insight into the (post)performative culture in church schools, this indicates the extent to which disciplinary power is, for them, an embedded daily presence; an invisible yet ever-present gaze. Whether this perspective has ideological and paradigmatic harmony with an education in a Christian manner, and whether Church of England education would be as effective without a performative system of SIAMS inspection are interesting and fundamental questions.

As a narrative inquiry researcher, I joined four church school leaders in the midst of their stories of SIAMS and I left them in the midst. Their stories were being lived and told before I became involved, and they have continued to be re-told and re-lived since my departure. Other life stories, different from the ones which the participants shared with me, were possible. Other events could have been foregrounded; those which they chose to include might, on another occasion, have been omitted. Other truths might have come to light. But this inquiry is based on the stories which the participants chose to retell to me, stories which have plausibility, lifelikeness and a convincing degree of verisimilitude and which provide a unique insight to the impact which SIAMS had on four Church of England primary school leaders in 2016 and 2017.

Furthermore, it is possible that, had four different church school leaders been involved, the findings might have been different. Different knowledge would have been co-created and different truths might have emerged as a result. Such is the uniqueness of narrative inquiry and of the experiences and life stories of individual participants; hence the inability to generalise or to assume parity of experience. Within the narrative paradigm, however, the research is no less valuable and the findings no less valid as a result of this uniqueness.

What Next?

Section 48 of the Education Act 2005 (Department for Education, 2005) establishes the requirement for the quality of denominational religious education and the content of collective worship to be inspected by "fit and proper persons" (ibid., s(5)), who also have the option of reporting on the SMSC development of pupils. This thesis has explored how this narrow legal remit has been extended in the culture and practice of Church of England education since 2005 and how the National Society and the CEEO have achieved the collaboration of all dioceses in England in doing so. What do not appear to have been explored on a national level, however, are the potential unintended compliance-based consequences which the church school leaders in this inquiry have experienced as a result of this expansion of the remit of s48 inspection. It is hoped that, by posing questions, this inquiry will aid the CEEO in its evaluation of both the positive and negative consequences of SIAMS, and of the sustainability of the many positive developments since 2005.

The emphasis on character education (Casson et al., 2017), the impact in church schools of Christian values, *Valuing all God's Children (*Church of England Education Office, 2014 and 2017b*)*, and *Deeply Christian, Serving the Common Good* (Church of England Education Office, 2016a) are just a few of the initiatives which combine to present a cohesive image of what is meant by a Church of England education in a Christian manner. These, and other reports and initiatives, are helping to set the agenda in education, both church and non-church, in England. What becomes more epistemologically and ontologically problematic, however, is the introduction to the stage of the concept of *inspecting* the impact and outcomes of these and other initiatives and judging, ostensibly objectively, schools on their response to them.

As a result of the conflict between the relational, subjective, and interpretive nature of SIAMS and the objective status subsequently accorded to the final inspection judgement, the school leaders in this study found that they were often uncertain as to how an inspector would judge them and how the quality of their evidence would be received and interpreted. They welcomed being inspected by an inspector who, they felt, understood the story of their school and who made a positive judgement as a result. Whether they would have felt as positive about the experience had they not been awarded the judgement of Outstanding, which both schools achieved, is debatable. The power games at play throughout the process, including the disciplinary power vested in SIAMS, which can lead to the ultimate judgement being negotiated to a greater or lesser extent between the two main players (inspector and headteacher), remain an unspoken yet fundamental element of any activity labelled as *inspection*. SIAMS is not exempt from these power games at present despite being a Christian inspection system which is intended to establish an objective picture of the distinctively

Christian provision in Church of England schools. It is possible that, should changes be made to deal with the dissonance related to the nature of knowledge in SIAMS, the issue of power imbalance which is currently embedded within the inspection relationship might be mitigated. In other words, if the awarding of an ostensibly objective grade were to be replaced by a system which enables the critically analytical sharing of the story of the school as a Christian learning community, the matter of inspector power could become less central and the integrity of church school leaders in relation to fabrication and image management might remain intact.

On balance, the four church school leaders reluctantly agree that SIAMS brings more benefits to their schools than it does negatives and that this is largely due to the accountability inherent within a system of *inspection*. This suggests that, in the case of these two church schools, a (post)fabrication and (post)performative culture pervades to the very heart of the work of educators who believe in and are driven by their vocation, self-belief and commitment to leadership, as well as to the core of education as *praxis*. Despite the strength of these driving factors, the reality of being publicly judged, regardless of personal agreement with the criteria which are imposed from without, leaves the church school leaders with little option other than to play the power games of inspection in the hope of gaining the upper hand and being judged favourably. This involves a certain degree of compromise for them, but they ultimately accept it as a necessary price, one worth paying in order to be judged as being successful.

Based on an analysis of the experiences of the four participants, it is reasonable to question whether issues of power, control, performativity, and image management have quietly embedded themselves over the past decade in Church of England education, shaping the discourse and establishing a new normal, outside of which it is difficult to stand. However, I suggest that these are issues which do not coexist ideologically, ontologically, or epistemologically comfortably with education in a Christian manner. The Church of England has communicated its vision for education and has unequivocally committed itself to the right of every individual, including those who do not conform to the academic profile favoured by the DfE, to flourish in their own way. This commitment resonates ontologically with the education in a Christian manner described by Astley and Hull and has its roots in the belief of the equal value of each person, made in the image of God. For this belief to become a reality, I suggest it requires that children, teachers, and school leaders are not all judged by a fixed measure and subsequently categorised depending on their performance against a norm which has been imposed by an ostensible expert. Such a system of judgement and categorisation simultaneously creates, perpetuates, and reifies an epistemology which determines that truth

is to be found in inspection judgements, grades, and reports rather than in being enabled to live in fullness the life given by God.

The CEEO's financial dependency on the DfE for the operation of a system which fulfils the requirements of s48 arguably constrains its freedom to act in a way entirely of its own choosing; interesting in the context of financialisation being one of Ball's five methods of performativity (Ball, 2013a). However, were the DfE to withdraw its grant funding for the operation of SIAMS, it is questionable whether the CEEO or Church of England dioceses could afford to continue to operate a system which enables them to monitor, and possibly ensure, the quality of the Christian nature of church schools and the legal basis for it. Therefore, this funding serves potentially to tie the CEEO to the DfE's agenda for s48 inspection and significantly narrows its ability to move in any direction which is not politically acceptable to the DfE, whilst simultaneously ensuring the CEEO's ability to retain a focus on quality.

This inquiry has been conducted and this thesis written with some awareness of the financial and political complexities with which the CEEO deals and does not seek to be unhelpfully critical of the current system. Rather, it has been undertaken with the courage and integrity of a "parrhesiastes" (Besley and Peters, 2007, p.93), speaking the truth as I see it, to challenge and to ask questions. It has the intention of shining a spotlight on some of the current issues facing SIAMS in the hope of increasing the effectiveness, and potentially the integrity, of the system as well as building its credibility on the national stage. The ethical principles which underpin the methodological basis of this inquiry include enabling participants to move forward from the inquiry reliving life in a more fulfilling way than was possible prior to retelling their stories. These principles extend to the CEEO and the future of SIAMS. It is hoped that there is a way to retain the progress achieved by and since the introduction of SIAS and SIAMS whilst addressing some of the ideological, ontological, epistemological and, I suggest, moral conflicts currently present in church schools as a result of SIAMS and as experienced by H1, H2, G1, and G2.

Earlier in my thesis, I explained the decision to make H1 the prime focus of the inquiry and I have analysed their story of SIAMS in Chapters Four and Five. I have also made reference to the experiences of H2, G1, and G2 and their resonance with those of H1. Having devoted a significant amount of time to listening to and analysing the stories of these four Church of England primary school leaders' experience of SIAMS, certain "narrative threads" (Clandinin, 2013, p.132; Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p.70) have emerged and these are briefly explored above. The narrative threads, based on the notion of verisimilitude and resonance for others in similar circumstances, raise the possibility of certain questions which might be worthy of consideration.

Questions for Consideration

1. Do the disciplinary power and concomitant governmentality which the stories of the four participants suggest might be inherent within SIAMS, and the in-built rhythm to the life of a church school to which it appears to give rise, combine to control and shape the way in which other leaders of church schools think, act, and behave both before and during an inspection?

2. If deemed to be plausible, and the performative impact thought to be more widespread than on the four church school leaders within this inquiry, the part played in this by SIAMS might be worthy of further study, particularly in light of the meaning of *inspection.* A question which might be worthy of consideration is whether the impact of church school leaders' commitment to and understanding of education in a Christian manner needs to be *inspected* rather than celebrated or otherwise affirmed and encouraged in an ontologically and epistemologically consistent manner. I suggest that this is a question of fundamental importance in any future reviews of issues connected to s48 of the Education Act 2005. Central to this is not only a consideration of the appropriateness of the inspectorial nature of SIAMS, but also discussion and preservation of the improvements which have been brought to church school education since, and as a result of, McKemey's work on SIAS in terms of what might be regarded as a rise in standards.

3. If thought to be credible, the research findings relating to dissonance in the type of knowledge which is created by the fluid and subjective relational and interpretive SIAMS process, and which is ultimately presented as the fixed and stable truth of a church school according to SIAMS, would be worthy of further thought. The findings of this research raise the question as to whether action to address this internal conflict would be beneficial to the ongoing credibility, integrity, and effectiveness of any system which monitors both compliance and quality in Church of England education. They also raise the possibility that addressing this conflict might mitigate issues related to power such as fabrications, impression management, and a compromise of integrity.

4. The role and importance of personal faith in relation to a commitment to a Church of England education varies between the participants in this inquiry but it is a significant factor for at least three out of the four. As an additional question, it would be interesting to discover whether this mixed picture of personal faith is reflected in a wider sample of church school leaders and whether it has an influence on school

leaders' understanding of and commitment to education in a Christian manner, particularly in light of the increased emphasis on theological understanding within the 2018 SIAMS Schedule. For the three participants who mentioned their own Christian faith, religious belief explicitly shapes their work and provides a paradigm within which they situate what they do, as well as why and how they do it.

Postscript

Margaret James

I began this thesis by offering a version of my own narrative beginnings in order to increase the reader's insight into how and why the knowledge created as a result of this inquiry came into being. One of the key themes which emerged in doing so was the presence and my awareness of everyday power in both personal and professional relationships. At the start of my doctoral studies, I was a SIAMS manager for two Church of England dioceses. I am now a DDE, with overall responsibility for SIAMS in a diocese but with greater detachment from it on an everyday operational basis. In some ways this increases my ability to exert power within the field; in others, it reduces it, as the extent of my responsibilities results in delegation and the trusting of inspection-related matters to a new SIAMS manager. This day-to-day separation from the power of SIAMS perhaps enables me to have less contact with the process and to thereby quash internal dissonance which has arisen as a result of my studies and research.

This, however, is an obfuscation and lacks integrity.

As a DDE, all aspects of education in a Christian manner in my diocese are my responsibility and I cannot retain integrity whilst hiding from that. I have found the disciplinary power at work in the inspection relationship between SIAMS and the four church school leaders with whom I have worked to be disturbing, in the same way that the power at work in a personal relationship which relies for its perpetuation on complicity is disturbing. I eschewed that in my personal life; yet I continue my professional relationship with SIAMS. Why?
There is much to be praised in the Church of England's education in a Christian manner. It values individuals and seeks their flourishing. It dares to be counter-cultural in its insistence that all are of worth because they are made in the image of God. It continues to stand up for the vulnerable and disadvantaged and refuses to be reduced solely to a performative input/output conception of education as *techne* (Patton, 2002). It celebrates diversity, offering an inclusive welcome regardless of religion, culture, financial worth, academic ability, or social standing. It is a system of education which seeks social cohesion and encourages social capital by being part of bringing communities together. It has its roots in the biblical exhortation to live life in all its fullness and it offers that that life can be found in Christ.

And then it judges a school leader's success through *inspection*.

As a result of my doctoral journey, I believe that the benefits of a church school education in a Christian manner are not best nurtured in this way, by creating a performative stage for the enactment of fabrications, or by awarding an ostensibly objective judgement, based on subjective evidence. SIAMS inspection appears to create the need for individuals to perform, to fabricate, to hide elements of the truth of the daily reality of school life, to present what might be thought of as an acceptable image of self, and potentially, to live a cover story. I believe that, in this way, it creates imbalance in the church school world, imbuing those within the closed circularity of expertise with power and authority over those who live out education in a Christian manner on a daily basis. This relationship of power means that some church school leaders balance all of the demands placed upon them in search, not only of life in all its fullness for those in their schools, but also of favourable judgement by a system of inspection of the quality of their attempts to do so. Whilst it is possible that, at times, these two different agendas might come together, for example, in a focus on high quality religious education, I remain to be convinced that a performative system of *inspection*, which leads to both intended and unintended consequences related to fabrication and image management, is the best way to encourage this to be a daily reality in Church of England schools. As long as success in SIAMS remains a high-profile measure of a good church school, the findings of this inquiry suggest that some church school leaders, encouraged and enabled by diocesan leaders such as myself, will continue to perform, to fabricate, to live out cover stories, and to tick boxes.

Writing this thesis is my contribution towards reimagining how the CEEO might value those who lead education in a Christian manner and equip them to a high standard. Part of this is a challenge to identify a means of doing this whilst removing the performative requirements and consequences of inspection.

Meanwhile, I continue my work as a DDE with responsibility for the outworking of SIAMS, with conflicted thoughts, emotions, and motivations.

In turn, the four school leaders continue to adhere to the criteria contained within the SIAMS agenda whilst seeking to lead learning communities dedicated to education in a Christian manner.

This narrative inquiry began in the midst and it has ended in the midst.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altrichter, H and Kemethofer, D. (2015) Does accountability pressure through school inspections promote school improvement?, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 26:1, 32-56.*

Archdiocese of Birmingham (2016) http://www.ourladys.bham.sch.uk/policies.html (accessed 12 April 2018).

Asthana, A. and Boycott-Owen, M. (2016) www.theguardian.com/education/2018/jan/11/epidemic-of-stress-blamed-for-3750-teachers-on-longterm-sick-leave (accessed 12 April 2018).

Astley, J. (1992) 'Tradition and Experience: Conservative and Liberal Models', in Astley, J., and Day, D. (eds.) (1992) *The Contours of Christian Education*. McCrimmons, pp.41-53.

Astley, J. (1994) 'The place of understanding in Christian education and education about Christianity', in Astley, J. and Francis, l. (eds.) (1994) *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education.* Gracewing, pp.105-117.

Astley, J. and Day, D. (eds.) (1992) *The Contours of Christian Education*. McCrimmons.

Astley, J. and Francis, l. (eds.) (1994) *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education.* Gracewing.

Astley, J. (2013) Church Schools and the Church's Service for the Poor. In Worsley, H., (ed.) (2013), *Anglican Church School Education: Moving Beyond the First Two Hundred Years*. Bloomsbury pp.101-118

Atkinson, R. (1998) *The Life Story Interview, Qualitative Research Methods Vol. 44.* Sage Publications.

Atkinson, R. (2007) 'The Life Story Interview a Bridge in Narrative Inquiry', in Clandinin, J. (ed.) (2007) *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology.* Sage Publications, pp.224-245.

Atkinson, P. and Coffey, A. (2003) 'Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing', in Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J. F. (eds.) (2003) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns.* Sage Publications, pp.415-428.

Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press.

Ball, S. J. (1990) *Politics and Policy Making in Education.* Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (1994) *A critical and post-structural approach.* Open University Press.

Ball, S. J. (1998) 'Performativity and fragmentation in 'postmodern schooling'', in Carter, J. (ed.) (1998) *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare.* Routledge: London and New York, pp.187-203.

Ball, S. (2000) 'What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes', in, Ball, S. (ed.) (2000) *Sociology of Education: Major Themes Vol IV Politics and Policies.* Routledge Falmer, pp.1830-1840.

Ball, S. J. (2012) *Politics and policy making in education: Explorations in policy sociology,* Vol 33. Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2013a) *Foucault, Power and Education.* Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2013b) 2nd edition, *The Education Debate.* The Policy Press.

Bernstein, B. (1996) 'Pedagogic Codes and their Modalities of Practice', in Ball, S. J. (ed.) (2000) *Sociology of Education Vol I: Theories and Methods.* Routledge Farmer: London and New York, pp.1-24.

Besley, T. and Peters, M.A. (2007) *Subjectivity and Truth: Foucault, Education, and the Culture of Self.* Peter Lang.

Blaylock, L., Christopher, K., Diamond-Conway, J., Matter, H., Moss, F. and Pett, S. (2016) *Understanding Christianity: Text, Impact, Connections.* Christian Education Publications.

Bolton, G. (2010) *Reflective Practice: Writing and Professional Development 3rd edition*. Sage.

Bridges, D. (2006) Educational Research: pursuit of the truth or flight into fancy? *British Educational Research Journal.*

Brown, A. (1993) 'Aided schools: help, hindrance, anachronism or trailblazer', in Francis, L. and Lankshear, D. W. (eds.) (1993) *Christian Perspectives on Church Schools*. Gracewing, pp.163-176.

Brown, A. (2017) *How to see Collective Worship Anew.* Grove Books Limited.

Bruner, J. (1986) *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds.* Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (2002) *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life.* Harvard University Press.

Bryan, H. and Revell, L. (2011) Peformativity, Faith and Professional Identity: Student Religious Education Teachers and the Ambiguities of Objectivity. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 59:4, pp.403-419.*

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble.* Routledge: New York and London.

Carabine, J. (1998) 'New Horizons? New Insights? Postmodernising social policy and the case of sexuality', in Carter, J. (ed.) (1998) *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare.* Routledge: London and New York, pp.121-135.

Carter, J. (ed.) (1998) *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare.* Routledge: London and New York.

Casson, A., Cooling, T., and Francis, L. J. (2017) *Lessons in Spiritual Development: Learning from Leading Christian-ethos Secondary Schools*. Church House Publishing.
Chadwick, P. (2012) *The Church School of the Future Review*. Archbishops' Council.

Chadwick, P. (2013) Conflict and Consensus in the Dual System. In Worsley, H., (ed.) (2013) *Anglican Church School Education: Moving Beyond the First Two Hundred Years*. Bloomsbury, pp.43-59

Church of England www.churchofengland.org (accessed 13 June 2018).

Church of England Education Office (2014) *Valuing All God's Children*. Archbishops' Council.

Church of England Education Office (2016a) *Church of England Vision for Education: Deeply Christian, Serving the Common Good.* Archbishops' Council.

Church of England Education Office (2016b) *Religious Education in Church of England Schools: A Statement of Entitlement.* Archbishops' Council.

Church of England Education Office (2017a) *SIAMS Handbook.* Archbishops' Council.

Church of England Education Office (2017b) *Valuing All God's Children*. Archbishops' Council.

Church of England Education Office (2018) *SIAMS Inspection: An Evaluation Schedule for Schools and Inspectors.* Archbishops' Council.

Clandinin, J. (ed.) (2007) *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology.* Sage Publications.

Clandinin, D. J. (2013) *Engaging in Narrative Inquiry.* Left Coast Press, Inc.

Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (1995) *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes.* Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (1998) 'Personal Experience Methods', in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) (1998) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* Sage Publications, Inc., pp.413-427.

Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (2000) *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research.* Jossey-Bass.

Clandinin, D. J. and Rosieu, J. (2007) 'Mapping a Landscape of Narrative Inquiry: Borderland Spaces and Tensions', in Clandinin, J. (ed.) (2007) *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology.* Sage Publications, pp.35-75.

Clapham, A. (2015) Post-fabrication and putting on a show: examining the impact of short notice inspections. *British Educational Research Journal, Vol 41, No. 4, pp.613-628.*

Clarke, C. and Woodhead, L. (2015) *A New Settlement: Religion and Belief in Schools*. Westminster Faith Debates.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2007) *Research Methods in Education 6th edition*. Routledge.

Connelly, F. M. and Clandinin, D. J. (1995a) 'Educational Qualities of the Landscape: Desires, Tensions, and Possibilities', in Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (1995) *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes.* Teachers College Press, pp.153-163.

Connelly, F. M. and Clandinin, D. J. (1995b) 'Personal and Professional Knowledge Landscapes: A Matrix of Relations', in Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (1995) *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes.* Teachers College Press, pp.25-35.

Connelly, F. M. and Clandinin, D. J. (1995c) 'Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes: Secret, Sacred, and Cover Stories', in Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (1995) *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes.* Teachers College Press, pp.3-15.

Cooling, T. (1994) *A Christian Vision for State Education*. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Cooling, T. (2010) *Doing God in Education*. Theos.

Cooling, T. (2018) 'Formation and Christian Education in England', in Stuart-Buttle, R. and Shortt, J. (eds.) (2018) *Christian Faith, Formation and Education.* Palgrave Macmillan, pp.115-130.

Cooling, T., Green, B., Morris, A. and Revell, L. (2016) *The Role of Christian Faith in Church School Classrooms: Research Conversations with Classroom Teachers.* Draft version, read February 2016.

Courtney, S.J. (2016) Post-panopticism and school inspection in England. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 37:4, 623-642.*

Cox, J. (2011) *More than caring and sharing: Making a church school distinctive.* Kevin Mayhew Ltd.

Croft, A. and Jeffrey, B. (2008) Creativity and performativity in teaching and learning: tensions, dilemmas, constraints, accommodations and synthetics. *British Educational Research Journal, 34:5, 577-584.*

Davies, M. (2017) *Report questions 'community' admission policies of Church of England schools,* https://churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2017 /24-november/news/uk/report-questions-community-admission-policies-of-church-of-england-schools (accessed 6 August 2018).

De Wolf, I. F. and Janssens, F. J. G. (2007) Effects and side effects of inspections and accountability in education: an overview of empirical studies. *Oxford Review of Education, 33:3, 379-396.*

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society.* Sage Publications.

Dearing, R. (2011) *The Way Ahead: Church of England schools in the new millennium*. Archbishops' Council.

Dent, M. and Whitehead, S. (eds.) (2002) *Managing Professional Identities: Knowledge, performativity and the 'new' professional.* Routledge: London and New York.

Denzin, N. K. (1994) 'The Art and Politics of Interpretation', in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Sage, pp.500-515.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Sage.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) (1998) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* Sage Publications, Inc.

Denzin, N. K. (1998) 'The Art and Politics of Interpretation', in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) (1998) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials.* Sage Publications, Inc., pp.313-344.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2013) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research, 4th Edition.* Sage.

Department for Education (1944) *Education Act.* Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (1992) *Education Act.* Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (1996) *Education Act*. Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (1998) *Education Reform Act*. Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2002) *Education Act*. Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2005) *Education Act*. Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2010) *Academy Act*. Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2016) *Educational Excellence Everywhere.* Crown Copyright.

Department for Education (2016) *Memorandum of Understanding between the National Society and the Department for Education.* Crown Copyright

Department for Education (2018) *Schools Causing Concern*. Crown Copyright.

Dewey, J. (1939) *Experience and Education.* New York: The MacMillan Company.

Diocese of Gloucester (2017) www.gloucester.anglican.org (accessed 3 November 2017).

Diocese of Worcester (2017) www.cof-worcester.org.uk (accessed 3 November 2017).

Diocese of Worcester (2018) https://cofeworcester.contentfiles.net/media/assets/file/2018-19_Diocesan_Education_Team_Training_and_Support_SLA.pdf (accessed 14 September 2018).

Education and Skills Funding Agency (2017) *Academies Financial Handbook.* Crown Copyright.

Edwards, R. (2003) Mobilizing lifelong learning: governmentality in educational practices, *Journal of Education Policy, 17:3, 353 – 365.*

Ehren, M. C. M., Gustafsson, J. E., Altrichter, H., Skedsmo, G., Kemethofer, D. and Huber, S. G. (2015) Comparing effects and side effects of different school inspection systems across Europe, *Comparative Education, 51:3, 375-400.*

Ehren, M. C. M. and Visscher, A. J. (2006) Towards a theory on the Impact of School Inspections, *British Journal of Educational Studies, 54:1, 51-72.*

Elbourne, T. (2009) *Church Schools: a Mission-Shaped Vision.* Grove Books Limited.

Elbourne, T. (2012) *Understanding Church Schools: Ideas for Today from Joshua Watson's Founding Vision.* Grove Books Limited.

Ellis, C. and Berger, L. (2003) Their Story/My Story/Our Story: Including the Reseracher's Experience in Interview Research, in Holstein, J. A. and Gubrium, J. F. (eds.) (2003) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns.* Sage Publications, pp.467-493.

Elonga Mboyo, J. P. (2017) The place of emotions while inspecting schools: reflections of two Ofsted inspectors, *School Leadership & Management, 37:3, 267-287.*

Elton, J. and Male, T. (2015) The impact on a primary school community in England of failed inspection and subsequent academisation. *School Leadership and Management, 35:4, 408-421.* Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Etherington, K. (2004) *Becoming a Reflexive Researcher: Using our Selves in Research*. Jessica Kingsley Publications.

Fine, M. (1994) 'Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research', in Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (eds.) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Sage, pp.70-82.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Penguin.

Foucault, M. (ed. Gordon, C.) (1980) *Power/Knowledge*. The Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1991) 'Politics and the study of discourse', in Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller, P. (eds.) (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* The University of Chicago Press, pp.56-69.

Francis, L. and Lankshear, D. W. (1993) *Christian Perspectives on Church Schools.* Gracewing.

Francis, L. and Thatcher, A. (eds.) (1990) *Christian Perspectives for Education*. Gracewing: Fowler Wright Books.

Freeman, M. (2010) *Hindsight: The Promise and Peril of Looking Backward.* Oxford University Press.

Gane, M. and Johnson, T. (1993) *Foucault's New Domains.* Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Polity Press.

Gillies, D. (2008) Quality and equality: the mask of discursive conflation in education policy texts. *Journal of Education Policy, 23:6, 685-699.*

Goffman, E. (1956) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* University of Edinburgh, Social Sciences Research Centre.

Goldacre, B. (2013) *Building Evidence into Education*. UK Government.

Gough, B. (2003) 'Deconstructing Reflexivity', in Finlay, L. and Gough, B. (eds.) (2003) *Reflexivity: A practical guide for researchers in Health and Social Sciences.* Oxford, Blackwell, pp.21-36.

Green, E. (2009) *An Ethnographic Study of a City Technology College with a Bible-Based Ethos.* Thesis submitted to the University of Oxford for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Green, E., Cooling, M., Cooling, T., Farnell, A., Smith, D. and Wheldon, A. (2018) *What If Learning*. Available at: http://www.whatiflearning.co.uk (accessed 6 August 2018).

Green, S. G. (2015) *The Relationship between Ethos, Learning Habits and Educational Outcomes of English Church of England Secondary Schools and Academies.* Thesis submitted to Canterbury Christ Church University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Hall, J. B. (2017) Examining school inspectors and education directors within the organisation of school inspection policy: perceptions and views, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 61:1, 112-126.*

Hall, C. and Noyes, A. (2009) New Regimes of Truth: The Impact of performative school self evaluation systems on teachers' professional identities, *Teaching and Teacher Education, Vol 25, 6, August 2009, 850-856.*

Hammersley, M. (1989) *The Dilemma of Qualitative Method: Herbert Blumer and the Chicago Tradition.* Routledge, London and New York.

Handy, C. (1994) *The Empty Raincoat.* Hutchinson.

Heikkinen, H., Kakkori, L. and Huttunen, R. (2001) This is My Truth, tell me yours: some aspects of action research quality the light of truth theories. *Educational Action Research, 9:1, 9-24.*

Hennink, M., Hutter, I. and Bailey, A. (2011) *Qualitative Research Methods.* Sage Publications Ltd.

Hirst, P. H. (1974) *Moral Education in a Secular Society.* London: University of London Press.

Hirst, P. H. (1981) Education, catechesis and the church school, *British Journal of Religious Education*, 3, pp.85-93.

Hirst, P. H. (1994) 'Christian education: a contradiction in terms?', in Astley, J. and Francis, l. (eds.) (1994) *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education.* Gracewing, pp.305-313.

Holstein, J. A. and Gubrium, J. F. (1997) 'Active Interviewing', in Silverman, D. (ed.) (1997) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* Sage Publications, pp.113-129.

Holstein, J. A. and Gubrium, J. F. (eds.) (2003) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns.* Sage Publications.

Hope, A. (2013) 'Foucault, panopticism and school surveillance research', in Murphy, M. (ed.) (2013) *Social Theory and Education Research: Understanding Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and Derrida.* Routledge, pp.35-51.

Hufton, N. (2001) Truth and Inquiry: A Reply to David Bridges, *British Educational Research Journal, 27:1, 79-82.*

Hull, J. M. (1990) 'Christian Nurture and Critical Openness', in Francis, L. and Thatcher, A. (eds.) (1990) *Christian Perspectives for Education*. Gracewing: Fowler Wright Books, pp.301-319.

Hull, J. M. et al. (1994) 'Critical openness in Christian nurture', in Astley, J. and Francis, l. (eds.) (1994) *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education.* Gracewing, pp.251-275.

Jeffrey, B. and Woods, P. (1998) *Testing Teachers: The Effect of School Inspections on Primary Teachers.* Falmer Press.

Josselson, R. (2007) 'The Ethical Attitude in Narrative Research: Principles and Practicalities', in Clandinin, J. (ed.) (2007) *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology.* Sage Publications, pp.537-566.

Kohler Riessman, C. (2003) 'Analysis of Personal Narratives', in Holstein, J.A. and Gubrium, J. F. (eds.) (2003) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns.* Sage Publications, pp.331-346.

Jones, K. L. et al. (2017) The unintended consequences of school inspection: the prevalence of inspection side effects in Austria, the Czech Republic, England, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland. *Oxford Review of Education, 43:6, 805-822.*

Lindgren, J. (2015) The Front and Back Stages of Swedish School Inspection: Opening the Black Box of Judgement, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational research, 59: 1, 58-76.*

Lloyd, M. (1999) 'Performativity, Parody, Politics', in Bell, V. (ed.) (1999) *Performativity and Belonging.* Sage Publications.

Loxley, A., and Seery, A. (2008) 'Some Philosophical and other related issues of insider research', in Sikes, P. and Potts, A. (eds.) (2008) *Researching Education from the Inside: Investigations from Within.* Routledge: London and New York, pp.15-32.

Lumb, A. (2016) *Spirituality in a Church School within a Performance-Driven Culture.* Grove Books Limited.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984) 'The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge (tr. Bennington, G. and Massumi, B.)', in *Theory and History of Literature,* Vol 10. Manchester University Press, pp.1-56.

Merrill, B. and West, L. (2009) *Using Biographical Methods in Social Research.* Sage Publications Ltd.

Miller, G. (1997) 'Building Bridges: The possibility of analytic dialogue between ethnography, conversation analysis and Foucault', in Silverman, D. (ed.) (1997) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* Sage Publications, pp.24-44.

Miller, R. L. (2000) *Researching Life Stories and Family Histories.* Sage Publications.

Miller, P. and Rose, N. (1993) 'Governing Economic Life.' In Gane, M. and Johnson, T. (1993) *Foucault's New Domains.* Routledge.

National Society (2014) *Making a Difference? A Review of Religious Education in Church of England Schools.* Archbishops' Council.

National Society (2005) *Statutory Inspection of Anglican Schools (SIAS).* Archbishops' Council.

