SUMMARY

This is a study of conflict in areas of middle management in the comprehensive school. The roles of Head of Department and Head of Year are focused upon, and an attempt has been made by means of questionnaires and interviews to explore and identify particular areas of conflict between them where there is competition for scarce resources. These areas are then analysed.

Some consideration is given to the literature on role conflict in schools, and Action Theory and the Dialectic approach have been used as methods of understanding organisational behaviour. Case studies have been made of some conflict situations in the light of these theories. The resolution of particular conflict situations between curricular and pastoral unit sides of the school has been studied in the context of conflict resolution in the school generally.

The findings from the investigation reveal a wide range of bureaucratic structures and a pattern of committees and discussion groups which encourage consultative and democratic processes as a means of finding an accommodative balance between conflicting interests. The resolution of conflict in the school was seen to be related to the way in which the head interpreted his role. The evidence in this study indicates a reformulation of the role of the head in the emergence of systems of organisation in which he may be seen to be moving from the position of autocrat to that of manager or enabler who seeks to resolve conflict and to further school goals by means of a consensual approach. Headship models along these lines are outlined. Though the evidence of this enquiry suggests a new interpretation of the head's role, the indication is that he remains the most powerful figure in school government.
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INTRODUCTION

It is a commonplace to relate schools to industrial enterprises, and to consider the possibility of using modern industrial ideas of management in a school situation. The two areas have much in common: problems of communication, delegation, departmental autonomy, budget determination. Management theories (1) stress the need to establish good personal relationships, in the interests of efficiency, by encouraging a high degree of participation in decision-making processes. Such theories prescribe that those in authority should ensure that the individuals within the community achieve a sense of personal worth by undertaking significant and important roles.

In the light of management theories stressing participation in decision-making, a school community could be seen in terms of structural functional analysis with its organisation consisting of interlocking work groups: Heads of Departments, Heads of Years, Working Parties, Team Teaching, Staff Meetings, all of which might involve effective participation in pursuing the aims of the school. Many decisions taken at present by the head, or by a small policy group, might be shared in by more of those who are concerned. American research on teacher participation has shown ineffective results only in areas in which teachers were indifferent, and one might suppose that there are not many such areas (2).

The school is different from most industrial organisations in that its staff is composed of professionals who expect, and usually have been given, a high degree of discretion in their primary role of teaching. The emphasis in all aspects of recent curricular reform has been to place more responsibility upon the teacher in the use of equipment, materials, and subject matter. The trend in examination work has been to allow more scope for such decisions. Even in the most autocratic school,
Heads of Departments have exercised the power to determine subject content and methods of teaching, and this has been organised through formal and informal meetings within departments. Some of this responsibility will shift between staff when schools move from the 'collected' departmental concept towards the integrated ideal (3). The 'collected' concept describes the situation where the content of a subject has fixed boundaries and is apart from other subjects. By contrast, the integrated ideal sees the subject areas of the curriculum in open relation to each other and requires teachers to work between departments. Sometimes the integrated approach has merely resulted in the emergence of new 'collected' departments. Bernstein describes how power is changing hands where these developments are taking place, and this is a source of tension and conflict between teachers.

On the administrative side most 'school level' management has been in the hands of the head, and a recent dissertation revealed headteacher support for consultation at all levels but little enthusiasm for teachers taking decisions in administrative matters (4).

Democracy in schools is much spoken about but a decision-making staff conference which deals with all matters concerned with the running of the school is probably unique to Countesthorpe (5) in the maintained sector; on the independent side we have the work of educators like A.S. Neill. It may be that more schools are moving towards this kind of organisation, as is indicated in this study, and, if this is the case, one might expect a better system of personal relationships in schools, leading to less conflict, though a more open system of staff participation does not help all teachers. In situations where staff disagreements are brought out into the open, personal feelings are often at risk, and the less articulate at a disadvantage. Staff involvement should be easier than in the industrial setting because the staff are linked to senior teachers by
training and experience. However, writing in an Australian context, Bassett (6) notes that some staffs have such poor morale, and are torn by such internal dissension, that a proper working relationship is difficult, and greater professional participation might be fraught with difficulties. He suggests also that heads might not have the professional maturity needed. Webb (7) has argued that the quality of human relationships is not a simple function of type, size, or growth of organisations, and it may be that such relationships are not directly related to the organisational structure. It is too easy to relate alienation and discontent to an authoritative system of organisation. Seeman (8) found that on four out of ten items requiring a preference between leadership of a directive nature and a non-directive group centred approach, a majority preferred the more authoritarian style. A greater participation sometimes produces a negative reaction from those who feel that the extra responsibility, and the time consuming activities associated with committee and discussion procedures, have made an already difficult timetable that much worse. Some teachers resented being consulted on decisions which they felt the principal was paid to make.

More teachers may be seen to be playing dual roles in schools, a mixture of teaching and administration. Conflict is possible between the two sides even within the one role. One side may call attention to the needs of the individual, the other might stress rather the needs of the common good. That an increase in the number of decision-making roles in schools is likely to produce more conflict situations was the hypothesis which led the writer towards the present enquiry.

The trend has been from small to large schools with the average size of school more than doubling in twenty years (9). During the same period, there has been a growing complexity in school goals and an
increasing diversity in the educational and social provision within the schools (10). The increase in the size of school, together with the diversity of provision, resulted in schools requiring additional organisational arrangements for their operation, and there emerged the growth of middle management structures, following recommendations by Burnham Reports that special payments should be made to those who were appointed to areas of responsibility in the large schools. With the increase in size, the diversity of academic and pastoral provision, and complex structures of organisation creating middle management positions of authority, the comprehensive school became a school different in kind from those that preceded it.

When special payments were first introduced they were related specifically to advanced academic work, and the writer can speak from his own experience of the conflict that was introduced into school as a direct result of these payments. The head's decision was the most important factor when allowances became available, and teachers sought to influence him in their favour with regard to the distribution of such posts. With the advent of the large comprehensive, the new area of growth in the organisational structure was the provision of welfare; a proportion of the special allowances was given to those in charge of the administration of pupils' welfare, and this was made possible by dividing the large school into smaller units with the pupils divided into Houses or Years. This kind of organisation became a characteristic feature of the large school. The power of the head was increased because of the controlling influence he exercised with regard to these payments for special responsibilities. Prior to these payments, teachers' salaries were determined by national agreements, and the head's power over salaries ceased once a teacher had been appointed to his school. In a large comprehensive at present there are six levels of promotion within the
school over which the head has considerable power, and this is apart from the control exercised by him with regard to a teacher's chances of promotion in other schools"(11).

The key figures at middle management level to emerge in the large school were the Head of Department and the Head of House or Head of Year, with the Head of Department being responsible for curricular matters and the Head of House/Year being responsible for pastoral welfare, and their functions indicate potential sources of conflict. A school has a limited amount of resources in terms of manpower, finance, buildings, and time, and the more of these resources given to curricular activities the less will be available for pastoral concerns. It is in this context that reference will be made in this study to scarce resources. Resources may be seen to be scarce so far as the pastoral side is concerned if most resources are applied to curricular needs, and vice versa. If schools are seen as primarily concerned with teaching 'subjects' then teachers, money, space, and time, given by the head to pastoral care may result in potential conflict between those who represent the different sides of school organisation. The new social divisions in large schools were both a philosophical and an expedient response to the problems which arose when such schools were established. The writer was involved during the early days of re-organisation in secondary education and experienced this conflict. The growth in middle management in curricular and pastoral divisions and the spread of decision-making, indicated the interaction process between the focal roles on the curricular/pastoral sides as being an area of research, and led to the decision to study identifiable areas of conflict between the pastoral and departmental staff.

In every type of social organisation there are occasions for conflict, with individuals and groups seeking particular ends; the essential aspect of
educational change may be found in conflict, in the struggle between groups and between their ideas (12). The organisational theory upon which this study is based relies heavily upon Weber, and in particular upon the interpretation of his work outlined by Collins (13). Collins maintains that conflict models of organisations are part of a tradition which started with Weber. This study will view the school as an arena in which individuals pursue their own interests in a process of social interaction with others. Where one of the actors has the opportunity to impose his will on another, one recognises the existence of power. Conflict will be seen as the natural result of situations of inequality existing in a school.

Conflict existed in the schools of the past which were smaller and organised on a more authoritarian basis. Open hostility was not infrequent. In a large open school situation, where there are a multiplicity of decisions to be made by different groups and individuals, there are likely to be a multiplicity of opinions which may lead to conflict. What may be referred to as the common sense view of conflict is that it is destructive. Sociological orthodoxy has been concerned with order and threats to the stability of this order have been interpreted as social problems to be both deplored and, ideally, eliminated.

The Marxist position is that the existing social order is itself the social problem, and conflict has been seen as inevitable and as something to be encouraged as the precursor of a better system. This is the view taken by Dahrendorf (14) who sees conflict as desirable in all group life as a means of giving direction to social change. In this study, conflict in school will be seen as making possible changed conditions to meet the needs of participants in a system of human interaction which is itself constantly subject to change.

The structural functionalist position raises problems to which reference may be made. It has been
indicated earlier that structural arrangements do not oblige men to behave in a pre-determined manner. Men consciously interpret the situations in which they find themselves, and in the light of these interpretations they select their responses in accordance with the goals they wish to achieve. Only by exploring the human consciousness and the interrelation of men's definitions and responses is it possible to understand the regularities and patterns which exist in the social life of the school.

Parsons (15) saw society as an integrated system with stability and equilibrium as the norm, and shared values cementing together the social fabric. Yet he did not investigate the origins and dynamics of these values and his assumption that shared beliefs and values increase the integration and stability of a social system has been carried over into industrial relations theory by Dunlop (16) who acknowledges Parsons' influence. According to Dunlop, industrial systems include within themselves built-in tendencies towards equilibrium and radical conflict is excluded from participants' ideologies. This would not appear to be a realistic description of organisations where the beliefs and values of different participants, and their divergent or congruent characteristics, have to be treated as problematic. The Catholic schools in this enquiry would claim a shared set of values and beliefs which, ideally, should inform their organisational structures. The County schools would not claim so much in this regard. Whether the Catholic beliefs actually inform their structures is a matter for dispute which has exercised the minds of those responsible for Church schools. In this enquiry, there was more conflict found in the Catholic sector than in the County, and a comment on this will be found in the Conclusion.

The position taken in this study is that the social structure and the social consciousness of the participants are dialectically related, each acting upon and influencing the other, in some situations leading to
increased stability and in others to heightened conflict. Whether the participants' understandings which arise from the structural forces within which they operate are shared or conflicting may be a matter of contingency; structural forces of themselves do not determine such understandings and beliefs. The actors' responses to objective situations depend on how that situation may be perceived and defined, and will result from the goals and motives which the participants bring to the situation. As a result one needs to consider how structural influences are mediated by those processes which shape teachers' definitions.

The emphasis in this investigation on the action frame of reference as a means of understanding the social life of the school does not mean that one should neglect structural influences of which the actors themselves may be unconscious. The views and definitions of the teachers in the focal roles being investigated are highlighted, but they should not be treated as a sufficient explanation of the social situation being investigated. Men's consciousness does have an independence from structural factors, but such consciousness is not wholly autonomous. Definitions of reality are socially generated and sustained, and the objective characteristics of the organisational structure exercise a restraint upon individual and group action. One must recognise the dynamic interaction between structure and consciousness as being a complex two-way process in which men's goals, ideas, and beliefs influence and are influenced by the social structure. The analysis by Hyman (17) which stresses the need for a dialectical approach to the industrial situation contains many valuable insights which may be applied to the school situation.

The aim of this enquiry is to explore defined areas of conflict between the focal roles, and to investigate ways in which such conflicts may be resolved.
so that school goals may be achieved; such goals are considered to be problematic. The resolution of conflict in the school will be seen to be related to the way in which the head interprets his role.

Power relationships may have a natural tendency to generate conflict but where a right to wield power is recognised one may speak of authority rather than power. Simon (18) says that authority that is viewed as legitimate is not felt as coercion or manipulation, either by the man who exercises it or by the man who accepts it; the head's authority has normally been recognised and his attitude and actions are seen to be crucial in the management of the school. Reference has been made to an increase in his authority or power in the school, but much of the evidence in this study indicates a reformulation of the role in the emergence of a system of organisation which emphasises consultative and democratic processes in which the head is viewed as a supportive and enabling agent in management.

The delegation of areas of responsibility in the large school has introduced simple power relationships at middle management level which have been characterised in many cases by involuntary or calculative compliance, and has produced open conflict between the curricular and pastoral sides. The final part of this study will be concerned with a critical analysis of the reformulated role of the head and his approach to the resolution of such conflict through a system of procedural process. There will be some discussion as to the manipulative character of such procedures which might suggest that the new approach is simply an attempt on the part of management to introduce theories of the 'human relations' type into schools: an emphasis on consultation procedures will necessarily produce a greater understanding by all involved with the school as an organisation.Whilst this may be one interpretation of what is happening, the evidence from this enquiry would suggest that something
more than this is taking place and that a serious attempt is being made to encourage participation in school government by all members of staff and others involved in the school community.
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CHAPTER 1

THE EMERGENCE OF MIDDLE MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES IN LARGE SCHOOLS AND THE PROBLEM TO BE INVESTIGATED

The development of a complex system of middle management structures in comprehensive schools may be seen to have been linked with the growth in the size of schools and promoted by an increase in the range and scale of special responsibility payments resulting from a series of salary awards to which reference will be made.

1. The Growth of the Large School.

The move towards comprehensive education was one away from the small school. The average size of maintained secondary schools in England and Wales rose between 1956 and 1976 from 391 to 830 (Table 1). The total number of these schools fell from 5,262 to 4,473. In 1976, 1,324 of these schools had over 1000 pupils (Table 1). Table 1 illustrates the growth in size of maintained secondary schools in England and Wales. The size of school is determined by the number of pupils on the register, and the figures are of secondary schools excluding middle schools deemed secondary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 200</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 to 300</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 to 400</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 to 600</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 to 800</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 to 1000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 and over</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>5,148</td>
<td>4,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average size of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 100</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Growth in size of maintained secondary schools, 1956–1976
(D.E.S. private letter, April 1977)
Rubinstein and Simon (1) point out that the size of the new urban schools built in the 1950s ranged from about 1200 to 2200, with an average size of about 1600. The authors say that the large school had been insisted upon as early as 1947, when the Ministry of Education laid down that a single secondary school could only be a viable unit if the annual entry was not less than 300 or 330. Miles (2) said that this came about because the proposed new schools were seen to be extensions of existing secondary schools, rather than as new kinds of schools. If a selected 20 to 25% of the population produced Sixth Forms of a certain size in existing grammar schools, then the new schools would have to be four times the size of existing schools, which suggested schools of 2000.

In 1965, the D.E.S. Circular 10/65 (3) suggested that, wherever possible, an all-through comprehensive school should be at least six form entry size (180 pupils) which would lead to schools of 1000 to 1200 pupils; schools of this size would ensure viable Sixth Forms, with a wide range of options for pupils. Clearly the assumptions about the types of mind among an age group of children, and about the numbers of children likely to stay on beyond the statutory leaving age, had changed between 1947 and 1965.

The official D.E.S. view has not changed since 1965. The D.E.S. says that there is no 'ideal' size for a comprehensive school, and no hard and fast rules are laid down in national policy. The LEA has the right to determine the size of its schools after taking account of a number of different factors: the local school population, the buildings available, and the pattern it wants to develop. A D.E.S. Report (4) claims that the average size of comprehensives is about 950 (in 1977) though the average over the whole range of maintained secondary schools has been shown to be 830 (Table 1). In the Report just quoted,
the D.E.S. says that the argument that large comprehensives (i.e. 2000 pupils or more) were necessary to ensure a wide range of academic studies to serve viable (in economic terms) groups of students has not been proven wrong. A large part of the growth in Sixth Forms in comprehensive schools is accounted for by 'non-academic' students who pursue a variety of qualifications.

2. The Growth of Special Allowances in Schools.

The emergence of large schools coincided with the growth of a system of special allowances. These had been recommended by the Spens (5) and McNair (6) committees, but few allowances were paid up to 1948. In 1951, the Burnham Report (7) prescribed ranges of total expenditure on allowances which were linked to the unit totals of schools. These unit totals were weighted in favour of the older pupils. (This system has been consolidated so that in 1976, children aged under 14 counted as two units, under 15s as three, under 16s four, under 17s six, and pupils aged 17 and over counted as eight units. The units are added up to produce a unit total which relates to the number of special responsibility allowances made available by the L.E.A., see Appendix 1)

The payment of these allowances was left to the discretion of the L.E.A. with regard to those who should benefit, and by how much. The teachers meanwhile were pressing for the scheme to become less discretionary. Authorities varied in their interpretation of the Report, and a further Burnham Report (8) in 1956 introduced a more rigid type of allowance scheme. As a result, a scale of allowances for deputy heads and four grades of payment, from A (lowest) to D, for heads of subject departments in schools in which advanced work was undertaken, was instituted.

The 1956 Report undoubtedly recognised the
need for delegation of responsibility in the new large schools, and provided the opportunity for the introduction into the structure of school organisation of middle management on the departmental side. The result was that a merit order was introduced into schools as far as the departments were concerned, though it would not be possible to document this because of the part played in the determination of the merit order by the individual head. Individual departments made claims for priority as regards payment, and with resources limited there was considerable in-fighting (9). Special allowances may be seen to have played a part in the growth of this particular form of school conflict. A subject which did not attract pupils for advanced work would not qualify for an allowance. The many all-age and secondary modern schools did not qualify for these departmental allowances in the 1950s, and, even when some of these schools were grouped together after re-organisation schemes took place during the late 1950s and early 1960s, allowances were rare because of the necessity to be doing advanced work to qualify.

In 1961 (10) a fifth grade E allowance was introduced for the most senior department head. In 1971 (11) the salary structure was simplified by the introduction of five scales of pay for all assistant teachers, with the exception of deputy heads whose salaries were tied to those of heads. In 1972 (12) a sixth scale was allowed with the introduction of three discretionary senior teacher posts in schools beyond a certain size, and then, when scales 2 and 3 were amalgamated in the Burnham agreement following the Houghton Report, 1974 (13), the scales reverted to five.

3. The Growth of Middle Management Structures.

The structures of organisation which immediately
developed in schools following the introduction of the system of special allowances were not the result of any particular thinking or writing about educational management. The existing organisation in the secondary school had been the head, his deputy, and specialist teachers. Though the deputy had not been recognised as fundamental to the structure of schools before 1956, the schools had established such posts after the 1945 Burnham Report (14) with the allowances then made available. In the elementary schools, the third tier, after the head and his deputy, was composed of class teachers who were not specialists. The secondary schools were the schools doing the advanced work and the specialist teachers in charge of the subjects considered by the head to be the most important became Heads of Departments. The need to be specific as regards the function of the individual who should receive the special allowance made it certain that the overriding importance would be attached to curricular roles.