National Society (2013) *Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS).* Archbishops' Council.

Nias, J. (1989) *Primary Teachers Talking.* Routledge.

O'Malley, P. (1996) 'Risk and Responsibility', in Barry, A., Osbourne, T., Rose, N. (eds.) (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* UCL Press, pp.189-207.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2017a) *Ofsted News email, Issue 63*. Crown Copyright.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2017b) *School Inspection Handbook*. Crown Copyright.

Olson, K. (2011) *Essentials of Qualitative Interviewing.* Left Coast Press Inc.

Olssen, M. (1999) *Michel Foucault: Materialism and Education.* Bergin & Garvey.

Penninckx, M. and Vanhoof, J. (2015) Insights gained by schools and emotional consequences of school inspections. A review of evidence. *School Leadership & Management, 35:5, 477-501.*

Penninckx, M. and Vanhoof, J., De Maeyer, S. and Van Petegem, P. (2015a) Explaining effects and side effects of school inspections: a path analysis. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice.*

Penninckx, M. and Vanhoof, J., De Maeyer, S. and Van Petegem, P. (2015b) Enquiry into the side effects of school inspection in a 'low stakes' inspection context. *Research Papers in Education, 24 August 2015.*

Perryman, J. (2006) Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes: disciplinary mechanisms and life under special measures. *Journal of Education Policy, 21:2, 147-161.*

Perryman, J. (2009) Inspection and the fabrication of professional and performative processes. *Journal of Educational Policy, 24:5, 611-631.*

Peters, M. A. (2003) Truth-telling as an Educational Practice of the Self: Foucault, Parrhesia and the ethics of subjectivity. *Oxford Review of Education, 29:2, 207-224.*

Pinnegar, S. and Daynes, J. G. (2007) 'Locating Narrative Inquiry Historically: Thematics in the Turn to Narrative', in Clandinin, J. (ed.) (2007) *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology.* Sage Publications, pp.3-34.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988) *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences.* State University of New York Press, Albany.

Prior, L. (1997) 'Following in Foucault's Footsteps: Text and Context in Qualitative Research', in Silverman, D. (ed.) (1997) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* Sage Publications, pp.63-79.

Pritchard, J. (2011) *Education and the Church: into the next 200 years*. General Synod of the Church of England.

Quinn Patton, M. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods, 3rd edition.* Sage Publications.

Ronnberg, L. (2014) Justifying the Need for Control. Motives for Swedish National School Inspection during Two Governments. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 58:4, 385-399.*

Rose, N. (1996) 'Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies', in, Barry, A., Osborne, T., Rose, N. (eds.) (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* UCL Press, pp.37-64.

Sarup, M. (ed.) (1993) *Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism, 2nd edition.* Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Seddon, T. (2000) 'Education: Deprofessionalised? Or Reregulated, Reorganised and Reauthorised?', in Ball, S. (ed.) (2000) *Sociology of Education: Major Themes Vol IV Politics and Policies.* Routledge Falmer, pp.2016-2037.

Segerholm, C. and Hult, A. (2018) Learning from and Reacting to School Inspection – Two Swedish Case Narratives. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 62:1, 125-139.*

Shipway, B. (2011) *A Critical Realist perspective of Education*. Routledge, London and New York

Silverman, D. (ed.) (1997) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice.* Sage Publications.

Silverman, D. (2005) *Doing Qualitative Research, 2nd edition*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Smyth, A. and Holian, R. (2008) 'Credibility issues in research from within organisations', in Sikes, P. and Potts, A. (eds.) (2008) *Researching Education from the Inside: Investigations from Within.* Routledge, London and New York, pp.33-47.

Spielman, A. (2017a) www.gov.uk/government/speeches/hmcis-commentary-october-2017 (accessed 25 November 2017).

Spielman, A. (2017b) https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/hmcis-commentary-october-2017 (accessed 25 November 2017).

Stobart, G. (2008) *Testing Times: The uses and abuses of assessment.* Routledge.

Stuart, M. (1998) 'Writing, the Self and the Social Process', in Hunt, C. and Sampson, F. (eds.) (1998) *The Self on the Page: Theory and Practice of Creative Writing in Personal Development.* Jessica Kingsley Publishers, London and Philadelphia, pp.142-152.

Tardebigge Church of England Voluntary Aided First School (2018) *Admissions Policy.* Available at: https://tardebigge.worcs.sch.uk/about-us/admissions (accessed 6 August 2018).

Trowler, P. (2003) *Education Policy, 2nd edition.* Routledge.

Tullis Owen, J. A., McRae, C., Adams, T. E. and Vitale, A. (2009) Truth Troubles. *Qualitative Inquiry 15:1, 178-200* (originally published online 2 December 2008).

Webster, L. and Mertova, P. (2007) *Using Narrative Inquiry as a research method: an introduction to using critical event narrative analysis in research on learning and teaching.* Routledge.

Whittaker, F. (2018) https://schoolsweek.co.uk/damian-hinds-ascl-2018-conference-speech-the-full-text/ (accessed 13 June 2018).

Winter, R., Buck, A. and Sobiechowska, P. (1999) *Professional Experience and The Investigative Imagination: The Art of reflective writing.* Routledge.

Woozley, A. D. (1949) *Theory of Knowledge.* Hutchinson and Co (Publishers) Ltd.

Worsley, H. J. (2013a) *Anglican Church School Education: Moving Beyond the First Two Hundred Years.* Bloomsbury Academic.

Worsley, H. J. (2013b) *What Motivates Christian Educational Practitioners? Theology as a School Resource.* Grove Books Limited.

Wright Mills, C. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination.* New York, Oxford University Press.

Youdell, B. (2011) *School Teacher: Identity, Power and Politics in Education.* Routledge, London and New York.

Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS)

The Evaluation Schedule for the Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools

2013

Contents

$$\approx$$

Introduction to appendices1 and 2 – denominational character

Appendix 1:
Guidance on Anglican character in schools

Appendix 2:
How effectively does the school, through its Methodist character, have a positive impact on the lives of all learners?

Appendix 3:
Religious Education in Church of England Schools: A Statement of Entitlement from the Board of Education/National Society Council

Introduction

This evaluation schedule sets out the expectations of the National Society and the Methodist Church for the conduct of the Statutory Inspection of Anglican and Methodist Schools (SIAMS) under Section 48 of the Education Act 2005. It incorporates changes in structure and emphasis that reflect current educational practice, broader developments in school inspections and the recommendations as set out in *The Church School of the Future* review (by Dr Priscilla Chadwick) and the Methodist Church Education Commission.

The schedule provides criteria and grade descriptors to support inspectors in evaluating how well the school's distinctive Christian character and values ensure the development and achievement of the *whole* child or young person.

Church schools make up a highly diverse 'family' of institutions across nursery, primary and secondary phases. The SIAMS Framework seeks to evaluate the *impact* that these church schools have on all their learners. Inspectors are expected to interpret the grade descriptors based on the context of each school being inspected. They should take into account the age range of learners and the religious backgrounds represented in the school community.

Descriptors are not intended to be used as a checklist. Inspectors should apply the descriptors in each grade to determine the 'best fit' for the school in the light of evidence collected. This should assist inspectors in building a picture of the school's effectiveness and analysing the reasons for this within the school's provision.

The Schedule applies to Anglican, Methodist and Joint Anglican/Methodist schools. Additional guidance to assist inspectors in the evaluation of the distinctive Anglican and Methodist character of school is provided in Appendices 1 and 2.

The evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the school and of the impact of its Christian character on learners embraces both their academic and personal development. This will include taking into account their achievement. Academic achievement is understood as attainment together with progress from starting points, not simply standards attained. Guidance on the evidence sources for this is provided on p 23 of the Schedule.

Core Questions

The principal objective of the inspection is to evaluate **the distinctiveness and effectiveness of the school as a church school.**

A church school's self-evaluation, verified by inspection, will seek to judge how well the school's distinctive Christian character and values ensure the development and achievement of the *whole* child or young person.

Towards this objective, inspectors should seek answers to four core questions.

1. **How well does the school, through its distinctive Christian character, meet the needs of all learners?**

2. **What is the impact of collective worship on the school community?**

3. **How effective is the religious education?**

4. **How effective are the leadership and management of the school as a church school?**

The order of the core questions is not hierarchical and the same is true for the bullet points in each section of the grade descriptors. Together they provide a basis for evaluation that meets the principal objective.

Voluntary Controlled (VC) schools

Inspectors are required to answer core questions 1, 2 and 4 in evaluating the distinctiveness and effectiveness of VC schools. However, within core question 1, an evaluation should also be made of the contribution made by religious education to the Christian character of the school and the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of learners.

For each core question, the schedule identifies evaluation statements, evidence that inspectors may take into account and grade descriptors.

Inspectors will make a judgement on overall effectiveness using the guidance that follows the core questions.

Christian Character

How well does the school, through its distinctive Christian character, meet the needs of all learners?

This section deals with the achievement of the *whole* child. Achievement is seen in terms of the academic and personal development of all learners, together with their well-being and spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. There is a focus on the Christian character of the school, particularly its Christian values and the impact that they have on this achievement in its widest sense.

Evaluation statements

When judging the impact of the school's Christian character inspectors **must** evaluate:

- how well the Christian character contributes to the academic achievement, personal development and wellbeing of all learners, regardless of their ability or background
- how effectively the Christian character supports the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of all learners whether they are Christian, of other faiths or of none
- how effectively the distinctively Christian character shapes the relationships between all members of the school community
- how well the Christian character promotes an understanding of and respect for diverse communities
- the contribution of religious education to the Christian character of the school

Supporting evidence

Inspectors **may** take account of:

1. **Learners' achievement**
    a. the impact of the school's Christian character on the achievement of individuals and groups and the proportion of learners making expected levels of progress, particularly those that are vulnerable. This should be based on national data and the school's current analysis (see guidance on p 23)
    b. the effectiveness of the school's Christian character in ensuring the highest levels of personal development and well-being
    c. how effectively the school promotes good attendance and addresses issues relating to poor attendance and exclusion and how strategies reflect its Christian character

2. **Christian values**

   a. the extent to which the school's values are distinctively Christian in character, in addition to being shared human values

   b. the extent to which all members of the school community and particularly learners, can make links between the values and Biblical teaching

   c. the school's effectiveness in ensuring that Christian values make a significant impact on the lives of all members of the school community

   d. the extent to which learners are able to recognise that values are important to those of other faith traditions and those of none

3. **Spiritual, moral, social and cultural development**

   a. the breadth of experiences available to all learners through curricular and extra-curricular activities

   b. how well the school offers opportunities for learners to reflect on and respond to beliefs, values and profound human experiences from a range of faith perspectives

   c. the extent to which the opportunities for spiritual, moral, social and cultural development are characterised by distinctively Christian values

   d. how well daily collective worship, religious education and other aspects of the curriculum enable learners to make informed choices which are based on Christian values

   e. the extent to which the school operates as a distinctively Christian community

4. **Relationships**

   a. how well the school fosters positive relationships based on distinctively Christian values between all members of the school community

   b. how well members of the school articulate the link between their behaviour and Biblical teaching

   c. how well the school promotes personal self-esteem, good work attitudes and mutual support based upon its distinctively Christian values

5. **Understanding of and respect for diverse communities**

   a. how well learners understand the role of the Christian church, particularly the Anglican/Methodist church, at a local, national and international level

   b. how well learners understand Christianity as a multi-cultural world faith

c. to what extent learners understand and respect difference and diversity within local, national and global faith communities

6. **Religious education**

   a. the contribution religious education makes to the Christian character of the school

   b. the contribution religious education makes to learners' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development

   c. how well religious education contributes to learners' understanding of and respect for diverse faiths and cultures

Grade Descriptors: Christian Character

Outstanding (1)

- Distinctively Christian values are made explicit and are deeply embedded in the daily life of the school. All members of the school community articulate the distinctively Christian characteristics of the school's values and the significant impact they have on the daily lives and achievements of learners.

- The school's Christian character has a high profile and clearly shapes its approach to issues of attendance and pupil exclusion for all groups of learners.

- There is a highly developed interpretation of spirituality shared across the school community. Learners have regular opportunities to engage in high quality experiences that develop a personal spirituality. They are passionate and confident to express their thoughts and views in considerable depth through a rich variety of styles and media.

- The Christian character and values of the school have a significant impact on the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of all learners.

- The behaviour of learners is of the highest standard and relationships between all members of the school community are consistently attributed to the Christian character and values of the school.

- Learners are fully aware that Christianity is a multi-cultural world faith. They have a high degree of understanding and respect for diversity and difference both within the church and in other faith communities.

- Learners are excited and challenged by religious education. It makes a significant contribution to learners' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and plays a major role in determining the Christian character of the school.

Good (2)

- Distinctively Christian values are clearly expressed. This ensures that most members of the school recognise the distinctive characteristics of the school's values and identify how they affect their daily lives and their achievements.

- The school's Christian character consistently informs its approach to issues of attendance and pupil exclusion for all groups of learners.

- The school has a clear definition of spirituality that is understood by most adults. Experiences are identified in the curriculum, which provide opportunities for learners to explore spirituality. Learners

respond well and are developing the ability to express their thoughts clearly and with confidence.

- The Christian character and values of the school contribute to the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of learners.

- Learners behave well and relationships between all members of the school community are generally linked to the Christian character and values of the school.

- Learners have some understanding of Christianity as a multi-cultural world faith and respect the diversity and difference within other faith communities.

- Learners readily recognise the importance of religious education in their lives. It makes a positive contribution to learners' spiritual moral, social and cultural development and to the Christian character and values of the school.

Satisfactory (3)

- Most members of the school recognise the school's values as distinctively Christian and acknowledge the difference they make to their daily lives and achievement.

- The school's Christian character sometimes informs the way in which it approaches issues of attendance and pupil exclusion.

- There is some understanding of spirituality amongst the school's leaders. Opportunities for spiritual development are not always clearly identified in the curriculum or in other areas of school life. Consequently, learners' ability to respond to these experiences is at an early stage of development.

- The Christian character and values of the school have a limited impact on the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of learners.

- The behaviour of learners is mostly good and relationships between all members of the school community are generally attributed to the Christian character and values of the school.

- Learners have only a basic awareness of Christianity as a multi-cultural world faith and this restricts their understanding of and respect for diversity within the Church.

- Learners have generally favourable views of religious education and acknowledge its importance in their lives. Religious Education contributes, although inconsistently, to learners' spiritual moral, social and cultural development and to the Christian character of the school.

Inadequate (4)

Inspectors should use their professional judgement in making this judgement. The distinctive Christian character of the school may be inadequate if *more than one* of the following apply:

- The school's values are present at an implicit level but very few members of the school community recognise their distinctive Christian characteristics.

- The school's approach to pupil attendance and exclusion is not related to its Christian values and is ineffective.

- There is no clear understanding of spirituality among the school leaders. The school has little idea of how to provide opportunities for spiritual development. Learners show little enthusiasm to engage and respond to experiences for spiritual development and demonstrate a lack of ability to express their thoughts.

- The behaviour of learners is often poor and relationships between some members of the school community fall short of what is expected in a church school.

- Learners have little understanding or respect for diversity and difference within the Church and other faith communities.

- Learners express mixed or negative views of religious education and often fail to see its importance in their lives. Religious education makes a very limited contribution to learners' spiritual moral, social and cultural development and to the Christian character of the school.

Collective Worship

What is the impact of collective worship on the school community?

This section deals with the *impact* of collective worship on *all* members of the school community. It evaluates how the importance of collective worship is demonstrated in the life of the school and how well it develops learners' understanding of Anglican/Methodist traditions and practice. It evaluates the extent to which collective worship makes an important contribution to the overall spiritual development of members of the school community.

Evaluation statements

When judging collective worship, inspectors **must** evaluate:

- the extent to which collective worship is distinctively Christian and central to the life of the school community
- how well collective worship enables the participants to develop an understanding of Jesus Christ and of the Christian understanding of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit
- how well collective worship sets the distinctive values of the school in their Christian context.
- how well the school community, learners and adults, values and engages with collective worship
- the extent to which collective worship is relevant to, and makes a difference to the lives of all members of the school community
- how well collective worship develops personal spirituality within the school community through a range of experiences
- how effectively the school community is involved in the planning, leadership and evaluation of collective worship
- the extent to which opportunities for prayer contribute to the spiritual development of members of the school community

Supporting evidence

Inspectors **may** take account of:

1. The **central attributes of collective worship** and to what extent they:
    a. develop the Christian vision and ethos of the school and contribute to the spiritual, moral, social, and cultural development of participants
    b. ensure worship is relevant to the life experience of the whole school community
    c. ensure worship is engaging, inspiring and transformative

d. provide opportunities to understand and celebrate the religious festivals in the Church's year

2. The **theological basis of collective worship** and the extent to which it:

    a. reflects local Anglican/Methodist traditions and practices, including the Eucharist/ Communion where appropriate

    b. contributes to learners' understanding of Christian theological concepts and beliefs at an appropriate level

    c. reflects the Trinitarian nature of Christianity

    d. gives the Bible a significant place in worship

3. The **key elements of an act of worship** and the extent to which:

    a. the *gathering* for worship is enhanced by, for example, music, actions or symbols and by those leading the worship

    b. the *engagement and encouragement* of participants is grounded in distinctively Christian teaching

    c. *participants respond* in, for example, praise, the use of silence, songs, guided reflection, prayer and also through their actions

    d. those who lead worship provide an appropriate *conclusion* to the act of worship

4. The **leadership and management of worship** and the extent to which:

    a. worship is planned systematically so that there is continuity, variety and clear focus on Christian beliefs and festivals

    b. monitoring, evaluation and planning involves the whole school community and results in improvement

    c. leaders ensure worship is creative, alive and cohesive

    d. worship is inclusive, rooted in the Christian faith, but accessible to all member of the school community whatever their religious background or stage of development

    e. learners regularly encounter a range of leaders, including learners themselves

5. The **centrality of prayer** and the extent to which:

    a. learners understand the nature and purpose of prayer

    b. learners understand the part it may play within an individual's life and in the life of the worshipping community

    c. prayer contributes to the spiritual development of the whole school community

    d. appropriate opportunities are provided for prayer and other worship activities, such as Christian reflection outside collective worship

Grade Descriptors: Collective Worship

Outstanding (1)

- All members of the school community place great value on collective worship and can articulate its place in their school life and what it means to them personally.
- Collective worship has a strong focus on the person of Jesus Christ and learners understand the central position He occupies in the Christian faith.
- Collective worship has a strong focus on God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit and learners can recognize and express this with understanding.
- Collective worship regularly includes Biblical material and learners are able to relate this to the school's core values and their own lives.
- Learners can identify clearly the distinctive features of different Christian traditions in worship particularly local Anglican/Methodist practice.
- Collective worship is inspirational and inclusive. It engages all learners and its impact can be clearly discerned in all parts of the school community's life.
- Themes raise aspirations, inspire a high level of spiritual and moral reflection and challenge learners to take responsibility for their own conduct and charitable social actions expressed in Christian terms.
- All of the key elements of worship are a natural and integral feature of all acts of collective worship wherever they are held and imaginative use is made of a variety of settings.
- Planning ensures that there is both variety and continuity and that themes are rooted in Christian beliefs. Learners develop a secure understanding of the seasons of the Church year and Christian festivals including local celebrations. A range of members from the school community, including local clergy, contribute to planning.
- Monitoring and evaluation have a clear purpose and are managed efficiently. Feedback gathered from a range of stakeholders provides insight into how worship influences the life of the community and leads directly to significant improvement.
- A range of leaders, from different Christian traditions, offers learners a rich experience of worship.
- Learners are confident in planning and leading acts of worship, whether prepared beforehand or spontaneous, and have frequent opportunities to do so.
- Learners understand the value of personal prayer and reflection as part of their own spiritual journey. They seek out opportunities for this in their own lives and contribute confidently and sensitively to prayer in worship.

Good (2)

- Members of the school community see the importance of worship in the life of the school and are able to talk about what it means to them.
- Collective worship often includes teaching about the person of Jesus Christ and learners have an understanding of his important place in worship.
- Learners are aware of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit in worship but their understanding of this is undeveloped.

- Collective worship often includes Biblical material and learners are able to make some links between this and their own lives and to the school's core values.
- Learners have an understanding of different Christian traditions in worship, particularly local Anglican/Methodist practice, though cannot always articulate these fully.

- Most learners recognise the value of worship, respond positively and participate willingly.
- Themes are relevant and pay close attention to learners' spiritual and moral development. In response, learners take some action in the service of others.
- Most of the key elements of worship are present though some are less developed than others. The setting is appropriate and often varies.
- Planning provides a structure that enables learners to encounter Christian beliefs. Worship is related to significant moments in the life of the school and the seasons of the Church. Most Christian festivals are celebrated or acknowledged in the context of worship. There is some contribution from clergy and other members of the school community.
- Regular monitoring and evaluation identifies where improvement is needed and often informs development planning.
- Staff and clergy are regularly involved in planning and leading collective worship with some involvement of other Christian traditions.
- Learners enjoy contributing within collective worship and are increasingly taking responsibility for particular aspects.
- Learners understand the purpose of prayer and reflection in both formal and informal contexts. Many make use of prayer in their own lives and regularly contribute relevant and appropriate prayers to school worship.

Satisfactory (3)

- Collective worship is recognized as important in the life of the school community and is valued. It meets legal requirements but there is no consistent approach to improving the quality of the worship experiences provided.
- Learners have some knowledge of the life of Jesus Christ though his significance in worship is not fully understood.
- Reference is made to God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit on occasions but the significance of this has not been made explicit to learners.
- Collective worship sometimes includes Biblical material but its relation to learners' lives and the school's core values is not always explicit.
- Learners have some understanding of a few different Christian traditions in worship mainly related to local Anglican/Methodist practice and to some Christian festivals.
- Learners behave well, are attentive and respond to the different elements of worship but are often passive.
- Learners regularly experience such elements as song and prayer but there is limited variation in the pattern and setting for collective worship.
- Themes support the school's core values, particularly in the area of moral development. Spiritual development may be more limited

because planning for this is less focused. Occasionally learners are prompted to respond in service to others.

- Planning provides a basic structure for collective worship but insufficient consideration is given to the coherent development of Christian themes. The main Christian festivals are usually included. Responsibility for planning lies with a few members of staff with little involvement from other members of the school community.
- Some feedback on collective worship is gathered that prompts small changes to the arrangements for worship although there is limited analysis of its impact on the school community.
- Collective Worship is mainly led by senior staff and sometimes clergy with occasional contributions from members of other Christian traditions.
- Learners occasionally contribute to leading collective worship but this is not a regular feature.
- Learners are familiar with prayer as a part of the daily life of the school and sometimes contribute written prayers.

Inadequate (4)

Inspectors should use their professional judgement in making this judgement. Collective Worship may be inadequate if *more than one* of the following apply:

- Worship does not hold a distinctive place in the daily life of the school and learners cannot see its importance in their lives. Little monitoring and evaluation of worship occurs and no account is taken of learners' views. There is insufficient impact on improvement.
- Learners show at best half hearted or little response to aspects of worship.
- Neither the place of the person Jesus Christ nor Biblical material are given prominence in worship and the key elements of worship have a low profile and do not support learners in being more fully engaged in worship.
- Learners have limited awareness of different Christian traditions including Anglican/Methodist. The major Christian festivals are celebrated but learners gain little understanding of Christian beliefs and values from worship.
- There is little to raise learners' spiritual awareness or to directly inspire them in the service of others. Prayer and reflection play a limited role in the pattern of school life so learners derive little spiritual benefit.

Religious Education

How effective is the religious education?

This section deals with the way religious education contributes to a church school's Christian character. At the heart of religious education in church schools is the teaching of Christianity, rooted in the person and work of Jesus Christ. As inclusive communities, church schools encourage learning about and learning from other religions and fostering respect for other religions and world views.

Evaluation statements

When judging the effectiveness of the religious education, inspectors **must** evaluate:

- the achievement of learners in religious education
- the quality of teaching and learning in religious education
- the effectiveness of the curriculum in religious education and especially the teaching of Christianity
- the effectiveness of the leadership and management of religious education.

Supporting evidence

Inspectors **may** take account of:

1. **Progress and standards based upon the school's performance data**
    a. standards attained by learners at the end of each key stage
    b. progress for individuals and groups of learners, considering their starting points
    c. how well gaps in performance are narrowing for different groups of learners (where information is available)

2. **Quality of teaching and learning**
    a. teachers' understanding and implementation of high quality religious education teaching over time as evidenced by observation of lessons, the school's own monitoring, other learning activities, discussion with learners and scrutiny of their work
    b. the extent to which learning activities address both learning about and learning from religion and enable learners to acquire and apply knowledge and skills set out in the syllabus for religious education
    c. the extent to which religious education makes a contribution to the distinctively Christian values of the school and to the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of learners

d. the extent to which learners enjoy religious education and are enabled to speak about religious ideas and faith

3. **Quality of the curriculum**

   a. the extent to which the school's syllabus reflects **the National Society Statement of Entitlement for Religious Education** (Appendix 3) and in particular, whether Christianity is the majority study:

      - in Key Stages 1 – 3: at least ⅔ Christianity
      - in Key Stage 4: the study of Christianity will be a significant and substantial part of courses that lead to any public qualification
      - in Key Stage 5: the opportunity to study Christianity at AS and A level

      (NB The Statement of Entitlement does not apply to Methodist schools)

   b. the religious education provision for all students in the sixth form

   c. the proportion of curriculum time dedicated to meeting religious education objectives (5% - 10%)

   d. the extent to which pupil achievement in religious education is equal or better than comparable subjects

   e. the proportion of learners taking a recognised and appropriate qualification at KS 4

4. **Effectiveness of leadership and management of religious education**

   a. the extent to which monitoring of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment leads to an improvement in the performance of learners across the school

   b. the extent to which religious education works with and informs effective teaching and learning across the curriculum

Grade descriptors: Religious Education

Outstanding (1)

- Standards of attainment of all learners are in line with national expectations with a significant number attaining higher than the national average*.

- Attainment is high and progress is rapid in developing an understanding of Christianity and a broad range of religious beliefs.

- In exceptional circumstances, where groups of learners attain below those nationally, the gap is narrowing dramatically over a period of time as shown by attainment data.

- Learners are inspired by the subject and learn exceptionally well. They develop and apply a wide range of higher level skills to great effect in their enquiry, analysis, interpretation, evaluation and reflection of their understanding of the impact of religion on believers.

- Learners are impressive in the way that they use creativity and originality to apply their knowledge and skills in religious education to their own personal reflections on questions of meaning and purpose.

- The majority of teaching is outstanding and it is never less than consistently good.

- Highly effective use of assessment informs teaching and learning in religious education and exemplar evidence demonstrates progress made by learners.

- Religious education has a very high profile within the school curriculum and learning activities provide fully for the needs of all learners.

- The religious education curriculum is rich and varied enabling learners to acquire a thorough knowledge and understanding of the Christian faith through a wide range of learning opportunities.

- The religious education curriculum provides opportunities for learners to understand and to make links between the beliefs, practices and value systems of the range of faiths studied.

- Links with the Christian values of the school and spiritual, moral, social and cultural development are intrinsic to the religious education curriculum and they have a significant impact on learners.

- Rigorous and extensive monitoring and evaluation results in well focused action plans that demonstrably lead to improvement.

- Subject leadership has the highest level of subject expertise and the vision to realise ambitious expectations and improvement.

'National standards' throughout the descriptors for religious education refers to the levels set out in the syllabus adopted by the governors of the school and the extent to which they may reflect the QCA's 8 point scale.

Good (2)

- Standards of attainment for the large majority of learners are at least in line with national expectations and often higher.

- Learners make good progress given their starting points. Or, standards of attainment are average but learners make rapid and sustained progress given their starting points over a period of time.

- In exceptional circumstances overall attainment may be slightly lower than national expectations but with some groups of learners making outstanding progress.

- Learners understand the value of the subject and they mostly learn well. They develop a range of skills including some of the following: enquiry, analysis and interpretation, evaluation and reflection. Learners have a good ability to apply these skills to understanding the impact of religion on believers.

- Learners show originality and creativity in applying their knowledge and skills in religious education and are developing the ability to apply this to questions of meaning and purpose.

- The majority of teaching is good.

- Assessment procedures are in place and these inform planning, teaching and learning.

- Religious education has a high profile within the school curriculum and learning activities are differentiated to meet the needs of different groups of learners.

- Learners display a secure knowledge of many of the key aspects of Christianity and the Bible and the main practices and beliefs of the other faiths and cultures studied.

- Religious education makes a good contribution to the Christian values of the school and to the learners' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development.

- Effective use is made of a range of routine monitoring and evaluation procedures that accurately identify strengths and focus on raising standards that lead to improvement in pupil performance.

- The subject leader effectively communicates expectations to senior leaders, governors and staff about improvement in teaching and learning in religious education and is well informed on current developments in religious education.

Satisfactory (3)

- Standards of attainment for the majority of learners are in line with national expectations.

- Progress is satisfactory with learners making at least comparable progress to national expectations. Or, attainment is low but there is accurate and convincing evidence that progress over a sustained period of time is improving strongly and securely.

- The quality of learning and engagement within the subject are generally good but with some variation in some year groups or key stages.

- Teachers sometimes, though not always, ensure that lessons are structured around the development of skills such as enquiry and reflection.
- Learners have a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of Christianity and some religions and beliefs but their ability to answer questions of meaning and purpose is limited.
- The majority of teaching is satisfactory and there is likely to be some good teaching.
- The religious education curriculum caters for the learning needs of some learners but those needing either reinforcement or more challenging learning activities are not routinely planned for.
- Some assessment takes place but this is inconsistent across year groups and does not always accurately inform future teaching and learning.
- The religious education curriculum offers some opportunities to enhance the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of learners.
- The religious education curriculum offers learners some opportunities to understand the main teachings, beliefs and practices of Christianity and some other world faiths but implementation is inconsistent and is therefore not fully effective. As a result, learners do not have sufficient knowledge or understanding of religions nor of respect between diverse faith communities.
- Religious education has modest links to some aspects of the school's Christian values but these are not made explicit and are not consistently identified in teachers' planning.
- There is regular monitoring of some aspects of religious education and self-evaluation is broadly accurate in identifying priorities for improvement that offer adequate challenge.
- The subject leader is aware of current developments in religious education and incorporates some of these in his/her practice.

Inadequate (4)

Inspectors should use their professional judgement in making this judgement. The effectiveness of RE may be inadequate if *more than one* of the following apply:

- Standards of teaching, learning and assessment are inadequate with the result that standards of attainment and rates of progress, for the majority of learners and groups of learners, are consistently lower than national expectations.
- The religious education curriculum makes little contribution to the Christian values of the school and its promotion of spiritual, moral, social and cultural development is limited.

- Insufficient opportunities exist to develop learners' knowledge and understanding of Christianity or other faiths and the impact on the lives of believers.
- Subject leadership is poor. Procedures for the monitoring and evaluation of religious education are weak and fail to identify essential improvements in teaching and learning.

Leadership and Management

How effective are the leadership and management of the school as a church school?

This section is about the impact of the leadership and management of the school as a church school and the extent to which leaders and managers at all levels, including governors, articulate and promote a distinctive vision for the school that is based upon the Christian character of the school. It is also concerned with the effectiveness of leaders and managers in ensuring that the school's distinctive Christian character has a positive impact on pupil's personal and academic development and the well-being of all members of the school community.