Rubinstein and Simon (15) said that there was recognition that the large comprehensive school would require special forms of organisation so that individual children might be well known to the teachers. In the second stage of the NFER project on comprehensive schools in 1970 (16), a study of administration in 50 schools found that in 26 of the 29 larger schools with more than 800 pupils, the school was divided in some way for the purposes of pupil welfare, and in two thirds of these large schools the day-to-day handling of pupil welfare was clearly the responsibility of the sub-division. Table 2.1 in this Report (p.31) indicates that at this time 20% of the responsibility allowances in the 50 schools went to posts connected with pupil welfare and administration. The point was made that a higher percentage of the total allowances went to social units in urban schools, particularly in London, than was
the case in rural schools. Generally speaking, the larger the school in both urban and rural areas the greater was the proportion of allowances given to pupil welfare and administration. This proportion is more significant when one notes that 14 of the 21 smaller schools in the survey (those with less than 800 pupils) were not divided to any extent, and in these schools what is referred to as the traditional system operated in which the responsibility for the organisation of pupil welfare was that of the head and deputy head, helped by the senior master or mistress.

The new structure of organisation emerged in schools because the larger size and the variety of guidance needed made the traditional social organisation inadequate. The first NFER Report, 1968 (17), found that 299 of its 331 schools had House System organisations which concerned themselves with pupil welfare. The researchers working on the second stage of the Report in 1970 (18) had expected to find that, when a school was sub-divided for general welfare purposes, the vertical House system would again be the most prevalent form of organisation. The enquiry found that in 32 of the 50 schools investigated, the House system, where it existed at all, was concerned at most with internal school competitions, assemblies or meals, and in the other 18 schools, where the House system meant more than this, it was supplemented in 7 of them by other forms of organisation. 8 of the schools with strong House systems were in purpose-built accommodation. The comprehensive schools in Coventry, referred to later, set the pattern for this type. Benn and Simon (19) have shown that in 1968, the pure House system was used in only 17% of British comprehensive schools.

Clearly there had been a dramatic change in the organisation in the comprehensive schools with regard to the children's welfare. The Coventry system, which included 8 purpose-built schools, was organised on a
House basis. These schools were built between 1953 and 1959. Their example was followed by a number of other LEAs. Benn and Simon report that the idealism about the House and tutor group was thought to have been taken from the English Public School system. The Public School, which preceded the State day school, would have claimed ideally to have been a caring community. The teacher was often cast in the role of the missionary (20). A famous early nineteenth century Public School headmaster could claim that his school was father, mother, and all other relatives, to its inmates (21).

The growth of comprehensive schools gave the concept of pastoral care a new and extended life. The factors of size and diversity produced the problem of preserving the social life and individual care which was thought to have existed in the smaller schools in the past. In the case of the day grammar schools, in so far as the 'caring' concept was taken over from the Public School it would have been done in what has been described as the traditional system; the grammar, all-age, and elementary schools were mainly small schools and the system of head and deputy being responsible for the welfare of the children was the rule. The size of the new schools was the significant factor in the development of structured pastoral systems.

Benn and Simon (22) reported that faith in the House system of organisation carried through into the 1960s. For a variety of reasons a belief grew up that the House system did not meet the needs of many schools. Perhaps the most important conclusion was that it operated at its best in purpose-built accommodation, and more and more schools had to operate in schools adapted from existing buildings, and in many cases on split sites. The lavish accommodation of the earlier schools, with assembly halls and kitchen facilities built into each House building, became impossible. It was found that,
as more and more children stayed on in comprehensive Sixth Forms, the tendency grew to hive off that part of the school in separate buildings, and to run it along the lines of a Sixth Form Club with its own social life.

The need to keep the incoming pupils to the large school together as a unit which could be merged gradually with the rest of the school was another reason for using the horizontal division of the Year or Lower School unit. The needs of the young were different from the needs of older children, and horizontal divisions within the school enabled those needs to be identified and taken into account in the organisation. The division into years was also found to be more practicable in encouraging children to participate in democratic procedures within schools. Benn and Simon reported that more schools used the Year system than any other form of social organisation. In 1976, Poster (23) said that the Year organisation was predominant in comprehensive schools, and in a random sample of 15 East Anglian schools he found 12 were organised on a Year basis and 3 on a House basis. In the writer's sample of schools for this study all of the 10 schools in his enquiry were organised on a horizontal Year basis.

The large schools were seen by Benn and Simon to have a departmental side which formed one leg of the staff structure and a social unit side which formed the other leg of the structure. They wrote of the departmental side as generally being very well developed, forming schools within schools, with the larger departments taking many important decisions. They described the social units holding their own meetings and playing a vital role in the care of the general welfare of the pupils. The senior staff who organised and operated the departments and social units such as Years constituted the middle management staff with which this study is
particularly concerned.

4. The Power of the Head.

The emergence of new social structures during the late 1950s and 1960s, and the increased number of allowances available for the large schools, resulted in an increase in the power of the head because of the control which he had over the distribution of these special posts and allowances.

Musgrove (24) makes a case against this viewpoint when he claims that heads have little power over their staffs except within quite circumscribed limits, and he says that they have few gifts to offer apart from approval and perhaps occasional unmerited promotions; in his view, their main power lies in being able to suspend teachers. This statement is not borne out in terms of the writer's experience in schools. In thirty years he has not met a single case of a teacher being suspended by the head (though one has heard of Local Education Authorities and Governing Bodies suspending teachers in the case of criminal law action) whereas the power wielded by heads in areas such as promotion, special allowances, special timetable provision, specialist rooms, permission to be absent from school on secondment or short courses, plays an important part in any teacher's life. Increases in salaries for special responsibilities would come high on a list of a head's powers. Arguing that power derives from social imbalance, Musgrove says that the head who promotes to a departmental headship a man who has earned it (presumably in the view of the head - writer's addition) merely restores the social balance, but, if he can promote a man who has not earned it, he has tipped the balance decisively in his own favour: the promoted man can be expected to spend the rest of his career discharging his obligation. Musgrove adds that the head who is tempted into such an exchange must weigh against its advantages in the use of his power its possible disadvantages in
Musgrave (25) says that all heads have great power resources that they can use in exchange for obedience and allegiance of staff. He has some control over the salaries of his staff, since he can recommend teachers for responsibility allowances. He can allocate quiet or noisy, well or badly equipped classrooms to teachers, giving them more or fewer spare periods for correcting and preparing lessons, and allocate new or old books and equipment to them. Locke (26) points out that the teachers depend upon the head for appointments to posts of responsibility and the extra pay which goes with them. Musgrove's view of the head having little power is outweighed in the literature on the role of the head by the opposite view which shows the head as being able to consolidate his power and authority in schools by the distribution of special allowances. In a recent work, Poster (27) argues that the power of the head is unquestionable.

"Above all, though he has no absolute powers over the engagement of teaching staff, he can so advertise, allocate posts of responsibility and, to be brutally frank, manipulate, that he can surround himself by staff who will see things his way."

Formally the head is obliged to work in consultation with his governors or managers, and with the local authority inspectorate. The local authority inspectors would endeavour to ensure that the academic and pastoral sides of the school would be taken into consideration, so that a balanced situation might be achieved. An interview with a Senior Inspector of Schools in Surrey, whose period of office covered the years 1956-1976, is included in the Appendix (Appendix 11), and gives a description of the way large schools developed with their academic and pastoral divisions, with the teachers in charge of these being awarded special allowances. The interview supports the view taken in
the increase in the size of schools led to the need for changes in organisation and in particular to the growth of pastoral structures. It is also strongly supportive of the argument presented in this section with regard to the power of the head.

5. Middle Management Roles.

This chapter so far has set out to show:

(1) that the move towards a comprehensive system over the period from 1956 to 1976 has been a move towards large schools,
(2) that the same period saw the growth in the payment of special allowances, and
(3) that large schools brought with them middle management structures in which large areas of responsibility for decision-making were delegated by heads to staff in focal positions;
(4) that the departmental structure emerged as the first leg of the middle management structure and
(5) that social units, in the first place House systems but more recently Year systems, emerged as the second leg.

The growth of middle management structures on the departmental and social unit sides may be seen as an organisational response to the needs of the large schools which had come into existence. The leading roles in these academic and pastoral divisions are the Head of Department and the Head of Year. These roles are singled out in this study and their key aspects may now be considered. What follows is what the writer believes would constitute an ideal-typical specification for each role. Each item is common to the roles found in each of the ten schools in this investigation. A complete list of specifications for these roles found in these schools has been given in Appendices III and IV.

(i) Head of Department

The key aspects of the Head of Department's role may be seen to be:-

(1) To care for departmental staff and their
interests and to allocate them to classes in the school.

(2) To provide a syllabus of the school's work in the subject for the staff within the department and to provide syllabus advice and pastoral care to students on teaching practice within the department.

(3) To hold regular departmental meetings with regard to the teaching of the subject, to discuss aims and teaching problems.

(4) To be consulted by head, Head of Year, or other colleagues on any matter concerning the teaching or organisation of the subject and to liaise with the inspectorate.

(5) To be able to explain to parents and staff what is involved in the various courses in the department, and to co-ordinate where possible with other disciplines.

(6) To spend the money allocated to the department.

(7) To keep records of text books, reference books, or equipment belonging to the department and to be responsible for the use of departmental areas in the school.

(8) To see that homework is set and marked in the department and to see that records of work done are kept.

(9) To decide on courses to be followed leading to examinations.

(10) To supervise ancillary staff allocated to the department.

(ii) Head of Year

The Head of Year's role may similarly be divided in ideal typical terms as follows:-

(1) PARENTS The Head of Year will keep in touch with parents by report and/or letter regarding standards of attendance, punctuality, behaviour and work. Special evenings will be set aside
for interviewing parents at regular intervals and these will be held at least once a year. In order that the Head of Year may properly care for his pupils he is entitled to have referred to him by the head, all matters concerning the parents and children in his Year. If necessary the Head of Year will visit the child at home. The Head of Year will liaise with parents over matters concerned with outside agencies such as Medical and Guidance Services.

(2) STUDIES The Head of Year will ensure that the courses suit the needs of his pupils. He will see that the Form Tutors and Subject Teachers adhere to the Homework Timetable and he will consult with them when problems of work or behaviour arise. He will consult with Heads of Departments when options and examinations have to be decided.

(3) DISCIPLINE The Head of Year will be responsible for the good order of the pupils in his Year and will ensure that school rules, e.g. uniform, are kept. He will make arrangements to cover Form Tutors if absent from Registration Periods.

(4) RECORDS The Head of Year will maintain a personal file for each child and keep his records up to date so that he is in a position to provide references when required.

(5) GENERAL The Head of Year will be expected to give leadership to his Year, to take assemblies, to endeavour to establish an identity for the Year and to make possible good relationships. The Head of Year should make himself aware of the academic, practical, and social needs of his pupils, and pay particular attention to those pupils who have special disabilities or who need special help.
6. Areas of Conflict.

The analysis so far has shown the emergence of large schools with middle management structures concerned with departmental and social responsibilities. The typical functions of Head of Department and Head of Year, in charge of these two sides, indicate possible sources of conflict. Bates (28) writing in the second NFER Report said that when a school reaches about 800 pupils it becomes too large generally for the traditional system of organisation (with the head and his deputy 'caring' for the children in welfare matters - writer's addition) but pointed out the difficulties of subdividing schools between 750 and 1100 pupils. He claimed that with the organisation of four Houses or five Year groups, with both boys and girls to be taken into account, a minimum of 8 to 10 teachers would be required to lead each organisational unit, and this would prove a heavy burden on schools of that size to find the responsibility allowances and extra free periods that can reasonably be taken from the normal demands of subject teaching. Bates goes on to say that, once the school gets larger than 1100, the time and money needed to staff such organisation could be found from existing resources without this having a significant effect upon subject priorities. It appears clear that Bates was suggesting a conflict of priorities for all large schools in that he assumed that the resources provided were meant for subject priorities; in the schools over 1100 the time and money needed for pastoral care would not be missed but in smaller schools the subject departments might consider such expenditure to be unreasonable. He referred to the fact that some schools created Heads of Lower, Middle, or Upper Schools and so saved on the number of administrative positions.

The present writer believes that Bates touched upon an area of conflict much wider in its implications than that concerned with special allowances and the
allocation of time and money. Bates was considering the problem of establishing social divisions into a school which had none, and he made the point that the gross allocation of resources in the smaller comprehensive could only be shared between the departments and social units at the expense of the long established departments. The same would be true of the large schools but their very large allocation of resources might mean that the departments would be so well supplied that they would not miss a proportion of their resources passing to the social unit division. This kind of analysis appears to ignore the possibility that even a school of 800 was much bigger than the majority of secondary schools in the past and a school different in kind from them might require a different sharing of school resources. It could be considered a misconception to take the view that only such resources as would not be missed by the subject departments would be allocated to the pastoral side. The creation of new posts on the pastoral side meant competition for resources of all kinds, and the relationship between the departmental and social units would be vital to school organisational efficiency.

The writer is head of one of the schools in this study. This makes him a participant observer of the complex middle management structure in one school, and makes possible one interpretation of the interaction process between the focal roles in that school. Thirty years experience of secondary education which has seen the emergence of all that has been referred to so far, together with an acquaintance with the literature on conflict in schools, which will be referred to in Chapter 3, led to the belief that the pastoral and departmental staff would come into conflict in definable areas of school activity.

In dealing with the curriculum side of school life there were many areas of departmental activity, between departments, within a department, or in a
department's relationships with the pastoral life of the school, which gave rise to strain and tension and resultant conflict. The age, qualifications, experience, personality and expertise of each member of the department, are all joined together in a web of relationships. The Head of Department is the one most exposed to comment and criticism on both a personal and a professional level. He distributes his staff to their teaching duties and they may be put in positions they dislike. Some of the classes to be taught will be resented. Heads of Departments take decisions about choice of examinations and courses and determine syllabuses, and they are in a position to operate as Heads of Teams or as individuals. They call meetings and run them as they choose. The Head of Department is responsible for the teaching of the subject throughout the school and here he relates with the Heads of Years who are responsible for the over-all welfare of their students, which includes the way they are taught. Thus pressure may be brought to bear on a Head of Department by, say, the Head of Sixth Form who may feel that preparatory work done lower down the school is badly organised. A Head of Year may feel that a student should take a particular subject because it would benefit his career if he could make a success of it, and the Head of Department may wish the student to move out of the subject because of a perceived lack of ability. The Head of Department may resent a Head of Year who, as a member of his teaching team, has to neglect his teaching in order to conduct some administrative business that he claims cannot wait. The Head of Department may resent interference with his teaching time by a Head of Year seeking children for some administrative procedure. In allocating staff to teaching areas in the school he may find a conflict situation with a Head of Year who does not like certain teachers because they cannot achieve good discipline or good examination results. Some of the Heads of Departments
will find that their subjects are not rated highly by those in responsible positions, including Heads of Years, and prejudice may enter into advice given to parents or children. There may be a tendency for the Head of Department to restrict entries to examination courses to cater for the more able students whilst the Head of Year may tend to encourage more to enter because of pressure from the parents.

Communication in any large institution presents difficulties and much of the foregoing will suggest that communication is often difficult between Heads of Departments and teachers within their departments and between Heads of Departments and other senior staff. The power structure in the school has an important bearing upon conflict in school and can produce considerable tension for the individual Head of Department or Head of Year. Musgrove (29) claims that some of the most valuable work in schools is done in extra-curricular activities, as an area of work apart from the pressures of the power structure. The Head of Department can take decisions about his subject and his teachers and this is a form of power. Certain subjects and subject teachers are more respected than others, and therefore have more power to control school affairs; in this sense Mathematics has considerable power whereas all non-examination subjects have little or none, save where in a particular school the head may choose to single out a subject for special consideration.

Whereas the Head of Department may be seen to represent the 'instrumental' culture, concerned with the acquisition of skills and studies leading to examinations which are vocationally important, the Head of Year is particularly concerned with the 'expressive' culture and its derived norms of conduct; his work, more often than not, requires the transmission of values which have a cohesive character and are strongly involved with consensual rituals such as assemblies,
though one might claim that this can only be seen as part of the general cultural scene in the school (30). The Head of Year takes up value positions in 'open' situations involving large groups of students and their attendant staff, as does the head on special occasions such as general assemblies. The Heads of Departments are more concerned with differentiating rituals and conflict may occur because of the clash between these sides of the school's culture (31).

The elitist assumptions which underlie the instrumental side can at times lead Heads of Departments to desire arrangements with regard to groupings of children for study groups different from those preferred by Heads of Years. The whole question of streaming or mixed ability, in a sense, represents a clash between the two sides: Heads of Departments may not be the first to welcome mixed ability groupings of students, and subject specialists may neglect the ritualisation processes which accompany the expressive side of the school's culture. Thus subject teachers may be found busily preparing a special lesson when an assembly or some ceremony is taking place. Clearly there are tensions in a school community between the values which focus on personal relationships (the Head of Year and the expressive culture) and those which focus on a rigorous impersonal discipline of mind (the Head of Department and the instrumental culture). Naturally these positions are extreme standpoints which are unlikely to be taken by either side. However, their consideration is valid in this discussion on possible areas of conflict between the focal roles.

7. Research Aims.

This study considers the strains and tensions associated with the relationship between the Head of Department and the Head of Year, in particular with regard to areas where these roles are in competition with each other for scarce resources. The writer seeks to
explore and to identify those areas more specifically.

Having explored and then analysed those areas of conflict between departments and social units, the next stage will be to investigate the ways in which such conflicts may be resolved so that the 'goals' of the school may be achieved.

There is a considerable body of literature on the goals of organisations which would dispute the 'common-sense' view that organisations have definite, identifiable purposes (goals) which they seek to attain. Thus Gouldner (32) suggests that organisational goals may be merely goals of top managers and Gross (33) maintains that organisations do not spend all, or even most, of their efforts on goal attainment. Silverman (34) asserts that we can ask an individual about his goals but we cannot approach an organisation in the same way. He believes that we can speak of an organisation having a goal only where there is an ongoing consensus between the members of an organisation about the purposes of their interaction.

One should not exaggerate the difficulties of attributing to an organisation characteristics which should be more accurately attributed to individuals or groups. Many industrial organisations have very distinct goals and it is not confusing to say that a particular industry has as its goal the manufacture of particular products. It is certainly more difficult to speak about the goals of a school, once one gets past the broadest generalisations about the education of its pupils. The individual school has a variety of goals, so diverse as to make categorisation almost impossible. In accepting, as the writer does, Silverman's view that the ongoing consensus between the members of an organisation is the only way in which we can speak of an organisation having goals, the writer is making use of that interpretation in terms of a school. Of all organisations, the school is perhaps the one least able
to commit itself at any time to a set of goals. The composition of the school is such that situations may arise at any time which make it imperative to re-examine the school's goals in the light of such situations. This does not mean that goals, which are distinct from those particular situations, do not stand as before. Such is the variety of school life that many diverse goals are being pursued concurrently by those engaged in the organisation.