In the following section 'leaders and managers' refers to school leaders, managers and governors.

Evaluation statements

When judging the effectiveness of leadership and management, inspectors **must** evaluate:

- the extent to which leaders articulate an explicit Christian vision that has an impact on:
    a. standards of achievement
    b. the distinctively Christian character of the school
    c. the well-being of all the whole school community
- if the arrangements for religious education and collective worship meet statutory requirements
- the extent to which school leaders secure the impact of this vision through evaluation and strategic planning
- how well leaders prepare for future leadership across church schools
- the effectiveness of partnerships with the local church, the deaneries, the diocese/district and the wider community, including the parents and carers

Supporting evidence

Inspectors **may** take account of:

1. **Christian vision**
    a. how well an explicit Christian vision is articulated and implemented
    b. the impact of the Christian vision on the achievement of all learners including the effectiveness of leaders in helping learners to overcome educational, social and economic disadvantage

c.   how well leaders promote the well–being of all learners, particularly their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development, through a broad and distinctive curriculum in addition to worship and religious education

2.   **Evaluation and strategic planning**
   a.   the impact of monitoring and evaluation on the school's Christian character

   b.   how well governors hold leaders to account for the school's effectiveness as a church school
   c.   the extent to which leaders enable all members of the school community to contribute to and understand the development and implementation of the school's distinctively Christian vision

   d.   the implementation and effectiveness of improvement plans related to the distinctive Christian characteristics of the school

   e.   the extent to which the issues in 'Focus for development' from the last inspection have been addressed and in a manner that has brought about positive outcomes for the learners

3.   **Future leadership of church schools**
   a.   the effectiveness of professional development in enhancing the Christian character of the school
   b.   the effectiveness of preparation for the future leadership of church schools by the implementation of an appropriate programme of staff development
   c.   the extent to which the National Society Statement of Entitlement for Religious Education is implemented, in particular:
      ▪   priority given to staff expertise and specialist qualifications in religious

         education
      ▪   priority given to professional development in religious education
      ▪   the level of resourcing for religious education

4.   **Partnership with key stakeholders**
   a.   the extent to which leaders and managers form partnerships and engage with the Church in parish, diocesan/district, national and global communities in a way that enriches the lives of learners
   b.   the effectiveness of the incumbent/minister/chaplain/youth worker in supporting individuals and developing the distinctive Christian character of the school
   c.   the effectiveness of parental engagement and contribution to school life

NB Good intentions and an aspirational outlook or a recent change of headteacher following a period of poor leadership do not in themselves provide sufficient proof of the capacity for sustained improvement.

Grade Descriptors: leadership and management

Outstanding (1)

- Leaders and managers consistently and confidently articulate, live out and promote a vision rooted in distinctively Christian values.

- Leaders and managers readily articulate the impact of explicit Christian values on the lives of learners and on the whole life of the school.

- Leaders and managers have a thorough understanding of the school's performance and distinctiveness based on effective and insightful self-evaluation.

- Self-evaluation involves all groups in the school community. It leads directly and convincingly to effective strategies for improvement and maintains a strong focus on meeting the needs of all learners.

- Leaders and managers ensure that the whole curriculum is informed by a distinctive Christian vision that contributes well to pupil behaviour and attitudes as well as their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development.

- Parents, the local church, the diocese/district and the wider community contribute fully to school life so that there is mutual and substantial benefit for all groups including their understanding of local, national and global communities.

- The development of all staff and governors as leaders in church schools is planned strategically with substantial benefits for the current leadership of the school.

- The leadership of worship and RE is given a high priority and this leads to highly effective practice in both areas.

Good (2)

- Leaders and managers articulate and promote a vision based on distinctively Christian values.

- Leaders and managers clearly describe the impact of Christian values on the learners and on the whole life of the school.

- Leaders and managers have a good understanding of the school's performance and distinctiveness based on the school's self-evaluation strategies.

- Self-evaluation strategies lead directly to the school's improvement planning. As a result, achievement and distinctiveness have improved or previous good performance has been consolidated for all groups of learners.

- Leaders and managers ensure that collective worship, RE and aspects of the curriculum are informed by distinctive Christian values that contribute to learners' good behaviour and attitudes together with their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development.

- Parents, the local church, the diocese/district and the wider community contribute fully to school life in such a way that there are

- clear benefits for learners, including their understanding of local, national and global communities.
- Effective use is made of opportunities that arise for the development of staff and governors as leaders in church schools, with clear benefits for the current leaders.
- The leaders of worship and RE are given good support in fulfilling their roles and this has enabled them to bring about improvements or maintain the previous good practice.

Satisfactory (3)

- Leaders and managers provide a concerted approach to the distinctiveness and effectiveness of the school as a church school although this is not driven by a clearly developed Christian vision.
- Leaders and managers have some awareness of the impact of distinctively Christian values on some aspects of school life although they are not clear about the difference they make across the whole school community.
- Leaders and managers articulate the school's priorities as a church school although the links between this and the school's self-evaluation are not always understood and do not always lead to improvement. Consequently, not all learners progress as well as they might and the school's distinctive character is not fully developed.
- Worship, RE and other aspects of the curriculum are based upon Christian values but these values are present at an implicit rather than explicit level. As a result, whilst learners recognise the school as a church school, they are not always able to recognise the impact that this has on their spiritual, social, moral and cultural development and on their well-being.
- Parents, the church, the diocese/district and the wider community contribute to school life but this is not always on a regular or sustained basis and this limits the benefit to learners and their understanding of local, national and global communities.
- The school provides some opportunities for the identification and development of staff and governors as leaders of church schools.
- The improvement strategies adopted by the leaders of worship and RE, whilst having some positive impact, are not sufficiently rigorous to bring about sustained improvement.

Inadequate (4)

Inspectors should use their professional judgement in making this judgement. The effectiveness of leadership and management may be inadequate *if more than one* of the following apply:

- One or more of the aspects from 'Focus for development' in the last inspection report have not been addressed in a way that has brought about improvement.

- Leaders and managers do not have a coherent vision or strategic plan for the distinctiveness and effectiveness of the school as a church school.

- Self-evaluation strategies are insufficiently rigorous to bring about improvements in pupil achievement, well-being or spiritual, moral, social and cultural development.

- The school's relationships with the diocese/district, church, parents and the wider community is weak and make little impact on learners' understanding of local, national and global communities.

- The leadership of the school does not ensure that worship or RE have sufficiently high profile in the school. As result both are no better than satisfactory and show little sign of improvement. Arrangements for RE and collective worship may not meet statutory requirements.

Summary Judgement

When evaluating the distinctiveness and effectiveness of the school as a church school inspectors will consider judgements on the four core questions.

- how well the school, through its distinctive Christian character, meets the needs of the needs of all learners

- the impact of worship on the school community

- the effectiveness of religious education

- the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the school as a church school

The school's effectiveness must also be considered in the light of the requirement that a school 'should enable every child to flourish in their potential as a child of God' (Chadwick). This will include not only their spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and their well-being but also their academic development. Sources of evidence for this judgement may include:

- the Ofsted report on the school if it is recent (within 12 months of the SIAMS inspection)

- an analysis of learners' current achievement produced by the school

- external analyses of the school's performance provided by the DfE, RAISE on line, local authority or the diocese (Data Dashboard)

- any other relevant school data such as post-16 provision, exclusion information, attendance data, attainment on entry, mobility of cohorts

Outline Guidance

- Where a school is in an Ofsted category it is unlikely that the grades for Overall Effectiveness and Core Question 1 will be higher than satisfactory.

- Where the most recent Ofsted inspection was less than a year ago it is unlikely that the SIAMS overall judgement and the judgement for Core Question 1 will be more than one grade different from Ofsted's most recent judgement for Overall Effectiveness

NB Inspectors should be aware that a school judged as outstanding by Ofsted will not necessarily be outstanding under SIAMS judgements. Inspectors should examine evidence for the distinctive elements of a church school, which will not all be included in the remit of an Ofsted inspection.

APPENDICES

Introduction to Appendices 1 and 2

Appendix 1: Guidance on the Anglican character of schools

Appendix 2: How effectively does the school, through its Methodist character, have a positive impact upon the lives of all learners?

Appendix 3: Religious Education in church schools – a Statement of Entitlement.

INTRODUCTION TO APPENDICES 1 AND 2
DENOMINATIONAL CHARACTER

The appendices in this section which relate to distinctive features of Anglicanism and Methodism have been agreed independently by each denominational body; The National Society Council and the Methodist Academies and Schools Trust. This accounts for the slightly different format of each appendix.

The appendices are *not intended to be treated as another layer of evaluation.* Rather they set out to provide schools and inspectors with guidance on some of the features which characterise each denomination and which learners may encounter in their schools.

The Evaluation Schedule includes particular references to denominational features, for example:
- *How well learners understand the role of the Christian church, particularly Anglican/Methodist Church, at a local, national and international level (Core question 1)*
- *The extent to which collective worship reflects Anglican/Methodist traditions and practices, including Eucharist/Communion where appropriate (Core question 2)*
- *The extent to which leaders and managers form partnerships and engage with the Church in parish, diocesan/district, national and global communities in a way that enriches the lives of learners (Core question 4)*

It is hoped that this guidance will help inform inspection judgements across these core questions.

In using the guidance the following should be taken into account:

- The guidance is not prescriptive. Rather it provides pointers to areas schools may explore as part of their denominational distinctiveness.

- Schools and inspectors will need to take into account the age of learners in considering the way the school engages them with denominational aspects.

- Schools and inspectors will need to respect the particular character, tradition and practice of the church to which the school is linked. There is great variety in Anglican practice, particularly in aspects of liturgy. The local church will be the main point of contact. It will be important for inspectors to use professional judgement because of the different ways schools interpret their Anglican, Methodist or joint status.

Appendix 1
Guidance on the Anglican character of schools

In the past inspectors have often asked: 'What is meant by Anglican tradition and practice? What might we expect to see in a school?' This appendix is offered to schools and inspectors as guidance on some of the features which characterise Anglicanism and which learners may encounter in their schools. It is not intended to be treated as another layer of evaluation but rather 4 areas to consider supported by more detailed explanation.

Inspectors and schools may explore:

- The ways in which the school lives out a consistent *narrative* ('Christian story') at all levels of its life which express a lively Christian character based on the Anglican tradition of the interplay of Scripture, Tradition and Reason.

- The effectiveness of the partnership and sense of *belonging* between the school, its Parish and Diocese and the opportunities offered by the school for learners to encounter the worldwide Anglican family. This starting point for this will be the particular local context of the parish church and the school.

- Learners' knowledge and experience of a range of characteristics distinctive of being *rooted* in the Anglican tradition. e.g. the parish system (a church called to serve all in its locality); the valuing of sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion); the use of common liturgical structure and some common texts in worship (e.g. The Lord's Prayer); the ordering of ministry (bishops, priests, deacons and the ministry of lay people).

- Ways in which learners are offered appropriate opportunities to participate in the mission of the worldwide Church and in the wider community (e.g. social action and charities, ecological awareness, consideration of peace and justice issues).

Additional guidance:

- Anglican belief holds that the Holy Scriptures 'contain all things necessary to salvation' and that its common faith can be summarised in the historic Creeds (especially, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds). So knowledge and understanding of the Bible and the Creeds may be communicated *at appropriate levels* to pupils.

- Learners' experience worship which is part of the heartbeat of the school. Worship should draw on the liturgical richness of the Anglican tradition through clear and consistent structure. Pupils may be given opportunities to develop a simple vocabulary of inherited liturgical texts at levels appropriate to their age (e.g. The Lord's Prayer, simple Responses, Collects and 'Classic' prayers) and understand some of the symbolism used in worship.

- Pupils may explore and, preferably, be afforded opportunities to experience the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion in ways that they can learn from them as well as about them. There should be a sense not just of the rituals themselves, but of their significance in the life of the Church and its members and, where appropriate, to their own lives.

- Pupils may be given opportunities to learn from the past and those who have trodden the path of faith before them. They might do this through learning of prominent Anglicans (e.g. William Wilberforce, Mary Williams, Joshua Watson, Mary Sumner, Desmond Tutu); or Anglican projects (e.g. The Children's Society, Church Urban Fund, 'CMS' and USPG' – now known as 'Us'); through discovering the story of a local church, saint or Christian person who has contributed to their own community; or through dialogue with older members of their own parish family.

- Pupils may be introduced to the various ways in which ministry is expressed in the living church and to the idea that all can have a part to play, regardless of age or status. There will be opportunities to encounter clergy and to learn of the role of the Bishop and Diocese (perhaps including a chance to visit their Cathedral where that is practicable).

- Pupils may develop an understanding of the Church of England's vocation to serve the whole community in every locality. Examples include local provision for Weddings and Funerals for all who seek them and other civic occasions in which the Church is seen to play a pivotal role. At a national level pupils may develop some knowledge of the Church's involvement in national events such as coronations, royal weddings, national thanksgivings etc. arising from its role as the Established Church.

The following may provide helpful background information:

'Understanding Church Schools: Ideas for Today from Joshua Watson's Founding Vision)' (2012) by Tim Elbourne   (Grove Booklets)

'The Lambeth Quadrilateral' (1886) which sets out four key articles for Anglicanism (www.msgr.ca/msgr-3/lambeth_quadrilateral.htm)

'Going for Growth- Transformation for children, young people and the Church' (2010) especially section 3 (.

'The Church School of the Future Review'' Chadwick) (2012) especially chapter 3

Agreed by the National Society Council. February 2013

.

APPENDIX 2

How effectively does the school, through its Methodist character, have a positive impact upon the lives of all learners?

This section deals with the Methodist character of the school and the way in which this distinctive character has an impact on the achievement, personal development and well-being of all learners and the overall Christian character of the school.

Evaluation Statements

When judging the impact of the school's Methodist character, inspectors must evaluate:

- Learners' knowledge and understanding of the life and teaching of John Wesley and the way in which this influences the lives of people today

- the extent to which worship develops learners understanding of Methodist traditions and practice in the present day

- The effectiveness of the partnership between the school, the local church and circuit and the community

- The effectiveness of leaders and managers - including governors, the minister and chaplain - in promoting, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's Methodist character

Supporting Evidence

Inspectors may take account of:

- Learners' understanding of the life and influence of John Wesley and its implications for Methodists today – in particular, the inclusive nature of Methodism and its assurance of God's love for all

- children's understanding of the meaning of "covenant" and commitment and its place within the Methodist tradition – as seen in the covenant service and the Methodist membership card

- children's understanding of 'community'' within the Methodist church – as seen in mutual support and pastoral concern between members

- children's understanding of the local, national and international dimensions of Methodism – in, for example, social action, mission and the lay preacher system

- children's experience of the Methodist tradition of singing – knowing that songs and hymns are often used to express firmly held beliefs

- the extent to which learners appreciate the importance of young people in Methodism today – e.g. the Methodist Assembly and Youth President

- children's understanding of the way in which the design of Methodist churches expresses the beliefs of its members and the traditions of Methodism

- the effectiveness of the Methodist minister/chaplain and the local church and circuit in influencing the life and ethos of the school community

- the effectiveness of governors in promoting, monitoring and evaluating the distinctive Methodist character of the school (e.g. commitment, service, putting others first, community, pastoral care, social action, justice, participation of young people, valuing all)

Agreed by the Methodist Academies and Schools Trust February 2013

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN CHURCH OF ENGLAND SCHOOLS
A Statement of Entitlement from the
Board of Education/National Society Council

This statement is intended as a guide for all involved in church schools and academies ensuring the teaching and learning of RE is treated with the importance and delivered with the excellence it deserves. It includes aims, outcomes, teaching and learning about Christianity, teaching and learning about other faiths and world views, curriculum balance, curriculum time, staff and outcomes for pupils. These areas raise the important issues for policy making for schools and dioceses. They can be used with parents and staff to promote understanding of the value of RE as well as to support curriculum development and syllabus writing where appropriate.

Education and mission

1. The General Synod motion of 1999 affirmed that Church of England schools stand at the heart of the mission of the Church to the nation. This was followed by the Dearing Report *The Way Ahead*, which looked in detail at how this was to be exemplified in the life of the schools.
2. *Going for Growth* (endorsed by General Synod in 2010) examined the work of the church with children and young people within the mission framework. The final Action Points have significant application to schools, especially the first:
   "*the Church at national, diocesan and local level is called to work towards every child and young person having a life enhancing encounter with the Christian faith and the person of Jesus Christ*" (5.2)
3. The mission imperative was clearly stated at the first meeting of the National Society in 1811, when the commitment to set up Church of England schools across the nation was undertaken specifically so that "the national religion (should be) the foundation of national education".
4. Consistent with this understanding of mission church schools put spiritual development at the heart of the curriculum. All members of the school community should experience Christianity through the life of the schools, as well as through the taught curriculum

Religious Education

5. Religious Education is central to this understanding of education and mission.
   The aims of Religious Education **in church schools** are:
    • To enable pupils to encounter Christianity as the religion that shaped British culture and heritage ad influences the lives of millions of people today
    • To enable pupils to learn about the other major religions, their impact on culture and politics, art and history, and on the lives of their adherents
    • To develop understanding of religious faith as the search for the expression of truth
    • To contribute to the development of pupils' own spiritual/philosophical convictions, exploring and enriching their own faith and beliefs.

6. The outcomes for pupils at the end of **their** education in church schools are that they are able to:
    • Think theologically and explore ultimate questions
    • Reflect critically on the truth claims of Christian belief
    • Develop the skills to analyse, interpret and apply the Bible text
    • Recognise that faith is a particular way of understanding and responding to God and the world
    • Analyse and explain the varied nature and traditions of the Christian community
    • Make a well informed response to Christianity
    • Respect those of all faiths in their search for God
    • Reflect critically on areas of shared belief and practice between different faiths
    • Enrich and expand their understanding of truth
    • Reflect critically and express their views on the human quest and destiny

Teaching and Learning Christianity

7. Christianity should be the majority study in RE n every school. In church schools that should be clearly adhered to. Understanding Christianity as a living religion is the foundation of pupils' Religious Education in schools. It is important that this draws on the richness and diversity of Christian experience in the breadth of its Anglican and other denominational forms, and in the variety of worldwide forms. The encounter must be an open one which stems from and instils respect for different views and interpretations and in which real dialogue and education takes place. Pupils will be enabled to deepen their understanding of God as encountered and taught by Christians.

Teaching and learning about other faiths and world views

8. Church schools have a duty to foster an accurate and increasing understanding of world religions and world views. As a result, pupils will gain greater insight into the world in which they are growing up. They will also be able to appreciate the faith of others and develop a deeper understanding of their own beliefs and practices. These outcomes must contribute to harmonious relationships within and between communities, promoting social inclusion and combating prejudice.

Curriculum balance

9. Christianity will form the majority study in all church schools
   • KS 1 – 3 at least 2/3 Christianity
   • KS 4 the study of Christianity will be a significant and substantial part of any public qualification
   • KS 5 the opportunity to continue the study of Christianity at As and A level

Curriculum time

10. Sufficient dedicated curriculum time, meeting explicitly RE objectives, however organised, should be committed to RE. Normally this should be between 5% and 10%.

Staffing

11. It should be a priority in church schools to build up staff expertise in RE
    • At least one member of staff should have specialist RE qualifications
    • All teachers teaching RE to have appropriate professional development
    • RE to have equal status with other core subjects in staffing, responsibility and resourcing

Outcomes for pupils

12. Pupil achievement in RE should equal or be better than comparable subjects, and all pupils should take a recognised and appropriate qualification at KS 4

Margaret James Thesis Appendix 2: Three Dimensional Narrative Inquiry Space Template for Data Analysis

Temporality

T1:   What are the temporal elements of the story? Is there a discernible timeline? What does this look like?

T2:   How can the story be divided into past, present and future? What is the place of hindsight in this?

T3:   Do issues of power and authority have any pattern of influence along this timeline? How? And what does this look like at different critical points in the story?

T4:   Does personal faith play a part at different times and in critical incidents along the timeline of the story? If so, how?

T5:   How have ideas of self and other changed over time in the story?

T6:   What is the pattern and influence of performativity over time and at different times in the story? Where does this come from?

T7:   What part has the Church of England in education played over time as a performative influence?

Sociality

S1:   Who are the key people/influences in the story? What does the influence look like and what difference does it make?

S2:   Where does this influence come from?

S2a: Personal faith?

S2b: Personal values?

S2c: Family?

S2d: Friends?

S2e: Professional colleagues or expectations within school?

S2f: Professional expectations from external agencies?

S3:   How do key players change over the course of the story and why?

S4:   Who are the members of the current 'cast'? What part are they playing in the now of the story?

S5:   What does the participant as 'self' look like as a member of the current cast? How strong are they? What is their influence? How does this differ from their earlier self?

S6: Is there any influence of or link with the Church of England vision for education? What kind of character is this in the story?

S7: What is the influence of my own presence and positionality in the story? Are there issues of power/authority in this? What are they and what difference does this make?

Place

P1: What are the dominant professional settings over the course of the story?

P2: How does home play a part in the story?

P3: Is there a sacred place, ie a place of worship, which is influential at different stages of the story? If so, what is it and what impact does it have?

P4: What impact do the participants think that these settings have on the story?

P5: What impact does the researcher think that these settings have on the story?

The interview took place in H1's office at XXXX Primary school. It was my second visit as the first time H1 had wanted to talk through the research project and what I wanted from him. The atmosphere was relaxed. We sat opposite each other on comfortable chairs and we were not interrupted.

MJ: I know that we talked it through when I came in the other day, but what would be really helpful, and really for it to take as long as you want it to take, there's no set anything. But what I am really interested in is the story of why you um are doing the job you are doing, here, now really. Why were you a teacher, why are you a head, why working in church schools, why here, um, what's your passion for education really. That kind of thing. It's just that it's your story really. I'll make some notes if that's alright. In a way I don't need to but I think it just helps me to focus and not stare at you the whole time (laughs). And then I'll transcribe this sometime, I don't know, the summer holidays probably. Thank you.

H1: Where do I start…well… **(T1, T2)**

MJ: Wherever you think it starts, I suppose.

H1: I suppose the reason I began teaching, I didn't set out to become head of a church school…I …like most people when you qualify you just want a job **(T1, T2)** and um whatever school you go into if it's a church school or a community school or a primary school …a free school or whatever it is um you just want to get started. And when you get your foot into the door then your career path takes...takes you in different directions I suppose. But in saying that I've been in I think my 6th school and um I've worked in 5 church schools. **(T5)**

MJ: Wow (laughs)

H1: Yeah.

MJ: There's a pattern there (laughs)

H1: There's a pattern there. Yeah... um. Starting in D Primary school, that was my first one. That was a church school. (T1, T2)

MJ: Yeah

H1: Um and um which was a wonderful experience. That was in 1988. So I qualified '87 and my first proper job was in January '88 in D. I had a term, an old term, in supply before I got a job, **(T1, T2)** which I learned more in that term than I did in anything else. Yeah, it was really good.

MJ: Yeah

H1: **And just experiences from then I suppose which led me to want to become a headteacher um I think frustrations as a teacher thinking 'I could do that'. (T2, T3, T5)**

MJ: Hmm

H1: I could do that I could do that better. Um or I'd like to have a chance at doing that. If you remember **back in the old days we had the old A and B scales...**

MJ: Oh yeah I remember that

H1: You remember. And I was in F I think, F Juniors...

MJ: Ah ha

H1: Um I remember being overlooked for an A allowance by someone who I just felt was contributing not very much in the school. I remember being very frustrated and that spurred me on... (T2, T5)

MJ: Ah that's interesting...

H1: ...to um you know look for courses that were for middle management. And **um I very quickly got the deputy headship of B... (T3)** um which was an experience um...because the head there, he was fantastic, but he was an old fashioned style head...

MJ: Yeah

H1: And um...ah yeah and it just worked out tha**t things were going very wrong at school and Ofsted came along and had him removed during Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week...(T1, T2)**

MJ: Oh gosh

H1: It was an extraordinary experience...

MJ: Wow

H1: thing to happen...um... **and just the next 18 months I was the acting head there...(T1, T3)**

MJ: Goodness

H1: that sort of period.

MJ: And what was that like? How was that for you?

H1: I look back on it and it was ...**quite a learning curve for me because I'd only been doing deputy headship for about 2 years (T5)** and I knew that there were...I knew the head wasn't moving forward...

MJ: Yeah

H1: He was a great head for children but he wasn't a paperwork person as it were...

MJ: Ok yes

H1: And it was very much needed and I felt I was a ...I recognised myself that I could do the paperwork better...

MJ: Right yeah

H1: Better, you know and I was prompting him to do things and he wouldn't do them and such like and **when Ofsted came in the county had already known that... the county when I got the job county warned me that they were watching him ...(T1, T3)**

MJ: Right

H1: Yes I was called into SH...

MJ: Oh goodness

H1: Yes and I yes yes and JS...

MJ: Yeah

H1: **J took me aside and said that er she gave me her phone number in case I ever needed her you know...(T1, T3)**

MJ: Oh goodness...so you were going into something then weren't you?

H1: Yeah yeah... Um but he was (coughs) he was a church goer and he was a wonderful church school head...

MJ: Ok

H1: He had all the values there...you know...um... and it was very hard in that sense...

MJ: Yes

H1: Um...to ...yeah I didn't want to be critical because I could see his heart was there and ...**but education was moving forward and forward and forward you know and in the next 18 months I put everything into it too much if you like because at the end of 18 months when a new head came I had er... my breakdown I had... (T2, T5, T6)**

MJ: Oh ok

H1: **I had 9 months off (T1)**

MJ: Right

H1: Um...I think through exhaustion...um and it just left...you know the whole effort of you know trying to put the school right... you know... and it was successful you know...

MJ: Ok right

H1: **Er I look back very proud of that time and um...(T2, T5)**

MJ: It took its toll on you...

181

H1: It took its toll. And er I didn't realise how much it was**...I mean I was ....er...at one point I was resenting having holidays and being home... it was er...it took over my life and I didn't see it happening...(T2, T5)**

MJ: Ok yeah

H1: I mean my [spouse] was seeing it happen but just let me go with it but one day I just...collapsed...I just....I was in the kitchen and I forgot how to make a cup of tea... **(T2 T5)**

MJ: Goodness...

H1: My [spouse] said 'Look you've got to go and see a doctor because you're um x, y and z and I hadn't noticed…

MJ: You hadn't noticed…

H1: You know**. I went to the doctor and he just signed me off you know...(T1 T3)**

MJ: Yeah it was frightening for you I would imagine

H1: Yeah... yeah it was um…

MJ: Did that put you off headship? It had taken…you had given it so much and it had taken…

H1: Hmm…

MJ: …so much from you...

H1: Did it put me off…? It didn't. Um because um I felt frustrated…

MJ: Still...

H1: Yeah**. I felt frustrated that…and it took me about 2 years to get my first headship after that proper…I went back as a deputy and …(T1 T3 T5)**

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: There was a new fantastic head at B, M, and she was a fantastic head and we got on really well and um... …**but my anxiety was still there because I went for interviews which I should have walked and …(T5)**

MJ: Yeah…

H1: **and I didn't get them. And I think that caused more anxiety…(T2 T5)**

MJ: I'm sure...yes

H1: Um and yeah um... but **then I got the headship at I um….(T1 T3)**

MJ: What made you keep going then when it was draining so much out of you? What was in you do you think?

H1: I was…**I still felt I could do the job really well. I believed. (T5)** That was what I wanted to do.

MJ: Right

H1: Um... **when I look back on what had happened at B...we had turned things around...(T2)**

MJ: yeah...

H1: **we had had a good church inspection as well and I was a part of that um... and...so then when I began applying for jobs I couldn't understand why I wasn't getting them, y'know...(T2 T3)**

MJ: Hmm

H1: And because my desire to become a head to a certain extent meant that when I went for interviews I was too nervous...

MJ: Yeah

H1: and that sometimes came across...

MJ: Ok yeah

H1: Um...I'd walk away and think, you know...what I should do next...(laughs)

MJ: Did it make you more frustrated...?

H1: Yeah

MJ: Yeah

H1: Yeah...um... **but then I got I and the rest is history then(T1)**...wonderful church school...got on with the vicar there straight away um and you know, I felt it was very much a team with her and felt that this was the environment that I felt comfortable with and I... er...**before I hadn't had any preference ...really...(T2 T7)**

MJ: and **that was the time...**

H1: **Really. And that was the point when I was nearly...I applied for a non-church school headship(T1 T2)** and um it was in the centre of G and I went in and you know they make you do an assembly...so I did that and I put candles out and I did my assembly...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: And I didn't get the job and I was speaking to the adviser afterwards and this was a county primary school, a normal county primary school, and she asked me why I had a candle in the worship and I...I sort of...was aghast... why she had asked that question…

MJ: Yeah...

H1: She wasn't impressed by it at all…

MJ: So your head was already in the church school space without you even realising it...

H1: Yeah. But I was also really taken aback why this adviser you know, the school adviser, was questioning it and also the governors hadn't liked it or...

MJ: No...

H1: Didn't feel that it was relevant to what I was doing…**and and then I thought I had a lucky escape then from that school because I would have really come up against real um barriers in that school…**(T2 T5 T7)

MJ: Yeah

H1: I know it wasn't a church school but that's no reason not um you know to have spirituality…

MJ: No no

H1: in education and and I said **I mean…I was so aghast…I'll never forget it…you know…it really stayed with me…**(T4 T7)

MJ: So it was an important moment...

H1: It was yeah. Um... and so um then the job at U came along. **I spent 8 very happy years there. And then the opportunity here came along.**(T3)

MJ: So …that moment in the community school interview...was that when you thought 'hang on I am a church school person here'? (laughs)

H1: I realised... I probably realised more so than anybody else...I mean I always look…there were always headships coming up and I went to look at them... I would walk around schools um... whether they were a church school or a non-church school you just get a feel for the school… and there were some…some schools you would go in and just feel ...felt the anxiety of the school and there was non-religious… you could tell from the head and the way that he or she ran the school...

MJ: Right…

H1: You know... and I'd go away thinking 'well I'm not applying for that one' you know... um **and so I had that feeling of ethos of a Church of England school right early on... now I er I reflect on it because I didn't really realise it at the time…**(T7)

MJ: No...

H1: **Not perhaps until I had had that experience.**

MJ: Yeah

H1: And so…yeah…I suppose that's …it was that point which steered me to…I'm more comfortable as head of a church school.(T5 T7) um… because I didn't want to put up with that kind of…I won't say ignorance but but but…that anxiety that I think...I think I would pick up I had to fight that…

MJ: Yeah

H1: as well with governors you know...

MJ: And there was something very strong there clearly that they didn't get that was very important…that you viewed as being very important in education…

H1: Yes that's right...

MJ: Ideologically almost you would be very different...

H1: Yes... I just got the feeling that the whole governing body didn't see it because they were just... they had discussed it with the adviser and in her feedback...

MJ: So it wouldn't have been a very good for for you (laughs)...

H1: No it wouldn't have been a good fit...no. It wouldn't…yeah yeah yeah…

MJ: So what is it in you that makes you want to be the head... be the leader?

H1: um...