It would be difficult to establish at any particular moment the goals of each individual member of the school organisation, even where a degree of consensus is established as a result of a continuous staff conference, a continuous process of consultation, a kind of self-education, which was the method in use at Nailsea School, as described by Richardson (35). It may be difficult, if it is possible, to distinguish between a personal goal being pursued by an individual within the organisation and the organisational goal which may result from the consensus of opinion of those taking part in the organisation. Musgrove (36) says that schools have multiple goals, and a division of labour makes the effective pursuit of disparate goals of a school possible. The on-going nature of such multiple goals of a school organisation means that a referral back to some previously accepted understanding of goals may have limited value in explaining the current goals of its members, or the nature of any particular interaction. Such a referral back may be an attempt to legitimate the pursuit of some sectional end. Thus it would not be uncommon to hear the pursuit of such a sectional end by an individual being described by that person as being 'for the good of the organisation'. What may be considered to be 'the good of the organisation' at any particular time may be seen to be problematic and the subject of continuous discussion by those involved in the school's system of consultation and decision-making bodies.
The large school, with its complex organisation, would appear to require sub-groupings and deliberate measures of organisational procedures designed to allow the staff to participate in the school's decision-making processes, and the claim could be made that an organisation such as a school may be seen to be well integrated when it seeks to encourage the expression of differences of opinion with regard to the ways in which the school's goals might be achieved. Conflict between individuals pursuing their own goals may be functional or dysfunctional according to the ways in which the goals of the participants may be seen to accord with existing goals of the school. These may be established by an on-going consensus between the members of the school about the purposes of their interaction. The 'primary task' of the school may be seen to be problematic in the face of each new conflict situation. There may be many different interpretations of the primary goal as defined by participants in conflict with others in the organisation; doubtless their own definitions of how they see the primary task or goal will affect their definitions of particular conflict situations.

8. Conclusion.

This chapter has set out to illustrate the development of the large school, and the growth in the payment of special allowances which led to a complex system of middle management structures on the departmental and social unit sides of school organisation. Reference has been made to the increase in the power of the head, in particular because of his control over the payment of special allowances. These allowances were paid mainly to Heads of Departments and Heads of Houses/Years who were the middle management in large schools; the key aspects of their roles have been outlined.

Areas of conflict between those occupying these roles have been indicated and the research problem has
been defined as being an investigation of these areas of conflict and the ways such conflict may be resolved in the school situation.

The chapter which follows will outline the organisational theory which will be used in this investigation into the ways actors in middle management roles behave in conflict with each other. The value of Action Theory as a method of understanding such behaviour will be stressed.
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In this chapter the writer proposes to outline the organisational theory which has been used in this research into school organisation.

1. Structural Functionalism.

Structural functional analysis presents some valuable insights in this area. Such an analysis is presented by Shipman (1). This portrays the school as a social organisation in which individuals are allocated to statuses which have regular patterns of behaviour. Continuity, co-ordination of activities, and the achievement of goals, are seen to be brought about by formal and informal arrangements within the organisation which continues relatively unchanged as individuals come and go. Underlying this model is an assumption that individuals share the same values. The school can usefully be viewed as a system of interconnected parts but Shipman says that his model is an idealized one, and he goes on to criticise it later in the same work when he outlines a conflict model. Despite its idealistic character, Shipman illustrates the way in which the school organisation persists even though external factors may suggest that certain features are irrelevant, and the implication is that organisations seen in this light are not sensitive to change.

Functional analysis may be seen as part of a genuine sociological explanation of what goes on in the school as an organisation. The functionalist model of interrelated processes provides a true causal explanation of some social phenomenon. Functionalism does not appear to be able to explain social change but Cohen (2) claims that this is because it cannot explain social persistence. If the theory could explain why social structures tend to persist then it would only have to be stated that change occurs when such conditions leading to persistence are not present. It would be an imaginary social world in which every item in a social system is so interrelated with each other that the whole
must persist in a given state, but this does provide a useful model for the analysis of an institution such as a school. A range of such models would help to explain why some systems tend to resist change and why some are prone to change.

There is no universally held functionalist approach but generally there is the expectation amongst those who hold this theory that the function of any sub-system within the organisation is to meet the needs of the system - aspects of an organisation are explained by demonstrating the contribution that it makes to the whole. The functionalist framework of analysis does not appear to explain why there is a tendency for the various parts of a system to serve the other parts and to move always towards a kind of equilibrium. Collins (3) believes that the 'system' is usually a myth and that everything does not affect everything else in an important way; the needs of the system is a way of expressing preferences for what a theorist believes is good, not a causal explanation of the way things actually happen. According to Cohen (4) there is nothing in functionalism itself which encourages an emphasis on solidarity as opposed to conflict. He claims that functionalism does not minimize the importance of conflict and refers to Radcliffe-Brown, one of the precursors of modern functionalism, who argued that a society could not operate unless there were some restraints on the expression of conflict, and some mechanisms for its resolution.

Under certain conditions, conflict may be seen as a means of reinforcing the status quo. Coser (5) says that multiplicity of conflicts stands in inverse relation to their intensity. He argues that conflict in the open society is likely to have stabilising and integrative functions; it vitalises existing norms and contributes to the emergence of new structures which are needed to satisfy new conditions. In the school context, the different affiliations of staff may allow participation in various group conflicts which in effect provide a balancing mechanism within the structure.

Coser believes that, given the proper procedures
for regulating conflict, the conflict becomes institutionalized and self-regulating. The provision of such procedures within a particular organisation may be seen as being management controlled, and an expression of management strategy and manipulation. Even so, there are limits to the institutionalization of conflict, and if the social forces within the organisation are strong enough such procedures may fail to contain it. Though the writer supports Coser's view of the value of conflict as a creative force in the school society, this has not been on the basis that conflict is functional in maintaining an existing system of organisation. Rather, conflict is seen as making possible changed conditions to further school goals which are themselves problematic. Dahrendorf's (6) work, which will be considered later, is seen to be relevant in this regard.

Silverman (7) claims that by moving away from the actors' definitions of the situation we run the risk of reifying the systems that we construct. The actors, with the choices given to them with regard to the action, may shape structures. Silverman (8) examines some studies by Zimmerman (9) and Sudnow (10), illustrates how behaviour is not a simple outcome of a 'formal' structure, and states that enacted rules operate in social conditions only by continual interpretation of their 'meaning' in the context of commonsense decision making. He sees the central weakness of the functionalist approach to be the avoidance of the causes of action. Selznick (11) using the 'needs' of systems to explain action in organisations argues that:

"The meaning of an act may be spelled out in its consequences, and these are not the same as the factors that called it into being."

Silverman maintains that causes and consequences are different, and one cannot impute the first from an observation of the second.

The classical work by Parsons (12) shows how a network of interlocking systems and subsystems functions
and thereby meets the needs of each part. In the Parsonian system, behaviour in organisations is predictable. The definition of the various types of role relationships which can arise allows the emergence of stable expectations on the part of self and others, the self accepting his duties towards others in the knowledge that others will allow self to exercise rights. In this way organisations, and the larger society, persist even though members change. Parsons argued that, of primary importance, is the definition of society's value system which is necessary before we can attribute functions to the parts of a system. The norms of an organisation, or of society itself, must first be legitimated by that society and then the integration of individuals and groups in an organisation will be found in the value system of the organisation, as reflected in its goal. The individual expectations are then derived from the process of socialisation and internalisation of norms. Parsons postulates the dynamic equilibrium of organisations and social systems whereby they adjust and adapt in the direction of new types of stability or new arrangements for maximum efficiency.

Parsons' model of the social system is probably the most elaborate formulation within the functionalist framework. It claims to incorporate within itself what is usually considered to be the antithetical action frame of reference. Walsh (13) says that Parsons claims that his model locates, as its central concern, the problem of social order, yet the Parsonian definition of the social system is in terms of the assumption of order. Parsons presupposes the orderly character of systems in terms of common norms and values. According to Walsh, Parsons provides, not an account of action (which presupposes some idea of self-conscious activity) but an account of behaviour or conduct which is determined by the system. This nullifies Parsons' claim to have produced a model of the social system which incorporates the action frame of reference within it. Parsons describes the social system as a
normatively orientated system of action organised in response to the necessary requirements for its survival. Roles are received by the actor from the social system, and internalised by him in conformity with the expectations attached to them. Social action is thereby the outcome of internalised role expectations. If the actor deviates from his proper role behaviour he is coerced back into line by other actors. Parsons suggests a possible reason for the deviant behaviour might be a faulty process of socialisation. He suggests, further, that the deviance might be the result of conflicting and competing values within the social system, so that different actors may internalise different norms. This may be considered even more confusing as an explanation because it suggests a deviant sub-system of values within the social system - a system which is supposed to be integrated by centralized values.

A strong criticism of Parsons' model is its presupposition of role consensus, with role being conceived of as a standardised item of behaviour. The available evidence concerning everyday behaviour points to the varied interpretations that actors place on roles. Walsh claims that, at the very most, norms and values may be seen to represent only idealized and generalized rules, expectations and definitions of the situation. Crucial to an understanding of the character of social action would be answers to questions about actors' behaviour which can never be explained by seeing such behaviour as determined by a social system. Warner (14) claims that Parsons' concentration on the 'Hobbesian problem of order' has led him to neglect the cognitive element in action. This would appear to be unfair on Parsons who saw order as unproblematic in that the social system contains within itself the balancing mechanism of social values which produce order. In reply to Warner, Parsons (15) maintains that, however important the cognitive element may be in any usable theory of
action, it cannot stand alone or in any simple sense 'predominate'. It must be complemented by what is variously called a 'motivational' or an 'affective' component. Parsons claims that various kinds of combination of the two are to be found at many levels of action in organisations. He insists that he is opposed to single factor explanations of phenomena in the world of human action and claims that he is being misinterpreted because his critics persist in focusing their attention on his work published forty one years ago and neglecting almost everything he has published since. However the importance of the social system as the determining factor in social interaction is emphasised by Parsons in some of his more recent work. Walsh (16) referring to this asserts that the reification of the social system is complete in the Parsonian model since 'concrete human individuals' have been excluded from it.

Silverman (17) says that Parsons' model indicates an unsatisfactory treatment of change and conflict. It is not clear how conflict will contribute necessarily to the stability of the system. He makes the same point about Parsons as about Selznick, namely, that he is pre-occupied with the consequences of a change rather than in examining its sources.

Katz and Kahn (18) use Parsons in their Open Systems Theory explanation of organisations. They follow him in their claim that all systems have a tendency towards a maintenance of boundaries within a moving equilibrium. Their concept of organisational space may be found useful in an analysis of school organisation.

"By organisational space we refer to the locus of the various organisational activities and the behaviour distances between members in carrying out their many organisation-related tasks." (19)

What is of significance is the way in which social space is perceptually bounded and differentiated. Spencer (20) argued that, where the internal structure is differentiated, there was greater possibility for integration of the whole which reduced internal disharmony.
The individual learns the limits of legitimate demands that may be made upon him in terms of his time and effort, and the responsibility that he has to bear. By such means organisational space is collectively defined in the perceptions of organisation members. The concept of organisational space clearly indicates that there are other social fields in which individuals are implicated and in which different sorts of behaviour are called forth. The understanding of internal organisational processes may be increased by considering such other fields, and by exploring the differences and similarities between patterns of organisational behaviour and patterns of behaviour in other spheres.

Katz and Kahn believe that internal strain is not the most potent cause of organisational change. The critical factors leading to this are outside the organisation. Silverman asserts that to analyse change from the viewpoint of conflicts of interest within an organisation would appear to be precluded from functionalist theory. The motivation of the actors does not appear to figure very largely in the Open Theory. The cause of any act appears only to be considered in terms of the supposed needs of the system and the causes of conflict are neglected; though Katz and Kahn refer to social patterns emerging as a result of a continuing tug-of-war. What they find interesting about conflict is the function it performs for participants within organisations and the way organisations adapt to absorb it when it may be seen to be dysfunctional.

The functional perspective sees organisational space as highly differentiated and characterised by a considerable degree of structural complexity. Institutions are seen to have whole systems of independencies determined by history and habits, personalities and power struggles. Appreciation of this wide ranging mutual interdependence of intra-organisational phenomena has been formalised by the development of the concept of the organisation as a system, an open system, a set of interrelated parts, each of which is related to every other part (as are the parts in the solar system or in a watch). Elements or
processes of the organisation are mutually dependent upon one another and a particular part or process cannot be separated and understood in isolation, but has to be viewed in the context of the whole. Investigation of a particular organisational outcome will lead to an appreciation of the dynamics of the whole organisation. An organisational culture is a dynamic, complex system, characterised by constant adjustments in its internal relations, increasingly required to adapt to changes taking place among the elements of the environment themselves.

Gouldner (21) has argued that the functionalist model, despite its insights, has limitations. It has focused on the-way much social interaction has hidden consequences which were unintended, and as a result neglected the importance of 'rational' behaviour. By emphasising integration in organisations it has neglected the differences in the amount of integration which occurs between organisations. Further, the functionalist appears to assume a consensus regarding goals in an organisation which may not be present. Silverman (22) claims that it remains as an unexplored issue whether members of organisations do orient themselves towards specific goals and do experience rules as predesigned and given in their relations with each other.

Silverman states that the functionalist method of analysis has remained the most popular way to explain the nature and structure of organisations perhaps because it is geared to the type of problems that management encounters in complex organisations where system survival in the face of rapid change, is so important. If this explanation is unacceptable, it may be held that the functionalist analysis is respectable because it appears to use the methods and perspectives of the natural sciences. Biological concepts appeared to give a scientific objectivity. Functions can be observed, whereas in action the ends of the actors may be seen to be imprecise, subjective, and difficult to quantify. Whereas Gouldner believes that
functional analysis, if more closely formulated, could take into account the different ends of different actors in an organisation where these are contradictory, Silverman doubts that this approach is possible.

Functionalist theory appears to give an inadequate account of the distribution of power in society, the possibility of radical social change, and the significance of social conflict. The role of power is important in the school situation and Musgrave has been quoted earlier (p.22) with regard to the head's power resources that can be used to achieve compliance. The functionalist model of the school would be an idealized one based upon shared values. The functionalist may look upon conflict and change as detrimental and he may fail to see that the established arrangements within the school do not benefit everyone equally. Some staff may feel at a positive disadvantage as when, for example, particular subject disciplines may be in receipt of inadequate resources. The material resources which are available may decisively limit the possibilities of action. The source of conflict, in a school as in society, is the struggle over the distribution of material resources and advantages. The functionalist theory stresses the essentially co-operative nature of society and the desire of individuals to join with others in common enterprises. Some school organisations may not encourage such a spirit of co-operation because of the differences of interests amongst its participants which may lead to conflicts over many issues. The school is unlikely to founder as an organisation because coercive power is available if need be to compel subordinate groups to comply with the policies decided upon by the top management group. The functionalist tends to see consensus being achieved by the society as a whole, or in this case by a school organisation as a whole, but the danger would be that the ruling group in the school might consider itself to be the only one able to take the 'overall view'. By comparison, conflict theorists prefer to
examine the organisational arrangements of the school from the point of view of different interest groups within the school. A structural functional model might suggest that the status quo is to be preferred to any alternative arrangement that may be made.

2. Stages in the Study of Organisations.

Hoyle (23) distinguishes three broad stages in the development of the sociological study of organisations. The first was the technical stage characterized by the scientific management movement which aimed at maximum efficiency which would be achieved by the application of logical and rational procedures. Taylor and his followers in scientific management conceived of workers as rational machines, and their theories may be seen to rest on an inadequate theory of motivation: man was responsive primarily to monetary incentives. It became evident that this conception ignored the influence of sentiments and values and attention moved towards an interest in the social factors in the work situation, beginning with the 'human relations' approach in industry which was seen by Hoyle as the second stage in the development of organisational theory.

The 'human relations' school is a title commonly applied to a group of American sociologists who were particularly influenced by the ideas of Elton Mayo (24). The key to worker morale and organisational peace was seen to be the quality of human relations which resulted from a supportive management which ensured effective channels of communication. This view may be criticised on the ground that it suggests a manipulative approach to workers on the part of management. The assumption made by writers in the 'human relations' tradition is that peace in the organisation is the norm, and conflict is seen to be pathological; conflicts are attributed to ignorance or misunderstanding of the facts of particular situations, and the theory is that provided the channels of communication are improved conflict will not occur.
Against this the point may be made that the communication of some facts may give rise to conflict which would not otherwise come about. Further, bad human relationships may be considered to be a symptom of organisational conflict rather than its cause which may be found in many complex phenomena. Social phenomena are, in the last analysis, products of the actions and interactions of individuals, and clearly the attitudes and actions of specific individuals can in particular circumstances have far reaching effects, though individual influence over social events is usually limited.

Organisational structure may be considered to be the main cause of conflict. The social organisation of the school involves a structure of inter-related roles which may determine, to varying extents, the behaviour of their occupants. From this perspective, men's social actions are not random or idiosyncratic but can normally be related to the pressures inherent in the situations in which they find themselves. Sociological analysis is indeed possible only because men tend to act in similar ways when confronted by the same type of social situation. Yet this basic truth can be overstated so that some social theorists may view human behaviour as determined mechanically by the social structure. As a result men may tend to be treated as merely passive playthings of social forces as part of an assumption that a fixed pattern of behaviour is called forth by specific social situations. Such a view will be rejected in this enquiry, though the importance of school structure as a conditioning influence on staff behaviour will be emphasised.

Collins (25) criticised the 'human relations' approach as involving a naive ideal of how peaceful and harmonious an organisation could be if only the informal groups in the organisation could be given a sense of belonging. As such Collins maintains that this work is biased against any extensive analysis of power conflicts.
The Hawthorne inquiries (26) are referred to by Blau and Scott (27) as exerting great influence. The conclusion arrived at was that increased productivity was a function of improved human relations, though Collins quotes Carey (28) in his claim that the so-called Hawthorne Effect is a myth because the operative variables appear to have been changes in material incentives. It was clear that the importance of informal groupings and leaders, which play an important part in influencing the achievement of organisational goals, had been ignored in the classical view and, further, that workers respond to non-economic rewards and sanctions. Democratic styles of leadership, which placed a great emphasis on communication, could produce a co-ordination of effort in an organisation.

A further development of the classical model has been the work of March and Simon (29) which has led to an emphasis on rational decision making. This is in the Weberian tradition and is part of a management theory which started with Chester Barnard (30) and which has attempted to combine an understanding of organisational politics with the idea of rational decision making where information may be inadequate. Collins (31) points out that the political self-interest of the managers is usually lost sight of by those who advocate this model.

Hoyle's third stage in the development of organisational theory, termed conceptual, is characterized by the search for an encompassing theory which will relate pertinent data to the design function and adaptability of organisations, and he says that it is in this area that attention has for the first time really been focused on organisations such as schools. This leads us to a consideration of Weber's work as being the basis for a theory which will help to explain the complexities of modern organisations, and in particular will serve to lead towards an understanding of school organisation.
3. A Theory of Conflict and Control in Organisations.

According to Collins (32) Weber's theory may be regarded as dealing only with a rigid form of bureaucracy but, in fact, it pulls together various subfields of organisational studies and links them to the main questions of general sociology. Collins points out that, though Mayo and Barnard, in the 1930s, wrote much that was considered new on informal groups and personal ties, Weber had built an entire theory of personalistic organisation and its dynamics under the rubrics of patrimonialism and charisma (33). Collins states that conflicts and manoeuvres are the very essence of Weber's analysis of bureaucracies. He asserts that a modern class conflict model like that of Dahrendorf (34) may be seen as part of a central tradition, which started with Weber, in which organisations may be understood best as arenas for the reconciliation of conflicting interests. Weber developed his organisational theory as part of the sociology of political struggle, and much of his work is concerned with the sociology of armies. Everyone in the army is capable of pursuing his own interests in opposition to its head, and many techniques of administration put resources in the hands of subordinates who proceed to undermine authority from above. This suggests some of the basic elements of an organisational theory: individuals pursuing their own interests, the sanctions they may use to gain compliance, and the administrative forms through which they are applied. Weber refers constantly to the interests that individuals are pursuing, as an explanation of organisational arrangements of all sorts. His treatment of class, status group, and party, indicates that individuals in all of them struggle in their own interests, and each group contains a status stratification that generates conflict.

Weber's models of patrimonial and bureaucratic organisation (35) contain a general theory of the conditions under which different kinds of power arrangements will be upheld or broken down. According to Collins, the implicit
struggles between rulers and their organisational servants are explained here; from this springs the whole line of analysis of power struggles, ideology, and goal displacement in governmental bureaucracies of which Mannheim (36) and Selznick (37) provided the classic works. Blau (38) made use of the findings about informal group organisation among workers and their struggle with their managers regarding work conditions to interpret the position of white collar workers. The tactics and manoeuvring by managers have been researched by writers from Barnard (39) to Dalton (40), and Etzioni (41) and Crozier (42) have used these researches to formulate many of the principles of a general theory of control and conflict in organisations. A reference to some of these works appears later in this chapter.

Aron (43) states that Weber's ideas underlying his conception of social action are as follows:
(a) Weber suggests that the different values to which we can aspire are embodied in human collectivities which are automatically in conflict with one another.
(b) Within a collectivity there is scarcely a political measure that does not involve an advantage for one class, and a sacrifice for another.

Political decisions will in the last analysis always be dictated by a commitment to values that cannot be demonstrated, in that the person or group who is involved can only define the situation from his (or the group's) vantage point. Men are unequally endowed in every respect - physical, intellectual, moral - and human action may be orientated towards obliterating the natural inequality through social effort, or rewarding people on the basis of their unequal qualities. Weber believed that there is no science which can determine the choice to be made but that every man chooses his God or his devil for himself. Aron says that in Weber's view society is not a consensus or a harmonious whole. Rather, social interaction may be described as conflict which results from the desire of each participant to impose his will upon the other.
Collins (44) following Weber, says that:
(a) the basic premises of the conflict approach are that everyone pursues his own best line of advantage according to resources available to him and to his competitors, and
(b) social structures — whether formal organisations or informal acquaintances — are empirically nothing more than men meeting and communicating in certain ways; social change is what happens when the balance of resources slips one way or another, so that the relations men negotiate over and over again come out in changed form.

Weber (45) defines power as an actor's opportunity to impose his will on another even against the other's resistance. Power exists within social interaction and designates a situation of inequality in which one of the actors has a chance to impose his will on another. In Aron's view (46) Weber stresses the notion of subjective meaning, the meaning the actor assigns to his actions, and his work demonstrates his belief in the permanence and irreducibility of conflict between classes, values, and nations.

The claim has been made earlier that Dahrendorf (47) may be seen as part of a central tradition which started with Weber. Conflict may be seen in Dahrendorf as a tolerable process which fosters rather than endangers the stability of the organisation. He sees it as an important factor in giving direction to social change and believes that wherever there is life there is conflict:

"All creativity, innovation, and development in the life of the individual, his group, and his society is due, to no small extent, to the operation of conflicts between group and group, individual and individual, emotion and emotion within one individual. This fundamental fact alone seems to me to justify the value judgement that conflict is essentially 'good' and 'desirable'."

Conflict resolution may imply that it is possible to eliminate given conflicts altogether. Dahrendorf rejects this as reflecting a sociologically mistaken ideology according to which complete elimination of conflict is possible and desirable. Similarly he regards
as mistaken the idea that conflict can be suppressed. He is concerned with the regulation of conflict in the sense of forms of control which address themselves to the expressions of conflict, rather than their causes, and effective conflict regulation in this sense presupposes the presence of the following three factors:

1. A recognition by both parties to the conflict of the fundamental justice of the opponent's cause. The crucial factor for effectively regulating conflicts is emphasis upon systematic divergence and opposition.

2. The organisation of interest groups. This organisation depends upon structural conditions which are not always present.

3. Procedural norms should be adhered to by all parties concerned.

Dahrendorf indicates three modes of structural change which may follow the regulation of conflict:

1. The total (or near total) exchange of the personnel in positions of domination in an organisation.

2. The partial exchange of the personnel in positions of domination.

3. No change of personnel but the incorporation of proposals and interests of the one party by the other in the dispute.

These three positions indicate the end points and centre of a scale measuring change in an organisation.

According to Selznick (49), every organisation has the same need for an accommodative balance between fragmentary group interests. The search for security and fulfillment is reflected in the struggle of individuals for place and preferment, in rivalry among units within the organisation. He speaks of new patterns of organisation emerging and old ones declining, not as a result of conscious design but as natural and largely unplanned adaptations to new situations. He describes the emergence of contending interest groups and their attempts to become the dominant influence in the organisation.
Selznick distinguishes between an organisation and an institution. An organisation is recognised by its formal system of rules and objectives, a system of consciously co-ordinated activities (50). An institution is more nearly a natural product of social needs and pressures - a responsive, adaptive organism. Institutionalization is described by Selznick as a process: something that happens to an organisation over time, which reflects the organisation's own distinctive history, the people who have been in it, the groups it embodies, and the vested interests they have created. The flexibility of possible personal and group interaction will determine the degree of institutionalization. This ensures that most enterprises may be a complex mixture of both designed and responsive behaviour.

The studies of key individuals and groups in organisations pursued by Dalton (51) focused on two types of managers who exist at all levels: the one type the systematizers and routinizers, to whom method and procedure are paramount, and the other type referred to as adapters and reorganisers who stress ends over means. Dalton refers to power struggles to describe the behaviour of executives seeking:
(1) to advance their departments,
(2) to answer the claims of competing subordinates,
(3) to protect their departments against the 'aggressions' of other departments.

Dalton says that knowledge of how persons behave in critical situations, and judgements by observers and participants as to who 'won' or 'lost', reveal that formal and informal authority do not always coincide and may in fact be far apart. He claims that cliques, small exclusive groups of persons with a common interest, are inseparable and essential for group life. In his view the organisation would fall apart without sustaining action by some clique. Cliques are encouraged by the formal division of labour and the assignment of responsibilities. Personnel, isolated in this way,
may magnify the importance of their function in the system, and at the same time may ignore and minimize the importance of others. Reorganisation following expansion, which leads to new divisions of labour, may lead to the emergence of cliques, and resistance by particular cliques to such change is occasioned by the fear that new arrangements may limit existing rights. The way in which individuals will identify with the existing or new arrangements may vary according to differences in age, ability, expectations, and personal and group responsibilities. Whatever the goals of an organisation there will be rivalry for higher posts, a voice in policy, or some other means of recognition from leaders. Dalton sees cliques as both an outgrowth and instrument of planning and change. In his view they are essential both to cement the organisation and to accelerate action. Every school has its cliques and they appear to be natural to organisational life. Such groupings may have implications for management in the kinds of consultative settings which are found in many schools as described in Chapter 8 of this study.

The staff-line focus of dispute among students of management is referred to by Dalton as an important feature of conflict in the industrial firms he studied (52). The distinction between staff, acting in an advisory capacity as experts, and staff, who are experienced production managers, is not so clear cut in the school situation as it might be in an industrial plant, since all middle management staff on the pastoral and curricular side spend the larger part of their time teaching in the classroom. In a sense all teachers may be seen to be in the line. Dalton's analysis is valuable as showing the different areas of conflict that arise which increase to the extent that men are seen to fit their particular function. He concludes that all creative effort arises from some measure of tension and conflict.

The focus on the terms 'formal' and 'informal' in organisational theory is considered by Dalton to be
helpful but inadequate for grappling with all aspects of the behaviour within organisations. He speaks of numerous concurrent interplays, interrelated and not, of varying importance for the organisation. He does not regard informal work as intrigue, plotting, and so on, but rather as being a possible source of change leading to the preservation of the organisation. Such informal work may protect the weak, recruit new personnel, as well as encourage power struggles. Dalton researched into a number of firms which, in his conclusion, he described as 'normal' and his evidence led him to assert that conflict is typical in organisational life, fluctuating as it does around some balance of the constructive and disruptive. He asserts that the mastery or compromise of one conflict merely launches us into another. Perpetual harmony is alien to life, and conflict and co-operation are usually intermingled in all advances.

The classic work on the conditions that allow voluntary associations such as political parties to be taken over by their elected leaders, who become a self interested and a self perpetuating group, was produced by Michels (53) and has been applied to a large variety of organisations. Collins (54) says that arguments concerning the 'Iron Law of Oligarchy' have been concerned to show whether or not democracy is possible, rather than to consider more fully the variations in conditions that make organisational leaders more and less powerful vis-a-vis their followers. Collins believes that the same problem exists in all types of organisation: official control may be subverted by those who are supposed to be carrying out a task imposed by others. He maintains that the conditions that determine just who wins what in these struggles of power at organisational levels - notably control over channels of communication - are the same in both bureaucratic theory and voluntary association theory.

Organisations may be seen as focal points for
power struggles along several dimensions, with participants using a number of tactics and devices, according to the individuals involved and their particular interests. Collins makes the point that organisations tend to change their structures and goals, as well as their personnel. The official idea of the organisation at one time may be reified, and changes described in moral tones, instead of looking at the real complex of interest groups who are always on the scene and among whom power has shifted over time. According to Collins, Michels acted as if there were movements away from an ideal without considering just which members of the organisation were actually concerned with upholding this ideal.

Michels focused on channels of administration and communication as the crucial variable for determining who won control but Collins indicates other variables: (1) the existence of channels of contact with important outside groups. (2) internal controls over areas of technical uncertainty. (3) the spatial distribution of the tasks in relation to the technology of communications.

In this connection Crozier (55), in his study of plants in the French tobacco monopoly, has shown that the one who controls information, particularly in areas of uncertainty, will have high power, as did the engineers and maintenance men who dealt with the unexpected in a highly routinized operation. Leaders who control the administrative machinery may exercise power over other participants because these can only act on the facts of the situation as known to them; thus whoever defines the situation has indirect control. The head of a school has an advantage over other staff with regard to the control of vital information and this will be referred to later (p.245).

The argument in this section has been to demonstrate that organisations may be seen to have many conflicting interests and this leads to the problem of control.

Etzioni (56) refers to the use of physical means
for control purposes as coercive power, the use of material means as utilitarian power, and the use of symbols as identitive power. (Identitive power is referred to by Etzioni in an earlier work (57) as normative power.) Other things being equal, the use of coercive power is more alienating to those subject to it than is the use of utilitarian power, and the use of utilitarian power is more alienating than the use of identitive power. Etzioni says that organisations usually use more than one kind of power, and that each type of power has very different sorts of consequences. Identitive power is predominant in schools but coercion and utilitarian power play an important part in all school relationships. The identitive power used by the head of a school in his interaction with his staff cannot be separated entirely from other forms of power. Where the head, using identitive strategies, endeavours to achieve compliance in particular situations it may be difficult to analyse whether the individual's response has been influenced by his recognition that the head has in reserve a coercive power which could be used if identitive power were to fail. A further consideration might be the fear that, whilst coercive power may not be used in that particular situation, there is a possibility of its use in other areas. There is a possibility that coercion may be used in all school relationships. The head acts on behalf of his governors in all that relates to the internal organisation, management and discipline of the school, and he exercises supervision over teaching and non teaching staff. This power enables him to take crucial decisions affecting staff in the way they function in school; reference has been made to this in Chapter 1 (p.22).

An organisation is concerned with ensuring that certain performances are carried out. Etzioni points out that if the organisation could recruit individuals who would perform as required automatically, or could educate its participants so they would perform adequately without supervision, there would be no need for a structure of
control. Thus selection of intake to an organisation has an important bearing on the control structure. Etzioni asserts that in general the more effective the selection, the less need for socialization. In the comprehensive school, which generally accepts every child who applies to join, the staff may have to rely heavily upon socialization to produce the desired characteristics in its membership. This would appear to be a valid explanation for the emergence of strong pastoral structures in such schools, though the outcomes of such socialization are problematic. It follows that the comprehensive school may depend heavily upon the selection of teachers, in so far as those in charge wish to build up particular characteristics. The more effective the socialization the less the need for supervision. The means of control affect the process. A coercive organisation leads to reaction and the intention to socialize may be frustrated. It may be contended that organisations that rely heavily upon identitive power are likely to be the most successful in terms of the achievement of socialization.

Etzioni maintains that the power used by an organisation to control its participants derives either from specific positions (e.g. in the school, Head of Department, Head of Year), from personal qualities (e.g. command of persuasive skills), or from a combination of both (e.g. a persuasive Head of Department or Year). He stresses that personal power is almost always identitive power, whilst positional power may be identitive, coercive, or utilitarian. Personal and positional power may be seen to be close to Weber's (58) charismatic and legal authority. In the positions which are focused on in this enquiry, there is a combination of positional and personal power. Etzioni describes the individual whose power is chiefly derived from his organisational position as an official, whereas the individual whose ability to control others is chiefly personal is referred to as an
informal leader; in his view one who commands both positional and personal power is a formal leader. The assumption is made by the writer that the positions of Head of Department and Head of Year are both formal leaders as their ideal-typical specifications (see p23) indicate. In any particular instance this would be a matter of empirical enquiry.

Etzioni quotes Parsons as saying that every collectivity must solve four basic functional problems: it must fulfill two instrumental needs of input and allocation, and two expressive needs of social and normative integration, and instrumental and expressive needs tend to be the activities of differentiated action systems. He speaks of Bales maintaining that this is because incompatible role orientations and psychological characteristics are required for these positions. This enquiry uses Bernstein's (59) outline of Instrumental and Expressive areas of activity rather than the strong division as stated by Parsons. However, there is a sense in which the organisation of the pastoral and curricular sides of the school may be seen to fulfill two different kinds of needs of the participants, and that staff who participate in these areas may require particular characteristics.

In organisations which rely heavily upon identitive power, such as schools, most of the organisational participants are controlled by formal leaders, and control is much more dependent upon personal qualities than in coercive organisations. The attempt may be made to appoint to senior staff positions in such identitive-power organisations those who can combine positional identitive power with personal power. This is particularly relevant in the case of pastoral posts with their emphasis upon the expressive culture of the school. Etzioni (60) makes the interesting comment that, to ensure the superiority of expressive matters, which are more directly related to religious goals, over instrumental ones, and to counter tendencies towards goal displacement,
religious organisations tend to insist on the superiority of the expressive leader over the instrumental one, whether the latter is an informal or a formal leader (61). In a Guidance Memorandum on the appointment of teachers issued by the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales to governing bodies of secondary schools, it is stated that teaching posts which carry pastoral responsibility in the school such as Head of Upper, Middle or Lower School are of great importance and only in very exceptional circumstances should such posts be held by non Catholic teachers(62).

Schools tend to be pervasive organisations in that they attempt to control most of the activities that take place within them, and also to set and enforce norms for activities which are carried on when the participants are outside the organisation. In general, the more pervasive organisation needs more efforts and resources to maintain a given level of control and depends mainly upon identitive power since it has no way of controlling its participants when they are outside the organisation. Because the modern school has a wide variety of activities carried out jointly by the same set of participants, organisational scope, that is, the number of activities in which their participants are jointly involved, is broad and enhances identitive power in that the participants identify with the organisation in activities within and outside of the organisation. Where the school climate or expressive culture is at variance with standards in the homes of its participants, there is a possibility of tension and conflict both in school and at home.

The structure of an organisation may be regarded as a network for applying controls, so that certain tasks can be carried out or at least attempted, since the outcomes are problematic.

At high levels in the organisation, according to Collins (63), it is likely that members will identify
with their jobs and with the organisation. One method of identitive control, then, is to co-opt members into responsible positions (see p. 230). A related method is to offer them a chance to be promoted and in this connection real but uncertain chances are the most effective. A reference has been made (p. 56) to Crozier's view that power accrues to those who can control areas of uncertainty. Exercising power always involves some sort of exercise of ideals. The ideals and the conflicts are intertwined. Power gives rise to at least implicit conflict between those who have the power and those who do not. People enact their authority by idealizing themselves and reifying their positions and their organisations. Ideals are the common currency used by those in powerful positions to hold themselves together. If an organisation consists of a structure of power in which certain people control other people the more identitive the control that is attempted by sharing power the less hierarchic the organisation becomes. Another path to identitive control, besides offering power, is to make organisational members committed to each other as equals. Thus personal friends may be promoted. This leads Collins to assert that the organisational leaders who attempt to use identitive control face a continual series of dilemmas. He asserts that the two main ways of getting identitive commitment (1) giving away some of one's power and (2) fostering highly mobilized egalitarian groups within the organisation, are both dangerous since men who internalize ideals come to consider themselves the best judges of the organisation's attempt to uphold and further such ideals. As a result he concludes that astute organisational politicians always attempt to mix identitive incentives with material rewards and perhaps subtle coercive threats and he refers (64) to Guenther Roth (65) who says that modern organisations are a mixture of control strategies, with the successful
organisational politicians using both formal rules and informal networks and personal emissaries in an attempt to gain maximum leverage.

A recognition that the head has coercive power over a wide range of staff activities may be seen as a controlling influence in all staff interaction. His control over material rewards, such as special allowance payments, the use of school resources, including time, money, equipment and buildings, gives considerable coercive power to one who may wish to base his control structure on identitive power. The material rewards and the ever present threat of coercion may mean that Etzioni's claim that identitive power is the one most commonly used in schools is questionable. The head who seeks to use such identitive power cannot escape from the fact that his other powers may influence his interaction with others when they are not explicitly in evidence. Collins' reference to the dangers of an attempt to achieve identitive commitment by power sharing through systems of consultation and delegation may have less relevance as far as the head of a school is concerned in that his safeguard is his reserve power of coercion which legally belongs to him. The danger is that consultative proposals and the delegation of power will be seen as a sham and a means of manipulation which will lead to conflict. This is referred to later (p. 229) in connection with Nailsea.

4. Action Theory

The perspective taken by the writer in the light of the organisational theory which has so far been outlined, particularly that which emphasises the part played by conflict, is that of the action approach. The ideal-typical Action Theory is presented by Silverman in his work referred to earlier. It will be used in this study as a method of analysing social relations within the organisation of a school. The writer is taking the position that, though human behaviour may be viewed as to some extent a reflection of the organisational structure
of the school, the determining factor in organisational behaviour may be seen as the outcome of the interaction of people who are largely concerned with their own problems albeit that these problems or responsibilities may flow in part from the role specifications which are the accepted 'rules of the game' at a particular moment in time. The structure and role specifications provide a framework for action which is subject to change as a result of men's action.

Blumer (66) sees the individual not as responding to role requirements, norms or values outside himself, but stresses the reflexive process whereby the individual makes indications to himself with regard to significant others before determining his line of action, withholding his action if he chooses, inspecting it, judging it, determining its possibilities, directing his actions towards it. Blumer depicts the nature of human society from the point of view of Mead. The individual interprets what confronts him and acts according to his interpretation of what he sees; he is not so much played upon by outside forces to which he responds, though outside forces play their part. Rather he constructs his action in the light of an interpretation of outside forces. What he takes into account are the things he indicates to himself, his wants, his feelings, his goals, the actions of others, the expectations and demands of others, and in particular, significant others. Human beings interpret each other's gestures and act on the basis of the meaning yielded by the interpretation. Participants in human interaction build up their respective lines of conduct by constant interpretation of each other's lines of action.