MJ: Because you did…you came out of a torrid time and continued to pursue that when in some ways if you hadn't…if you'd said 'I'll stay as the deputy' things might have been less anxious for you, mightn't it? But clearly there was a drive within you…

H1: Yes yeah…

MJ: that wouldn't let that happen.

H1: Yeah…um…it's hard to define… that's a hard question to answer really…I think…I… I… I dunno**…all the way through my younger days I was always chosen to be the captain of a team…I was never the best player… (laughs)…um… but um… when I was at university we played juke ball and in my 2nd year I was captain of the juke ball team… you know… and far better players played than me…I just…I just…**(T2 T5)

MJ: There was something in you…

H1: **There was something in me that I had never really recognised that I want…I just want to be um at the heart of things… I don't want to be told how to do things…**(T3)

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: I s'pose this thing about academies you know one of my greatest fears is that we come under an academies' trust that just starts telling me how to run my school...

MJ: Ok... Yeah

H1: And that is…that is something that is at the back of my mind...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: I'm trying to get across to the governors that that makes me uncomfortable...

MJ: Hmm hmm…

H1: **and because er coming here I was able to do what I wanted to do to a certain extent** (T3 T5 T6)

MJ: yeah...

H1: ...having recognised that the...the er issues...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: er I feel that when I was applying for headships I was never going for the Outstanding schools I was always always looking for the schools that had problems...

MJ: Ok yes right hmm hmm...

H1: I felt there was something in me that I could turn things around. I have a vision more so than the average person has got...I'm blowing my own trumpet here...

MJ: No no that's fine...

H1: **When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? Why can't the headteacher see that?'...and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only way of answering that I suppose is to become the head and...and stand by ...stand by...what I thought...what my beliefs were...**(T2 T3 T4 T5)

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: You know and I know that that head was obviously a very good head...

MJ: Yes...

H1: and and and they were doing a hard job and there's 99 things that they were trying to juggle at the same time which I perhaps I didn't understand at the time...

MJ: Hmm...

H1: ...I still...I still had that belief you know and the same when my...my... you know my children growing up and playing football for F or for wherever it was somehow umm...um...I ended up coaching the teams... you know and and the way they played...I played differently from other teams... um...because I could I could see that by playing that certain way you could win...because the age of the children were coping with that way of football and ....little things like that I could see in things...

MJ: yes...

H1: that other people, other coaches who were very experienced perhaps more experienced than me, couldn't see...and... I think that's one of the reasons why I was frustrated as a deputy...

MJ: yeah...

H1: **or um if I'd stayed in the classroom I would have been frustrated that's why I needed to lead a school...(T2 T3)**

MJ: Hmm...hmm...yeah...

H1: Perhaps if I went...if I wasn't a teacher I'd have been wanting to lead something in whatever other job I wanted to do...

MJ: Yes...ok...

H1: You know...

MJ: So the passion is to lead isn't it?

H1: Yeah... but without being all singing all dancing and telling...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: people what to do all the time because that's um...that's not my style...I recognise things and um usually work out the problem or um my way and um hopefully people go with that. **And um are I have found that the majority of the time people have done you know...I mean when I took over...that day I took over at B...(T3)** the first day the inspector was in it was um it was Mr G, do you remember him?

MJ: No...

H1: **It was... he was a quite big name in the county and he had to ring up Ofsted and the county and I remember standing there and him telling him 'you've got to leave' you know I couldn't believe it you know and also um we had to do the inspection that week and um ....**

MJ: **It was a huge day wasn't it?**

H1: **It was. Yes yeah it's still clear now... I can't remember the rest of the inspection but I can remember that moment...(T3 T6)**

MJ: That moment...

H1: **Him standing there and the phone call...him putting the phone down and um 'I'm asking you to leave' yes...**

MJ: **And that was a turning point in your life I suppose...**

H1: **It was. Yes yeah...it changed everything for the next 18 months...**

MJ: **Yes yeah...**

H1: **which led on to...me being ill(T2)**

MJ: **yes which led to that...**

H1: **yes... yeah...**

MJ: **But which also then led to you clawing your way back...(laughs)**

H1: **Yes yeah. Absolutely yeah.**

MJ: **Getting back to doing what you felt passionately about.(T1 T2)**

H1: Yeah yeah.

MJ: Just thinking about the whole um SIAMS process then for you here…because…tell me if I'm wrong but it seems like what's coming across is that your passion as a leader…I mean you don't want to be told what to do, do you?

H1: No no

MJ: Because you do believe that…and experience has borne this out for you…that you can see the right thing to do in different circumstances…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: Even in the football team you could see how to win

H1: Yeah

MJ:

You knew what to do

H1: Yeah

MJ: To do that…and then you are working in an environment where this inspection thing gets put on you and…which you're measured by….and is that not in some way telling you what you have to do? Is that a difficultly?

H1: It's funny…I …er... I was at a cluster heads meeting yesterday…we had it here actually...,and I er um... mine was the only church school there obviously and er they were all worried about the academies and they were all talking about Ofsted and I er…

MJ: Hmm hmm…

H1: And I was sitting there thinking…and I was half thinking about seeing you today…and I was thinking… 'D'you know I must be mad because as a church school head you actually get hit with 2 whammies don't you?

MJ: Yes that's right

H1: By 2 whammies

MJ: (laughs)

H1: (laughs)…and they're just worried about going back and you spend all your time um going into a classroom, walking around the school thinking about Ofsted on one side and you do things SIAMSy the other side…so there's impact there…um... it's understanding the Ofsted or understanding the SIAMS ….er…you've got to have belief that you understand it better than the average person…

MJ: Ok

H1: like the direction I give to the teachers…the ideas I throw in... um it's because I have that higher level of understanding… that's that's not boasting…it's I like to

think that that I've taken…I do a lot of reading…I've taken time out to look at things um what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can…I can…I can adapt in my way to um to ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here…

MJ: Hmm hmm.

H1: and even though there are certain criteria which SIAMS has, as Ofsted has, um I feel that it is my role to take that and adapt it my way...

MJ: Ok

H1: My influence you know and I very much… you know…leadership is much about how you influence...it's your influence on a building on on on an establishment and if you haven't got ideas then you're not a good leader in many ways...and able to carry that through…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I s'ppose…

MJ: And what if um if if it was asking you something, and there might well be criteria in there already that you don't see are that important, or that you don't agree with, um…I don't know if there are any…feel free to say if there are...**how would you, or how do you cope if there it is asking you in any way to do some things that you don't…that wouldn't be your way of doing it…what what would you do then?**

H1: It's funny that you should say that because when I first came here um…and in 2012...and when we were doing worship and um it was very…worship was very well established here…and we have our worship team and every Monday morning I'd do my worship to the whole school and um I was doing the worship, and I really struggled at first here worship-wise because I came into a system and um I struggled to be part of that system…(T2 T3)

MJ: Ok

H1: Um it… you know your first year of headship, you don't want to rock the boat too much and um I was rocking it enough because I was working on the Ofsted bit that had gone wrong and um I had rattled enough cages in that um but with the worship I was trying to run with worship and um after a year I just sat down and I felt it wasn't me...

MJ: Ok

H1: you know…

MJ: ...because you were trying to fit in with what was here…

H1: Yeah… you know, um and and there were some clashes then especially with W…I mean they weren't stand up arguments…

MJ: I can imagine you had to do it the way it was always done otherwise you weren't right...

H1: Yeah yeah

MJ: (laughs)

H1: (laughs) and um it felt, the teachers here, **the first 2 years, the XXXX way was thrown at me so many times... and and I had to fight against that so many times and it… at different times to um... so that I don't have that phrase said at all now... you know because there isn't a XXXX way.(T2 T3)** And I thought that that was what was holding the school back in 2012. You know and we weren't moving forward because of that so certain senior members of staff were proud of throwing that at me in a staff meeting and um you **know I'd go 'grrrr' in my room…(T5)**

MJ: I'm sure…

H1: and I'd get very angry about that...

MJ: yeah

H1: Now er um like with that Monday morning I um…one of the things…when I first became a teacher at D primary school, um DC was the head and um he was nearing the end of his career anyway but he was a fantastic leader of worship um he he…every Monday morning we we'd go into the hall as a… as a school and he hadn't prepared a thing but what he... (laughs) but what he'll do he he …

MJ: Those were the days (laughs)

H1: (laughs) yeah but he he had that strong belief in worship…we used to do worship every day and everybody did their own worship and every Monday morning he'd come in and he'd sit there or he'd stand there and he taught the children about the paper he'd read the day before…or the incident that he'd heard about at the weekend and…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: and I used to be just engrossed by this person who would talk about something, he must have had...it was a real talent but he was so comfortable within himself and…and... would talk about something he'd read about in the Times newspaper or or whatever...you know...and it would make you think ...and it wasn't …the convention of a worship or a service or of an assembly but it made you think...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: And I came here I was doing my Monday morning worships and I I was using the worship team less and less because I was talking a lot more um and after a

year I thought 'no, the style I want to do is not to always use the worship team but the children have got to be able to listen to the headteacher' because I come in I…I've got the value very much in the front to my mind and I like to try to use an example that illustrates that value so that um... hopefully the children learn from that and so do the staff so …I began using literally reading from the Bible then and I think that's a good role model you know and I said 'no I'm not just going to have children acting. Children need to be able to see adults standing up and using the Bible. So occasionally I'll use a Bible story and um I'll read from it, you know, and I began using the interactive whiteboard a lot more, doing power points with the children and I speak to the children **and there are times in education we try to make it all singing and all dancing for them, to entertain them, but I feel we need to be told…they need to be told, and I once sat down, (indistinct) and I thought 'that's how I'm going to change it'. And since then I've felt more comfortable about what I want to do.**(T4 T5) To answer your question I mean…I've ...I've looked at something and if it hasn't worked I haven't stuck with it…and try to think of a way round it that I feel more comfortable with... and that's what I've done. So I like to think that my Monday…my Mondays um …sometimes I use the children, sometimes I don't. I use a lot of questioning. Sometimes I just talk to them...um …and I can see it has impact. Sometimes it's a disaster (laughs)

MJ: (laughs)

H1: you know but but as a head you deliver so many assemblies you're not going to er always be perfect (laughs)

MJ: No

H1: Be it every time you know. Sometimes I…sometimes I've spent many hours that day before preparing it and I go and deliver it and I think 'that was really…not very good…' other times I've spent 5 minutes preparing it and it's gone kind of fantastic...

MJ: yeah yeah...

H1: as worship…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: You just can't tell sometimes...

MJ: So what would you say, if you did that on an inspection day, if it was that's what you were going to do anyway and they came in and you said 'Right I'm going to do what I would have always done' and if they criticised you for not using the children more then how would you deal with that?

191

H1: I think I'd explain what I've just explained to a certain extent. Yeah. In that if you're getting the message across, if you're illustrating the value and it's having an impact on the children and you know, over time I believe it does because I believe now that the teachers talk more about what Mr J said on Monday...

MJ: Right yeah

H1: I've heard that in the classroom which I've been pleased about …but also one of the big things I changed was all of the staff being in the assemblies because there was a timetable of, for adults being in worship you know and…

MJ: How did that go down?

H1: Not very well (laughs)

MJ: Took a while or...

H1: Yeah. Yes I s'ppose it took a while for them to come around to my way of thinking.(T3 T6) Um because immediately they came to me and said 'but when are we going to do our 1-1 sessions'…

MJ: yeah yeah...

H1: and I just said 'you have to think about another time'. And so I was very unpopular for about 3 or 4 weeks you know…

MJ: How do you find that? How is that for you when you're...

H1: Unpopular?

MJ: Yeah

H1: Um… the older I've got the better it is at dealing with it. When I was younger it used to really impact on me quite a bit… um… and ….(T2 T5)

MJ: But you still did it if you felt that it was right...

H1: If it was right... yes…yeah...and that's part of being a headteacher I s'ppose (laughs)

MJ: Yeah yeah...

H1: Or any leader or any manager I s'pose…Um…you've got to have a thick skin you know…I did something yesterday…um… I did my …a teacher brought in a mug in a worship so I emailed her afterwards and I said we are role models and that's not what I want to see in a worship you know so um…obviously I'll probably be unpopular for a day or two but um that's my role and as I said sometimes you've just got to do it. You know…(T2 T5)

MJ: Yeah...ok... So with um SIAMS then would you say that mostly or maybe totally you're actually happy…it matches what you think education is for?

H1: Ooh.

MJ: Or about?

H1: Er…it provides…**I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding…um…which wasn't there 20 years ago…(T6 T7)** like going back to D with DC and all that… I didn't always get a feeling of religiousness (laughs)

MJ: No…

H1: We did worship every day and I remember doing my first assembly as er as a probationer in those days

MJ: Yeah…

H1: and at the end of it the whole school applauded (claps) (laughs)(T2)

MJ: (laughs)

H1: I didn't ask for applause it …it was fantastic…it was typical of that school…

MJ: yeah…

H1: It was a lovely school…

MJ: Aaww yeah

H1: D… yeah… um but I wouldn't expect that today for example…(laughs)

MJ: No ok. Because there's a different emphasis

H1: Yes yeah um but there …

MJ: And how do you feel about them coming in and measuring you on all of these things…on how you lead the school, how good a church school you are?

H1: Um… oh that's the pressure, I s'ppose…

MJ: That is a pressure…

H1: That is a pressure. That is always with me. Um

MJ: Really?

H1: Yes. But so is Ofsted. Even though I know we're not due an Ofsted probably we won't get another Ofsted because of our Outstanding status…I still say to teachers I study the Ofsted schedule because I need to be Ofsted-ready all the time. That's why I push you to so this, why I push you to do that…

MJ: Hmm hmm.

H1: In the same way I push…and I'm talking about SIAMS quite a lot…I'm…there's a big push within that…so we're always ready….

MJ: So it's always there…it's always there…

H1: It's always there… back of my mind…

MJ: And is that a stress for you?

H1: Um…it's a stress that you learn to live with. And I think it…it works out very differently with different heads I suppose. Some heads perhaps can't live with it and that's why they go under. Some heads thrive on it…that's how I am…I go to

heads meetings…I sit at the back and I watch different people's reactions to things, you know… Some have to talk about it a lot…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Express themselves a lot to those headteacher colleagues…or to their staff…I don't know how much I talk about it to my staff openly…

MJ: Right…

H1: I suppose I've never asked that question or thought about that…you know um…I try to guide them a lot…to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms…

MJ: Hmmm…

H1: because the pressure on them of having an inspector…

MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them?

H1: I…I … try not to.(T3 T6)

MJ: Ok

H1: I try to put it a different way but sometimes it has to come out…If I feel I'm not getting the point across well enough I'll say well…well look…

MJ: Ok

H1: We've had an issue with TAs recently and making sure that they're really on board in class um and they've sort of baulked at it a bit…

MJ: Yes…

H1: Um… and I've said…I've actually said 'look with the change in the Ofsted criteria the inspector is coming and he's saying 'what are those two adults, not just the teacher, how are the contributing to the class?' **And that's the question I'm now asking when I do an observation more than I was two years ago**(T3 T6). You know and um so you have to be on board with knowing what next for the children and …and reporting back to the teacher and making those notes where perhaps you weren't doing 6 months ago. You know…

MJ: Ok so it's a last straw for you in a way…

H1: Yeah yeah yeah…

MJ: And is SIAMS the same for you as Ofsted in that? Because you know that they are going to come in and they are going to judge you and measure you. Um that…as a last straw then do you say you know 'you have to do this because SIAMS are going to be coming in?

H1: I would do but less so…

MJ: Less so with SIAMS?

H1: Less so…

MJ: And do you know why that is?

H1: D'you know…I don't know…(laughs)…um… I… I think because …I tend to think…we've got so much in place for SIAMS that we're just fine tuning really….we're it's running smoothly…you know…all the work was done perhaps two or three years ago you know… from the day I came in I've got a file in there…I kept it as a record…pictures…things we've done for SIAMS…I want to give it to the SIAMS inspector when he or she comes…to say 'it's not just about what we've done for the last six months it's about what we've been doing for the last three, four, five years…(T3 T6)

MJ: Yeah…

H1: You know and here's the evidence…I …because I've got that behind me I feel that they …they…they can see that we're a good…a good church school in that sense.

MJ: And would you um…you you used a phrase…and I don't know if you meant to…you said 'for SIAMS" you've got that stuff ready… do you think…would you do it ….do you do it because they're coming or would you do it anyway…or… a bit of both depending on what the issue is?

H1: I think I'd do it anyway…**I'm always taking photographs…going right back to when I was a deputy in B I was always taking photographs… and having…and now people call it evidence but looking back…(T5)**

MJ: Yeah…

H1: on…on things…you know… I remember making a display…um making displays of photographs of things the children were doing (indistinct)…yeah it's…

MJ: Yeah it's a way of celebrating…

H1: Yeah yeah… a few weeks later saying 'I remember that' you know… and er why would you do that, you know? and er it was up there you know. And so I've always sort of done that and it's just a part of my…of my… nature you know to have that…I don't use the term 'evidence' you know **but I want to show that we're doing a lot more than we can do on the day or the week that the inspector's in you know…(T6)**

MJ: Yeah I understand… ok… and um… on the same kind of thing really…do you… the things that you are doing and have been doing…all the changes that you've made and the stuff you've put in place um for SIAMS …and I don't mean anything by saying that phrase… do you think that you would do those things if it wasn't for SIAMS or does SIAMS in some way shape what you do and how you do it?

H1: Yeah I think it does shape…if I'm honest…I think I'd still be doing those things but…. but…I've been to your courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as best I can so…so… I s'ppose it does shape if I'm honest…(T3 T6 T7)

MJ: Yeah…but is that a bad thing?

H1: No it's not…no it's not…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I …I feel um I feel the school is better because of it…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I feel I'm a better leader because of it.

MJ: Oh right… ok

H1: Because I've got direction…got direction…when I think back again to DC…I love him to bits…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Um and when I think about when I went to F and then I went to B I don't think those 3 heads um…were as in tune ….

MJ: Ok…

H1: I suppose with the spiritual side…with the spiritual element…

MJ: Ok…

H1: understanding worship…understanding RE… understanding in that sense …even thought they were church school leaders….um… **of course the intensity wasn't there then…on church schools as it is now…um… I'm sure if they were heads now they would have adapted to things…**(T2 T6)

MJ: Yeah…

H1: but they were still brilliant heads you know…

MJ: Yeah…I understand…things have moved on…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: Um…so moving from here…what month is it…April?… yeah (laughs)… you're going to be inspected sometime in 16-17 aren't you? Um do you anticipate as it gets closer and gets more intense…for you… as a leader known that they're coming…wanting things to be in place…do you think about that…that preparation…time?

H1: I try not to (laughs)…

MJ: (laughs)…

H1: because um that's what causes the stress… you get wound up and that…and I see it… like I said…I see it in colleague headteachers so wound up because an

196

inspection is due that term and they're getting themselves really wound up…and it doesn't come (indistinct)…and I've been there and…and…

MJ: That's true…

H1: and it shouldn't do that… y'know…(T3 T6)

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Um…and... so... um... if I was to get wound up it would impact on the teachers y'know…so I like to think that I'll... I think I've got everything in place …I feel comfortable that we…the knowledge of the teachers as well…that has been the big thing…that's been the hard work getting the knowledge of the teachers up to speed with it as well…

MJ: Ok...

H1: I think everything's in…in place and there are some things that I… I need to work on perhaps a bit more…you heard last night about the Eucharist…the vicar's been trying to have um more than one Eucharist in this school for a couple of years now um…

MJ: Yes…

H1: and I've said no to that…I've put the opposition in to that…

MJ: Ok…

H1: Um because I didn't feel that the school… the time was right for the school…until now…that's not because of the inspection next year because of the issues we were having having 2 years, 18 months ago… you know… um… but now I feel… because everyone's on board…(T7)

MJ: More settled…

H1: More settled… um in school.

MJ: I see

H1: To…to introduce another aspect of worship to the school is the right time you know…and I've tried to explain that to the vicar and she …she er understands that...

MJ: Right…that's good…

H1: so I er what you say about the pressure on me as the headteacher…I ...I still don't want to put the extra pressure on the teachers because um like being a headteacher you've got 2 whammy Ofsted and SIAMS um…the teachers also…I don't want pressure on to do with extra services whereas the teacher down the road at M hasn't got any of that pressure…

MJ: Like me…(laughs)

H1: You know I'm very aware of protecting...of protecting the teachers as much as possible and that's why I said to the vicar 'look the Eucharist service that we used is very involved with the teachers and I...we can't do that 3 times a year'...and she's also...she's gone away and she's thought about it and has come back and...I was really impressed by her last night...

MJ: It was good...

H1: Yeah yeah yeah yeah...

MJ: But that is as a result of you and she talking about that for about 18 months by the sound of it...

H1: Yeah yeah... absolutely...yes...yeah...absolutely...

MJ: That's an example actually...because that's what you talked about doing with the staff that you know what it is you want but you don't want to impose it...you .you...and that's a really nice example of that isn't it?

H1: Yes...yeah...

MJ: you and J working on that...

H1: Yeah...

MJ: So do you think that as it...as the time passes now...the next year or so or however long it is...that...do you think that you will start to...because what I'm looking at essentially is does the inspection process make you act and decide and behave differently and in a way as this next 12 months goes that's getting to that crucial time for you...I'm not...well I am asking you to predict... but I'm not asking...I'm not holding you to it I'm just wondering what**...do you have any thoughts about what you think that will be like as it gets closer? Do you think it will force you in any way to do things that you don't really want to...do you envisage that...or...?**

H1: I don't. No. Um I mean there are things that I feel that we still need to do which...

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: Which um over the next 12 months I'll make sure are in place ...um... perhaps ramping it up to a certain extent um but then again it's been very much a journey from 2012 I suppose um and in that time SIAMS itself has changed you know...(T3 T6)

MJ: Hmm...

H1: um as you know... sort of... 18 months ago it was...you saw with the SIAMS schedule...

MJ: Hmm...

H1: which we've all had to adapt to

MJ: Yeah

H1: understand first of all and and then make sure it's working in that way…

MJ: Yeah

H1: that way in the schools…so that way it's been positive and and the children and…and the staff…feel positive working in that**…there are aspects of that SIAMS that I feel we are working towards…which er we will have in place in the next 6 months…**

MJ: So the timings maybe would be affected but in terms of what you would do that wouldn't change…

H1: No…(T3 T6)

MJ: you will do what you're doing…so…um… if I just sum up to make sure I've understood properly…that um that the existence of SIAMS does in some ways shape and make difference to what you do…

H1: Yes

MJ:…that's not um necessarily negative…

H1: No no…

MJ: and in some ways it enables you to be a better leader of a church school…

H1: One of the things about the new RE syllabus…when I started to work on the RE syllabus…in 2008 2009 when it first came out the way the subjects…it has the questions you know…

MJ: yeah…

H1: actually made teaching RE so much easier… I felt then it immediately made teaching RE so much easier…because you grappled with that question and then you could explore it…and I sort of adapted that for History and for Geography…

MJ: Oh…ok…

H1: in my own teaching…you know…

MJ: Ok…

H1: and with the staff I suppose at that time it really made me review things. Now that was a result of the pressures of church school inspections and everything else um made sure that every county has an Agreed Syllabus (indistinct)...so that's had an impact...that's changed my practice which I think is for the better...

MJ: for the better...

H1: which perhaps I may not have have done otherwise…I don't know I can't tell but yes but it's the heads that I meet at colleague heads meetings who are down on …... Ofsted or on whatever the changes are…

MJ: Yes...

H1: that's very hard to live by because you're the leader and if you're down all the time that will have an impact on your staff. So it has sort of shaped how I do things but it's made me a better church school leader, I think.

MJ: That's lovely. Thank you. Is there anything else you think is relevant that you want to say?

H1: Um...there's a lot there! (laughs)

MJ: There is a lot there (laughs)...What will be really helpful...what I'll do then K...apparently it takes about 9 hours to write up an hour's interview...

H1: Really?

MJ: Which is going to be my summer months... (laughs)... writing things up...and then um it is alright if I keep coming along to some governor meetings?

H1: Sure yeah

MJ: That's ok... and then when the inspection gets closer um if it's alright with you...if I could just be around ...I'll try not to get in your way...um and then on the inspection itself that will be really helpful. What I'll...when I have transcribed this I'll um I'll show it to you to make sure that you're happy with it...there might be some things in it that come across...that don't come across like you meant them to... and we can revise things then if you want to...

H1: Yeah

MJ: The transcriptions themselves are not going to be...I mean it's going to be anonymised anyway but I don't envisage putting the whole transcription into...into the...my thesis...um...one or or 2 I might put as an appendix to show how I have analysed ....because I have to analyse this now...I can't just tell your story otherwise all I am doing is telling a story...I have to look at it now...

H1: yeah yeah...

MJ: against my questions and see if there are themes coming out. And if I want to any clarifications can I...?

H1: Yes just email me.

MJ: Thank you. Thanks ever so much.

The interview took place in H1's office at XXXX Primary school. It was my second visit as the first time H1 had wanted to talk through the research project and what I wanted from him. The atmosphere was relaxed. We sat opposite each other on comfortable chairs and we were not interrupted.

MJ: I know that we talked it through when I came in the other day, but what would be really helpful, and really for it to take as long as you want it to take, there's no set anything. But what I am really interested in is the story of why you um are doing the job you are doing, here, now really. Why were you a teacher, why are you a head, why working in church schools, why here, um, what's your passion for education really. That kind of thing. It's just that it's your story really. I'll make some notes if that's alright. In a way I don't need to but I think it just helps me to focus and not stare at you the whole time (laughs). And then I'll transcribe this sometime, I don't know, the summer holidays probably. Thank you.

H1: Where do I start…well…

MJ: Wherever you think it starts, I suppose.

H1: I suppose the reason I began teaching, I didn't set out to become head of a church school…I …like most people when you qualify you just want a job and um whatever school you go into if it's a church school or a community school or a primary school …a free school or whatever it is um you just want to get started. And when you get your foot into the door then your career path takes…takes you in different directions I suppose. But in saying that I've been in I think my 6th school and um I've worked in 5 church schools.

MJ: Wow (laughs)

H1: Yeah.

MJ: There's a pattern there (laughs)

H1: There's a pattern there. Yeah… um. Starting in D Primary school, that was my first one. That was a church school.

MJ: Yeah

H1: Um and um which was a wonderful experience. That was in 1988. So I qualified '87 and my first proper job was in January '88 in D. **I had a term, an old term, in supply before I got a job, which I learned more in that term than I did in anything else. Yeah, it was really good.**(S2e)

MJ: Yeah

H1: **And just experiences from then I suppose which led me to want to become a headteacher um I think frustrations as a teacher thinking 'I could do that'.(S2e)**

MJ: Hmm

H1: I could do that I could do that better. Um or I'd like to have a chance at doing that. If you remember back in the old days we had the old A and B scales...

MJ: Oh yeah I remember that

H1: You remember. And I was in F I think, F Juniors...

MJ: Ah ha

H1: **Um I remember being overlooked for an A allowance by someone who I just felt was contributing not very much in the school. I remember being very frustrated and that spurred me on...(S2b S2e)**

MJ: Ah that's interesting...

H1: ...to um you know look for courses that were for middle management. And um I very quickly got the deputy headship of B... um which was an experience um...**because the head there, he was fantastic, but he was an old fashioned style head...(S1 S2e)**

MJ: Yeah

H1: And um...ah yeah and it just worked out that things were going very wrong at school **and Ofsted came along and had him removed during Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week...(S1 S2f)**

MJ: Oh gosh

H1: It was an extraordinary experience...

MJ: Wow

H1: thing to happen...um... and just the next 18 months I was the acting head there...

MJ: Goodness

H1: that sort of period.

MJ: And what was that like? How was that for you?

H1: **I look back on it and it was ...quite a learning curve for me because I'd only been doing deputy headship for about 2 years and I knew that there were...I knew the head wasn't moving forward...**

MJ: **Yeah**

H1: **He was a great head for children but he wasn't a paperwork person as it were...**

MJ: **Ok yes**

H1: And it was very much needed and I felt I was a …I recognised myself that I could do the paperwork better…

MJ: Right yeah

H1: Better, you know and I was prompting him to do things and he wouldn't do them and such like and when Ofsted came in the county had already known that… the county when I got the job county warned me that they were watching him …

MJ: Right

H1: Yes I was called into SH…

MJ: Oh goodness(S2e S2f)

H1: Yes and I yes yes and JS…

MJ: Yeah

H1: J took me aside and said that er she gave me her phone number in case I ever needed her you know…

MJ: Oh goodness…so you were going into something then weren't you?

H1: Yeah yeah… Um but he was (coughs) he was a church goer and he was a wonderful church school head…

MJ: Ok

H1: He had all the values there…you know…um… and it was very hard in that sense…

MJ: Yes(S2b)

H1: Um…to …yeah I didn't want to be critical because I could see his heart was there and …but education was moving forward and forward and forward you know and in the next 18 months I put everything into it too much if you like because at the end of 18 months when a new head came I had er… my breakdown I had…(S1 S5)

MJ: Oh ok

H1: I had 9 months off

MJ: Right

H1: Um…I think through exhaustion…um and it just left…you know the whole effort of you know trying to put the school right… you know… and it was successful you know…(S2e S2f)

MJ: Ok right

H1: Er I look back very proud of that time and um…

MJ: It took its toll on you…

H1: It took its toll. And er I didn't realise how much it was...I mean I was ....er…at one point I was resenting having holidays and being home... it was er...it took over my life and I didn't see it happening...

MJ: Ok yeah(S2b S2e S2f S5)

H1: I mean my [spouse] was seeing it happen but just let me go with it but one day I just…collapsed...I just….I was in the kitchen and I forgot how to make a cup of tea…

MJ: Goodness...

H1: My [spouse] said 'Look you've got to go and see a doctor because you're um x, y and z and I hadn't noticed…

MJ: You hadn't noticed…

H1: You know. I went to the doctor and he just signed me off you know...(S2c)

MJ: Yeah it was frightening for you I would imagine

H1: Yeah... yeah it was um…

MJ: Did that put you off headship? It had taken…you had given it so much and it had taken…

H1: Hmm…

MJ: …so much from you...

H1: Did it put me off…? It didn't. Um because um I felt frustrated…(S2b S5)

MJ: Still...

H1: Yeah. I felt frustrated that…and it took me about 2 years to get my first headship after that proper…I went back as a deputy and …

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: There was a new fantastic head at B, M, and she was a fantastic head and we got on really well and um... …but my anxiety was still there because I went for interviews which I should have walked and …(S2e S5)

MJ: Yeah…

H1: and I didn't get them. And I think that caused more anxiety…

MJ: I'm sure...yes

H1: Um and yeah um... but then I got the headship at I um….

MJ: What made you keep going then when it was draining so much out of you? What was in you do you think?

H1: I was…I still felt I could do the job really well. I believed. That was what I wanted to do.(S2b S5)

MJ: Right

H1: Um... when I look back on what had happened at B...we had turned things around...

MJ: yeah...

H1: we had had a good church inspection as well and I was a part of that um... and...so then when I began applying for jobs I couldn't understand why I wasn't getting them, y'know...(S2f)

MJ: Hmm

H1: And because my desire to become a head to a certain extent meant that when I went for interviews I was too nervous...(S2b)

MJ: Yeah

H1: and that sometimes came across...