Men define their situation and act in certain ways in order to attain certain ends. In this way they construct a social world. The Action Theory perspective recognises that the sociologist is limited in his understanding of life in organisations because of his inability to experience the experiences of others. One
can say that there is a probability that actors will respond in a particular way but no more than that. Behaviour in any situation cannot logically be understood simply by its being observed. There is a complex network of meaning around a person's behaviour and his action stems from his subjective definition of a situation as it appears to him. Action is a person's response to a stimulus after he has extracted some meaning from it. People read situations as they appear to them and they react in terms of this reading. The same stimulus received from different people may produce completely different action responses.

A person's actions and his response and understanding of the actions of others are guided by what Schutz (67) calls 'typifications'. These are patterns of behaviour given to us by history and the present structure of our society, a shared stock of knowledge which implies that certain types of behaviour are natural to various role players. This stock of natural behaviour in given situations changes very slowly but it does change as a result of men's actions. Role expectations do not determine action though they play their part. The typical teacher/pupil relationship has been well defined historically but such role expectations arise from and depend upon 'on-going' human interaction.

Because of the way human interaction has been described, the social order is seen as being essentially problematic. In social relationships the people involved may attach different meanings to their interaction.

The meanings attached to a solution to a problem situation may be different for each of the actors involved: here we may refer to Weber's (68) asymmetrical relationships. Any particular relationship is governed by the knowledge of the shared values of the common sense world and also by the experiences and personal history of the participants. The situation will be defined differently by the various actors. Conflict situations may usefully be examined from the different interpretation
of them by the participants. There is a sense in which people treat everyday life as unproblematic but, in a changing world, conflict situations arise which are new, and there is no known shared experience which can help to provide answers.

The writer is concerned in this study with an attempt to observe and interpret, in a theoretical framework, why actors behave as they in particular situations (69). Such explanations suggest a rationality of approach, a weighing of means and ends which is perhaps not often present in actual conflict situations, but the ideal typical explanation makes it possible to examine elements in behaviour which may appear to be non-rational to other participants.

The actions of members of an organisation can be explained when their definitions of a situation have been understood. The first task of organisational analysis is to distinguish the different ends and expectations which actors bring to their membership of the organisation, which derive from their various historical experiences and from the multiple statuses which they hold. These variations arise also from the different experiences of actors within the organisation which encourage or discourage certain ends and expectations and generate others. All this affects the involvement of the individual and his response to the behaviour of others. The nature of this involvement is likely to be affected by whether authority is maintained by consensus or superior power, and Crozier (70) has shown how people use strategies to preserve and enlarge their area of discretion.

Action proceeds from the actors' ranging involvements, and their definitions of the situations are reflected in the role system of the organisation; this indicates the probable action of others without which social life could not proceed. Change can come about from outside the organisation or as a result of the interaction of the actors. But changes that come about as a result of outside forces are still governed
by the definition of the situation used by the actors. The reactions of participants in different organisations are different. When the stock of knowledge changes then one might expect a change in the definition of the situation by participants inside the organisation. The actors can bring about a change in the rules of the game but they cannot be sure that what they intend to happen as a result will be the actual outcome. Consequences may be intended or unintended.

Social organisation is still important as being part of the process by which action is determined, but such organisation is interpreted by those who participate. Conduct is ever developing in an on-going process of interaction between people. The fitting together is a constant process of interpretation and definition. The process of sustaining and changing conduct is ever present in group life. Participants are constantly redefining each other's acts. It is intrinsic in dealing with problem situations. Human interaction becomes formative as a result of a constant redefinition which produces new relations, new types of behaviour, new conceptions. Social interactions then have a developmental life apart from the dictates of social structure, but not entirely so.

5. The Dialectical View

A dialectical approach to the study of organisations which stresses the importance of the process through which organisational arrangements are produced and maintained has much in keeping with the action approach being used in this study. Thus, whilst Silverman stresses the way in which the social world is constructed, following the individual definitions of particular situations, and points to the problematic nature of the social order existing in organisational life, an organisation life which depends upon the interests, ideas and power wielded by individuals, Benson (71) emphasises that such individual definitions produce contradictions and conflict which constantly undermine the structure of an organisation as
it exists at any time and shows how the process of interaction between individuals in an organisation may be analysed by the basic principles of social construction, totality, contradiction, and praxis. There is a strong similarity here with the approach used by Silverman which is to interpret situations by a method of analysis which sees the action in an organisation over a period of time in terms of stability, instability, and new stability. Whilst the latter method of analysis will be used later in this enquiry to interpret particular problem situations between conflicting parties, there would be some value, at this stage, in considering Benson's four principles in some detail.

Benson's work which is more recent than Silverman's appears to be particularly significant and valuable as support for the action approach used in this study because dialectical theory is seen as being essentially a processual perspective. The production, destruction, and reproduction of organisational forms may be seen to be explained in terms of social process. The writer is not a Marxist and does not accept a determinist view with regard to the inevitability of such a process of change. Change is seen as being inherent in the human condition and organisations will change because people see things differently at different times in history. The conscious conflict in the mind which considers the various alternative courses of action brings with it the possibility of change and development in our institutions and organisations. Benson says that the social world is in a continuous state of becoming, and that social arrangements which seem fixed and permanent are temporary, arbitrary patterns, which are always subject to change. He is concerned to show that dialectical analysis involves a search for fundamental principles which account for the emergence and dissolution of specific social orders.
In outlining the first of these principles, that of social construction, Benson shows that people are continually constructing their social world. Social patterns emerge following the interaction of people and a set of institutional arrangements are made. Gradually, through continued interaction, arrangements previously made are modified or replaced. The arrangements are created from what Benson describes as 'the basically concrete, mundane tasks confronting people in their everyday life' (72). The existing social structure, itself a construct of the previous behaviour of people interacting amongst themselves, is an important constraint. New social structures - following upon different definitions of such situations by the same or by different people - occur within an existing structure. The interests of particular groups within the existing structure will exercise a constraint upon the emergence of new structures and these groups will seek to defend their interests in any such new structure. Change may come about as a result.

The second principle, that of totality, is important because it stresses the need to study social arrangements as complex, interrelated wholes, with partially autonomous parts. Any organisation, or part of an organisation, must be seen as being related to, and influenced by, a larger whole which may affect the process of interaction being examined. Participants in any conflict situation will be affected by arrangements which may be made in related areas of activity and each situation must be seen to be one which may have multiple interconnections.

The third principle, that of contradiction, sees the social order as being one not of predictable development, through an extension or consolidation of the present order, but as being subject to many possibilities dependent upon human action. New patterns of social order will emerge which may be a development of the old order but may be against the established interests of the old order.
The final principle of praxis is the creative reconstruction of social arrangements following new definitions of the social order resulting in action and change.

Both Silverman and Benson reveal that the interaction of people produces social institutions and organisations. The interactionist approach is admirably dealt with by Hargreaves (73) who draws heavily upon the concepts and ideas of Goffman (74). The allocation of power and the system of power arrangements have a decisive influence over the kind of adjustment people are able to make within an organisation. The importance of power relationships in understanding organisational life and behavioural accommodations of individual members has been emphasised in the earlier part of this chapter and Crozier's work has been quoted. His model of man (75) allows action to issue from sentiments as well as from formal commands. He says:

"A human being does not only have a hand and a heart. He also has a head which means that he is free to decide and to play his own game."

Some individuals and groups in an organisation may be seen to be in dominant positions in that they can impose and enforce their definitions of situations, whilst others are in a position where they have to accept such definitions. The existing organisation may have advantages and disadvantages for various groups and the participants in conflict with each other over the possibility of change will have these interests very much in their minds as they act out their roles. However, Noway (76) points out that research limited to the idea of the amount of power of individuals in organisations may overlook several issues of importance to an understanding of the role of power in organisations. He indicates that powerful individuals may or may not choose to exercise influence in decision-making situations.
Thus a distorted view may be given in particular situations by strategic decisions taken beforehand, decisions about who is to be influenced and when and how influence is to be exercised. It would not be difficult to suggest situations in school where the head may choose not to take the lead in formulating a policy. Another level it is possible that a Head of Department with comparatively low power may organise support for himself or others by skilful political manoeuvring which may allow him to influence decision-making.


A major contribution to organisational studies, which would appear to be particularly relevant in this investigation into schools' management structures, has been made by Burns and Stalker (77) in their study of a number of firms in the electronics industry. They found it necessary to use two models of work organisation; these 'ideal types' are called 'mechanistic' and 'organic'.

Burns describes the mechanistic system of organisation as one in which the tasks are broken down into specialisms and the structure of organisation is hierarchical. Roles are clearly defined and there is a sense in which each individual pursues his role as if it was something quite distinct from the task of the firm as a whole. The system of communication is formal and mainly vertical, with instructions and decisions issued by superiors higher up in the structure. A simple control system is operated by the management and there is the assumption that all knowledge about the firm's situation is available to the head of the firm, and that this is of no concern to the individual pursuing his own particular role within the system. Promotion within such a system tends to be the result of long service and conformity to the rules of the organisation. Burns in describing this 'ideal type' of mechanistic organisation says that it would seem to be appropriate to an enterprise existing
under relatively stable conditions.

By contrast, Burns describes the 'ideal type' of organic organisation as being adapted to unstable conditions, to periods of change and development, to times when new problems arise which cannot be dealt with by the existing role structure in an organisation. There is a need for the task of the firm as a whole to be understood by individuals whose roles cannot be defined rigidly and formally. Communication needs to pass across the organisation laterally as well as vertically, and consultation seeking solutions to new problems is more important than vertical commands. The head of the firm cannot be expected to know, nor would he claim to know, the answers to all the problems, nor the best way forward at any given time. Innovation is likely to occur at different levels of the organisation, which makes it imperative that the over-all aims of the organisation be understood.

Burns (78) speaks of three social systems at work in any organisation. The first of these is the formal authority system derived from the aims of the organisation, a co-operative system using people with particular skills to perform a given task. There is a code of behaviour which is concerned with the formal organisation and another code of conduct having rules explicit and implicit that control the actual behaviour of those who work in the institution, both of which govern relationships between those involved in the organisation. The second of Burns' social systems is concerned with the fact that organisations are places where individuals compete for advancement and power. The individual will have his specified role in the organisation's task but as well he will be concerned to extend the control he has over his own situation. He may be able to increase his personal power by attaching himself to people or sections of people who will help him to do this, and here we refer to the internal politics of the institution. The third social system is concerned with the fact that individuals may be seen to have the
need to further their careers. The three kinds of social systems built out of participants' commitments are not exhaustive. Burns asserts that:

"Besides commitments to the concern, to political groups, and to his own career prospects, each member of a concern is involved in a multiplicity of relationships."

These personal relationships arise out of compatibilities and non-compatibilities of age, interest, and background, respect, popularity, apprehension, all of which give rise to differing commitments.

One could say that there is a quantitative variation in the investment of the social self. One's commitment to the political and careerist interests may represent alternative modes of self-advancement which may be isolated from the co-operative system of the working environment directed towards the stated task of the organisation. The ends of the organisation may be more or less adjusted to serve the political and career ends of individuals who are in positions of authority in the structure.

The style of management in a school is determined by the head and is likely to be found somewhere along a line between the two 'ideal types' referred to in this section. In Chapter 8 of this study (p. 225) it is suggested that models of headship may be seen as being on a continuum with an autocratic head at one end and an enabling head, who emphasises the power of his staff in decision making, at the other. The autocratic head would appear to fit naturally into a mechanistic model whilst the enabling head fits into the organic type. In the mechanistic system the autocratic head would be responsible for over-all strategy which would be known in its entirety only to himself, and innovation from other staff would be unlikely. In an organic system, under an enabling head, greater commitment and understanding may be sought at all levels in the organisation to meet the needs of situations in which new and unfamiliar problems may arise.
7. **Conclusion.**

Structural functional analysis presents valuable insights into school organisation, in particular with regard to the network of social roles and role sets in the organisation. The concept of organisational space has been referred to which, being highly differentiated, brings to the school considerable structural complexity. The avoidance of the causes of action would appear to be a major weakness and the most satisfactory method of understanding organisational behaviour would appear to be to study the action of the individual, which can be understood only in the light of his definition of particular situations. This gives to human relationships a developmental life.

The importance of conflict in organisational life has been indicated and Weber's work has been seen to be of crucial importance in this regard. Attention has been given to Etzioni's formulation of a general theory of control. His assertion that identitive power is predominant in schools has been noted but the standpoint taken in this study would be to see management of the school adopting a mixture of control strategies in a social organisation that is essentially problematic and subject to change both as regards its goals and the structures established to achieve them. Coser's approach may be seen to be part of consensus theory and whilst much of his work is valuable and recognisably the basis for management strategies referred to later in this study (p.248) one is left with the impression that conflict leads to readjustments in the existing system of organisation which enables it to perform better. In a sense then conflict will be eliminated. Dahrendorf has been seen to reject the view that the elimination of conflict is possible or desirable, and concentrates on the methods of regulation of conflict through control structures which are concerned with the various ways in which conflicts are expressed. His reference to the factors involved in the effective
regulation of conflict, and his modes of structural change, are particularly valuable in a consideration of procedural structures to be found in schools; these will be referred to in Chapter 4.

The work of Crozier and Burns is taken into account in the Action Theory presented by Silverman, which is used later in this study to analyse in a theoretical manner the conflict situations which are the subject matter of this investigation. Benson's Dialectical View of organisations gives additional insight into the way organisations may change following social action by their participants.

In the next Chapter there will be a discussion of the literature on conflict in schools, and this will focus on the many conflicting ideas, assumptions, and values, within and between middle management groups in schools.
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CHAPTER 3
ROLE CONFLICT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

In this Chapter the writer proposes to discuss the work of Grace (1), Richardson (2), and Dunham (3), all of which provide evidence of conflict in secondary schools.

1. Preliminary Survey.

The classic study of the sub-culture of the school staff is perhaps that of Waller (4). He saw the school as being in a state of peril, balanced between chaos and order, and at any moment likely to become unmanageable. His model was of an autocratic school attempting to enforce a discipline which was not accepted. The school's authority was constantly being threatened by all the school's participants.

The article by Wilson (5) on teacher conflict is also considered a classic but, though well informed and sensitive to the position in schools, it did not provide evidence in support of its analysis. Wilson's work prompted Grace (6) to conduct his investigation into secondary schools which in turn led to the writer investigating the particular conflict between the roles of Head of Department and Head of Year.

Grace referred to the work done by Wilson on the diffuse nature of the teacher's role, the teacher's concern with status by Tropp (7), his exposure to conflicting expectations in Merton (8), the affectivity and moral orientation of the role in Floud (9), and the characteristics of the setting in which teachers work in Corwin (10) and Hoyle (11).

Wilson stressed the diffuse character of the teacher's role and pointed to the lack of knowledge regarding results and the difficulty of knowing where the role ends, which is the experience of so many teachers. With regard to the roles being studied in this work, it is likely that many specific areas of activity may be seen to be 'performed' but wider considerations, such as the areas of their work involved with the encouragement of
interests, the improvement of behaviours and attitudes, and the awareness of values, cannot easily be measured. Considerable self-involvement, for example, by a Head of Year investigating the reasons behind poor behaviour, may result in no improvement and the cri-de-coeur of one who was tired of being involved with other peoples' problems (12). Grace found little evidence that teachers see or feel much of a problem in this area of role diffuseness, but this has to be taken in line with his earlier comment that there was little evidence of anything relating to the teacher's role. A different conclusion, regarding this area of role diffuseness, may be drawn from the evidence produced in this work.

A second area of conflict designated by Wilson was the teacher role set. Burnham (13) found that deputy heads in secondary modern schools were exposed to very significant conflict because they came between the head and his assistants. It will be shown in this study that Heads of Departments and Heads of Years, along with Directors of Studies on the curriculum side, and Counsellors on the pastoral side, absorb much of the odium previously reserved for the Deputy Head.

Musgrove and Taylor's evidence (14) showed that the teacher's concept of his role varied with the type of school and with the social context of the school defined in terms of social class. They claimed that teachers' and parents' priorities were largely the same, and that tension between the two sides was unnecessary and could be resolved by Parent-Teacher Associations. Whilst it might be agreed that in large areas of school activity the teachers' and parents' priorities may coincide, the means taken to achieve ends may be a source of tension. The suggestion that tension could be resolved by Parent-Teacher Associations would appear to claim too much for these bodies; many of the parents whose views are likely to conflict with the views of teachers are unlikely to be involved at any level with Parent-Teacher Associations.

Musgrove found that the greatest source of conflict for nearly all the teachers in his enquiry was the perceived expectations of the head (15). The evidence
of this present work suggests that the head's role has not diminished as a result of the increased participation of all staff in school government, with the spread of decision making bodies, but that it has changed. The increased power of the head, in certain respects, has already been argued in Chapter 1. The need of the teachers to satisfy heads has to some extent shifted towards the requirement to satisfy areas of authority in middle management. By contrast with Musgrove, Grace found that teachers generally were satisfied with their treatment as professionals, particularly in their relationships with heads.

A third area mentioned by Wilson was that of the school as an institution, and he asserted that, of all professions, teachers have the least control of the institution in which their role is performed. One might suggest that this is much less so in the context of the large school, where large areas of administrative work are undertaken by middle management. In schools on split sites, it is not unusual to find teachers at middle management level having complete control over the day-to-day running of their own areas of administration. The interview with a senior inspector of schools (16) suggested that in some cases the factor which necessitated the growth of pastoral middle management roles was that re-organised schools often found themselves on split sites.

The self-interest of the teacher, particularly with regard to his career prospects, as opposed to the interests of the school, his position as the upholder of values not generally practised in society, and the marginal role played by some teachers, for example, teachers of practical subjects, are further areas of conflict designated by Wilson. All these are important in the study of middle management and have been explored in this study.

It is recognised that the extent to which teachers will actually perceive these situations as problems, or feel personally troubled by them, will depend upon a number of mediating variables: the
nature and intensity of the conflict, whether it has a moral or self-orientation, the teacher's age, sex, professional qualifications and role concept, the subject specialism, and the characteristics of the school, its size, organisation, the head's role concept and performance, and so on.

2. Grace on Conflict.

Grace in his study focused his attention upon possible role conflicts of the professional teacher within the bureaucratic organisation of the school. He set out to investigate four potential problem areas: role diffuseness, role vulnerability, role commitment versus career orientation, and value conflict. He investigated a sample of 150 secondary school teachers during the period 1967-1970 in what he said was a small town - small school context. He found that the majority of teachers in his study did not find role diffuseness to be a major source of strain or conflict. Grace was referring in this concept of role diffuseness to the ambiguity of the teacher's task, and the difficulty in knowing whether the teacher was accomplishing anything in large areas of school activity not subject to evaluation by external examination. The majority of high scorers in his questionnaire which related to the ambiguity of the teacher's role were secondary modern teachers who had not the benefit of examination results, work with the Sixth Form, or letters from former pupils. The present study makes use of diffuseness with regard to the rights and duties which make up the roles of Head of Department and Head of Year. Sometimes these rights and duties are not specified clearly and this leads to duplication in role performance and in some cases to neglect. This is not likely to present itself as a problem in the small school type of organisation considered by Grace. Grace referred to Heads of Departments and their responsibilities but not to any staff specifically on the pastoral side, other than the head and his deputy. Each teacher undoubtedly accepted a pastoral commitment.
as being part of the ordinary teacher's role and this came out strongly in Grace's discussion on value conflict.