MJ: Ok yeah

H1: Um...I'd walk away and think, you know...what I should do next...(laughs)

MJ: Did it make you more frustrated...?

H1: Yeah

MJ: Yeah

H1: Yeah...um... but then I got I and the rest is history then...wonderful church school...got on with the vicar there straight away um and you know, I felt it was very much a team with her and felt that this was the environment that I felt comfortable with and I... er...before I hadn't had any preference ...really...(S2b S5)

MJ: and that was the time...

H1: Really. And that was the point when I was nearly...I applied for a non-church school headship and um it was in the centre of G and I went in and you know they make you do an assembly...so I did that and I put candles out and I did my assembly...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: And I didn't get the job and I was speaking to the adviser afterwards and this was a county primary school, a normal county primary school, and she asked me why I had a candle in the worship and I...I sort of...was aghast... why she had asked that question...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: She wasn't impressed by it at all...

MJ: So your head was already in the church school space without you even realising it...

H1: Yeah. But I was also really taken aback why this adviser you know, the school adviser, was questioning it and also the governors hadn't liked it or...

MJ: No...

H1: Didn't feel that it was relevant to what I was doing...and and then I thought I had a lucky escape then from that school because I would have really come up against real um barriers in that school...(S2b)

MJ: Yeah

H1: I know it wasn't a church school but that's no reason not um you know to have spirituality...

MJ: No no

H1: in education and and I said I mean...I was so aghast...I'll never forget it...you know...it really stayed with me...

MJ: So it was an important moment...(S2b S6)

H1: It was yeah. Um... and so um then the job at U came along. I spent 8 very happy years there. And then the opportunity here came along.

MJ: So ...that moment in the community school interview...was that when you thought 'hang on I am a church school person here'? (laughs)

H1: I realised... I probably realised more so than anybody else...I mean I always look...there were always headships coming up and I went to look at them... I would walk around schools um... whether they were a church school or a non-church school you just get a feel for the school... and there were some...some schools you would go in and just feel ...felt the anxiety of the school and there was non-religious... you could tell from the head and the way that he or she ran the school...

MJ: Right...(S2b)

H1: You know... and I'd go away thinking 'well I'm not applying for that one' you know... um and so I had that feeling of ethos of a Church of England school right early on... now I er I reflect on it because I didn't really realise it at the time...(S5)

MJ: No...

H1: Not perhaps until I had had that experience.

MJ: Yeah

H1: And so...yeah...I suppose that's ...it was that point which steered me to...I'm more comfortable as head of a church school. um... because I didn't want to put up with that kind of...I won't say ignorance but but but...that anxiety that I think...I think I would pick up I had to fight that...(S2b S6)

MJ: Yeah

H1: as well with governors you know...

MJ: And there was something very strong there clearly that they didn't get that was very important...that you viewed as being very important in education...

H1: Yes that's right...

MJ: Ideologically almost you would be very different...

H1: Yes... I just got the feeling that the whole governing body didn't see it because they were just... they had discussed it with the adviser and in her feedback...

MJ: So it wouldn't have been a very good for for you (laughs)...

H1: No it wouldn't have been a good fit...no. It wouldn't...yeah yeah yeah...

MJ: So what is it in you that makes you want to be the head... be the leader?

H1: um...

MJ: Because you did...you came out of a torrid time and continued to pursue that when in some ways if you hadn't...if you'd said 'I'll stay as the deputy' things might have been less anxious for you, mightn't it? But clearly there was a drive within you...

H1: Yes yeah...

MJ: that wouldn't let that happen.

H1: Yeah...um...it's hard to define... that's a hard question to answer really...I think...I... I... I dunno...all the way through my younger days I was always chosen to be the captain of a team...I was never the best player... (laughs)...um... but um... when I was at university we played juke ball and in my 2nd year I was captain of the juke ball team... you know... and far better players played than me...I just...I just...

MJ: There was something in you...

H1: There was something in me that I had never really recognised that I want...I just want to be um at the heart of things... I don't want to be told how to do things...

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: I s'pose this thing about academies you know one of my greatest fears is that we come under an academies' trust that just starts telling me how to run my school...

MJ: Ok... Yeah

H1: And that is...that is something that is at the back of my mind...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: I'm trying to get across to the governors that that makes me uncomfortable…

MJ: Hmm hmm…

H1: and because er coming here I was able to do what I wanted to do to a certain extent

MJ: yeah…

H1: …having recognised that the…the er issues…

MJ: Ah ha…

H1: er I feel that when I was applying for headships I was never going for the Outstanding schools I was always always looking for the schools that had problems…

MJ: Ok yes right hmm hmm…

H1: I felt there was something in me that I could turn things around. I have a vision more so than the average person has got…I'm blowing my own trumpet here…(S2b S5)

MJ: No no that's fine…

H1: When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? Why can't the headteacher see that?'…and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only way of answering that I suppose is to become the head and…and stand by …stand by…what I thought…what my beliefs were…(S2b S2e)

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: You know and I know that that head was obviously a very good head…

MJ: Yes…

H1: and and and they were doing a hard job and there's 99 things that they were trying to juggle at the same time which I perhaps I didn't understand at the time…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: …I still…I still had that belief you know and the same when my…my… you know my children growing up and playing football for F or for wherever it was somehow umm…um…I ended up coaching the teams… you know and and the way they played…I played differently from other teams… um…because I could I could see that by playing that certain way you could win…because the age of the children were coping with that way of football and ….little things like that I could see in things…

MJ: yes…

H1: that other people, other coaches who were very experienced perhaps more experienced than me, couldn't see…and… I think that's one of the reasons why I was frustrated as a deputy…

MJ: yeah…

H1: or um if I'd stayed in the classroom I would have been frustrated that's why I needed to lead a school…(S2b S5)

MJ: Hmm…hmm…yeah…

H1: Perhaps if I went…if I wasn't a teacher I'd have been wanting to lead something in whatever other job I wanted to do…

MJ: Yes…ok…

H1: You know…

MJ: So the passion is to lead isn't it?

H1: Yeah… but without being all singing all dancing and telling…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: people what to do all the time because that's um…that's not my style…I recognise things and um usually work out the problem or um my way and um hopefully people go with that. And um are I have found that the majority of the time people have done you know…(S2b) I mean when I took over…that day I took over at B… the first day the inspector was in it was um it was Mr G, do you remember him?

MJ: No…

H1: It was… he was a quite big name in the county and he had to ring up Ofsted and the county and I remember standing there and him telling him 'you've got to leave' you know I couldn't believe it you know and also um we had to do the inspection that week and um ….

MJ: It was a huge day wasn't it?

H1: It was. Yes yeah it's still clear now… I can't remember the rest of the inspection but I can remember that moment…

MJ: That moment…

H1: Him standing there and the phone call…him putting the phone down and um 'I'm asking you to leave' yes…

MJ: And that was a turning point in your life I suppose…

H1: It was. Yes yeah…it changed everything for the next 18 months…

MJ: Yes yeah…

H1: which led on to…me being ill (S1 S2f S5)

MJ: yes which led to that…

H1: yes... yeah…

MJ: But which also then led to you clawing your way back…(laughs)

H1: Yes yeah. Absolutely yeah.

MJ: Getting back to doing what you felt passionately about.

H1: Yeah yeah.

MJ: Just thinking about the whole um SIAMS process then for you here…because…tell me if I'm wrong but it seems like what's coming across is that your passion as a leader…I mean you don't want to be told what to do, do you?

H1: No no

MJ: Because you do believe that…and experience has borne this out for you…that you can see the right thing to do in different circumstances…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: Even in the football team you could see how to win

H1: Yeah

MJ:

You knew what to do

H1: Yeah

MJ: To do that…and then you are working in an environment where this inspection thing gets put on you and…which you're measured by….and is that not in some way telling you what you have to do? Is that a difficultly?(S2f)

H1: It's funny…I …er... I was at a cluster heads meeting yesterday…we had it here actually...,and I er um... mine was the only church school there obviously and er they were all worried about the academies and they were all talking about Ofsted and I er…

MJ: Hmm hmm…

H1: And I was sitting there thinking…and I was half thinking about seeing you today...and I was thinking… 'D'you know I must be mad because as a church school head you actually get hit with 2 whammies don't you?(S2f S7)

MJ: Yes that's right

H1: By 2 whammies

MJ: (laughs)

H1: (laughs)…and they're just worried about going back and you spend all your time um going into a classroom, walking around the school thinking about Ofsted on one side and you do things SIAMSy the other side…so there's impact there…um**… it's understanding the Ofsted or understanding the SIAMS**

….er…you've got to have belief that you understand it better than the average person…

MJ: Ok

H1: like the direction I give to the teachers…the ideas I throw in… um it's because I have that higher level of understanding… that's that's not boasting…it's I like to think that that I've taken…I do a lot of reading…I've taken time out to look at things um what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can…I can…I can adapt in my way to um to ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here…(S2b S2f S5)

MJ: Hmm hmm.

H1: and even though there are certain criteria which SIAMS has, as Ofsted has, um I feel that it is my role to take that and adapt it my way…(S2f)

MJ: Ok

H1: My influence you know and I very much… you know…leadership is much about how you influence…it's your influence on a building on on on an establishment and if you haven't got ideas then you're not a good leader in many ways…and able to carry that through…(S5)

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I s'ppose…

MJ: And what if um if if it was asking you something, and there might well be criteria in there already that you don't see are that important, or that you don't agree with, um…I don't know if there are any…feel free to say if there are…how would you, or how do you cope if there it is asking you in any way to do some things that you don't…that wouldn't be your way of doing it…what what would you do then?

H1: It's funny that you should say that because when I first came here um…and in 2012…and when we were doing worship and um it was very…worship was very well established here…and we have our worship team and every Monday morning I'd do my worship to the whole school and um I was doing the worship, and I really struggled at first here worship-wise because I came into a system and um I struggled to be part of that system…(S2e S5)

MJ: Ok

H1: Um it… you know your first year of headship, you don't want to rock the boat too much and um I was rocking it enough because I was working on the Ofsted bit that had gone wrong and um I had rattled enough cages in that um

211

but with the worship I was trying to run with worship and um after a year I just sat down and I felt it wasn't me...(S2e S2f S5)

MJ: Ok

H1: you know...

MJ: ...because you were trying to fit in with what was here...

H1: Yeah... you know, um and and **there were some clashes then especially with W...I mean they weren't stand up arguments...(S2e)**

MJ: I can imagine you had to do it the way it was always done otherwise you weren't right...

H1: Yeah yeah

MJ: (laughs)

H1: (laughs) and um it felt, **the teachers here, the first 2 years, the XXXX way was thrown at me so many times... and and I had to fight against that so many times and it... at different times to um... so that I don't have that phrase said at all now... you know because there isn't a XXXX way. And I thought that that was what was holding the school back in 2012. You know and we weren't moving forward because of that so certain senior members of staff were proud of throwing that at me in a staff meeting and um you know I'd go 'grrrr' in my room...(S2e)**

MJ: I'm sure...

H1: and I'd get very angry about that...

MJ: yeah

H1: Now er um like with that Monday morning I um...one of the things...when I first became a teacher at D primary school, um DC was the head and um he was nearing the end of his career anyway but he was a fantastic leader of worship um he he...every Monday morning we we'd go into the hall as a... as a school and he hadn't prepared a thing but what he... (laughs) but what he'll do he he ...

MJ: Those were the days (laughs)

H1: (laughs) yeah but he he had that strong belief in worship...we used to do worship every day and everybody did their own worship and every Monday morning he'd come in and he'd sit there or he'd stand there and he taught the children about the paper he'd read the day before...or the incident that he'd heard about at the weekend and...

MJ: Hmm...

H1: and I used to be just engrossed by this person who would talk about something, he must have had...it was a real talent but he was so comfortable

within himself and…and… would talk about something he'd read about in the Times newspaper or or whatever…you know…and it would make you think …and it wasn't …the convention of a worship or a service or of an assembly but it made you think…

MJ: Ah ha…

H1: And I came here I was doing my Monday morning worships and I I was using the worship team less and less because I was talking a lot more um and after a year I thought 'no, the style I want to do is not to always use the worship team but the children have got to be able to listen to the headteacher' because I come in I…I've got the value very much in the front to my mind and I like to try to use an example that illustrates that value so that um… hopefully the children learn from that and so do the staff so …I began using literally reading from the Bible then and I think that's a good role model you know and I said 'no I'm not just going to have children acting. Children need to be able to see adults… standing up and using the Bible. So occasionally I'll use a Bible story and um I'll read from it, you know, and I began using the interactive whiteboard a lot more, doing power points with the children and I speak to the children and there are times in education we try to make it all singing and all dancing for them, to entertain them, but I feel we need to be told…they need to be told, and I once sat down, (indistinct) and I thought 'that's how I'm going to change it'. And since then I've felt more comfortable about what I want to do.(S2a S2b S2e S5) To answer your question I mean…I've …I've looked at something and if it hasn't worked I haven't stuck with it…and try to think of a way round it that I feel more comfortable with… and that's what I've done. So I like to think that my Monday…my Mondays um …sometimes I use the children, sometimes I don't. I use a lot of questioning. Sometimes I just talk to them…um …and I can see it has impact. Sometimes it's a disaster (laughs)

MJ: (laughs)

H1: you know but but as a head you deliver so many assemblies you're not going to er always be perfect (laughs)

MJ: No

H1: Be it every time you know. Sometimes I…sometimes I've spent many hours that day before preparing it and I go and deliver it and I think 'that was really…not very good…' other times I've spent 5 minutes preparing it and it's gone kind of fantastic…

MJ: yeah yeah…

H1: as worship…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: You just can't tell sometimes…

MJ: So what would you say, if you did that on an inspection day, if it was that's what you were going to do anyway and they came in and you said 'Right I'm going to do what I would have always done' and if they criticised you for not using the children more then how would you deal with that?

H1: I think I'd explain what I've just explained to a certain extent. Yeah. In that if you're getting the message across, if you're illustrating the value and it's having an impact on the children and you know, over time I believe it does because I believe now that the teachers talk more about what Mr J said on Monday…(S2f S5)

MJ: Right yeah

H1: I've heard that in the classroom which I've been pleased about …but also one of the big things I changed was all of the staff being in the assemblies because there was a timetable of, for adults being in worship you know and…

MJ: How did that go down?

H1: Not very well (laughs)

MJ: Took a while or…

H1: Yeah. Yes I s'ppose it took a while for them to come around to my way of thinking. Um because immediately they came to me and said 'but when are we going to do our 1-1 sessions'…

MJ: yeah yeah…

H1: and I just said 'you have to think about another time'. **And so I was very unpopular for about 3 or 4 weeks you know…**

MJ: How do you find that? How is that for you when you're…

H1: Unpopular?

MJ: Yeah

H1: Um… the older I've got the better it is at dealing with it. When I was younger it used to really impact on me quite a bit… um… and ….

MJ: But you still did it if you felt that it was right…

H1: If it was right… yes…yeah…and that's part of being a headteacher I s'ppose (laughs)(S2b S2e S5)

MJ: Yeah yeah…

H1: Or any leader or any manager I s'pose…Um…**you've got to have a thick skin (S5)** you know…I did something yesterday…um… I did my …a teacher brought in a

214

mug in a worship so I emailed her afterwards and I said we are role models and that's not what I want to see in a worship you know so um**…obviously I'll probably be unpopular for a day or two but um that's my role and as I said sometimes you've just got to do it. You know…**(S2b S2e S5)

MJ: Yeah...ok... So with um SIAMS then would you say that mostly or maybe totally you're actually happy…it matches what you think education is for?

H1: Ooh.

MJ: Or about?

H1: Er…it provides…**I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding…um…which wasn't there 20 years ago…**(S2f) like going back to D with DC and all that… I didn't always get a feeling of religiousness (laughs)

MJ: No…

H1: We did worship every day and I remember doing my first assembly as er as a probationer in those days

MJ: Yeah...

H1: and at the end of it the whole school applauded (claps) (laughs)

MJ: (laughs)

H1: I didn't ask for applause it …it was fantastic…it was typical of that school...

MJ: yeah…

H1: It was a lovely school...

MJ: Aaww yeah

H1: D... yeah… um but I wouldn't expect that today for example...(laughs)

MJ: No ok. Because there's a different emphasis

H1: Yes yeah um but there …

MJ: And how do you feel about them coming in and measuring you on all of these things…on how you lead the school, how good a church school you are?

H1: Um... oh that's the pressure, I s'ppose…

MJ: That is a pressure…

H1: That is a pressure. That is always with me. Um…

MJ: Really?

H1: Yes. But so is Ofsted. Even though I know we're not due an Ofsted probably we won't get another Ofsted because of our Outstanding status…I still say to teachers I study the Ofsted schedule because I need to be Ofsted-ready all the time. That's why I push you to so this, why I push you to do that…(S2f S4)

MJ: Hmm hmm.

H1: In the same way I push...and **I'm talking about SIAMS quite a lot...I'm...there's a big push within that...so we're always ready....**

MJ: **So it's always there...it's always there...**

H1: **It's always there... back of my mind...**

MJ: **And is that a stress for you?**

H1: **Um...it's a stress that you learn to live with. And I think it...it works out very differently with different heads I suppose. Some heads perhaps can't live with it and that's why they go under. Some heads thrive on it...that's how I am...I go to heads meetings...I sit at the back and I watch different people's reactions to things, you know... Some have to talk about it a lot...**(S2f S4 S5)

MJ: Yeah...

H1: Express themselves a lot to those headteacher colleagues...or to their staff...I don't know how much I talk about it to my staff openly...

MJ: Right...

H1: I suppose I've never asked that question or thought about that...you know um...**I try to guide them a lot...to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for...and I hate using those terms...**

MJ: **Hmmm...**

H1: **because the pressure on them of having an inspector...**

MJ: **Why do you use them if you hate using them?**

H1: **I...I ... try not to.**(S2b S2f S4 S5)

MJ: Ok

H1: I try to put it a different way but sometimes it has to come out...If I feel I'm not getting the point across well enough I'll say well...well look...

MJ: Ok

H1: We've had an issue with TAs recently and making sure that they're really on board in class um and they've sort of baulked at it a bit...

MJ: Yes...

H1: Um... and I've said...**I've actually said 'look with the change in the Ofsted criteria the inspector is coming and he's saying 'what are those two adults, not just the teacher, how are the contributing to the class?' And that's the question I'm now asking when I do an observation more than I was two years ago. You know and um so you have to be on board with knowing what next for the children and ...and reporting back to the teacher and making those notes where perhaps you weren't doing 6 months ago. You know...**(S2f S4)

MJ: Ok so it's a last straw for you in a way...

H1: Yeah yeah yeah…

MJ: And is SIAMS the same for you as Ofsted in that? Because you know that they are going to come in and they are going to judge you and measure you. Um that…as a last straw then **do you say you know 'you have to do this because SIAMS are going to be coming in?**

H1: I would do but less so…

MJ: Less so with SIAMS?

H1: Less so…

MJ: And do you know why that is?

H1: D'you know…I don't know…(laughs)…um… I… I think because …I tend to think…we've got so much in place for SIAMS that we're just fine tuning really….we're it's running smoothly…you know…all the work was done perhaps two or three years ago you know… from the day I came in I've got a file in there…I kept it as a record…pictures…things we've done for SIAMS…I want to give it to the SIAMS inspector when he or she comes…to say 'it's not just about what we've done for the last six months it's about what we've been doing for the last three, four, five years…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: You know and here's the evidence…I …because I've got that behind me I feel that they …they…they can see that we're a good…a good church school in that sense.

MJ: And would you um…you you used a phrase…and I don't know if you meant to…you said 'for SIAMS" you've got that stuff ready… do you think…would you do it ….do you do it because they're coming or would you do it anyway…or… a bit of both depending on what the issue is?

H1: I think I'd do it anyway…I'm always taking photographs…going right back to when I was a deputy in B I was always taking photographs… and having…and now people call it evidence but looking back…(S2e S2f S4)

MJ: Yeah…

H1: on…on things…you know… I remember making a display…um making displays of photographs of things the children were doing (indistinct)…yeah it's…

MJ: Yeah it's a way of celebrating…

H1: Yeah yeah… a few weeks later saying 'I remember that' you know… and er why would you do that, you know? and er it was up there you know. **And so I've always sort of done that and it's just a part of my…of my… nature you know to have that…I don't use the term 'evidence' you know but I want to show that**

we're doing a lot more than we can do on the day or the week that the inspector's in you know...(S2b)

MJ: Yeah I understand… ok… and um… on the same kind of thing really…do you… the things that you are doing and have been doing...all the changes that you've made and the stuff you've put in place um for SIAMS …and I don't mean anything by saying that phrase… **do you think that you would do those things if it wasn't for SIAMS or does SIAMS in some way shape what you do and how you do it?**

H1: Yeah I think it does shape…if I'm honest…I think I'd still be doing those things but…. but…I've been to your courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as best I can so…so… I s'ppose it does shape if I'm honest…

MJ: Yeah…but is that a bad thing?

H1: No it's not…no it's not…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I …I feel um I feel the school is better because of it…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I feel I'm a better leader because of it.

MJ: Oh right… ok

H1: Because I've got direction…got direction…when I think back again to DC…I love him to bits…(S2b S2f S5 S7)

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Um and when I think about when I went to F and then I went to B I don't think those 3 heads um...were as in tune ….

MJ: Ok...

H1: I suppose with the spiritual side...with the spiritual element…

MJ: Ok…

H1: understanding worship...understanding RE… understanding in that sense …even thought they were church school leaders….um… of course the intensity wasn't there then…on church schools as it is now…um… I'm sure if they were heads now they would have adapted to things…

MJ: Yeah...

H1: but they were still brilliant heads you know…

MJ: Yeah…I understand...things have moved on…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: Um…so moving from here…what month is it…April?… yeah (laughs)… you're going to be inspected sometime in 16-17 aren't you? Um do you anticipate as it

gets closer and gets more intense...for you... as a leader known that they're coming...wanting things to be in place...do you think about that…that preparation…time?

H1: I try not to (laughs)...

MJ: (laughs)...

H1: because um that's what causes the stress... you get wound up and that…and I see it... like I said...I see it in colleague headteachers so wound up because an inspection is due that term and they're getting themselves really wound up…and it doesn't come (indistinct)…and I've been there and…and…

MJ: That's true…

H1: and it shouldn't do that… y'know…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Um…and… so… um… if I was to get wound up it would impact on the teachers y'know…so I like to think that I'll... I think I've got everything in place …I feel comfortable that we…the knowledge of the teachers as well…that has been the big thing…that's been the hard work getting the knowledge of the teachers up to speed with it as well…(S2f)

MJ: Ok...

H1: I think everything's in...in place and there are some things that I… I need to work on perhaps a bit more…you heard last night about the Eucharist…the vicar's been trying to have um more than one Eucharist in this school for a couple of years now um...

MJ: Yes…

H1: and I've said no to that…I've put the opposition in to that...

MJ: Ok...

H1: Um because I didn't feel that the school… the time was right for the school…until now…that's not because of the inspection next year because of the issues we were having having 2 years, 18 months ago... you know… um... but now I feel… because everyone's on board…(S2e S2f)

MJ: More settled...

H1: More settled… um in school.

MJ: I see

H1: To...to introduce another aspect of worship to the school is the right time you know…and I've tried to explain that to the vicar and she …she er understands that...

MJ: Right...that's good...

H1: so I er what you say about the pressure on me as the headteacher…I …I still don't want to put the extra pressure on the teachers because um like being a headteacher you've got 2 whammy Ofsted and SIAMS um…the teachers also…I don't want pressure on to do with extra services whereas the teacher down the road at M hasn't got any of that pressure…(S2e S2f)

MJ: Like me…(laughs)

H1: You know I'm very aware of protecting…of protecting the teachers as much as possible and that's why I said to the vicar 'look the Eucharist service that we used is very involved with the teachers and I…we can't do that 3 times a year'…and she's also…she's gone away and she's thought about it and has come back and…I was really impressed by her last night…(S2b S4)

MJ: It was good…

H1: Yeah yeah yeah yeah…

MJ: But that is as a result of you and she talking about that for about 18 months by the sound of it…

H1: Yeah yeah... absolutely...yes…yeah…absolutely…

MJ: That's an example actually…because that's what you talked about doing with the staff that you know what it is you want but you don't want to impose it…you .you…and that's a really nice example of that isn't it?

H1: Yes...yeah…

MJ: you and J working on that…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: So do you think that as it…as the time passes now…the next year or so or however long it is…that…do you think that you will start to…because what I'm looking at essentially is does the inspection process make you act and decide and behave differently and in a way as this next 12 months goes that's getting to that crucial time for you…I'm not…well I am asking you to predict… but I'm not asking…I'm not holding you to it I'm just wondering what…do you have any thoughts about what you think that will be like as it gets closer? Do you think it will force you in any way to do things that you don't really want to…do you envisage that…or…?

H1: I don't. No. Um I mean there are things that I feel that we still need to do which…

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: Which um over the next 12 months I'll make sure are in place …um… perhaps ramping it up to a certain extent um but then again it's been very much

a journey from 2012 I suppose um and in that time SIAMS itself has changed you know…(S2f)

MJ: Hmm…

H1: um as you know… sort of… 18 months ago it was…you saw with the SIAMS schedule…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: which we've all had to adapt to

MJ: Yeah

H1: understand first of all and and then make sure it's working in that way…

MJ: Yeah

H1: that way in the schools…so that way it's been positive and and the children and…and the staff…feel positive working in that…there are aspects of that SIAMS that I feel we are working towards…which er we will have in place in the next 6 months…

MJ: So the timings maybe would be affected but in terms of what you would do that wouldn't change…

H1: No…

MJ: you will do what you're doing…so…um… if I just sum up to make sure I've understood properly…that um that the existence of SIAMS does in some ways shape and make difference to what you do…

H1: Yes

MJ:…that's not um necessarily negative…

H1: No no…

MJ: and in some ways it enables you to be a better leader of a church school…(S2f S5)

H1: One of the things about the new RE syllabus…when I started to work on the RE syllabus…in 2008 2009 when it first came out the way the subjects…it has the questions you know…

MJ: yeah…

H1: actually made teaching RE so much easier… I felt then it immediately made teaching RE so much easier…because you grappled with that question and then you could explore it…and I sort of adapted that for History and for Geography…

MJ: Oh…ok…

H1: in my own teaching…you know…

MJ: Ok…

221

H1: and with the staff I suppose at that time it really made me review things. Now that was a result of the pressures of church school inspections and everything else um made sure that every county has an Agreed Syllabus (indistinct)...so that's had an impact...that's changed my practice which I think is for the better...

MJ: for the better...

H1: which perhaps I may not have have done otherwise...I don't know I can't tell but yes but it's the heads that I meet at colleague heads meetings who are down on …... Ofsted or on whatever the changes are…

MJ: Yes…

H1: ==that's very hard to live by because you're the leader and if you're down all the time that will have an impact on your staff. So it has sort of shaped how I do things but it's made me a better church school leader, I think.==(S2e S2f S5)

MJ: That's lovely. Thank you. Is there anything else you think is relevant that you want to say?

H1: Um…there's a lot there! (laughs)

MJ: There is a lot there (laughs)...What will be really helpful…what I'll do then K…apparently it takes about 9 hours to write up an hour's interview…

H1: Really?

MJ: Which is going to be my summer months... (laughs)... writing things up…and then um it is alright if I keep coming along to some governor meetings?

H1: Sure yeah

MJ: That's ok… and then when the inspection gets closer um if it's alright with you…if I could just be around ...I'll try not to get in your way…um and then on the inspection itself that will be really helpful. What I'll…when I have transcribed this I'll um I'll show it to you to make sure that you're happy with it...there might be some things in it that come across...that don't come across like you meant them to... and we can revise things then if you want to…

H1: Yeah

MJ: The transcriptions themselves are not going to be…I mean it's going to be anonymised anyway but I don't envisage putting the whole transcription into...into the…my thesis...um...one or or 2 I might put as an appendix to show how I have analysed ….because I have to analyse this now…I can't just tell your story otherwise all I am doing is telling a story…I have to look at it now...

H1: yeah yeah…

MJ: against my questions and see if there are themes coming out. And if I want to any clarifications can I…?

H1: Yes just email me.

MJ: Thank you. Thanks ever so much.

The interview took place in H1's office at XXXX Primary school. (P1) It was my second visit as the first time H1 had wanted to talk through the research project and what I wanted from him. The atmosphere was relaxed. We sat opposite each other on comfortable chairs and we were not interrupted.

MJ: I know that we talked it through when I came in the other day, but what would be really helpful, and really for it to take as long as you want it to take, there's no set anything. But what I am really interested in is the story of why you um are doing the job you are doing, here, now really. Why were you a teacher, why are you a head, why working in church schools, why here, um, what's your passion for education really. That kind of thing. It's just that it's your story really. I'll make some notes if that's alright. In a way I don't need to but I think it just helps me to focus and not stare at you the whole time (laughs). And then I'll transcribe this sometime, I don't know, the summer holidays probably. Thank you.

H1: Where do I start…well...

MJ: Wherever you think it starts, I suppose.

H1: I suppose the reason I began teaching, **I didn't set out to become head of a church school…I …like most people when you qualify you just want a job and um whatever school you go into if it's a church school or a community school or a primary school …a free school or whatever it is um you just want to get started. And when you get your foot into the door then your career path takes…takes you in different directions I suppose. But in saying that I've been in I think my 6th school and um I've worked in 5 church schools.(P1 P4 P5)**

MJ: Wow (laughs)

H1: Yeah.

MJ: There's a pattern there (laughs)

H1: There's a pattern there. Yeah... um. Starting in D Primary school, that was my first one. That was a church school.

MJ: Yeah

H1: Um and um which was a wonderful experience (P1 P4). That was in 1988. So I qualified '87 and my first proper job was in January '88 in D. I had a term, an old term, in supply before I got a job, which I learned more in that term than I did in anything else. Yeah, it was really good.

MJ: Yeah

H1: And just experiences from then I suppose which led me to want to become a headteacher um I think frustrations as a teacher thinking 'I could do that'.

MJ: Hmm

H1: I could do that I could do that better. Um or I'd like to have a chance at doing that. If you remember back in the old days we had the old A and B scales...

MJ: Oh yeah I remember that

H1: You remember. **And I was in F I think, F Juniors…**

MJ: Ah ha

H1: Um I remember being overlooked for an A allowance by someone who I just felt was contributing not very much in the school. I remember being very frustrated and that spurred me on…(P1 P4)

MJ: Ah that's interesting…

H1: ...to um you know look for courses that were for middle management. And um **I very quickly got the deputy headship of B… um which was an experience um…**(P1 P4) because the head there, he was fantastic, but he was an old fashioned style head…

MJ: Yeah

H1: And um…ah yeah and it just worked out that things were going very wrong at school and Ofsted came along and had him removed during Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week…

MJ: Oh gosh

H1: It was an extraordinary experience…

MJ: Wow

H1: thing to happen...um… and just the next 18 months I was the acting head there...

MJ: Goodness

H1: that sort of period.

MJ: And what was that like? How was that for you?

H1: I look back on it and it was …quite a learning curve for me because I'd only been doing deputy headship for about 2 years and I knew that there were...I knew the head wasn't moving forward…

MJ: Yeah

H1: He was a great head for children but he wasn't a paperwork person as it were…

MJ: Ok yes

H1: And it was very much needed and I felt I was a ...I recognised myself that I could do the paperwork better...

MJ: Right yeah

H1: Better, you know and I was prompting him to do things and he wouldn't do them and such like and when Ofsted came in the county had already known that... the county when I got the job county warned me that they were watching him …

MJ: Right

H1: Yes I was called into SH...

MJ: Oh goodness

H1: Yes and I yes yes and JS...

MJ: Yeah

H1: J took me aside and said that er she gave me her phone number in case I ever needed her you know…

MJ: Oh goodness...so you were going into something then weren't you?

H1: Yeah yeah... Um but he was (coughs) he was a church goer and he was a wonderful church school head…

MJ: Ok

H1: He had all the values there...you know...um... and it was very hard in that sense...

MJ: Yes

H1: Um…to …yeah I didn't want to be critical because I could see his heart was there and …but education was moving forward and forward and forward you know and in the next 18 months I put everything into it too much if you like because at the end of 18 months when a new head came I had er... my breakdown I had…

MJ: Oh ok

H1: I had 9 months off

MJ: Right

H1: Um…I think through exhaustion...um and it just left…you know the whole effort of you know trying to put the school right... you know... and it was successful you know...

MJ: Ok right

H1: Er I look back very proud of that time and um…

MJ: It took its toll on you...

H1: It took its toll. And er I didn't realise how much it was...I mean I was ....er...at one point I was resenting having holidays and being home... it was er...it took over my life and I didn't see it happening...

MJ: Ok yeah

H1: I mean my [spouse] was seeing it happen but just let me go with it but one day I just…collapsed...I just….I was in the kitchen and I forgot how to make a cup of tea…(P2)

MJ: Goodness...

H1: My [spouse] said 'Look you've got to go and see a doctor because you're um x, y and z and I hadn't noticed…

MJ: You hadn't noticed…

H1: You know. I went to the doctor and he just signed me off you know...

MJ: Yeah it was frightening for you I would imagine

H1: Yeah... yeah it was um…

MJ: Did that put you off headship? It had taken…you had given it so much and it had taken…

H1: Hmm…

MJ: …so much from you...

H1: Did it put me off…? It didn't. Um because um I felt frustrated…

MJ: Still...

H1: Yeah. I felt frustrated that…and it took me about 2 years to get my first headship after that proper…I went back as a deputy and …

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: There was a new fantastic head at B, M, and she was a fantastic head and we got on really well and um... …but my anxiety was still there because I went for interviews which I should have walked and …

MJ: Yeah…

H1: and I didn't get them. And I think that caused more anxiety…

MJ: I'm sure...yes

H1: Um and yeah um... **but then I got the headship at I um….(P1)**

MJ: What made you keep going then when it was draining so much out of you? What was in you do you think?

H1: I was…I still felt I could do the job really well. I believed. That was what I wanted to do.

MJ: Right

H1: Um… when I look back on what had happened at B…we had turned things around…(P1 P4)

MJ: yeah…

H1: we had had a good church inspection as well and I was a part of that um… and…so then when I began applying for jobs I couldn't understand why I wasn't getting them, y'know…

MJ: Hmm

H1: And because my desire to become a head to a certain extent meant that when I went for interviews I was too nervous…

MJ: Yeah

H1: and that sometimes came across…

MJ: Ok yeah

H1: Um…I'd walk away and think, you know…what I should do next…(laughs)

MJ: Did it make you more frustrated…?

H1: Yeah

MJ: Yeah

H1: Yeah…um… but then I got I and the rest is history then…wonderful church school…got on with the vicar there straight away um and you know, I felt it was very much a team with her and felt that this was the environment that I felt comfortable with and I… er…before I hadn't had any preference …really…(P1)

MJ: and that was the time…

H1: Really. And that was the point when I was nearly…I applied for a non-church school headship and um it was in the centre of G and I went in and you know they make you do an assembly…so I did that and I put candles out and I did my assembly…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: And I didn't get the job and I was speaking to the adviser afterwards and this was a county primary school, a normal county primary school, and she asked me why I had a candle in the worship and I…I sort of…was aghast… why she had asked that question…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: She wasn't impressed by it at all…

MJ: So your head was already in the church school space without you even realising it…

H1: Yeah. But I was also really taken aback why this adviser you know, the school adviser, was questioning it and also the governors hadn't liked it or…

MJ: No...

H1: Didn't feel that it was relevant to what I was doing...**and and then I thought I had a lucky escape then from that school because I would have really come up against real um barriers in that school...(P1)**

MJ: Yeah

H1: I know it wasn't a church school but that's no reason not um you know to have spirituality...

MJ: No no

H1: in education and and I said I mean...I was so aghast...I'll never forget it...you know...it really stayed with me...

MJ: So it was an important moment...

H1: It was yeah. Um... and so um then the job at U came along. I spent 8 very happy years there. And then the opportunity here came along.(P1)

MJ: So ...that moment in the community school interview...was that when you thought 'hang on I am a church school person here'? (laughs)

H1: I realised... I probably realised more so than anybody else...I mean I always look**...there were always headships coming up and I went to look at them... I would walk around schools um... whether they were a church school or a non-church school you just get a feel for the school... and there were some...some schools you would go in and just feel ...felt the anxiety of the school and there was non-religious... you could tell from the head and the way that he or she ran the school...(P4 P5)**

MJ: Right...

H1: You know... and I'd go away thinking 'well I'm not applying for that one' you know... um and so I had that feeling of ethos of a Church of England school right early on... now I er I reflect on it because I didn't really realise it at the time...

MJ: No...

H1: Not perhaps until I had had that experience.

MJ: Yeah

H1: And so...yeah...I suppose that's ...it was that point which steered me to**...I'm more comfortable as head of a church school. um... because I didn't want to put up with that kind of...I won't say ignorance but but but...that anxiety that I think...I think I would pick up I had to fight that...(P1 P4)**

MJ: Yeah

H1: as well with governors you know...

MJ: And there was something very strong there clearly that they didn't get that was very important…that you viewed as being very important in education…

H1: Yes that's right...

MJ: Ideologically almost you would be very different...

H1: Yes... I just got the feeling that the whole governing body didn't see it because they were just... they had discussed it with the adviser and in her feedback...

MJ: So it wouldn't have been a very good for for you (laughs)...

H1: No it wouldn't have been a good fit...no. It wouldn't…yeah yeah yeah…

MJ: So what is it in you that makes you want to be the head... be the leader?

H1: um...

MJ: Because you did…you came out of a torrid time and continued to pursue that when in some ways if you hadn't...if you'd said 'I'll stay as the deputy' things might have been less anxious for you, mightn't it? But clearly there was a drive within you…

H1: Yes yeah…

MJ: that wouldn't let that happen.

H1: Yeah…um…it's hard to define… that's a hard question to answer really…I think…I… I... I dunno…all the way through my younger days I was always chosen to be the captain of a team...I was never the best player… (laughs)...um... but um… when I was at university we played juke ball and in my 2nd year I was captain of the juke ball team… you know… and far better players played than me…I just…I just…

MJ: There was something in you…

H1: There was something in me that I had never really recognised that I want…I just want to be um at the heart of things… I don't want to be told how to do things...

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: I s'pose this thing about academies you know one of my greatest fears is that we come under an academies' trust that just starts telling me how to run my school...

MJ: Ok... Yeah

H1: And that is…that is something that is at the back of my mind...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: I'm trying to get across to the governors that that makes me uncomfortable...

MJ: Hmm hmm…

H1: and because er coming here I was able to do what I wanted to do to a certain extent

MJ: yeah...

H1: ...having recognised that the...the er issues...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: er I feel that when I was applying for headships I was never going for the Outstanding schools I was always always looking for the schools that had problems…

MJ: Ok yes right hmm hmm…

H1: I felt there was something in me that I could turn things around. I have a vision more so than the average person has got…I'm blowing my own trumpet here…

MJ: No no that's fine…

H1: When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? Why can't the headteacher see that?'...and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only way of answering that I suppose is to become the head and...and stand by …stand by…what I thought...what my beliefs were…

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: You know and I know that that head was obviously a very good head…

MJ: Yes…

H1: and and and they were doing a hard job and there's 99 things that they were trying to juggle at the same time which I perhaps I didn't understand at the time...

MJ: Hmm…

H1: …I still…I still had that belief you know and the same when my…my… you know my children growing up and playing football for F or for wherever it was somehow umm…um…I ended up coaching the teams… you know and and the way they played…I played differently from other teams... um…because I could I could see that by playing that certain way you could win…because the age of the children were coping with that way of football and ….little things like that I could see in things…

MJ: yes…

H1: that other people, other coaches who were very experienced perhaps more experienced than me, couldn't see…and… I think that's one of the reasons why I was frustrated as a deputy…(P2)

MJ: yeah…

H1: or um if I'd stayed in the classroom I would have been frustrated that's why I needed to lead a school…

MJ: Hmm…hmm…yeah…

H1: Perhaps if I went…if I wasn't a teacher I'd have been wanting to lead something in whatever other job I wanted to do...

MJ: Yes…ok...

H1: You know...

MJ: So the passion is to lead isn't it?

H1: Yeah... but without being all singing all dancing and telling…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: people what to do all the time because that's um…that's not my style…I recognise things and um usually work out the problem or um my way and um hopefully people go with that. And um are I have found that the majority of the time people have done you know…I mean when I took over**…that day I took over at B… the first day the inspector was in it was um it was Mr G, do you remember him?**

MJ: No…

H1: It was… he was a quite big name in the county and he had to ring up Ofsted and the county and I remember standing there and him telling him 'you've got to leave' you know I couldn't believe it you know and also um we had to do the inspection that week and um ….

MJ: It was a huge day wasn't it?

H1: It was. Yes yeah it's still clear now… I can't remember the rest of the inspection but I can remember that moment…

MJ: That moment…

H1: Him standing there and the phone call…him putting the phone down and um 'I'm asking you to leave' yes…

MJ: And that was a turning point in your life I suppose…

H1: It was. Yes yeah…it changed everything for the next 18 months…(P4)

MJ: Yes yeah…

H1: which led on to…me being ill

MJ: yes which led to that…

H1: yes... yeah…

MJ: But which also then led to you clawing your way back…(laughs)

H1: Yes yeah. Absolutely yeah.

MJ: Getting back to doing what you felt passionately about.

H1: Yeah yeah.

MJ: Just thinking about the whole um SIAMS process then for you here…because…tell me if I'm wrong but it seems like what's coming across is that your passion as a leader…I mean you don't want to be told what to do, do you?

H1: No no

MJ: Because you do believe that…and experience has borne this out for you…that you can see the right thing to do in different circumstances…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: Even in the football team you could see how to win

H1: Yeah

MJ:

You knew what to do

H1: Yeah

MJ: To do that…and then you are working in an environment where this inspection thing gets put on you and…which you're measured by….and is that not in some way telling you what you have to do? Is that a difficultly?

H1: It's funny…I …er... I was at a cluster heads meeting yesterday…we had it here actually…,and I er um... mine was the only church school there obviously and er they were all worried about the academies and they were all talking about Ofsted and I er…

MJ: Hmm hmm…

H1: And I was sitting there thinking…and I was half thinking about seeing you today…and I was thinking… 'D'you know I must be mad because as a church school head you actually get hit with 2 whammies don't you?

MJ: Yes that's right

H1: By 2 whammies

MJ: (laughs)

H1: (laughs)…and they're just worried about going back and you spend all your time um going into a classroom, walking around the school thinking about Ofsted on one side and you do things SIAMSy the other side…so there's impact there…um... it's understanding the Ofsted or understanding the SIAMS ….er…you've got to have belief that you understand it better than the average person…

MJ: Ok

H1: like the direction I give to the teachers…the ideas I throw in... um it's because I have that higher level of understanding… that's that's not boasting…it's I like to

think that that I've taken…I do a lot of reading…I've taken time out to look at things um what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can…I can…I can adapt in my way to um to ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here…

MJ: Hmm hmm.

H1: and even though there are certain criteria which SIAMS has, as Ofsted has, um I feel that it is my role to take that and adapt it my way...

MJ: Ok

H1: My influence you know and I very much… you know…leadership is much about how you influence...it's your influence on a building on on on an establishment and if you haven't got ideas then you're not a good leader in many ways...and able to carry that through…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I s'ppose…

MJ: And what if um if if it was asking you something, and there might well be criteria in there already that you don't see are that important, or that you don't agree with, um…I don't know if there are any…feel free to say if there are...how would you, or how do you cope if there it is asking you in any way to do some things that you don't…that wouldn't be your way of doing it…what what would you do then?

H1: It's funny that you should say that because when I first came here um…and in 2012...and when we were doing worship and um it was very…worship was very well established here…and we have our worship team and every Monday morning I'd do my worship to the whole school and um I was doing the worship, and I really struggled at first here worship-wise because I came into a system and um I struggled to be part of that system…

MJ: Ok

H1: Um it… you know your first year of headship, you don't want to rock the boat too much and um I was rocking it enough because I was working on the Ofsted bit that had gone wrong and um I had rattled enough cages in that um but with the worship I was trying to run with worship and um after a year I just sat down and I felt it wasn't me...

MJ: Ok

H1: you know…

MJ: ...because you were trying to fit in with what was here…

H1: Yeah… you know, um and and there were some clashes then especially with W…I mean they weren't stand up arguments…

234

MJ: I can imagine you had to do it the way it was always done otherwise you weren't right...

H1: Yeah yeah

MJ: (laughs)

H1: (laughs) and um it felt, the teachers here, the first 2 years, the XXXX way was thrown at me so many times... and and I had to fight against that so many times and it... at different times to um... so that I don't have that phrase said at all now... you know because there isn't a XXXX way. And I thought that that was what was holding the school back in 2012. You know and we weren't moving forward because of that so certain senior members of staff were proud of throwing that at me in a staff meeting and um you know I'd go 'grrrr' in my room...(P1 P5)

MJ: I'm sure…

H1: and I'd get very angry about that...

MJ: yeah

H1: Now er um like with that Monday morning I um…one of the things…when I first became a teacher at D primary school, um DC was the head and um he was nearing the end of his career anyway but he was a fantastic leader of worship um he he…every Monday morning we we'd go into the hall as a… as a school and he hadn't prepared a thing but what he... (laughs) but what he'll do he he …

MJ: Those were the days (laughs)

H1: (laughs) yeah but he he had that strong belief in worship…we used to do worship every day and everybody did their own worship and every Monday morning he'd come in and he'd sit there or he'd stand there and he taught the children about the paper he'd read the day before…or the incident that he'd heard about at the weekend and…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: and I used to be just engrossed by this person who would talk about something, he must have had...it was a real talent but he was so comfortable within himself and…and... would talk about something he'd read about in the Times newspaper or or whatever...you know...and it would make you think ...and it wasn't …the convention of a worship or a service or of an assembly but it made you think...

MJ: Ah ha...

H1: And I came here I was doing my Monday morning worships and I I was using the worship team less and less because I was talking a lot more um and after a

year I thought 'no, the style I want to do is not to always use the worship team but the children have got to be able to listen to the headteacher' because I come in I…I've got the value very much in the front to my mind and I like to try to use an example that illustrates that value so that um... hopefully the children learn from that and so do the staff so …I began using literally reading from the Bible then and I think that's a good role model you know and I said 'no I'm not just going to have children acting. Children need to be able to see adults… standing up and using the Bible. So occasionally I'll use a Bible story and um I'll read from it, you know, and I began using the interactive whiteboard a lot more, doing power points with the children and I speak to the children and there are times in education we try to make it all singing and all dancing for them, to entertain them, but I feel we need to be told...they need to be told, and I once sat down, (indistinct) and I thought 'that's how I'm going to change it'. And since then I've felt more comfortable about what I want to do. To answer your question I mean…I've …I've looked at something and if it hasn't worked I haven't stuck with it…and try to think of a way round it that I feel more comfortable with... and that's what I've done. So I like to think that my Monday…my Mondays um …sometimes I use the children, sometimes I don't. I use a lot of questioning. Sometimes I just talk to them...um …and I can see it has impact. Sometimes it's a disaster (laughs)

MJ: (laughs)

H1: you know but but as a head you deliver so many assemblies you're not going to er always be perfect (laughs)

MJ: No

H1: Be it every time you know. Sometimes I…sometimes I've spent many hours that day before preparing it and I go and deliver it and I think 'that was really…not very good…' other times I've spent 5 minutes preparing it and it's gone kind of fantastic...

MJ: yeah yeah...

H1: as worship…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: You just can't tell sometimes...

MJ: So what would you say, if you did that on an inspection day, if it was that's what you were going to do anyway and they came in and you said 'Right I'm going to do what I would have always done' and if they criticised you for not using the children more then how would you deal with that?

H1: I think I'd explain what I've just explained to a certain extent. Yeah. In that if you're getting the message across, if you're illustrating the value and it's having an impact on the children and you know, over time I believe it does because I believe now that the teachers talk more about what Mr J said on Monday...

MJ: Right yeah

H1: I've heard that in the classroom which I've been pleased about …but also one of the big things I changed was all of the staff being in the assemblies because there was a timetable of, for adults being in worship you know and…

MJ: How did that go down?

H1: Not very well (laughs)

MJ: Took a while or…

H1: Yeah. Yes I s'ppose it took a while for them to come around to my way of thinking. Um because immediately they came to me and said 'but when are we going to do our 1-1 sessions'…

MJ: yeah yeah…

H1: and I just said 'you have to think about another time'. And so I was very unpopular for about 3 or 4 weeks you know…

MJ: How do you find that? How is that for you when you're…

H1: Unpopular?

MJ: Yeah

H1: Um… the older I've got the better it is at dealing with it. When I was younger it used to really impact on me quite a bit… um… and ….

MJ: But you still did it if you felt that it was right…

H1: If it was right... yes…yeah...and that's part of being a headteacher I s'ppose (laughs)

MJ: Yeah yeah…

H1: Or any leader or any manager I s'pose…Um…you've got to have a thick skin you know…I did something yesterday…um… I did my …a teacher brought in a mug in a worship so I emailed her afterwards and I said we are role models and that's not what I want to see in a worship you know so um…obviously I'll probably be unpopular for a day or two but um that's my role and as I said sometimes you've just got to do it. You know…

MJ: Yeah...ok... So with um SIAMS then would you say that mostly or maybe totally you're actually happy…it matches what you think education is for?

H1: Ooh.

MJ: Or about?

H1: Er…it provides…I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding…um…which wasn't there 20 years ago… like going back to D with DC and all that… I didn't always get a feeling of religiousness (laughs)

MJ: No…

H1: We did worship every day and I remember doing my first assembly as er as a probationer in those days

MJ: Yeah...

H1: and at the end of it the whole school applauded (claps) (laughs)

MJ: (laughs)

H1: I didn't ask for applause it …it was fantastic…it was typical of that school…

MJ: yeah…

H1: It was a lovely school…(P1)

MJ: Aaww yeah

H1: D... yeah… um but I wouldn't expect that today for example...(laughs)

MJ: No ok. Because there's a different emphasis

H1: Yes yeah um but there …

MJ: And how do you feel about them coming in and measuring you on all of these things…on how you lead the school, how good a church school you are?

H1: Um... oh that's the pressure, I s'ppose…

MJ: That is a pressure…

H1: That is a pressure. That is always with me. Um…

MJ: Really?

H1: Yes. But so is Ofsted. Even though I know we're not due an Ofsted probably we won't get another Ofsted because of our Outstanding status…I still say to teachers I study the Ofsted schedule because I need to be Ofsted-ready all the time. That's why I push you to so this, why I push you to do that…

MJ: Hmm hmm.

H1: In the same way I push...and I'm talking about SIAMS quite a lot…I'm…there's a big push within that…so we're always ready….

MJ: So it's always there…it's always there…

H1: It's always there… back of my mind...

MJ: And is that a stress for you?

H1: Um...it's a stress that you learn to live with. And I think it…it works out very differently with different heads I suppose. Some heads perhaps can't live with it and that's why they go under. Some heads thrive on it…that's how I am…I go to

238

heads meetings…I sit at the back and I watch different people's reactions to things, you know… Some have to talk about it a lot…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Express themselves a lot to those headteacher colleagues…or to their staff…I don't know how much I talk about it to my staff openly…

MJ: Right…

H1: I suppose I've never asked that question or thought about that…you know um…I try to guide them a lot…to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms…

MJ: Hmmm…

H1: because the pressure on them of having an inspector…

MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them?

H1: I…I … try not to.

MJ: Ok

H1: I try to put it a different way but sometimes it has to come out…If I feel I'm not getting the point across well enough I'll say well…well look…

MJ: Ok

H1: We've had an issue with TAs recently and making sure that they're really on board in class um and they've sort of baulked at it a bit…

MJ: Yes…

H1: Um… and I've said…I've actually said 'look with the change in the Ofsted criteria the inspector is coming and he's saying 'what are those two adults, not just the teacher, how are the contributing to the class?' And that's the question I'm now asking when I do an observation more than I was two years ago. You know and um so you have to be on board with knowing what next for the children and …and reporting back to the teacher and making those notes where perhaps you weren't doing 6 months ago. You know…

MJ: Ok so it's a last straw for you in a way…

H1: Yeah yeah yeah…

MJ: And is SIAMS the same for you as Ofsted in that? Because you know that they are going to come in and they are going to judge you and measure you. Um that…as a last straw then do you say you know 'you have to do this because SIAMS are going to be coming in?

H1: I would do but less so…

MJ: Less so with SIAMS?

H1: Less so…

MJ: And do you know why that is?

H1: D'you know...I don't know...(laughs)...um... I... I think because ...I tend to think...we've got so much in place for SIAMS that we're just fine tuning really....we're it's running smoothly...you know...all the work was done perhaps two or three years ago you know... from the day I came in I've got a file in there...I kept it as a record...pictures...things we've done for SIAMS...I want to give it to the SIAMS inspector when he or she comes...to say 'it's not just about what we've done for the last six months it's about what we've been doing for the last three, four, five years...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: You know and here's the evidence...I ...because I've got that behind me I feel that they ...they...they can see that we're a good...a good church school in that sense.

MJ: And would you um...you you used a phrase...and I don't know if you meant to...you said 'for SIAMS" you've got that stuff ready... do you think...would you do it ....do you do it because they're coming or would you do it anyway...or... a bit of both depending on what the issue is?

H1: I think I'd do it anyway...I'm always taking photographs...going right back to when I was a deputy in B I was always taking photographs... and having...and now people call it evidence but looking back...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: on...on things...you know... I remember making a display...um making displays of photographs of things the children were doing (indistinct)...yeah it's...

MJ: Yeah it's a way of celebrating...

H1: Yeah yeah... a few weeks later saying 'I remember that' you know... and er why would you do that, you know? and er it was up there you know. And so I've always sort of done that and it's just a part of my...of my... nature you know to have that...I don't use the term 'evidence' you know but I want to show that we're doing a lot more than we can do on the day or the week that the inspector's in you know...

MJ: Yeah I understand... ok... and um... on the same kind of thing really...do you... the things that you are doing and have been doing...all the changes that you've made and the stuff you've put in place um for SIAMS ...and I don't mean anything by saying that phrase... do you think that you would do those things if it wasn't for SIAMS or does SIAMS in some way shape what you do and how you do it?

H1: Yeah I think it does shape…if I'm honest…I think I'd still be doing those things but…. but…I've been to your courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as best I can so…so… I s'ppose it does shape if I'm honest…

MJ: Yeah…but is that a bad thing?

H1: No it's not…no it's not…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I …I feel um I feel the school is better because of it…

MJ: Hmm…

H1: I feel I'm a better leader because of it.

MJ: Oh right… ok

H1: Because I've got direction…got direction…when I think back again to DC…I love him to bits…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: Um and when I think about when I went to F and then I went to B I don't think those 3 heads um…were as in tune ….

MJ: Ok…

H1: I suppose with the spiritual side…with the spiritual element…

MJ: Ok…

H1: understanding worship…understanding RE… understanding in that sense …even thought they were church school leaders….um… of course the intensity wasn't there then…on church schools as it is now…um… I'm sure if they were heads now they would have adapted to things…

MJ: Yeah…

H1: but they were still brilliant heads you know…

MJ: Yeah…I understand…things have moved on…

H1: Yeah…

MJ: Um…so moving from here…what month is it…April?… yeah (laughs)… you're going to be inspected sometime in 16-17 aren't you? Um do you anticipate as it gets closer and gets more intense…for you… as a leader known that they're coming…wanting things to be in place...do you think about that…that preparation…time?

H1: I try not to (laughs)...

MJ: (laughs)...

H1: because um that's what causes the stress… you get wound up and that…and I see it... like I said…I see it in colleague headteachers so wound up because an

inspection is due that term and they're getting themselves really wound up...and it doesn't come (indistinct)...and I've been there and...and...

MJ: That's true...

H1: and it shouldn't do that... y'know...

MJ: Yeah...

H1: Um...and... so... um... if I was to get wound up it would impact on the teachers y'know...so I like to think that I'll... I think I've got everything in place ...I feel comfortable that we...the knowledge of the teachers as well...that has been the big thing...that's been the hard work getting the knowledge of the teachers up to speed with it as well...

MJ: Ok...

H1: I think everything's in...in place and there are some things that I... I need to work on perhaps a bit more...you heard last night about the Eucharist...the vicar's been trying to have um more than one Eucharist in this school for a couple of years now um...

MJ: Yes...

H1: and I've said no to that...I've put the opposition in to that...

MJ: Ok...

H1: Um because I didn't feel that the school... the time was right for the school...until now...that's not because of the inspection next year because of the issues we were having having 2 years, 18 months ago... you know... um... but now I feel... because everyone's on board...

MJ: More settled...

H1: More settled... um in school.

MJ: I see

H1: To...to introduce another aspect of worship to the school is the right time you know...and I've tried to explain that to the vicar and she ...she er understands that...

MJ: Right...that's good...

H1: so I er what you say about the pressure on me as the headteacher...I ...I still don't want to put the extra pressure on the teachers because um like being a headteacher you've got 2 whammy Ofsted and SIAMS um...the teachers also...I don't want pressure on to do with extra services whereas the teacher down the road at M hasn't got any of that pressure...

MJ: Like me...(laughs)

H1: You know I'm very aware of protecting...of protecting the teachers as much as possible and that's why I said to the vicar 'look the Eucharist service that we used is very involved with the teachers and I...we can't do that 3 times a year'...and she's also...she's gone away and she's thought about it and has come back and...I was really impressed by her last night...

MJ: It was good...

H1: Yeah yeah yeah yeah...

MJ: But that is as a result of you and she talking about that for about 18 months by the sound of it...

H1: Yeah yeah... absolutely...yes...yeah...absolutely...

MJ: That's an example actually...because that's what you talked about doing with the staff that you know what it is you want but you don't want to impose it...you .you...and that's a really nice example of that isn't it?

H1: Yes...yeah...

MJ: you and J working on that...

H1: Yeah...

MJ: So do you think that as it...as the time passes now...the next year or so or however long it is...that...do you think that you will start to...because what I'm looking at essentially is does the inspection process make you act and decide and behave differently and in a way as this next 12 months goes that's getting to that crucial time for you...I'm not...well I am asking you to predict... but I'm not asking...I'm not holding you to it I'm just wondering what...do you have any thoughts about what you think that will be like as it gets closer? Do you think it will force you in any way to do things that you don't really want to...do you envisage that...or...?

H1: I don't. No. Um I mean there are things that I feel that we still need to do which...

MJ: Hmm hmm

H1: Which um over the next 12 months I'll make sure are in place ...um... perhaps ramping it up to a certain extent um but then again it's been very much a journey from 2012 I suppose um and in that time SIAMS itself has changed you know...

MJ: Hmm...

H1: um as you know... sort of... 18 months ago it was...you saw with the SIAMS schedule...

MJ: Hmm...

H1: which we've all had to adapt to

MJ: Yeah

H1: understand first of all and and then make sure it's working in that way…

MJ: Yeah

H1: that way in the schools…so that way it's been positive and and the children and…and the staff…feel positive working in that…there are aspects of that SIAMS that I feel we are working towards…which er we will have in place in the next 6 months…

MJ: So the timings maybe would be affected but in terms of what you would do that wouldn't change…

H1: No…

MJ: you will do what you're doing…so…um… if I just sum up to make sure I've understood properly…that um that the existence of SIAMS does in some ways shape and make difference to what you do…

H1: Yes

MJ:…that's not um necessarily negative…

H1: No no…

MJ: and in some ways it enables you to be a better leader of a church school…

H1: One of the things about the new RE syllabus…when I started to work on the RE syllabus…in 2008 2009 when it first came out the way the subjects…it has the questions you know…

MJ: yeah…

H1: actually made teaching RE so much easier… I felt then it immediately made teaching RE so much easier…because you grappled with that question and then you could explore it…and I sort of adapted that for History and for Geography…

MJ: Oh…ok…

H1: in my own teaching…you know…

MJ: Ok…

H1: and with the staff I suppose at that time it really made me review things. Now that was a result of the pressures of church school inspections and everything else um made sure that every county has an Agreed Syllabus (indistinct)…so that's had an impact…that's changed my practice which I think is for the better…

MJ: for the better…

H1: which perhaps I may not have have done otherwise…I don't know I can't tell but yes but it's the heads that I meet at colleague heads meetings who are down on …… Ofsted or on whatever the changes are…

MJ: Yes…

H1: that's very hard to live by because you're the leader and if you're down all the time that will have an impact on your staff. So it has sort of shaped how I do things but it's made me a better church school leader, I think.

MJ: That's lovely. Thank you. Is there anything else you think is relevant that you want to say?

H1: Um…there's a lot there! (laughs)

MJ: There is a lot there (laughs)…What will be really helpful…what I'll do then K…apparently it takes about 9 hours to write up an hour's interview…

H1: Really?

MJ: Which is going to be my summer months… (laughs)… writing things up…and then um it is alright if I keep coming along to some governor meetings?

H1: Sure yeah

MJ: That's ok… and then when the inspection gets closer um if it's alright with you…if I could just be around …I'll try not to get in your way…um and then on the inspection itself that will be really helpful. What I'll…when I have transcribed this I'll um I'll show it to you to make sure that you're happy with it…there might be some things in it that come across…that don't come across like you meant them to… and we can revise things then if you want to…

H1: Yeah

MJ: The transcriptions themselves are not going to be…I mean it's going to be anonymised anyway but I don't envisage putting the whole transcription into…into the…my thesis…um…one or or 2 I might put as an appendix to show how I have analysed ….because I have to analyse this now…I can't just tell your story otherwise all I am doing is telling a story…I have to look at it now…

H1: yeah yeah…

MJ: against my questions and see if there are themes coming out. And if I want to any clarifications can I…?

H1: Yes just email me.

MJ: Thank you. Thanks ever so much.