The work done by Grace in the small school context contrasts strongly with Richardson's work in the highly complex management system at Nailsea to be considered later in this chapter. Grace stressed the need to take into account the teacher's perceptions when educational and organisational change is contemplated. He stressed the need for planned change which monitors the consequences of innovation in terms of teacher reaction and satisfaction. Grace acknowledged that current attempts to include more 'social work' content in the teacher's role brought with them the possibility of increased role strain and role conflict for the teacher, and here he may have been referring to the creation of pastoral posts. He mentioned the increase in role strain, as a result of changed educational contexts, and their effect upon the teacher's perception of results, as being an important area of research, but Grace was not working in this area. Dunham provided evidence of this and will be referred to later. Grace suggested that, within the school situation, the professional orientation of a teacher may conflict with bureaucratic requirements in two main areas: in the specialist area of teaching within the classroom, and in the formulation and execution of general school policy. Grace concluded that teachers prized their autonomy in the classroom, and the enjoyment of this prevented serious experience of role conflict in this area. It is accepted that autonomy here has in the past been virtually complete, though a move towards a more integrated curriculum and team teaching groups is to be expected which leads to a different situation. The teacher in the privacy of his classroom can interpret the nature of his role and its activities, and can satisfy his need for 'self-actualisation'. In their possession of this professional autonomy, Grace found that teachers had considerable confidence, and were largely
free from role vulnerability. The stress and strain present inside the classroom situation in respect of all kinds of teachers appears to have been ignored. The efficient teacher may be subject to considerable stress in maintaining a high level of performance when confronted by difficult classes whilst his less efficient colleague may face this situation more often. The point that is being made is that the fact that the teacher is left alone and therefore autonomous in the classroom does not mean that there is no strain. The writer's experience would lead him to speculate that many teachers leave the profession because of their inability to cope with such strain.

From this point of view, a move in the direction of team teaching could help the weaker teacher, though such a teacher might find it difficult to work in the more open team situation. Regarding participation and a wider professional involvement, Grace stated his impression, which was tentative, that many staff readily accepted the head's policy in general matters, provided their autonomy in the classroom was not affected. Attitudes changed when policies, such as unstreaming, were adopted. Grace found that teachers were satisfied in their participation in decision-making in their schools, though it is not clear what was meant by participation. He was investigating small schools, and there is research which claims to show that the larger the size of school, the less the participation in decision-making. In Bridges' enquiry the large school referred to one with a staff of 20-32 teachers, and the small school to one with a staff of 12-19. Neither of these schools would be considered large in the present study. Most comprehensives would have upwards of 40 teachers, and a school of 1500 pupils would have upwards of 90 teachers. The smallest school in this present enquiry had over 50 members of staff. Grace referred to Corwin who distinguished the teacher as having a characteristic 'employee' role, as opposed to a professional role. Corwin meant that an 'employee' type would be one who was prepared to carry out the wishes of those in authority without question. It is true that the existence of
school governors, representing community interests, and the presence of an inspectorate, which has the duty and the right to visit schools, constitute a limitation upon the autonomy of the teacher, though the inspectorate normally acts in an advisory capacity unless the head requests an inspection with regard to a particular teacher's performance. Should this occur, the teacher would look to his professional association to protect his interests. The independent status of the teacher, like that of many professionals employed in public and private organisations, may be in large part a fiction, but as Johnson (19) asserts, it is a significant fiction, and Corwin's description would be inaccurate with regard to the teachers interviewed in this enquiry.

In Grace's study, conflict arising from a sense of role vulnerability was to be found clearly among secondary modern teachers, who were not graduates, and this conflict reflected differences in the teacher's evaluation of his role and that of the general public with whom he reacted; a further factor in role vulnerability related to the teacher's main subject specialism, in that in some schools, some subjects gave poor status to those in charge of them. The sensitivity with regard to the way different subjects may be treated will be referred to later as one area of discontent between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years. The secondary modern non-graduate is referred to later as one who sometimes attained middle management status, particularly on the pastoral side, in the comprehensive school.

Grace claimed that there was no evidence of any lack of professional treatment or bureaucratic constraints, though if this statement is matched up with the finding that it appeared to be apparent that many teachers had little professional pride, and adopted an 'employee' role, then it is not surprising
that little conflict was experienced. Grace acknowledged that the absence of significant conflict may have been the result of his study being concerned with relatively small schools.

Other reasons suggested for the lack of conflict were the amount of participation practised in some of the schools, which the writer has already questioned, and the orientation of the teachers to questions of wider professional involvement. The large schools in this present study contain within their staffs many teachers who, in all probability, would have been heads in their own right in the days of the small schools, and this presents a situation where the demand for more direct participation in school government is growing and is being met by the decentralising process in decision-making, particularly in the sphere of middle management.

Grace pointed to the fact that developments were taking place which might result in a reduction of teacher autonomy, and one of these was the growth of bureaucratic procedures. The argument of this study would be along the lines that the increase in the size of schools which has seen a growth in such procedures has brought about an increase in the autonomy of the teacher with the spread of decision-making, particularly at middle management level.

Role conflict also arose regarding commitment to a school, as expressed in a number of years service as compared with the rapid mobility between schools, which was often related directly to quick advancement in the profession. In this connection, the advantages of the large school, with many different areas of responsibility providing for advancement within the school for those teachers giving long service, was noted.

Considerable conflict was experienced by teachers over the question of values, but Grace did not consider the findings unexceptional. The teacher versus
society in the matter of standards has been present in every age. Grace believed that much discussion involving parents, teachers, and pupils, takes place over academic questions, and career plans and value issues should demand the same kind of attention. Such discussions would ease the path of teachers at present caught in the crossfire of generations. This observation would certainly be true with regard to the present situation in comprehensive schools. The parents are invited at least annually to consult with subject teachers over a report which has been made with regard to the pupils' performances on the academic side of the school. However, there has been a significant increase in the amount of time given in the large schools to career plans and value issues. Grace stressed that in the context of values, the teacher should be seen as the teacher counsellor rather than as the teacher missionary. The question of values is of particular relevance with regard to the responsibilities associated with work on the pastoral side.

Grace's work was specifically concerned with exploring areas of conflict different from those investigated in the present study. He was not concerned with problems of middle management in large schools. His work has particular value because it is based upon research conducted in schools, and though his findings are not spectacular they are based upon evidence; there has not been very much of this provided, previous to his work, with regard to conflict in schools. Some reference has been made to conclusions and implications which he has made which are relevant to the present study.

3. Richardson on Conflict.

The most valuable evidence, following that of Grace, is that reported by Richardson (20). Richardson
was concerned to test the belief that if change was to be brought about from within a school it would have to be accompanied or even preceded by the examination of relationships within staff groups, and by a search for a greater understanding of the nature of leadership. She worked as a consultant to the head and staff at Nailsea, a large comprehensive school near Bristol, and in effect this meant she worked with the management group. Richardson studied in depth the emotional and intellectual demands in the management task, but her approach precluded any attempt at making comparisons between Nailsea and other schools, and put out of reach any kind of quantitative data that a survey type of investigation carried out in several schools simultaneously might have yielded. The writer has worked with management groups in ten schools in this study and data from ten comprehensive schools was used to define and then analyse areas of conflict.

Richardson spoke in her Report (p. 2) of the central issue in her work as being the nature of authority and an exploration of staff responsibilities in furthering the school task, and she referred to the presence of many conflicting ideas, assumptions and values, and of many conflicts within the individual as well as within the groups of the staff and students in the school. Richardson asserted that secondary schools, in trying to cope with the problem of expansion, have created a structural division between the sub-system concerned with the curriculum, largely concerned with the intellect, and the sub-system concerned with pastoral care, largely concerned with the emotions; a division which was threatening to destroy the integrity of the teacher's task and to fragment the leadership roles of the head and his senior colleagues. This reflection was based upon her findings at Nailsea. Chapter 4 in her Report entitled 'The curricular-pastoral divide in school organisation' is used as the basis for the discussion in this chapter on the conflict between the curricular and
social units in the school.

The first part of her assertion, that structured sub-systems have appeared in secondary school organisation because of the increase in size of the schools, forms part of the argument of Chapter 1 of this present work. The second part of her assertion that this system of management was threatening to destroy the integrity of the teacher's task would not appear to be supported by the evidence obtained from the schools investigated in this present enquiry. This study sets out to explore areas of conflict between the curriculum and social unit divisions and to explore the viewpoint that such conflict may be seen to have an important creative aspect, if organisational procedures are adequate.

Richardson spoke of a polarization between subject-centred and caring pupil-centred attitudes. She spoke of tension between the two sides and this study seeks to identify these areas of tension and conflict in a specific way. She claimed that there was a danger that teachers would perceive themselves, or feel they were perceived, either as being concerned about intellectual standards or as being concerned with emotional growth. She said that a school which subdivided its senior members in this way may unconsciously be putting its most experienced and skilled teachers into straitjackets, from which they would find it increasingly difficult to escape. The majority of the experienced teachers who were interviewed in this study did not express such limitations with regard to their roles. As stated elsewhere, all teachers recognised their teaching and pastoral commitments, but with regard to a certain set of particular areas of responsibility some had functions which were particular to the pastoral side and some to the curriculum side of the organisation.

Richardson said that the tension revealed itself at Nailsea in the separated meetings of the Heads of Departments on the one hand and of the Heads of Sections, including Houses, on the other. The Departmental Heads
meeting was attended by 27 teachers and included three senior pastoral Heads (the Heads of Lower School, the Director of Intermediate Studies, whose title was later changed to Head of Middle School, because his function was so obviously pastoral, and the master in charge of Sixth Form Studies, whose title was later changed to Head of Upper School in recognition of his pastoral function). It would appear that the meetings were never 'separated' enough as far as the Heads of Departments were concerned, and one of the sources of tension lay in the fact of the presence of pastoral people at curriculum meetings. The pastoral staff indicated above went to the Departmental meetings whereas curriculum staff could not attend the meetings of the senior pastoral staff. Only 9 members of staff, in addition to the head, constituted the Section Heads meeting and 5 of those attended the Heads of Departments' meetings. The Section Heads' meetings were held in the head's study, whereas the Departmental meetings were held in a classroom. Sometimes the other four members of the Section Heads meeting were invited to the Department Heads' meeting.

Richardson pointed to the ambiguity about the boundaries of the meetings. She said that there was 'apparently some feeling that the group of section heads was perceived as more privileged and as closer to the Headmaster in the consultative structure' (p. 67). This would appear to be putting the matter mildly. The writer would conclude that it was obvious that the head was indicating by his organisational procedures the special position accorded to the pastoral staff. Because of the pastoral presence at Heads of Departments' meetings it is difficult to claim that a polarisation of attitudes was taking place as a result of the Heads of Departments and Section Heads meeting 'separately'. With 5 of the 9 pastoral staff present at both meetings one might assume that the Heads of Department would be in a good position to consult across the pastoral/curricular boundary. Richardson claimed that the head became convinced that the 'splitting of the curricular and pastoral functions between the two sub-groups of senior
staff was slowing down the process of improving the consultative procedures in the staff group as a whole.

The changes that were made to bring the curricular and pastoral sides of the school into a closer relationship were as follows. The 'separate' meetings of department heads and section heads were abolished and these were substituted by a combined senior staff meeting (pastoral and curricular) and a new standing committee was set up consisting of the head and his two deputies, and the pastoral Heads of Upper, Middle, and Lower Schools, which met for a working lunch lasting an hour and a half every week. This standing committee became the top management group which was superior to middle management. Since the three staff who had previously attended the Heads of Departments meeting were now promoted en bloc to the new top management group, and could, as well, attend the combined staff meeting, the head was making it plain that he considered their roles on the pastoral side to be superior to those of Heads of Departments. Richardson regarded this as a step forward in the development of consultative procedures, and a move away from the fragmentation of leadership roles.

The Heads of Departments had previously been able to feel that the Heads of Lower, Middle, and Upper Schools were closer to middle management than to the head and his two deputies, but the new structure changed this. In the standing committee the section heads expressed concern lest their departmental head colleagues might now feel diminished and the problem of relative status was raised in the new senior staff group. The head had to answer a question in the latter meeting about decision making in the top management group, and he stated that in fact it would be possible for decisions to be made in that group. Fears were expressed about the relative powers of the two groups. Richardson spoke of suspicion, unease and uncertainty.

A few years later further changes in the structure in the school were introduced as a result of which the House System was abandoned and a Year System introduced, a transition fairly common in large schools.
which was referred to in Chapter 1. With the emergence of Heads of Years, the 3 members of the standing committee of top management with pastoral responsibilities in the Lower, Middle, and Upper Schools, took on different roles as Director of Staff Development, Director of Careers and Examinations, and Director of Social Education (later Director of Curriculum and Resources) leaving the Heads of Years to assume pastoral responsibility for their Years, and to remain in the sphere of middle management on equal terms with Heads of Departments.

In her detailed discussion of the complex middle management organisation at Nailsea, Richardson identified particular areas of tension as follows:

1. availability of secretarial help
2. information
3. time
4. reports
5. curricular or pastoral function to take precedence
6. communications
7. relative status
8. choice of courses and examinations
9. allocation of funds.

She spoke of conflict, suspicion, fears, hostility, and strong feelings.

Her book contains the evidence but she writes in the Report from a new position of understanding and conceptualization, and she focuses on a number of 'key' questions about power and influence, interaction, polarisation of attitudes and opinions, the fragmentation of the school task into curricular and pastoral concerns, the choice between the 'human relations' approach to staff consultation, with its ad hoc working parties and apparent absence of hierarchy and the management approach with its hierarchical structure of leadership and its apparent absence of consultation at lower levels, and the role of the head. She spoke of the need for further research in more schools as her own evidence was limited to Nailsea.

The present study set out in the first place to
define the areas of conflict between the focal roles of Head of Department and Head of Year by consulting senior management staff in ten schools. The lists of conflict areas which emerged from this research are strikingly similar to those of Richardson. In the list quoted above, conflict areas listed in this study and not mentioned by Richardson in the Report, such as options and examinations, the allocation of teachers between different years, the diffuseness of the particular role and competing philosophies, are all to be found in the evidence she provided and discussed in her book. Perhaps the one area of conflict which she did not emphasise in her book and in the report, which the present writer found to be important, was that of Personalities. Perhaps it was not possible to deal adequately with this in the context of a named school and, in the book, real named individuals.

Richardson's work is most valuable in showing the response made in one school to its changing needs by its development of organisational structures; a limitation might be that its problems could be peculiar to one school. As a consultant to a named school one wonders how much the author had to leave out with regard to personalities, since the book had to be approved in manuscript by the staff concerned. This is not meant to be a reflection on the author of the book and subsequent report, nor on the staff at Nailsea. People see things differently. The study at Nailsea is original and most valuable. The insights into the complexity of life in the large school will be of great help in understanding the difficulties of introducing changes into school organisation. Richardson did not set out to define and analyse particular areas of conflict, relative to the roles of Heads of Departments and Heads of Years, and

* The writer was concerned with a Report made by the Nuffield Humanities Team which never did see the light of day because members of staff could not approve of comments made regarding individual staff members.
the writer sees this as a further development of her work. The context in which she worked with its underlying background of tension between the curricular and pastoral sides of the school is one which has been found in the evidence on which this study is based.

4. Dunham on Conflict.

According to Dunham (21), a number of common stress situations and responses can now be identified with a reasonable degree of confidence. These are: re-organisation, role conflict and role ambiguity, and poor working conditions. He spoke of the severe stress being experienced by teachers and said that more research was needed to provide knowledge of stress situations. His research findings, based largely upon personal interviews with large numbers of teachers on management courses, showed that re-organisation to comprehensive schools had resulted in emotional, psychological and material changes which have contributed to the stress of teaching. He made the point that the general flexibility of life in the comprehensive school should in theory be more liberating but teachers felt more assured in having the more definite structured organisational situations they had experienced in smaller schools.

A number of conflict situations were described and the author suggested that they would probably be related to the general interaction between the academic and pastoral sides of the school organisation. He spoke of the increase in the past few years of a type of role conflict which was a major source of stress for some teachers, namely the middle managers of the school; this conflict was concerned with their involvement with teaching, management and social work.

Dunham referred to Herzberg (22) and McGregor (23) who have argued that increased participation in decision-making led to greater satisfaction at work. They claimed that when workers felt that they were being consulted about important decisions they believed that their judgement and experience were respected and their contribution was valued. Dunham referred to the dissatisfaction felt by teachers at Nailsea, when working
parties and study groups were set up to consider important policy decisions. The head there felt that, with exceptions the more problems were subjected to open discussion the greater the divergence of opinion seemed to be. Some teachers in this situation longed for firm leadership and there was disillusionment with democracy. Dunham reported that his evidence showed that schools which had set up working parties had been more successful in reducing group conflict. In these groups teachers could begin to appreciate the school perspective, rather than a narrow departmental position, and he produced evidence from the head of one comprehensive school who outlined his system of committees and working groups.

5. **Summary.**

The writer's line of enquiry regarding conflict in schools runs directly from Waller to Wilson and thence to Grace and Richardson's book and report on Nailsea. Her report and the report by Dunham are recent publications. Waller and Wilson did not provide evidence in their classic studies. Grace provided evidence but his work was not concerned with large schools, and he did not refer to the particular conflict problems of middle management because they did not figure in the small schools he was investigating. Richardson's study at Nailsea, which may also be considered a classic, did not set out to focus on, or to analyse, the areas of conflict between the pastoral and curricular sides of the school, though her book provides many examples of the tension and clash of interest between them. The present study sets out first to identify the areas of conflict in middle management and then to explore whether such conflict may be creative if managed through patterns of procedural process.

This question of procedural process in large schools is the subject matter of the next Chapter which explores the possible resolution of conflict in the organisation of the school in the light of Action Theory and the Dialectical View.
CHAPTER 3

CHAPTER 4
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN THE LIGHT OF
ACTION THEORY AND THE DIALECTICAL VIEW.

The use of Action Theory as a method of understanding what goes on in organisations, with the school being seen as an organisation, was proposed in Chapter 2. The Chapter which followed was concerned with a discussion of the literature on the presence of role conflict in schools. This Chapter will explore conflict in schools, and in discussing its positive value reference will be made to political theory. Consideration will be given to the Action Theory perspective and the Dialectical View as being helpful in the management of conflict in schools.

1. The School and Its Goals.

The focus will be on the school as an organisation and, in particular, upon parts of the organisation and the relationships of dynamic interdependence between them. As a result of these relationships, the organisation of the school may be maintained and its goals made known as a result of the on-going process of discussion by the participants in the school about the purposes of their interaction. The identification of their goals may be seen to be determined as a result of an on-going procedural process whereby the facts concerning different situations, which arise as a result of the dynamic interaction between people, are submitted to a series of discussion groups which have as their function the operation of varying sectors of school life. Thus a Heads of Departments' meeting may be expected to deal with what constitutes goals with regard to the curriculum.