Margaret James Thesis Appendix 6: H1 Temporality Analysis: Sample

i.   **H1 Temporality Analysis, pages 1-4**

Temporality coding	Quotes from life-story interview transcription	Comments/thoughts on Sacred, Secret and Cover stories
T1: What are the temporal elements of the story? Is there a discernible timeline? What does this look like	• H1: Where do I start…well…. MJ: Wherever you think it starts, I suppose. H1: I suppose the reason I began teaching, I didn't set out to become head of a church school…I …like most people when you qualify you just want a job and um whatever school you go into if it's a church school or a community school or a primary school …a free school or whatever it is um you just want to get started.	Sacred - assumption that most people would want to start their teaching career with a permanent post. Any job is better than no job. No sense of church school vocation at that point. Sacred - getting a permanent post is the right thing to do. It is the course of action of which to be most proud.
	• Starting in Dursley Primary school, that was my first one. That was a church school…That was in 1988. So I qualified '87 and my first proper job was in January '88 in Dursley.I had a term, an old term, in supply before I got a job…	Secret - I wonder if there is a sense of embarrassment in starting out as a supply teacher because they couldn't get a permanent post.
	• Um I remember being overlooked for an A allowance by someone who I just felt was contributing not very much in the school. I remember being very frustrated and that spurred me on…	Secret - private reasons for being driven to be a leader. Sense of needing to prove themselves and demonstrate that they were as capable as others in the profession. Sacred - professional recognition and reward by others is a driving force and something to be sought.
	• And um…ah yeah and it just worked out that things were going very wrong at school and Ofsted came along and had him removed during	Sacred - what Ofsted does and says carries a lot of weight. They have powers to remove and approve.

	Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week…	**Secret** - I detect a sense of pride despite feeling bad for their colleague. This might have been the 'break' they had been looking for.
	• …um… and just the next 18 months I was the acting head there…	**Secret** - as above
	• I was prompting him to do things and he wouldn't do them and such like and when Ofsted came in the county had already known that.... the county when I got the job county warned me that they were watching him …	**Sacred** - the power of the external body which watches and measures and judges and has the power to act decisively with the result that people's lives are changed. Echoes of the Panopticon - the ever-present, invisible, watchful eye. **Secret** - as previously. **Sacred** - as above
	• J took me aside and said that er she gave me her phone number in case I ever needed her you know…	**Secret** - sense of collusion with the authorities, those who have power. Is there a further sense of pride in being in the confidence of the authorities?
	• H1: Um…to …yeah I didn't want to be critical because I could see their heart was there and …but education was moving forward and forward and forward you know and in the next 18 months I put everything into it too much if you like because at the end of 18 months when a new head came I had er.... my breakdown I had… MJ: Oh ok H1: I had nine months off	**Secret** - I can't imagine that this is a story which H1 shares lightly. And yet they carry it with them daily as they continue to work in the same profession in the same role which caused them to break down. Says something about their determination and sense of pride in leading successfully. Interesting to note that this occurred very early in their career and yet they went on to take on

247

	MJ: Right	several headships.
	H1: Um…I think through	Consistent and powerful
	exhaustion…um and it just	motivation from within I
	left…you know the whole effort	suspect.
	of you know trying to put the	**Cover** - do they feel that
	school right… you know… and it	every day they are living a
	was successful you know...	cover story?
	MJ: Ok right	**Sacred** - success in one's
	H1: Er I look back very proud of	career is worth sacrificing
	that time and um…	one's health for. For the
	MJ: It took its toll on you…	external validation and
	H1: It took its toll. And er I didn't	reward? Is this what a
	realise how much it was….I mean	performative culture within
	I was …er…at one point I was	education does to school
	resenting having holidays and	leaders?
	being home… it was er….it took	
	over my life and I didn't see it	
	happening...	
	MJ: Ok yeah	
	H1: I mean my wife was seeing it	
	happen but just let me go with it	
	but one day I just…collapsed….I	
	just….I was in the kitchen and I	
	forgot how to make a cup of	
	tea…	
	MJ: Goodness…	
	H1: My spouse said 'Look you've	
	got to go and see a doctor	
	because you're um x, y and z and	
	I hadn't noticed…	
	MJ: You hadn't noticed…	
	H1: You know. I went to the	
	doctor and he just signed me off	
	you know…	
	• I felt frustrated that…and it	**Sacred** - career
	took me about 2 years to get	advancement is a powerful
	my first headship after that	driving force. Effects of
	proper…I went back as a	performative expectations?
	deputy….	**Cover** - did H1 live life as a
		cover story throughout this
		time? Are they still doing
		this?

T2: How can the story be divided into past, present and future? What is the place of hindsight in this?	• When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? Why can't the headteacher see that?'....and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only way of answering that I suppose is to become the head and....and stand by …stand by…what I thought....what my beliefs were…	Sacred - H1 does not want to be told what to do by others. They want to lead, to make the decisions, to decide on the courses of action to be taken. This describes the type of leader H1 regards himself as being.
	• …if I'd stayed in the classroom I would have been frustrated that's why I needed to lead a school…	Sacred - the way to effect change in the way you believe to be right is to be the leader yourself. H1 attributes the same philosophy to their former self as they do to their present self.
	• H1: …Yes yeah it's still clear now... I can't remember the rest of the inspection but I can remember that moment… MJ: That moment… H1: Him standing there and the phone call…him putting the phone down and um 'I'm asking you to leave' yes… MJ: And that was a turning point in your life I suppose… H1: It was. Yes yeah…it changed everything for the next 18 months… MJ: Yes yeah… H1: which led on to...me being ill MJ: yes which led to that… H1: yes... yeah… MJ: But which also then led to you clawing your way back…(laughs) H1: Yes yeah. Absolutely yeah. MJ: Getting back to doing what you felt passionately about. H1: Yeah yeah.	Sacred/cover - they need to believe this as it is the story which decided the next steps they took and which led at the time to illness and breakdown. If that was the wrong decision at the time, then H1 was culpable for what happened to them and it could have been avoided. We tell ourselves the version of the past which best serves our purposes often with no intention of misrepresenting events. Big issues of truth surrounding Cover Stories.

	• …I really struggled at first here worship-wise because I came into a system and um I struggled to be part of that system…	**Cover** - selective highlights retold with hindsight. These were significant events in H1's life and career and they retell the story very much from the point of view which impacted upon them. It is a reductionist version of events, possibly told this way for the sake of this interview. It is the story they need to tell of those events and of that time in their life. A cover story can give the individual telling and living it, strength to move forward.

iii. H1 Temporality Analysis, pp.36-41

T6 What is the pattern and influence of performativity over time and at different times in the story? Where does this come from?	• …but education was moving forward and forward and forward you know and in the next 18 months I put everything into it too much if you like because at the end of 18 months when a new head came I had er.... my breakdown I had… • …because er coming here I was able to do what I wanted to do to a certain extent	**Sacred** – aspects of education always moving forward is a good thing even if its increasingly performative culture has adverse effects on those in leadership. Moving forward = progress. **Secret** – I get a sense that this is not a story which H1 shares widely, even though it is one which has shaped them and hurt them. A sense that the performative nature of education is something inevitable and to be accepted whatever the cost.

	• H1: It was he was a quite big name in the county and he had to ring up Ofsted and the county and I remember standing there and him telling him 'you've got to leave' you know I couldn't believe it you know and also um we had to do the inspection that week and um …. MJ: It was a huge day wasn't it? H1: It was. Yes yeah it's still clear now…. I can't remember the rest of the inspection but I can remember that moment… MJ: That moment… H1: Him standing there and the phone call…him putting the phone down and um 'I'm asking you to leave' yes…	**Cover** – H1 must have covered up a lot of ill-health prior to their breakdown in order to keep up with the performative demands which would have been placed on them in their role.
	• Yes I s'ppose it took a while for them to come around to my way of thinking.	**Secret** – was H1 secretly looking for a school in which the relative freedom they would be given would mitigate the potentially negative stranglehold of performative demands? H1 has learned from earlier experiences.
	• Er…it provides…I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding…um…which wasn't there 20 years ago…	**Sacred** – complete acceptance that those at the top of the performative culture within education have the right to remove heads from schools. H1 looking on as this happens to a colleague. Having already suffered H1

• MJ: And how do you feel about them coming in and measuring you on all of these things…on how you lead the school, how good a church school you are? H1: Um…. oh that's the pressure, I s'ppose… MJ: That is a pressure… H1: That is a pressure. That is always with me. Um…	would have known how that would have felt for the head. Conflict for them between empathy and the fact that they would now be the beneficiary of the system. **Secret** – what would H1's secret reaction to this have been? This was their big chance for the breakthrough they had worked so hard and waited so long for. Performativity brings rewards for those who are on the right side of the actions.
• …I still say to teachers I study the Ofsted schedule because I need to be Ofsted-ready all the time. That's why I push you to so this, why I push you to do that…	**Sacred** – as head, H1 gets to call the shots and be the leader of the culture of performativity within the school. It is H1's criteria which everyone else has to adhere to in this context.
• H1: In the same way I push….and I'm talking about SIAMS quite a lot…I'm….there's a big push within that…so we're always ready…. MJ: So it's always there…it's always there… H1: It's always there… back of my mind…. MJ: And is that a stress for you?	**Sacred** – SIAMS is good for church schools. Regarded as different from Ofsted. Agreement with H1's own philosophy for education. Which came first though –

H1: Um....it's a stress that you learn to live with. And I think it....it works out very differently with different heads I suppose. Some heads perhaps can't live with it and that's why they go under. Some heads thrive on it...that's how I am....I go to heads meetings...I sit at the back and I watch different people's reactions to things, you know… Some have to talk about it a lot… MJ: Yeah… H1: Express themselves a lot to those headteacher colleagues…or to their staff…I don't know how much I talk about it to my staff openly… MJ: Right… H1: I suppose I've never asked that question or thought about that…you know um....I try to guide them a lot....to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms… MJ: Hmmm.... H1: because the pressure on them of having an inspector… MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them? H1: I....I .... try not to. MJ: Ok H1: I try to put it a different way but sometimes it has to come out…If I feel I'm not getting the point across well enough I'll say well…well look… • Um… and I've said....I've actually said 'look with the change in the Ofsted criteria the inspector is coming and he's saying 'what are those 2 adults, not just the teacher, how are the contributing to the class?' And that's the question I'm now asking when I do an observation more than I was 2 years ago.	SIAMS requirements or H1's educational philosophy? How have they merged over time in H1's quest to sit comfortably within a system which will not drive them to breaking point again? ==Sacred== – school inspection is a pressure but it must be accepted. Change is not an option. `Secret` – this pressure is with them every day but they hide it most of the time from colleagues and staff. Cover – in this hiding of their `secret story` has their professional life become a cover story? ==Sacred== – as above Cover – as above ==Sacred== – the performative aspects of education through inspection have significant power and authority. In order to appease

	• MJ: And is SIAMS the same for you as Ofsted in that? Because you know that they are going to come in and they are going to judge you and measure you. Um that…as a last straw then do you say you know 'you have to do this because SIAMS are going to be coming in? H1: I would do but less so…. MJ: Less so with SIAMS? H1: Less so… MJ: And do you know why that is? H1: D'you know….I don't know…(laughs)….um… I…. I think because …I tend to think…we've got so much in place for SIAMS that we're just fine tuning really….we're it's running smoothly…you know…all the work was done perhaps 2 or 3 years ago you know…. from the day I came in I've got a file in there…I kept it as a record….pictures…things we've done for SIAMS…I want to give it to the SIAMS inspector when he or she comes…to say 'it's not just about what we've done for the last 6 months it's about what we've been doing for the last 3, 4, 5 years…	them, some compromising of self must take place. This takes place in a virtually unquestioned fashion. People's feelings, health, reactions must be subject to those performative demands.
	• …I don't use the term 'evidence' you know but I want to show that we're doing a lot more than we can do on the day or the week that the inspector's in you know…	**Cover** – the performative requirements of inspection can be a useful thing for a head to hide behind at times. Collusion with the system can be beneficial.
	• Yeah I think it does shape…if I'm honest…I think I'd still be doing those things but…. but…I've been to your courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as	**Sacred** – changes in inspection requirements result in changes in teaching practice in the classroom. This is inevitable. It is

	best I can so…so…. I s'pose it does shape if I'm honest…	also a good thing. Sense that continual change = improvement and progress. <mark>Cover</mark> – heads can hide behind this performativity culture to bring about change whilst blaming eg Ofsted for what they require.
	• ….um…. of course the intensity wasn't there then…on church schools as it is now…um…. I'm sure if they were heads now they would have adapted to things…	
	• MJ: Um…so moving from here…what month is it….April?… yeah (laughs)… you're going to be inspected sometime in 16-17 aren't you? Um do you anticipate as it gets closer and gets more intense….for you…. as a leader known that they're coming….wanting things to be in place….do you think about that…that preparation…time? H1: I try not to (laughs)…. MJ: (laughs)…. H1: because um that's what causes the stress… you get wound up and that…and I see it…. like I said….I see it in colleague headteachers so wound up because an inspection is due that term and they're getting themselves really wound up…and it doesn't come (indistinct)…and I've been there and….and… MJ: That's true… H1: and it shouldn't do that… y'know….	<mark>Sacred</mark> – SIAMS is not as bad in the performativity stakes as Ofsted but must be listened to nonetheless because it will still judge you. Not as bad for H1 because they believe it is more aligned to their own educational philosophy than Ofsted is.
	• MJ: … I'm just wondering what…you do have any thoughts about what you think that will be	

	like as it gets closer? Do you think it will force you in any way to do things that you don't really want to...do you envisage that....or...? H1: I don't. No. Um I mean there are things that I feel that we still need to do which… MJ: Hmm hmm H1: Which um over the next 12 months I'll make sure are in place ....um.... perhaps ramping it up to a certain extent um but then again it's been very much a journey from 2012 I suppose… • H1: that way in the schools…so that way it's been positive and and the children and…and the staff…feel positive working in that…there are aspects of that SIAMS that I feel we are working towards…which er we will have in place in the next 6 months.... MJ: So the timings maybe would be affected but in terms of what you would do that wouldn't change… H1: No.... MJ: you will do what you're doing…so....um.... if I just sum up to make sure I've understood properly…that um that the existence of SIAMS does in some ways shape and make difference to what you do.... H1: Yes MJ:....that's not um necessarily negative… H1: No no....	**Cover** – H1 has been gathering 'evidence' for the forthcoming inspection for years now. Does this enable them to say that it is not in fact reactive evidence gathering for a performative culture but more of a way of life within the school? **Cover** – as above **Cover** – is appears to be very important to H1 that they are the one in control of what they do in school and why they do it. To admit that it is purely to meet performative criteria in order to be favourably judged would, I believe, be significantly damaging to H1's sense of self. Therefore, they mitigate the demands of a performative inspectorate by knowing the expectations well in advance of inspection and 'making them their own'.

		Sacred – time brings change which means improvement. Heads from years ago would have adapted according to H1 – they cannot envisage any other way of coping with the performative education system other than going with it and adapting to its demands.
		Sacred – inspection brings stress but must be worked with and appeased as a system with power. How complicit are school leaders with the system? Does their subservience to it in practice give it an authority which it would not have otherwise? Despite a decision to work within its demands, H1 is clear because of their own experience that the system should not be so punitive for heads. **Secret** – for H1, the constant reminder of what the system can do to you if you allow it. **Cover** – how much does that

		knowledge create the need to live an ongoing cover story?
		Cover – immediate response of 'no' to my question followed by an admission that things are being done ready for the inspection. There is an internal conflict in having to act in this way and a reluctance to be seen to be acting in response to the demands of inspection. SIAMS creates this internal conflict for leaders of church schools. Is this right? Does it fit with what SIAMS stands for?
		Cover or **Sacred?** – determination to be heard to be saying that SIAMS is not making them do the things they are doing, only impacting upon timings. So its impact is limited for H1 because it is already their philosophy for education which makes them do certain things in school. The pressure which

258

		SIAMS brings because of its status as a tool of measurement is one which H1 insists is good pressure rather than negative stress. Possibly H1 is determined to limit its power by insisting on and emphasising this.

<mark style="background:#00ff00">**S2b**</mark> <mark style="background:#00ff00">**Personal**</mark> <mark style="background:#00ff00">**values?**</mark>	• Um I remember being overlooked for an A allowance by someone who I just felt was contributing not very much in the school. I remember being very frustrated and that spurred me on…	<mark>**Sacred**</mark> – hard work should/will be rewarded with promotion at work.
	• H1: Yeah yeah.... Um but he was (coughs) he was a church goer and he was a wonderful church school head… MJ: Ok H1: He had all the values there....you know....um.... and it was very hard in that sense.... MJ: Yes H1: Um…to …yeah I didn't want to be critical because I could see his heart was there and …	<mark>**Sacred**</mark> **–** it is difficult to criticise and act against a head who is a church-goer and who demonstrates Christian values at work. However, the influence of a performative inspection culture takes precedence over this.
	• H1: It took its toll. And er I didn't realise how much it was....I mean I was ….er…at one point I was resenting having holidays and being home.... it was er....it took over my life and I didn't see it happening.... MJ: Ok yeah H1: I mean my spouse was seeing it happen but just let me go with it but one day I just…collapsed....I just….I was in the kitchen and I forgot how to make a cup of tea…	<mark style="background:#c0c0c0">**Secret**</mark> **/**<mark>**Sacred**</mark>– in education it is important to keep any struggles private and to keep on going regardless of one's own health. This leads to living a **Cover** story. A lie? How does this sit with H1's personal value system?
	• Did it put me off…? It didn't. Um because um I felt frustrated…	<mark>**Sacred**</mark> – strong work ethic – hard work is a worthy thing and brings results. Failure or frustration can be a driving force.
	• MJ: What made you keep going then when it was draining so much out of you? What was in you do you think? H1: I was…I still felt I could do the job really well. I believed. That was what I wanted to do.	<mark>**Sacred**</mark> – as above.

• H1: And because my desire to become a head to a certain extent meant that when I went for interviews I was too nervous.... MJ: Yeah H1: and that sometimes came across.... MJ: Ok yeah H1: Um....I'd walk away and think, you know…what I should do next…(laughs) MJ: Did it make you more frustrated....? H1: Yeah MJ: Yeah H1: Yeah....um.... but then I got I and the rest is history then....wonderful church school…got on with the vicar there straight away um and you know, I felt it was very much a team with her and felt that this was the environment that I felt comfortable with and I… er…before I hadn't had any preference ....really....	**Sacred** – as above. Never give up. Keep on keeping on. Things will work out in the end if you keep working hard and keep on picking yourself up after rejection.
• H1: Didn't feel that it was relevant to what I was doing…and and then I thought I had a lucky escape then from that school because I would have really come up against real um barriers in that school… MJ: Yeah H1: I know it wasn't a church school but that's no reason not um you know to have spirituality… MJ: No no H1: in education and and I said I mean....I was so aghast…I'll never forget it....you know…it really stayed with me…	**Sacred** – things happen for a reason. H1 was meant to be the head of a church school. An education which incorporates spirituality is the right thing.
• I realised.... I probably realised more so than anybody else....I mean I always look…there were always headships coming up and I went to look at them.... I would walk around schools um.... whether they were a church school or a non-church school you just get a feel for	**Sacred** – the head of a school has an incomparable impact on the ethos of the place. Aligning of spirituality within a school and a peaceful, positive ethos.

261

	the school… and there were some…some schools you would go in and just feel ….felt the anxiety of the school and there was non-religious… you could tell from the head and the way that he or she ran the school….	
	• …I suppose that's …it was that point which steered me to…I'm more comfortable as head of a church school. um… because I didn't want to put up with that kind of…I won't say ignorance but but but…that anxiety that I think….I think I would pick up I had to fight that…	<mark>Sacred</mark> – H1's own philosophy for education is in line with CofE schools. That is where they are at home. They are the best type of schools.
	• …I think…I… I…. I dunno…all the way through my younger days I was always chosen to be the captain of a team….I was never the best player… (laughs)….um…. but um… when I was at university we played juke ball and in my 2nd year I was captain of the juke ball team… you know… and far better players played than me…I just…I just…There was something in me that I had never really recognised that I want…I just want to be um at the heart of things… I don't want to be told how to do things….	<mark>Sacred</mark> – H1 is a born leader of people. H1's value system is such that they are driven to make sure this happens if it is not automatically recognised by those in control of a situation.
	• H1: I felt there was something in me that I could turn things around. I have a vision more so than the average person has got…I'm blowing my own trumpet here… MJ: No no that's fine… H1: When I was a teacher I used to think 'why can't the head see that? Why can't the headteacher see that?'….and I used to, time and time again I used to you know and my only	<mark>Sacred</mark> – as above. Strong sense of self-belief and a willingness to work as hard as is necessary to make this a reality.

	way of answering that I suppose is to become the head and….and stand by …stand by…what I thought….what my beliefs were…	
	• MJ: So the passion is to lead isn't it?	<mark>Sacred</mark> – H1 is a born leader. They are aware of what his leadership style is and has evidence that this is a successful means of leadership. They are driven by this belief and works hard in all circumstances to make it a reality.
	H1: Yeah…. but without being all singing all dancing and telling…	
	MJ: Yeah…	
	H1: people what to do all the time because that's um….that's not my style…I recognise things and um usually work out the problem or um my way and um hopefully people go with that. And um are I have found that the majority of the time people have done you know…	
	• H1: (laughs)…and they're just worried about going back and you spend all your time um going into a classroom, walking around the school thinking about Ofsted on one side and you do things SIAMSy the other side…so there's impact there…um…. it's understanding the Ofsted or understanding the SIAMS ….er….you've got to have belief that you understand it better than the average person…	<mark>Sacred</mark> – H1's level of self-belief enables them to make their own decisions and move others with them confidently.
	MJ: Ok	
	H1: like the direction I give to the teachers….the ideas I throw in…. um it's because I have that higher level of understanding… that's that's not boasting…it's I like to think that that I've taken…I do a lot of reading…I've taken time out to look at things um what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can…I can…I can adapt in my way to um to ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here…	
	MJ: Hmm hmm	
	• And I came here I was doing my Monday morning worships and I I	<mark>Sacred</mark> – as above. This shows a little of H1's

263

	was using the worship team less and less because I was talking a lot more um and after a year I thought 'no, the style I want to do is not to always use the worship team but the children have got to be able to listen to the headteacher' because I come in I…I've got the value very much in the front to my mind and I like to try to use an example that illustrates that value so that um…. hopefully the children learn from that and so do the staff so ….I began using literally reading from the Bible then and I think that's a good role model you know and I said 'no I'm not just going to have children acting. Children need to be able to see adults, males even, standing up and using the Bible. So occasionally I'll use a Bible story and um I'll read from it, you know, and I began using the interactive whiteboard a lot more, doing power points with the children and I speak to the children and there are times in education we try to make it all singing and all dancing for them, to entertain them, but I feel we need to be told….they need to be told, and I once sat down, (indistinct) and I thought 'that's how I'm going to change it'. And since then I've felt more comfortable about what I want to do.	thought process before taking action. Strongly linked to their values and belief system and involves being a role model and sharing the importance of the Bible to people's lives.
	• H1: and I just said 'you have to think about another time'. And so I was very unpopular for about 3 or 4 weeks you know… MJ: How do you find that? How is that for you when you're…. H1: Unpopular? MJ: Yeah	==Sacred== – being a leader is not a popularity contest. H1 will do what they think is right regardless of what other people think of them. Their feelings are very much secondary to doing

	H1: Um… the older I've got the better it is at dealing with it. When I was younger it used to really impact on me quite a bit… um… and …. MJ: But you still did it if you felt that it was right…. H1: If it was right…. yes…yeah….and that's part of being a headteacher I s'pose (laughs) MJ: Yeah yeah…. H1: Or any leader or any manager I s'pose…Um…you've got to have a thick skin you know…I did something yesterday…um…obviously I'll probably be unpopular for a day or two but um that's my role and as I said sometimes you've just got to do it. You know… • H1: ….I try to guide them a lot….to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms… MJ: Hmmm…. H1: because the pressure on them of having an inspector… MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them? H1: I….I …. try not to. MJ: Ok H1: I try to put it a different way but sometimes it has to come out…If I feel I'm not getting the point across well enough I'll say well…well look… • And so I've always sort of done that and it's just a part of my…of my…. nature you know to have that…I don't use the term 'evidence' you know but I want to show that we're doing a lot more than we can do on the day or the week that the inspector's in you know… •	what H1 thinks is the right thing. Strong value system here. **Cover** – first time there is any suggestion of H1's value system being compromised is with regard to the expectations of an inspector and what they will therefore do and say to the staff. Indication of the level of performativity here and the impact it has regardless of the strength of the head in other areas. **Cover** – H1 is at pains to explain that gathering evidence is something they have always done and it is therefore not a reaction to an inspector. I'm not sure about this though as inspection is the only area discussed in which H1 talks about taking

		action which compromises his value system in any way.
	• You know I'm very aware of protecting…of protecting the teachers as much as possible and that's why I said to the vicar 'look the Eucharist service that we used is very involved with the teachers and I…we can't do that 3 times a year'…and she's also….she's gone away and she's thought about it and has come back and….	<mark>Sacred</mark> – part of the role of a head is to protect his staff. The only area which contradicts this is the expectation to meet inspection criteria and then they are used as a means of getting staff members to act in accordance with what they want to happen because of his greater understanding of the inspection criteria.

ii.   **H1 Sociality Analysis, pp.18-32**

S2f Professional expectations from external agencies?	• … and Ofsted came along and had him removed during Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week…	<mark>Sacred</mark> – Ofsted is the ultimate in terms of performativity in the world of education. They have power to remove heads and they are to be feared. They cannot be influenced and will do what they will. Their judgements have to be accepted and heads play the game or suffer the consequences. In this instance, one head suffered and one was elevated.
	• …and I was prompting him to do things and he wouldn't do them and such like and when Ofsted came in the county had already known that…. the county when I	<mark>Cover</mark> – what had actually been going on behind the scenes? Is hindsight altering the reality of what happened

266

	got the job county warned me that they were watching him …	between H1 and the head before the Ofsted inspection? Careful use of the word 'prompting' as H1 would have known that they were not in a position to tell the head what to do.
	• Um…I think through exhaustion….um and it just left…you know the whole effort of you know trying to put the school right…. you know…. and it was successful you know….	**Sacred** – the 'County' had some elements of power and authority at the time and their warning words to H1 would have been taken seriously. **Secret** – collusion and exchange of information behind the scenes to the exclusion of the head.
	• It took its toll. And er I didn't realise how much it was….I mean I was ….er…at one point I was resenting having holidays and being home…. it was er….it took over my life and I didn't see it happening….	**Sacred** – suffering a breakdown was worth the effort it took to be affirmed by Ofsted. **Secret/Cover** – how much of this was kept as a secret at the time whilst H1 continued to live a Cover story of a head who was coping with the stress brought by the role.
	• …we had had a good church inspection as well and I was a part of that um… and…so then when I began applying for jobs I couldn't understand why I wasn't getting them, y'know….	**Sacred** – as above **Secret/Cover** – as above

	• It was… he was a quite big name in the county and he had to ring up Ofsted and the county and I remember standing there and him telling him 'you've got to leave' you know I couldn't believe it you know and also um we had to do the inspection that week and um ….	**Sacred** – affirmation by the inspectorate should have led to continued success for H1 at interview. The failure of this to happen made no sense to them. **Sacred** – power and authority of the external personnel ie county and Ofsted. If they said that the head had to go and H1 was to replace him on the spot there was to be no argument.
	• MJ: Just thinking about the whole um SIAMS process then for you here…because…tell me if I'm wrong but it seems like what's coming across is that your passion as a leader…I mean you don't want to be told what to do, do you? H1: No no MJ: Because you do believe that…and experience has borne this out for you…that you can see the right thing to do in different circumstances… H1: Yeah… MJ: Even in the football team you could see how to win H1: Yeah MJ: You knew what to do H1: Yeah MJ: To do that…and then you are working in an environment where this inspection thing gets put on you and…which you're measured by….and is that not in some way telling you what you have to do? Is that a difficultly?	**Sacred** – H1 was born to be a leader. To have this validated externally eg by County and by Ofsted, simply confirms what they already knew.

	H1: It's funny…I …er…. I was at a cluster heads meeting yesterday…we had it here actually….,and I er um…. mine was the only church school there obviously and er they were all worried about the academies and they were all talking about Ofsted and I er… MJ: Hmm hmm… H1: And I was sitting there thinking…and I was half thinking about seeing you today….and I was thinking… 'D'you know I must be mad because as a church school head you actually get hit with 2 whammies don't you? MJ: Yes that's right H1: By 2 whammies MJ: (laughs) H1: (laughs)…and they're just worried about going back and you spend all your time um going into a classroom, walking around the school thinking about Ofsted on one side and you do things SIAMSy the other side…so there's impact there…um…. it's understanding the Ofsted or understanding the SIAMS ….er….you've got to have belief that you understand it better than the average person… MJ: Ok H1: like the direction I give to the teachers….the ideas I throw in…. um it's because I have that higher level of understanding… that's that's not boasting…it's I like to think that that I've taken…I do a lot of reading…I've taken time out to look at things um what SIAMS is saying um I like to think I can…I can…I can adapt in my way to um to ensure that we are on the right track for SIAMS here… MJ: Hmm hmm. H1: and even though there are certain criteria which SIAMS has, as Ofsted has, um I feel that it is my role to take that and adapt it my way….	<mark>Sacred</mark> – the knowledge that inspection is imminent sharpens the mind and focuses the head onto what an inspector will look for in order to be forearmed and as well prepared as possible for the day. For H1, this is not unduly onerous because SIAMS is simply looking at things in the same way that H1 already thinks and leads their school. **Sacred** – although inspection criteria must be listened to, H1's view is that they have the final say in the case of any disagreement. Will this be borne out during the inspection? How much of this is a <mark>Cover</mark> story? **Sacred** – if Ofsted has spoken then it must be acted upon. That agenda gave legitimacy to H1's initial agenda at the school.

269

	• Um it… you know your first year of headship, you don't want to rock the boat too much and um I was rocking it enough because I was working on the Ofsted bit that had gone wrong and um I had rattled enough cages in that um but with the worship I was trying to run with worship and um after a year I just sat down and I felt it wasn't me....	**Secret** – making changes in other areas, however, was more difficult, because there was no external mandate – in fact, the opposite was the case. H1 had to deal with this more carefully and with a degree of private, **secret** thought and planning first.
	• MJ: So what would you say, if you did that on an inspection day, if it was that's what you were going to do anyway and they came in and you said 'Right I'm going to do what I would have always done' and if they criticised you for not using the children more then how would you deal with that? H1: I think I'd explain what I've just explained to a certain extent. Yeah. In that if you're getting the message across, if you're illustrating the value and it's having an impact on the children and you know, over time I believe it does because I believe now that the teachers talk more about what Mr J said on Monday....	**Sacred** – H1's insistence that they would argue with the inspector should they disagree with them. Very important to observe on the inspection day. Quite different from the attitude to Ofsted inspection.
	• Er…it provides…I think SIAMS is good for church schools because it provides such a good framework of understanding…um…which wasn't there 20 years ago… • MJ: And how do you feel about them coming in and measuring you on all of these things…on how you lead the school, how good a church school you are?	**Sacred** – the SIAMS criteria are good for church schools and H1 works easily with them, as long as they are able to make the final decision on how things are applied in their school. Not a freedom which they have with Ofsted.