The position taken here is that the school goal, or goals, will be known only where there is such an on-going process of discussion between the members of the school about the purposes of their interaction in particular areas of activity. Human relationships are seen as having a developmental life, and the writer seeks to explore whether the conflict referred to in Chapter 1, between the curricular and social unit sides of the school, may
be functional or dysfunctional, with regard to school goals, when managed through patterns of procedural process which continually seek to establish the relevance of certain behaviour to school goals.

2. The Head and Conflicting Interests.

The two types of post representing the curricular and pastoral areas of school life have been shown to have conflicting areas of activity, and the hypothesis being advanced is that the head will be shown to be seeking harmony in their mutual relationships, and to be aiming at the reconciliation of conflicting interests. Patterns of procedural process, built into structures of organisation may enable much of this conflict to be creative by making change possible, whether this be concerned with structures and/or goals. Such conflict may be seen to be functional to the school organisation. Where procedural process is not built into the organisational structure, it is possible that the conflict between the pastoral and academic or curricular side may be seen to be dysfunctional in that change may be difficult to achieve, if it is possible at all. If a value judgement is implied here it is not that all change is intrinsically good, but that change should be possible to enable conflict between competing interests to become functional.

This view of conflict resolution is in line with the theories of Deutsch (1) who says that conflict may be the prelude to growth, and that changes may take place either through a process of confrontation, which may be costly to the conflicting groups, or may take place through a process of problem-solving exercises which may be mutually rewarding.

3. Roles and Individual Social Action.

Within the school will be found a close-knit texture of social life in which individuals co-operate, form groups, distribute and accomplish tasks. At the same time, there will be individuals who refuse to co-operate with others for a variety of reasons, who object to working in groups, and who are unsuccessful in the actions they undertake. The over-all picture will be one of many groupings of teachers which reveal the dynamic nature of the co-operative relations among aggregates of people to
get particular tasks done. The school may be seen as a social world, a living process. It cannot be studied as an immobile structure, but must be seen as a multiplicity of behaviour patterns, covering a wide variety of roles.

Each of the roles being studied has its specified requirements, as outlined in Chapter 1, but one must accept the essentially ambiguous nature of social expression and experience, and the need to interpret it in the light of the person and his needs, which are dynamic, rather than be limited to the study of the role and its requirements in a particular structure of organisation. To grasp the nature of the activities which go to make up the social life of the school, one would need to view the different role behaviour as a medium of the constant interplay and mutual redefinition of individual identities. The individual Head of Department and Head of Year may be seen to interpret his role at different times as being something very different from the interpretation held by his colleagues in similar positions, and this will result from the continual redefinition of particular situations as they develop.

It is important that we consider individual social action. The individual perceives not just the act, but also the context within which the act occurs, and the particular definition will be affected by present and past experience, which is different for each individual. The teacher, whose past experience has been in a grammar school, is unlikely to respond to a particular situation in the same way as one whose background has been the secondary modern school. Deutsch (2) observed:

"Given the fact that the ability to place oneself in the other's shoes is notoriously underemployed and underdeveloped in most people, and also given that this ability is impaired by stress and inadequate information, it is to be expected that certain typical biases will emerge in the perceptions of actions during conflict."

There is no end to the biases at work in personal interaction.
The concepts of organisational space and boundary maintenance with regard to individual roles have been referred to in Chapter 2. The Head of Department and Head of Year learn the limits of legitimate demands that may be made upon them in terms of time and efforts and responsibilities. Because of the emphasis in this study upon individual social action, it may be thought that too much is made of boundaries between roles, and that role specifications are not all that important in a school organisation which is open to change. Though the role specification may allow for individual interpretation, the actor may still lean heavily upon a knowledge of specified areas in which he is expected to operate, and in which he has certain responsibilities. This would not detract from the individual nature of the actor's performance. The concept of organisational space clearly indicates that there are other social fields in which individuals are implicated and in which different sorts of behaviour are called forth. One's understanding of internal organisational processes may be increased by considering such other fields, and by exploring the differences and the similarities between patterns of organisational behaviour and patterns of behaviour in other spheres.

The spread of administrative decision making in middle management, which encourages considerable powers of discretion, is likely to lead to areas of uncertainty and to make it possible for the individual actor to take advantage of all available means to further his own privileges. The structure of organisation itself encourages a certain rivalry and competition, even with roles having the same functions; other factors, not directly related to the structure, such as the biases previously mentioned, further encourage this spirit of competition. In Deutsch's argument, where competitive relationships are strong the conflict between the parties is likely to be more destructive than where co-operative processes exist.

There are differential returns to individual roles: monetary, status, prestige, power, interest, and so on. If role specifications are too rigidly drawn
there is a danger of a vested interest in the position. If stable sub-groups form within the main structure, and these develop their own norms, then it is possible that rival groups will emerge.

Individual social action may depart from rational behaviour in relating to other individuals or when participating in group struggles. Distortion of information, hostility, over-sensitivity to differences, all enter the interaction among personal and social forces in the organisation and lead to distorted views that intensify and perpetuate conflict.

4. The Group within the School.

The social system of the school necessarily implies an allocation of power and different status positions among the individual actors. Coser (3) says that conflict ensues in the effort of various frustrated groups and individuals to increase their share of gratification.

In the large comprehensive school there would be at least fifteen subject departments, some of which, such as English, Mathematics, and Science, may have seven or eight teachers working under the direction of a Head of Department. On the pastoral side will be found four or five year or house groups, each with a set of tutors. The largest schools in this enquiry had ten forms in each year. These form tutors, meeting with the Head of Year, would represent a large group within the school. Obviously the teachers in the year groups would at other times be members of department groups and would then play different roles. The group may be seen as most important in exerting a tremendous influence on individual behaviour, sometimes overriding the norms of the organisation and the individual's own views with regard to particular situations. The individual Head of Department or Head of Year has an important part to play in the attitudes taken on school issues by his group. Just as the head of the school has power to influence his staff so does the leader in middle management. Informal leaders too may emerge from such groupings of
staff and a weak leader may take his decision to act from one who has proved that he can persuade the group to follow his lead. In the same way some heads of schools may find themselves to be manipulated by their senior colleagues and may accept the situation which has arisen for a variety of reasons.

Theorists who emphasise the importance of the work group prescribe ways in which managers should organise with this in view. One of the models of headship outlined in Chapter 8 will be seen to be in favour of this viewpoint, though the important dimension of power in organisational relationships will appear to have been largely ignored. The group and the processes of group interaction may be seen as a means towards the emergence of a better organisation but power relationships between the groups giving rise to conflict is a consideration which has to be taken into account.

The group process offers the individual a ready mechanism for giving expression to inter-personal rivalry and conflict. Individual aggression is not socially sanctioned whereas aggression on the part of a group may receive support from the immediate social environment. If the individual can shift his hostility to the group level, his personal aggressions can be released against others with the full support of his group. He can in this way express his anti-social tendencies with social approval. These personal hostilities may mar the activities of those who engage in procedural process in an organisation such as a school, and the discussion of educational issues relative to the goals of the school may be that much more difficult.

5. The Culture of the School.

Whilst the uniqueness of individuals is expressed in their personalities, the individuality of schools may be expressed in terms of their differing cultures. Studies such as Goffman's (4) and Whyte's (5) indicate that under certain conditions organisational cultures may come to dominate their members' existences. Each school has a unique culture and it is a considerable influence on
staff behaviour. The beliefs, attitudes, opinions and loyalties which make up the ethos of the school suggest to the individual the way things should be done. The person identifies with what is being done or how things are being done. The head plays an important part in determining the culture or the climate of his school.

He may set up a system of organisation that is sufficiently flexible to adjust to the many conflict situations that may arise within the system. In an 'open' situation, the school may benefit from social conflict which may be seen as a means which allows a re-adjustment of arrangements which are more adequate to the needs of the situation which may have arisen. A more rigid organisation which might seek to suppress conflict may make this impossible. This discussion will be taken further in Chapter 8, where different models of school organisation will be analysed.

It would appear to be necessary for the organisational structure to show tolerance of conflict, which itself may be a sign of real concern for the school and its goals. With the variety of interests present in the various groups formed by members of staff, one may find on many occasions that conflicts of opinion arise which are merely the result of different personalities coming to grips with a problem and interpreting it in different ways, and there may be no great intensity of feeling aroused. Many teachers may be stimulated to future action by the clash of opinion and different definitions of particular situations. The toleration of conflict may yet bring about the reconciliation of conflicting interests in a kind of consensus which will allow change and adjustment to new situations to take place. There may be some benefit here in considering briefly an analysis of conflict in political systems.

6. Consensus Values and Change in Political Theory.

Zeigler and Peak (6) contribute a valuable paper which includes an analysis of consensus values and change in the context of political theory. The need for political
systems is seen to arise from the fact that conflict is endemic to social existence. The political system takes conflict out of the private sector and into the public domain where social conflict can be conducted within prescribed limits. The authors use Coser's work, which expands that of Simmel, to show the value of conflict in creating and strengthening social bonds. Reference too is made to Schattschneider's (7) assertion that widespread involvement in multiple conflicts reduces the likelihood that a society will become polarised in its views. Zeigler and Peak insist that the positive effects of conflict come from increases in the scope of conflict and not from increases in its intensity; scope here refers to the breadth of participation. The freedom given to participants to give expression to their competing demands is likely to mean that intensity of feeling will be less than in a more rigid political system which does not allow such free expression. The authors claim that political change is straightforward in a democratic system which allows the free expression of different value positions. Such a system must respond to changes in value demands or lose popular support; such political systems may be described as being in a state of dynamic equilibrium. If coercion has to be used then the democracy degenerates into totalitarianism. Every political system relies to some extent on coercion. Zeigler and Peak assert that widespread social conflict is imperative for the vitality of democratic political systems. These views on the role of conflict in politics would seem to point the way towards its value in the small political world of the school.

7. Conflict in School.

Conflict is to be expected within the school organisation. Poster (8) says that the existence of role conflict in schools is unarguable and that:

"any attempt to define relationships is bound to open the door to the struggle for power and the tensions of group dynamics."

Coser (9) claims that such conflict is a valuable stabilizing mechanism in that a structure which allows a multiplicity of conflicts contains a mechanism for bringing together otherwise isolated, apathetic, or mutually hostile parties. Stable
relationships may be characterised by conflicting behaviour. If the participants feel their relationships are tenuous they will avoid conflict, fearing that it might endanger the continuance of the relationship. A certain amount of conflict would appear to be an essential element in the building up and persistence of group relationships, and the free expression of views and conflicting ideas and definitions with regard to conflict situations may enable a readjustment of structures.

8. The Structure to take account of Conflict.

A case then could be made out to structure the school in such a way as to cater fully for the conflict that may be expected in any organisation operating in a complex environment in which aspects of one and the same situation will often arouse incompatible impulses. Some process of choice must occur before action can take place, and this process would result in a series of structures by which the various incompatibles may be held together. Group integration may be seen, following Coser, not as being something static - not an absence of conflict - but a toleration of incompatibles which may lead to a development of new structures and courses of action. Tolerance of non-conformity appears to be the method of approach; this tolerance may allow the individual to define his particular situation and to express his views without fear of censure. In so far as all enjoy this freedom of expression there is more chance of the individual being able to see the conflict from new viewpoints.

This approach to conflict may make it possible for social change to take place in the community of the school. Freedom of expression of individual viewpoints would not mean that every petty disagreement would be made an issue at meetings of the whole staff or at other senior group meetings. This would be likely so to overload the system as to make it completely unworkable. Some kind of screening procedure of the conflicting value demands, as suggested by Zeigler and Peak (10) in their discussion of political systems, would appear to be necessary, in order that the quantitative
factor of the volume of demands which enter the system may be taken into account along with the qualitative factor regarding the importance of the various demands. This screening could perhaps best be operated through the complex system of committees which may be set up to bring into relationship the organisational structures which have developed both for the furtherance of pastoral care and for the development of the curriculum in schools. This complex system of committees may be seen to represent the on-going attempts on the part of the staff to clarify and to identify school goals. Perry (11) has outlined the various ways in which the principles of consultative management might be organised.

The system would need to be protected from 'overload' of conflict at any-one level, but demands which are basic or widespread, so that failure to allow them expression would result in socially disruptive or dysfunctional conflict taking place, must find an outlet in the organisation's procedural patterns. The more intolerant and rigid the screening, the greater is the likelihood that the 'realistic' demands may be disallowed entry to the area of discussion. The ideal situation would appear to be one which strikes a balance between the volume of demands and the full range of realistic demands. The system of organisation would need to be dynamic in that it would have to relate to a changing environment. The planning of the organisational structure in a school, which would allow such a screening function, would need to be sensitive to many factors and would be difficult.

9. The Head and Group Maintenance.

Phillips (12) in her work on small social groups says that in the field of education the staff working group has never received adequate attention. She provides an insight into the workings of a number of school staffs, and much of her material points to the head as being the most important person in the work of group maintenance: the process of keeping the group in good working order by caring both for the structure of the group and the needs of its members. The key role of the head in this study was seen to
be as a mediator between conflicting interest groups, and, in particular, the conflict areas between the academic departmental side and the pastoral unit side of the school.

In his approach to conflict, the head may take the approach that the procedures to resolve the conflict are available and should be used. In this case emphasis may be placed upon human relations skills, and an attempt may be made to clarify the existing role structure, the relationships between various roles, the varying definitions placed by each actor on the particular situation, and the relationship between these and the goals of the school as then understood. Despite the existence of written specifications for individual roles, the insight and understanding of these grows as a result of discussion in the light of concrete situations. Role specifications may change as a result of a decision which may be reached following a conflict situation. The crucial factor would appear to be the way in which conflicting definitions of situations may be seen to match up with known goals of the school, as these may be determined following discussion by those involved. In a sense what is happening is a process of clarification of problematic situations which brings to participants a deeper understanding of social arrangements and the possibility of change.

In the light of problematic conflict situations the head may set up a training group and attempt to seek a solution by group therapy, whilst making a systematic use of feedback of members' perceptions and attitudes to clarify the organisational structure.

The head may place an emphasis upon interaction across competing functional subdivisions and thus bring to the optimal level the shared experience between the groups. The head may encourage his staff to attend courses to gain knowledge and experience of roles in middle management, and visits to other schools may be helpful.

In the light of the general structure of organisation in the school, and its response to the problems of conflict, the head may develop additional machinery for conflict adjudication.

The head may recognise that the organisation as
planned cannot deal with conflict resolution in particular areas, and that additional machinery would not solve the problem. In this case, the solution would be to change the structure to meet the needs of group maintenance.

The argument has been advanced that organisations without internal conflict are on their way to stagnation. A system with differentiated substructures has conflict built into it by virtue of its differentiated subsystems. Conflict in schools between curricular and social units may be managed through patterns of procedural process which enable its functional or dysfunctional characteristics to be determined in its relationship to school goals.

10. Conflict as a Positive Force.

This analysis of school organisation is concerned with an attempt to explain how conflict may be seen to play a positive part in the reconstruction of organisations, so that the organisations may be seen to fulfil their purposes or goals as these may be understood by those involved in the interaction. The aim of making change possible in the organisational structure of the school is to enable the removal of constraints upon individual potentiality, though clearly the individual, seeking a change in the structure of organisation or in its goals, must influence his colleagues in the interaction so that they too seek the change that he hopes to achieve. The task of the procedural process in the school may be seen to serve the purpose of enabling criticism of the existing structures and of making possible a search for alternatives. In this situation there would be an acceptance of the view that the future social organisation may not necessarily be a projection of the present. The present order, which may be seen as having met the requirements of its participants at some time in the past, is open to many possible alternative arrangements. The present order has to be seen as including within it the possibility of change to meet new situations which constantly arise. The ideal to be aimed at might be to establish a situation in which people freely and collectively control the direction of change on the basis of a rational understanding of social process (13).
The ideal of continuous reconstruction of school organisation by a continuous process of staff consultation demands a recognition of the individual, who is capable of providing insight and understanding, and of developing a system of participatory management structures which allows a discussion at all levels in the organisation of alternative ways of organising activities. It would necessitate a situation in which individuals or groups are unable to dominate others by control over strategic resources, giving some departments or divisions advantages vis-a-vis others. It would require the availability of an adequate communication system so that rational discussion of possible change might be possible. Most of all it would need on the part of the participants tolerance and an agreement to compromise. The emphasis would be on the centrality of process to the situation which would enable conflict in school to be made use of as a positive or functional force.

This system of process would enable the different definitions of conflict situations to be taken into account when considering school goals and the possibilities of change, either in these goals or in the structure of organisation best able to achieve existing goals.

11. Summary.

The theoretical analysis presented in this Chapter is grounded in a view of human life which accepts the principles of the Dialectical View, together with an Action Theory approach to human behaviour. The key role of the head as the mediator between conflicting interests in the organisation of the school has been emphasised. This concludes the theoretical perspectives upon which this study rests. The following Chapter is concerned with the research procedures in the collection of data.

The theory outlined in this Chapter will be used in Chapter 8 where models of headship will be described and analysed in the light of the data from interviews with heads of schools in this enquiry. The continuous process of staff consultation referred to in this Chapter will be seen to play an important part in the organisational structures of these schools.
2. ibid., p.354.
5. WHYTE, W.H., The Organisation Man, Cape, 1957.
10. ZEIGLER, H. and PEAK, W., op.cit., p.216.
1. Introduction.

This research is a study of areas of organisational activity in ten schools, with the focus put on Heads of Departments and Heads of Years as they came into conflict in certain areas where the role occupants competed for scarce resources. These areas were defined in the exploratory stage of the enquiry referred to later. The study included an investigation into the ways in which such conflicts might be resolved, so that school 'goals', in so far as these may be determined at any given time, might be achieved.

The theoretical perspective used was that of the action approach outlined in Chapter 2. The determining factor in organisational life was seen to be the interaction of people, and the writer's position was that it would be necessary to establish participants' definitions of conflict situations, and to endeavour to understand those definitions by distinguishing the different ends and expectations which teachers brought to their membership of their schools. Those ends and expectations derived from their various historical experiences, and from the multiple statuses which they held. As indicated earlier, the variations arose from the different experiences of teachers within the schools, which encouraged or discouraged certain ends and expectations, and which generated others. The teachers' definitions of conflict situations might be the result of the role specifications, which should indicate probable courses of action, or might be caused by forces inside or outside the school. With this perspective in mind, the writer believed that the personal interview would be the most fruitful method of enquiry.

Before the personal interview stage could be attempted, the writer felt the need for an exploratory stage which would include a pilot study to identify and to define areas of conflict between the Head of Department and the Head of Year. In the early part of the investigation, interviews and questionnaires were employed, and at all stages of the enquiry the writer
had the advantage of being a participant observer in his own school which had strong similarities with the other schools in the enquiry. The attendant disadvantages were (a) the limited amount of time available for conducting the research and, in particular, for visiting other schools and (b) the difficulty concerning detachment. With regard to (a) access to other schools to study conflict situations might not be considered an easy matter, and further reference will be made to this when the writer elaborates on the various stages of the research enquiry. With regard to (b) a note on values follows.

Given the theoretical perspective and its implications regarding the value of the personal interview, and accepting the need for some exploratory and pilot work making use of the questionnaire method, there were five distinct stages in the collection of data. Before outlining these it would be proper in an introductory note for the writer to comment on the problem of values in his research; in particular, to indicate his own position as head of a comprehensive school with the difficulties this poses for research detachment and his approach to this problem.