H1: Um…. oh that's the pressure, I s'pose… MJ: That is a pressure… H1: That is a pressure. That is always with me. Um… MJ: Really? H1: Yes. But so is Ofsted. Even though I know we're not due an Ofsted probably we won't get another Ofsted because of our Outstanding status…I still say to teachers I study the Ofsted schedule because I need to be Ofsted-ready all the time. That's why I push you to so this, why I push you to do that… MJ: Hmm hmm. H1: In the same way I push….and I'm talking about SIAMS quite a lot…I'm….there's a big push within that…so we're always ready…. MJ: So it's always there…it's always there… H1: It's always there… back of my mind…. MJ: And is that a stress for you? H1: Um….it's a stress that you learn to live with.	**<mark>Sacred</mark>** – even though school inspection is a pressure it is something which H1 uses regularly in communication with their staff. It is a pressure they have learned to live with because it is a necessary evil – SIAMS less evil than Ofsted. They seem to deflect the pressure on themselves over the thought of being measured and judged by including their staff and increasing their understanding – sharing the load? The responsibility? What they believe is right for the school appears to bow somewhat in the face of inspection criteria – the one thing which supersedes them in terms of power and authority within their own school.
• H1:….I try to guide them a lot….to be aware um that this is what possibly an inspector might look for…and I hate using those terms… MJ: Hmmm…. H1: …because the pressure on them of having an inspector… MJ: Why do you use them if you hate using them? H1: I….I …. try not to.	**<mark>Cover</mark>** – how much do they cover up in front of their staff the amount of pressure that he is under? Do they see it as part of their role?

	MJ: Ok	
	H1: I try to put it a different way but sometimes it has to come out…If I feel I'm not getting the point across well enough I'll say well…well look…	practice is underpinned by what an inspector might look for? How great a driving force is that in reality? Greater than H1 would feel happy to admit?
	MJ: Ok	
	H1: We've had an issue with XXX recently and making sure that they're really on board in class um and they've sort of baulked at it a bit…	
	MJ: Yes…	
	H1: Um… and I've said….I've actually said 'look with the change in the Ofsted criteria the inspector is coming and he's saying 'what are those 2 adults, not just the teacher, how are the contributing to the class?' And that's the question I'm now asking when I do an observation more than I was 2 years ago. You know and um so you have to be on board with knowing what's next for the children and …and reporting back to the teacher and making those notes where perhaps you weren't doing 6 months ago. You know…	
	MJ: Ok so it's a last straw for you in a way….	
	H1: Yeah yeah yeah…	
	MJ: And is SIAMS the same for you as Ofsted in that? Because you know that they are going to come in and they are going to judge you and measure you. Um that…as a last straw then do you say you know 'you have to do this because SIAMS are going to be coming in?	
	H1: I would do but less so….	**Sacred** – SIAMS is less demanding as a performative inspection culture than Ofsted. Is this because of the culture of the inspectorate? Or because it fits more with H1's
	MJ: Less so with SIAMS?	
	H1: Less so…	
	MJ: And do you know why that is?	
	H1: D'you know….I don't know…(laughs)….um… I…. I think because …I tend to think…we've got so much in place for SIAMS that we're just fine tuning really….we're it's running	

	smoothly…you know…all the work was done perhaps 2 or 3 years ago you know…. from the day I came in I've got a file in there…I kept it as a record….pictures…things we've done for SIAMS…I want to give it to the SIAMS inspector when he or she comes…to say 'it's not just about what we've done for the last 6 months it's about what we've been doing for the last 3, 4, 5 years… MJ: Yeah…. H1: You know and here's the evidence…I …because I've got that behind me I feel that they …they…they can see that we're a good…a good church school in that sense.	philosophy? Or they are better prepared for it?
	MJ: And would you um…you you used a phrase….and I don't know if you meant to…you said 'for SIAMS" you've got that stuff ready… do you think…would you do it ….do you do it because they're coming or would you do it anyway…or… a bit of both depending on what the issue is? H1: I think I'd do it anyway…I'm always taking photographs…going right back to when I was a deputy in B I was always taking photographs… and having….and now people call it evidence but looking back….	**Sacred**/**Cover** – I don't know which this is. Is it real and unquestioned or is it compliance and appeasement?
	• MJ: Yeah I understand… ok… and um… on the same kind of thing really…do you…. the things that you are doing and have been doing….all the changes that you've made and the stuff you've put in place um for SIAMS …and I don't mean anything by saying that phrase… do you think that you would do those things if it wasn't for SIAMS or does SIAMS in some way shape what you do and how you do it?	**Sacred** – SIAMS is good for church schools. It helps the leaders to have a direction and a basis for their own philosophy.

	H1: Yeah I think it does shape…if I'm honest…I think I'd still be doing those things but…. but…I've been to your courses and I've listened to what the expectation is of a church school and um I've tried to take that information and to adapt it as best I can so…so…. I s'pose it does shape if I'm honest… MJ: Yeah…but is that a bad thing? H1: No it's not…no it's not… MJ: Hmm… H1: I ….I feel um I feel the school is better because of it…. MJ: Hmm…. H1: I feel I'm a better leader because of it. MJ: Oh right…. ok H1: Because I've got direction…got direction…	**Cover** – a sensible leader listens to what the expert says and then implements it accordingly. **Sacred** – the expert knows best and must be listened to.
	• MJ: Um…so moving from here… you're going to be inspected sometime in 16-17 aren't you? Um do you anticipate as it gets closer and gets more intense….for you…. as a leader knowing that they're coming….wanting things to be in place….do you think about that…that preparation…time? H1: I try not to (laughs)…. MJ: (laughs)…. H1: because um that's what causes the stress… you get wound up and that…and I see it…. like I said….I see it in colleague headteachers so wound up because an inspection is due that term and they're getting themselves really wound up…and it doesn't come (indistinct)…and I've been there and….and… MJ: That's true… H1: and it shouldn't do that… y'know…. MJ: Yeah… H1: Um…and…. so…. um…. if I was to get wound up it would impact on the teachers y'know…so I like to think that	**Sacred** – inspection, which cannot be avoided, causes stress and needs to be managed so that it doesn't get out of hand and make you ill. **Sacred** – it is part of a head's job to protect their staff from this pressure. **Sacred** – decisions about the worship life of the school are not driven by the demands of inspection. Is this a **Cover** story?

274

| | I'll.... I think I've got everything in place …I feel comfortable that we…the knowledge of the teachers as well…that has been the big thing…that's been the hard work getting the knowledge of the teachers up to speed with it as well…

MJ: Ok....

H1: I think everything's in....in place and there are some things that I… I need to work on perhaps a bit more…you heard last night about the Eucharist…the vicar's been trying to have um more than one Eucharist in this school for a couple of years now um....

MJ: Yes…

H1: and I've said no to that…I've put the opposition in to that....

MJ: Ok....

H1: Um because I didn't feel that the school… the time was right for the school…until now…that's not because of the inspection next year because of the issues we were having having 2 years, 18 months ago.... you know… um.... but now I feel… because everyone's on board…

MJ: More settled....

H1: More settled… um in school.

MJ: I see

H1: To....to introduce another aspect of worship to the school is the right time you know…and I've tried to explain that to the vicar and she …she er understands that....

MJ: Right....that's good....

H1: so I er what you say about the pressure on me as the headteacher…I ....I still don't want to put the extra pressure on the teachers because um like being a headteacher you've got 2 whammy Ofsted and SIAMS um…the teachers also....I don't want pressure on to do with extra services whereas | **Sacred** – head's job to protect their staff from the unduly onerous demands of school inspection.

Sacred or **Cover story?** H1 is immediately adamant that they will not be changing what they do in school because of the impending inspection. But then immediately describes how they will be refining things ready for SIAMS. Does SIAMS leave any other option for heads? Does it thereby compromise the integrity of otherwise very strong leaders? It will be crucial to observe this very closely during the inspection and to take note of the potential impact which my own presence is having on both the |

275

	the teacher does the road at M hasn't got any of that pressure…	inspector and the head.
	• MJ: …do you have any thoughts about what you think that will be like as it gets closer? Do you think it will force you in any way to do things that you don't really want to…do you envisage that….or…? H1: I don't. No. Um I mean there are things that I feel that we still need to do which… MJ: Hmm hmm H1: Which um over the next 12 months I'll make sure are in place ….um…. perhaps ramping it up to a certain extent um but then again it's been very much a journey from 2012 I suppose • H1: …so that way it's been positive and…and the children and…and the staff…feel positive working in that…there are aspects of that SIAMS that I feel we are working towards…which er we will have in place in the next 6 months…. MJ: So the timings maybe would be affected but in terms of what you would do that wouldn't change… H1: No…. MJ: you will do what you're doing…so….um…. if I just sum up to make sure I've understood properly…that um that the existence of SIAMS does in some ways shape and make difference to what you do…. H1: Yes MJ:….that's not um necessarily negative… H1: No no…. MJ: and in some ways it enables you to be a better leader of a church school…. • … you're the leader and if you're down all the time that will have an	**<mark>Sacred</mark> or <mark style="background:red">Cover</mark> story?** As above. **<mark>Sacred</mark>** – weighing up the pros and cons, SIAMS is good for the leadership of church schools and therefore is good for church schools.

276

	impact on your staff. So it has sort of shaped how I do things but it's made me a better church school leader, I think.	

H1 Place Analysis, pp.4-7

P4 **What impact do the participants think that these settings have on the story?**	• H1: I suppose the reason I began teaching, I didn't set out to become head of a church school…I …like most people when you qualify you just want a job and um whatever school you go into if it's a church school or a community school or a primary school …a free school or whatever it is um you just want to get started. And when you get your foot into the door then your career path takes…takes you in different directions I suppose. But in saying that I've been in I think my 6th school and um I've worked in 5 church schools. MJ: Wow (laughs) H1: Yeah. MJ: There's a pattern there (laughs) H1: There's a pattern there. Yeah… um. Starting in D Primary school, that was my first one. That was a church school. MJ: Yeah H1: Um and um which was a wonderful experience. • H1: Um I remember being overlooked for an A allowance by someone who I just felt was contributing not very much in the school. I remember being very frustrated and that spurred me on…to um you know look for courses that were for middle management. And um I very quickly got the deputy headship of B… um which was an experience um…because the head there,	**Sacred** – although unintentional at first, H1 now believes that church schools are the best places to work and would not work elsewhere. This view is held despite knowing about the existence and pressure of SIAMS. **Secret** – secretly held motivations for moving from one school to another. Motivated by the desire to lead a church school.

	he was fantastic, but he was an old fashioned style head...	**Sacred** – the setting of the events which led to H1 being acting head followed by his breakdown regarded now as a place where things were going wrong. Is this a reframing of events? Is it in fact a **cover story**?
	MJ: Yeah	
	H1: And um...ah yeah and it just worked out that things were going very wrong at school and Ofsted came along and had him removed during Ofsted and I became acting head during Ofsted week...	
	• Um... when I look back on what had happened at B...we had turned things around...	**Sacred** – as above.
	• ...there were always headships coming up and I went to look at them... I would walk around schools um... whether they were a church school or a non-church school you just get a feel for the school... and there were some...some schools you would go in and just feel ...felt the anxiety of the school and there was non-religious... you could tell from the head and the way that he or she ran the school...	**Sacred** – automatic alignment of the type of school with the levels of anxiety he could detect. Assessment of place based on previous emotional experiences. A personification of the place.
	• ...I'm more comfortable as head of a church school. um... because I didn't want to put up with that kind of...I won't say ignorance but but but...that anxiety that I think...I think I would pick up I had to fight that...	**Sacred** – church schools are the best places.
	H1: ... I remember standing there and him telling him 'you've got to leave' you know I couldn't believe it you know and also um we had to do the inspection that week and um	**Sacred** – automatic alignment of place with an emotional experience. That office is forever linked in H1's memory to the events which unfolded. They can remember the
	MJ: It was a huge day wasn't it?	
	H1: It was. Yes yeah it's still clear now... I can't remember the rest of	

	the inspection but I can remember that moment… MJ: That moment… H1: Him standing there and the phone call…him putting the phone down and um 'I'm asking you to leave' yes…	office, the telephone etc.

SACRED STORIES

- Any job is worth going for at the start of a career but H1 soon realised that their destiny was to be the head of a church school.
- Having a job and working hard at it is something to be proud of and should be rewarded with promotion.
- Being acknowledged, affirmed, praised and rewarded for this hard work by external agencies, especially those with power and authority, such as the inspectorate, makes all of the pain, hard work and personal hardship worthwhile. Impact of a performative culture within education.
- Striving to attain this level of recognition is a driving force.
- It is important to believe in yourself.
- Inspectors are to be respected and listened to but only if they say what H1 says he already thinks.
- H1 struggles with the idea of being what to do by others. They like to be the one in control.
- The way to bring about positive change is to be the leader. In H1's case, to be the head at which point they will be the one calling the shots.
- The inspectors are always there in the wings. They are a threat to H1's autonomy but they unarguably have power. Strong echoes of the Panopticon in H1's attitude to their expectations.
- Whoever is ultimately in charge has the power and authority and therefore the control.
- Experts have power and authority and therefore must be listened to. But they do not judge. Inspectors do and this causes conflict for H1 which they work hard to manage from below.
- There is a conflict within education over where the power and authority should lie and do lie: heads, expert trainers, inspectors.
- Inspectors can be managed from below, appeased. This enables the head, H1, to retain power and control of their own school.
- Ditto governors.
- Stress has made them ill in the past. They survived and will not allow it to happen again.
- Previous breakdown was an inevitable part of their journey of leadership, their journey to headship.
- H1 knows best. Sense of others in education now catching up with what they have always known to be true.
- Strong sense of self-belief which enables them to lead others with confidence.
- H1 was born to lead.
- Leadership is about having and using influence.
- The expectation of the inspectorate can be 'used' by the clever head to get members of staff to do what they wants them to.
- Part of a head's role is to protect their staff.

- In contrast, a head can cascade the pressure brought by inspection across all staff in order to spread the responsibility and thereby manage the pressure on self.
- We can put difficult times behind us and move on as long as we continue to be successful at the thing which previously defeated us.
- H1 is able, knowledgeable and competent. They deserve to be listened to and respected by their staff.
- They will challenge and overturn stories previously held as Sacred by others when they believe them to be untrue and damaging.
- Being a leader is not a popularity contest and H1 is prepared to be unpopular if it means doing the right thing.
- This gets easier as a leader becomes more experienced and develops a thick skin with age.
- H1 is good at leading school collective worship and they will not listen to others' criticism of them in this regard.
- 'Old-fashioned' headship is substandard by today's measures because the demands of the inspectorates equate with progress and a rise in professional standards.
- Improvements are always made over time. With these improvements come increased demands on those involved.
- The present is a place of safety from which to reimagine a past which was difficult for H1 but which they ultimately survived.
- There are powers at work, which cause things to happen for a reason – fate? God?
- An element of personal compromise is necessary to achieve one's goals ie recognition by others.
- Personal compromise is necessary in order to appease the system. Changing the system is not an option. It has too much power and authority.
- (Are heads complicit in giving the system its power due to their failure/inability to stand against it?)
- Success in inspection brings stress but it is necessary and manageable. The alternative is even more stressful ie to be 'condemned' by the inspectorate. This is not an option H1 is willing to countenance.
- A successful leader learns to recognise and manage stress because it is a given and cannot be escaped.
- SIAMS inspection is a scene for 2 experts to decide who is pre-eminent: the head or the inspector? Where is the locus of power in this aspect of education?
- Spirituality is an essential element of a good education.
- A church school education is the best sort for children and the best schools for adults to work in and to lead.
- H1 is driven by their beliefs of what is right and what should therefore happen.
- Strong, moral and possibly religious/spiritual role models for children are important.
- The Bible is an important influence for children to have in their lives.

- Working in an environment which is commensurate with one's own beliefs is important. Doing otherwise would cause tension such as would lead to illness.
- SIAMS is good for church schools. Therefore, measurement and being judged is good for church school leaders.
- SIAMS is already aligned to H1's own philosophy for education so any compromise for them is limited.
- When in leadership in education, personal struggles must be kept private and the leader must soldier on if at all possible.
- Things will work out in the end if you keep on going and pick yourself up after each setback. Success is the just reward of hard work and perseverance.
- The head is central to the ethos of a school.
- Preparation is essential in managing the performative expectations of inspections. Forewarned is forearmed. Another element of how to manage from below.
- H1 believes that they will have the final say in a SIAMS inspection.
- Ofsted is in a different league.
- Inspection is a given. It must be managed in order to limit its ability to make you ill. Good preparation and a high level of knowledge are important aspects of this management.
- School staff and leaders must be inspection-ready at all times. Echoes of the Panopticon with a seeing yet unseen figure with power and authority, and a post-fabrication era.
- Home is a place of safety.

SECRET STORIES
- Leaders do not talk with staff about elements of their past of which make them feel vulnerable or reveal their struggles.
- Internal drive can be as much about proving things to self as to others.
- H1 is strongly motivated from within.
- Success is something to be secretly proud of.
- Any collusion with the authorities, those with power and authority, must be kept secret. One way of doing this is to be well-appraised of their expectations and to embed them as your own.
- H1 carries with them a deeply held secret story which drives and shapes their attitude to those with power and authority. Details of their breakdown are not widely or easily shared.
- Success over your personal demons is liberating and only comes as a result of hard work and perseverance.
- H1's breakdown is a dear friend now which he holds closely within them. They derive secret strength from it.
- H1 believes that H1 knows best.
- There are a lot of behind the scenes machinations which determine the power and authority within a school. Important to be on the right side of this.
- Important for H1 to believe that they are the one with the power, authority and control within the school.

- They fear being controlled by others.
- Is it really their agenda or are they cleverly and secretly managing figures with greater power from below?
- Always secretly carries within them the knowledge that an inspector has greater power and authority. I believe that this shapes what they do in school without them admitting it.
- Has a constant level of anxiety inside that they will be judged unfavourably. This secretly shapes their actions.
- The performative nature of education has hurt them, shaped them, cannot be changed and so must be worked with. Managed.
- Performativity brings rewards for those on the right side of the expectations. But it is always there and might not judge you so favourably the next time.
- H1 secretly learns from other people's failures.
- They still define themselves by the breakdown they had decades ago. They make decisions now and take actions in the knowledge that this is a factor in who they are. They act to minimise the potential of recurrence.
- Leaders keep secrets from other members of staff to protect their status and the respect others might have for them.
- Revisiting the past secretly enables you to learn from past mistakes and failures without anyone knowing and to do better in the future.
- H1 has a deeply emotional and sensory connection with schools past and present. The events of their breakdown have affected them to the extent that they remain with H1 through each of their school moves.

COVER STORIES
- Is a cover story the outworking of secretly held sacred stories? Are they inevitable?
- Does what H1 keeps secret mean that they are living a cover story constantly at work?
- There is a constant tension between them being the authority figure in school, the one with control, and wisely acknowledging the power of the inspectorate. Does the way that they mitigate this eg by knowing inspection requirements well in advance and embedding them as their own, result in them living a cover story at work? Does SIAMS force them to do this?
- In any retelling of the past, do we portray the cover story of our choice?
- Do we, does H1, reframe past events in the light of the future from the standpoint of what subsequently ensued?
- Have they created a cover story as the only possible comfortable way of living with the past and with current pressures?
- Cover stories can protect us from ourselves, from the decisions we took in the past which led to certain events unfolding. H1 appears to have a cover story surrounding the events which led to his breakdown.
- In this way, cover stories can give us the strength we need to keep moving forward.

- Cover stories also protect us from the judgements which might be made by others were they to know our secret stories. Does an inspection increase the need for a cover story? Or does it cut through them to expose the secret story? Probably depends on the respective skill of the head and the inspector. Is it a game then won by the more skillful player? How useful is this? H1 is determined that they will be the more skillful, better informed of the two players.
- How does a cover story in this way relate to truth, honesty and integrity? Does SIAMS perpetuate the need for cover stories for H1, thereby compromising their integrity?
- Does inspection deflect energy away from potentially more meaningful actions? Or does it ensure quality of provision because of its ability to create a Panopticon? Does it define its own truth which H1 has then to buy into? They claim not.
- Is H1 really the one with power and authority in their own school or is this covering the reality of the fact that the inspectorate runs the show from a distance?
- Does H1 feel 'less compromised' by taking action to appease SIAMS because his philosophy is more naturally aligned with its expectations?
- H1 seems to acquire inside knowledge from an 'expert' in how to appease the system which then shapes the way in which practice is changed and subsequently presented to an inspector. Is it possible that this is even more compromising than attitudes to Ofsted due to its insidious nature of wresting control? At least with Ofsted such action is up front and openly said.
- Does the sacred regard for compliance with school inspection create an inescapable cover story for H1?
- Will H1 stick to what they say are their beliefs in how to run their school if an inspector disagrees or will they present a cover story in order to protect the value of all the work they have put in over the years?
- Collusion with the system can be a helpful element in ensuring that other members of staff perpetuate the cover story eg you have to do this because an inspector will…
- Conflict in H1's interview data over how much they are doing in school 'for SIAMS'. Difficult area for them which creates internal conflict against what they declare are their principles and beliefs. Is it right for SIAMS to do this to heads?
- SIAMS causes H1 to compromise their value system at times. They don't like to admit this.
- H1 says that they will stand up for what they believe and not present a cover story to an inspector just to appease the system.
- A wise professional or leader does not always say what they really think to other colleagues. Think one thing; live out another.
- Living a cover story can protect others and is therefore a good and kind thing to do.

- Does an inspection system which requires compliance and appeasement inevitably lead to its subjects living cover stories? Is this morally right for SIAMS?

- H1 keeps their own anxieties, pressures and stresses hidden from other headteacher colleagues. From an inspector?

- Some cover stories, when H1 realises they are living them, they change. Will this be true with regard to inspection requirements?

- H1 appears to carry a conflict between being the leader they believe they should be and the leader which the performative inspection system on education requires them to be.

- Does my presence as researcher, and a person previously potentially regarded as an authority figure, increase the cover story lived out and presented? Or is it giving them freedom to speak more openly and honestly than is usual for them?

- Am I yet another agent of the performative culture in which H1 works or am I an agent of freedom and release?

SACRED STORY ISSUES	OBSERVATIONS
Where does the locus of power actually lie – with the inspector or with H1? Who will feel they have the final say?	Strong belief for H1 that knowledge is power. Therefore, the locus of power lies with the one who has the greater knowledge. Despite acknowledging the expert status of the inspector (SB), H1 believes they have ensured they have at least as much knowledge of SIAMS in advance of the inspection. H1 has a greater degree of knowledge about the school – obviously – and so this combination means that they are in a position of considerable knowledge and therefore of power. *Knowledge is power. Power is control. Control is peace of mind for H1 and this leads to success for them.*
Will H1's sacred belief that hard work and thorough preparation will bring rewards in the shape of the inspector's approval?	They were nervous in the week before the inspection after receiving unexpected notification. But they have made sure that they prepared really thoroughly in the last few years and then again over the past week. *Knowledge is key for H1 in SIAMS as knowledge is their link with power.*
Will H1 submit to the greater authority of the inspector?	This did not become an issue. H1 made sure that their authority remained high. They did this by ensuring their knowledge was significant.
(How) will H1 manage the inspector from below? Will doing so enable them to retain control whilst appeasing the system?	They definitely did this and did it very well. They made sure that they knew the SIAMS criteria and expectations inside out. Then they made sure that they had passed this onto their staff and that between them they had evidence prepared for the inspector. *Knowledge and their use of it is central to how they have operated and approached SIAMS.*
(How) will H1 compromise their integrity and beliefs during the inspection?	This did not appear to have happened at all on the day. *Debatable whether their approach beforehand is a compromise of integrity or whether it is simply wise management from below.*
In what ways will the inspection be a time which allows H1 to be open about their educational philosophy and beliefs?	Nothing noted.

SECRET STORIES	OBSERVATIONS
How much does H1 reveal of their secret motivations and driving force?	Nothing noted.
How will H1 manage anxiety and the fear of being judged by others?	They worked very hard in the week before the inspection to get everything ready and in place. They trust their team because of the thorough preparation over recent years which has been based on H1's knowledge, gained through accessing training, of what SIAMS will require. *Key concepts of knowledge, power, control, preparation.*
How will H1 deal with being measured by an inspector?	They knew that they had enough evidence for the school to be judged as Outstanding because they know the expectations thoroughly. They have managed the whole process quite expertly. *Are they an example of a model, self-regulating citizen who, unbeknown to themselves, have been manipulated by the all-seeing powerful system? Or have they played the system so expertly that they have turned it on its head and done the manipulating themselves?*
How much of the behind the scenes story of the school over the past few years remain hidden?	Very little has been said in my presence by H1 about the past events at the school, but they asked for me to not be in the first meeting of the day with the inspector so I do not know what they shared at that time. I suspect very little as they would believe themselves to be prepared enough to not need to fall back on 'excuses' from the past.
COVER STORIES	OBSERVATIONS
How much will H1 gloss over difficulties which they have faced as leader of the school?	As above.
How much open collusion with staff and governors will take place behind the scenes?	Staffroom observations were interesting. The staff, especially one particular teacher, were very keen to maintain the front of stage image in my presence eg hushed another member of staff when they started saying something, glanced quickly in my direction and soon after went out of the staffroom with her and returned a little time afterwards. Not really necessary but demonstrates the wish to project a cohesive image to all outsiders not just the inspector. H1 had made sure that they were all very

	well prepared, ready and confident. *Is this evidence of a cover story? Or is it clever management from below? Or is it evidence that they have been made subject to the system whilst believing that they retain the power?*
How much will H1 'play the game' of SIAMS? Will this make them feel compromised?	H1 played the game by making sure that they had as much knowledge of the system well enough ahead of the inspection to make it appear that everything was done at their behest and according to their own vision, philosophy etc. They played the game so well that they won ie got a judgement of Outstanding. *But did they really win? Did they really have the power or had the system embedded itself deep within them to the extent that it was the one doing the controlling without the subject even being aware of this? H1 doesn't feel at all compromised. They see it as a game, a power struggle, and they deem themselves the victor. Is this all that matters? Does it matter that they might be being controlled without recognising it? Would knowing this, having it pointed out to them through this research, undermine them? H1 might not accept my perspective. The story is theirs to tell; the analysis is mine.*
Will H1 play the part of the leader they believe they should be/are or the leader which the system requires them to be?	I don't believe they see any conflict between these two concepts. Is there any difference? *Possible example of the post-fabrication era in church school leadership.*
Does my presence enhance the need for H1 to live out a cover story during the inspection?	H1 didn't want me to be in the first meeting of the day with the inspector. This would have been their main interaction with the inspection and they were very clear that they wanted to establish themselves and take control of the day/situation without my presence. *Possibly I would have been a distraction…a competitor for superiority in terms of power and knowledge…possibly they were too nervous and needed to calm themselves without an audience…* This is a shame for me from a data gathering point of view but gives me an insight into the level of their nerves and their desire/need to retain control at all costs. They had been very willing for me to be part of the inspection, do my research etc but then denied me the main source of evidence of their interaction with the inspector. Were there things

| | they wanted to say without me being present? Would the fact that I had had access to the backstage preparation but that they were not able to prepare me and control me before the inspection mean that I would be an unwelcome 'loose cannon' on the day? My presence could have undermined their absolute authority and power in a way that they could not cope with or risk.

After they had had the initial feedback from the inspector I left the room and left them alone. H1 welcomed this saying that they felt "stunned" and "emotional". Despite telling me this and being happy for me to know, they did not want me to witness the effect this would have as they processed the outcome of the day. |

Margaret,

I have decided to do the main worship myself. I want to show leadership in action, but also I want her to see the importance we give to the trinity in worship and how we have developed the style of a worship, not just to fit in with the Christian elements but having listened to children evaluations what we have added for them eg in our reflection they wanted to have a key stage question each rather than one overall thought or question, so this has been a pupil impact on worship. Also Bishop XXX visited in March and was impressed by the way we introduced the trinity and wrote the words we used down to use, so on reflection, even though it is out of line with what we normally do I think I would like to show her the work that has gone into the worship.

To answer your questions
- I immediately informed my deputy and emailed Chair of Govs and Chair of Ethos. I then told the staff at the staff meeting later in the day. I did not want to panic them but explain calmly and with confidence to them what I had been told. I then emailed the other staff to make sure they were all informed. In the evening we had an Ethos meeting anyway so I was able to explain to them the process with the information I was given.
- Following the phone call, I was a bit surprised at the timing in that I believed we were going to have it in the autumn term. Ironically I had prepared a presentation for the Ethos meeting outlining that fact and an action plan of what we needed to do to be fully ready by September. They were finishing off touches and some evidence gathering points mainly. I I also was worried about the fact the SATs were on and I had an important meeting and the vicar was not available for the day but having slept on it I realised that we just have to work around it and felt better after that.

  I felt ok, in my view we are doing 90% of everything in all 4 areas, we are an RE hub and have done a lot of work with the staff on developing the understanding Christianity units this year well ahead of other schools, that must be a great positive, shows that RE is a high profile here. These points I made at the staff meeting to make sure everyone felt positive. I want to make the point that this is an interim year and we are experimenting with these units of work because XX is an RE Hub leader and has to understand what does or does not work so can advise. It has had a positive impact on the teaching and learning and has helped pull the teachers together to improve RE and this has fed into a really positive feeling amongst the staff as a team and is contributing to the ethos of the school. The children are benefitting from this as a result.

  So there is a real positive buzz as the teachers' confidence in the teaching of RE has never been higher and they are pulling together to make sure all the other elements are in place as well.

There was not a huge amount to do except highlight areas which we have done this week.

Overall I am calm, had a great weekend, it was very busy so did not dwell on anything too long. The danger is to over think things and then miss something essential.

Two nights ago I had a sleepless night, did not sleep at all and was in my study at 3am working on my laptop. But I slept well last night. Felt butterflies for the first time today but I have to keep calm for everyone else otherwise they will fall apart.

Everything else in school has been put on the back burner, but I am aware I need to give some attention to my meeting tomorrow as it is important also.

Each day I have had a list of what I want to look at, my spouse thinks I am trying to cram in too much knowledge but I don't want to miss anything, that is my biggest worry I suppose.

- I have not had a special meeting, but early on outlined what I needed for all staff so that they were clear. XX and I are going to set up a room with the evidence this afternoon and finalise everything. There is a staff meeting tonight where we will discuss tomorrow and see if we have missed anything. Otherwise we have just had quiet conversations when required. XX has met with the staff in role as RE lead and has checked with the two teachers who are going to be observed if they have everything in place and what their planning for the lesson is like.
- There has been no negative impact, I have been really pleased by how positive everyone has been, it just reflects the team spirit and ethos we have here. I hope that will come across.
- On Thursday my first meeting will be crucial with her, hopefully after that my usual calmness will take me through the day. Hopefully nerves will not get the better of me once we get started.
- I want her to see that we are a forward thinking church school, that the children have a huge knowledge about the church, RE and they do live the values. I have a file I have kept for 5 years since I joined to show that everything here is well embedded. What I have noticed when I have visited other schools is that they may have many church school requirements in place but here we have had those in place for far longer. Hopefully she can understand that as many visitors tell me that is what they pick up here. The number of supply teachers, parents I show round the school all comment on the calm nature of the school and how well the children get on with each other I am keen to get across because I firmly believe that is why they all do so well both academically and socially.
- It is a bit like being at an interview with people you know, I will be embarrassed if I slip up in anyway, or say a silly thing. I know there is so much beyond the 4 areas she is looking at going on here I just hope I get

that across so that you can see it as well. Can I have the first meeting with her on my own, just need that time I think.

Hope that is a help