2. A Note on Value-Orientation.

As headmaster of two comprehensive schools since 1964, the writer was aware of many of the problems associated with the emergence of large schools and the resultant process of decentralising decision-making in areas of school activity concerned with the curriculum and pastoral care, as described in Chapter 1. The writer was a participant observer in these schools which had complex organisational structures. In his role as head he was concerned with group maintenance and the resolution of conflict which arose from competing demands made by middle management staff.

The writer believed that the guiding principle of the comprehensive school was that the education of all children should be held to be of equal value (1). He believed that the model for the school, in its attempt to put this principle into action, was the family which he saw as an 'equal value' system. The assumption made with regard to the family was that the parents would value all the children equally. Favouritism and
relative rejection occurred but these were regarded as faults. The family might be seen as a working model. Its failures reminded us of our humanity, and a school based on the family will have failures. The family might be seen to be concerned on a day-to-day basis with the fair allocation of its resources of affection, concern, time, and money. The children would not be categorised, and the parents would be seen to care for each child and would seek for each child's fulfilment. Within the family the children learned their first system of relationships and the effect of these was of vital importance for the time when they entered school. The home was seen as a true educative world, and the school should be seen as a partner in the educative process.

The writer saw the main purpose of the school as being concerned with teaching and learning, and few members of staff were not members of teaching departments in which the children were expected to learn. In most schools only the head might be working outside such departments. The Heads of Departments were important roles. The staff were occupied largely with teaching yet some of the Head of Department's work was seen to be more important than teaching. Thus in most schools, the lower down the seniority order a teacher might be, the more teaching he was expected to perform, though an exception might be made for a teacher in his first or second year of probationary service. A Head of Science Department was likely to teach fewer Science classes than the other members of his department so that he might have time to carry out his administrative duties which were concerned with providing the kind of organisation within his department which would allow good teaching to take place. One would not claim that this time for administration was wasted. Certainly the Head of Department would not think so.

The Comprehensive School was in most cases a large school. When large schools came into existence it was considered important to introduce a new kind of
post for a teacher who would teach for most of his
time but who would have time allocated for specific
responsibilities, not to organise and administer
a subject, but to organise and to administer the
pastoral care of children. This was to ensure that
in the large schools each child would be known personally
to certain teachers, so that some of the benefits of
small schools would be retained along with the advantages
which accrued from the large schools, in particular those
concerned with facilities and subject provision. The
view held by the writer was that such a pastoral provision
would benefit the departmental and teaching side of the
school which could concentrate on its main task of
teaching, in the knowledge that other senior staff would
take care of pastoral problems. Though these responsibilities
were seen to be separated, this was not different from
the responsibilities which parents divide up between themselves
in the running of the family. This would not mean that
both parents would not be concerned with the whole child,
nor that either side of the school might not be concerned at
different times with the other's main activity. The 'equal
value' principle was to be the guide.

The writer taught in a small secondary school of
230 children and then transferred into a school of 1200,
following re-organisation. He believed that the only way
in which the larger school could operate successfully was
to institute some organisational structures to 'break-down'
the large scale nature of the school in the interests of the
individual, and most heads would believe in the necessity of
this process.

The fact that most heads in large schools have
introduced a pastoral system of one kind or another does not
answer the question as to the relative importance attached
by the individual head to the teaching and pastoral sides. The
writer took the view that the child should be happy and contented
in school, as in the family, if his learning experience was to
be satisfactory. He believed that the pastoral staff in the
large school should set out to achieve this happiness so
that the children would be able to learn within the teaching
departments. The two sides should work together closely and rewards in the way of special allowances should go to each so that teachers who choose one or other might feel equally secure in the possibilities of promotion.

Because there was an attempt made to provide for all children in the one school, there was the possibility that to make the system work more stress might have been laid upon the social side of running the schools, particularly in the early days of re-organisation. Teachers on the departmental side might have resented what they saw as a move away from the teaching institution ideal towards a social welfare institution ideal which some may have thought emphasised the importance of happiness or pastoral care in school as opposed to high academic standards. A head of a school would be unlikely to say other than that he would seek to achieve both.

The writer had experience in his school of students who were pressurised by ambitious parents and under extreme stress attempted suicide. In the writer's school there were three nervous breakdowns amongst the pupils in seven years, and in each case the pupils were trying to respond to the very high expectations of parents. In these cases the pastoral commitment had to take precedence at a particular time. These were extreme situations. One would hope to strike a sensible balance between pastoral welfare and academic teaching which would benefit both teachers and students and would not jeopardise the prospects of those teachers and students aiming at high academic standards. The writer has no leaning to one or other and does not accept a dichotomy between the two. If the many goals of the Comprehensive School are to be achieved, both curricular and pastoral considerations would play their parts and the organisational structure should cater for this.

This statement might add some clarification to the work in hand in that it shows the way the writer defines the situation regarding the curricular and social unit divisions. The research problem was shaped by his values and in a sense the work cannot be seen to be value free. Ford (2) asserts that it is in those areas in which sociological research is most vital that the sociologist's own values are likely to influence his research interests.
Detachment was difficult as one could not help but feel justified when one heard of situations which appeared to support one's own value position and be tempted to explain away to oneself opposing views. The writer sought to report his findings without prejudice, and, as a student of school organisation interested in exploring the conflicts between the curricular and pastoral sides of schools which were described to him by those interviewed in the enquiry, to interpret those findings in the light of sociological theory.

3. Enquiry 1.

Reference has been made to the writer's position as head of two Comprehensive Schools. The second of these was in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Arundel and Brighton, which in 1970 had ten maintained Comprehensive Schools. The heads of these schools met regularly during the period 1970-1973 to discuss the many problems which were affecting them in their schools during a period of growth in the comprehensive sector of education. The writer had been appointed head at one of these schools in 1971, and he came to know most of the other heads as a result of these meetings. They were interested to learn from each other through a very open discussion of the problems in the schools. The writer wished to conduct an exploratory study of organisational structures in schools. He anticipated some difficulty in gaining access to schools, and took the opportunity which presented itself at these meetings of heads to seek their support. The friendly relationships which existed at the meetings resulted in their agreement to co-operate. This meant that access had been obtained to nine Catholic secondary schools. At this stage the writer thought that these nine, together with his own school, might have provided sufficient data for his enquiry into organisational structures and areas of conflict between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years.

The writer arranged to visit each school to interview the head and some of his senior assistants in order to investigate, as a first step in this research, the way in which each school was organised to achieve
its goals, whatever these might have been. The intention was to investigate the spread of decision-making processes in large schools and, in particular, to single out the positions of Head of Year and Head of Department for special study. The writer made a point, in this exploratory enquiry, to investigate the incidence of conflict in these organisations which practised the delegation of decision-making in large areas of school life, and specific questions were included in the interviews on this subject conducted with heads and their senior staff. The sets of questions which the writer felt to be suitable for the head, the Head of Year, and the Head of Department, were based partly on his experience as participant observer and partly on the findings of Richardson at Nailsea, referred to in Chapter 3. (The questions are in Appendix V, VI, and VII) It is the writer's experience that schools have common as well as particular problems, and the questions asked were considered by him to be meaningful to all senior teachers in large schools.

The purpose of the first enquiry was to explore and identify areas of strain and tension associated with the relationship between Head of Department and Head of Year and interviews were conducted with nine heads and nineteen senior assistant staff in their schools. In this enquiry the writer relied upon the heads to nominate the senior staff who were interviewed. In every case the head of the school told the writer that the senior staff had agreed willingly to be interviewed. It is not possible to say in what sense this makes them volunteers. The writer, in his capacity as head, had the experience of one of his senior staff refusing to be interviewed by a NFER researcher into 'The Teacher's Day' and, on that occasion, another member of staff volunteered to take his place.

One might assume that it would not be easy to get into schools to discuss conflict situations with senior staff, and the writer must confess to some anxiety while awaiting replies to the initial letter to the head which explained the nature of the enquiry
and the kinds of questions that were to be asked. Perhaps the writer had an advantage over the ordinary applicant to conduct research into school life because of his own position as head: as head of a school one has had many applications from people wishing to conduct research but never from another head, and it is possible that the novelty of the situation gave some advantage with regard to receiving permission. (School teachers have researched into school life and particular mention may be made of Hargreaves and Lacey. Heads who have done this are Harland, Poster and Taylor, all of whom have been quoted in parts of this research) Whether the fact that the writer was known to be a head influenced the kind of answer received in the interviews and later in the questionnaires is something that cannot be evaluated. Whatever the reason, the writer had no refusal in the nine Catholic schools in this exploratory enquiry and only one in the six County schools approached in Enquiry 3. In that one case there were special circumstances resulting from a pending re-organisation. In this first enquiry then the respondents were nominated by the heads concerned.

The writer interviewed all nine heads. Eight of the interviews were tape recorded and transcribed later. The one head not recorded had suffered a severe stroke in the previous year and his quiet voice could not be picked up on the tape in the normal way. Notes were made of his replies and written up later. The interview with each head lasted about an hour and a half, and was usually continued later during the lunch break. In some cases, during lunch, senior staff joined in discussions on school organisation. Shorter interviews, usually about half an hour in length, followed on the same day with individual senior staff:

* In Enquiry 4, the heads provided the writer with lists of middle management staff and he sent individual letters to four in each school. There were no refusals.
these filled the roles of deputy heads, directors of studies, Heads of Years and Heads of Departments. The interviews were either taped, and transcribed later, or, in a few cases where the interview was conducted out of doors, notes were taken and written up later. In this way, nineteen senior staff were interviewed in the nine schools which had been visited.

From the information received through interviews, meetings with staff at break times, and lunchtime conversations, a descriptive analysis of structures of organisation in some Catholic schools was written and circulated to all the heads concerned in the first enquiry (Appendix VIII). The intention in sending this document to the schools was in part to provide a service to the heads in that the contents might be of some use in planning future development and in part to seek any comments or criticism. No criticisms were forthcoming. Five of the heads wrote and acknowledged receipt of the document with thanks. The writer felt that the sending of the document for general information purposes made it easier to approach the heads with regard to the third stage of the enquiry.

The writer noted the spread of decision making processes and the important part played by the two senior roles of Head of Department and Head of Year in the larger schools. Four of the nine schools were in this category and the heads in these schools provided the writer with written role specifications for these two roles. Those specifications common to the four large schools, together with the specifications for the two roles in the writer's school, were put together and, after further information had been supplied by the five other schools referred to later, typical role specifications were drawn up as indicated earlier (page 23).

The questions asked of Heads of Departments and Heads of Years specifically referred to the possibility of strain and tension between the two roles, and the interviews gave the writer a clear insight into the different kinds of problem situations which could arise; reference to these was made on page 27.
The information also led to the identification of eighty conflict situations involving senior staff, and these were written up (Appendix X). The writer has drawn up a classification of these in Table 2.

**CLASSIFICATION OF 80 CONFLICT SITUATIONS**

(Enquiry 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles in Conflict+</th>
<th>Conflict Areas *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY v HD</td>
<td>16 1 7 2 1 3 11 1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD v OD</td>
<td>3 1 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>1 5 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY + HD v H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21 2 14 11 1 7 15 2 3 4 | 80 |

* 1 Time  + HY = Head of Year
  2 Resources HD = Head of Department
  3 Communications OS = Other Staff
  4 Personalities DH = Deputy Head
  5 Exams & Options SM = Senior Master
  6 Teachers \ LEA = Local Education Authority
  7 Curriculum OD = Other Departments
  8 Diffuseness DSt = Director of Studies
  9 Status DS = Departmental Staff
  10 Philosophy TT = Team Teaching
      H = Head

Table 2
It should be stressed that this classification does not indicate (1) frequency in schools (2) intensity of conflict (3) salience of conflict. The eighty situations were grouped in the following areas:

1. **Time** - Whether the Head of Year, rather than the Head of Department could command the use of the child's scarce resource of time.

2. **Resources** - The conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over the provision of working areas and equipment and secretarial help needed by both to conduct their administrative duties.

3. **Communications** - Misunderstanding between the Head of Year and Head of Department.

4. **Personalities** - In one sphere the Head of Year is superordinate to the Head of Department and in another he is subordinate to the Head of Department and personality clashes arise.

5. **Options and Examinations** - The Head of Year and Head of Department often differ in their views as to the needs of their students.

6. **Teachers** - The allocation of teachers and students between Years and Departments is often a source of strong disagreement.

7. **Curriculum** - The case for integrated studies is often made by Heads of Years in opposition to the views of Heads of Departments who have an interest in their own subjects.

8. **Diffuseness** - The rights and duties of Heads of Years and Heads of Departments are sometimes not clearly specified and this leads to some duplication in role performance and in some cases to neglect.

9. **Status** - The positions of Heads of Years and Heads of Departments are both of high status and power and their relative status and power gives rise to some jealousy and tension.

10. **Philosophy** - Sometimes the Heads of Years feel that they are taking an 'over-all' or school view and Heads of Department will dispute this and this situation brings tension and conflict.
The conflict situations are interpretations of what happened as seen by the writer, who was in the position of an outsider, and the descriptions represent his definition of what took place. This is so even in the cases where the situations took place in his own school. In many of the situations an account of the same incident was received from more than one party, and the problem as stated by those directly involved would be presented in a different light: there were obvious discrepancies present between the account of the same incident by the people involved. The interpretation of the conflict situation from the point of view of the detached observer, the so-called objective approach, holds the danger of the observer substituting his view of the field of action for the view held by the actors. It has to be recognised that the actor acts towards his world on the basis of how he sees it, and not on the basis of how that world appears to the observer.*

As indicated in Table 2, 45 of the 80 recorded situations were seen to be concerned with conflict between the Head of Year and Head of Department roles with the remainder, though fitting into the defined areas, being conflicts between people involved in other roles in the schools' organisations. The writer was seeking evidence of strain and tension between the two roles but in the open-ended discussions which went on in Enquiry 1 many of those interviewed gave evidence of other kinds of conflict. The writer decided to record this and to make use of it in Enquiry 2.

* The recorded interviews in Enquiry 4 present the actual words of those concerned, and the writer would claim in analysing that material to be pre-occupied with the position of the actors.
4. **Enquiry 2.**

Eighty questions, derived from the interviews conducted in Enquiry 1, were arranged randomly in the questionnaire which was used in a pilot study in the writer's school (Appendix XI). The questionnaire was sent to 24 senior staff. The questions had the following objectives:

(a) to establish whether certain categories of role conflict are perceived as potential problem situations in general by a sample of serving Heads of Years and Heads of Departments and

(b) to establish whether these categories of conflict had been personally experienced by the senior staff who had completed the questionnaire.

The writer made use of a model outlined by Getzels and Guba, which had been employed by Grace and reported by Eggleston (3) in order to investigate the perception and experience of role conflict because it suited the needs of this stage of the enquiry and followed closely the style of questioning adopted in the interviews conducted in Enquiry 1. The writer felt that it was necessary to distinguish between perception of the category of conflict as a potential problem in schools generally and experience in the respondent's own school. Many of the senior staff interviewed had wide experience and the column dealing with perception of the areas of conflict as potential problems gave these teachers the opportunity to use such experience when scoring. In some schools it could be that changes had taken place in organisation whereby actual areas of conflict had been resolved, and this too would be reflected in the different scores registered between potential and actual experience.

Table 2 classified 45 of the 80 conflict situations as being between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years. These 45 covered ten areas of conflict. 10 of the 80 questions in the questionnaire used in Enquiry 2 related specifically to these areas of conflict between the two posts of Head of Department and Head of Year and
the intention was to see how these questions scored in comparison with other areas of strain and tension. Thus Time as an area of conflict was an important area of strain and tension for most teachers interviewed at all stages of the enquiry but the writer wanted to establish whether time as a scarce resource, which if used for pastoral administrative tasks could not be used for teaching, was a significant source of conflict between the two posts being studied.

Responses, as used by Grace (4) to the questions on perception of conflict, were as follows:

0 Not a problem at all
1 A problem of little importance
2 A problem of moderate importance
3 A problem of great importance
4 A problem of very great importance

Responses to the questions on role conflict experience were as follows:

0 Not at all
1 To a small extent
2 To a moderate extent
3 To a great extent
4 To a very great extent

The respondents were also asked to indicate their age, sex, length of experience as a teacher, and subject. 22 of the 24 Heads of Departments and Heads of Years responded. The writer had made it clear to his senior staff that the completion of the questionnaire was voluntary and, though he had to remind a number of staff once about its completion, he decided not to pursue the matter when 2 of the 24 failed to respond.

An analysis of the responses showed that the ten areas of strain and tension listed earlier were worthy of further study. The scores for these areas have been listed in Table 3.
Mean Scores and Rank Orders of Perception and Present Experience of Strain and Tension for Heads of Department and Heads of Years in Writer's School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>HY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuseness</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N = | 16 | 6 | 16 | 6 | 16 | 6 |

Table 3
5. **Enquiry 3.**

The ten questions relating to areas of conflict between the two posts of Head of Year and Head of Department were extracted from the first questionnaire and were used in the second questionnaire for Enquiry 3 (Appendix XII).

The second questionnaire was sent to four of the nine Catholic schools which were visited in Enquiry 1. These four schools were chosen because of their strong departmental and social unit systems, with their consequent spread of decision making processes. The writer asked the schools concerned for staff lists showing senior staff in Head of Department and Head of Year positions. Questionnaire forms were put into closed envelopes and addressed to each person listed. 83 senior staff were sent forms in this way and 37 completed forms were returned. This final and somewhat disappointing response was achieved after the writer had spoken to the heads of the schools on the telephone and had received permission to put letters on the staff notice boards asking for the forms to be completed.

Because the questions on the second questionnaire were also on the first, the writer made use of the 22 returned forms out of 24 distributed in his own school to give a total of 59 completed forms out of 107 given out in the Catholic sector. The response rate then for the Catholic sector was 55%. 13 HYs responded out of 22 (59%) and 46 HDs out of 85 (54%). There was no recognisable pattern as between respondents and non-respondents. There was an even spread across all subjects. The best response rate was amongst the science departments of whom nine responded but there were more Science departments (Physics, Chemistry and Biology) than any single subject department, e.g. English, Maths, Music. English, Maths and Physical Education, each supplied four responses out of a possible five. The response would appear to provide a reasonable cross section of opinion of senior staff in the five Catholic schools.
At this stage the writer decided to widen the enquiry by including more schools. Clearly the choice of Catholic schools in the first instance had been prompted by the existence of a group of heads meeting regularly who had agreed to the proposed research. An approach was made to the Area Inspector for the South West Division of the County of Surrey in which the writer's school was sited. The Inspector thought that it would not be politic for one head to investigate neighbouring schools to enquire into organisational structures and the incidence of conflict, and he suggested that an approach should be made to another Division in North West Surrey. The Officer in charge there gave the writer permission to approach the schools in her area. Knowing nothing of these schools the writer approached the Area Inspector for the North West and he suggested a list of schools which would be suitable from the point of view of size, organisation, and social background. As a result, the writer approached five County Schools which had Head of Year and Head of Department systems of organisation, and the head of each school gave his permission for an approach to be made to his senior staff with regard to the completion of the second questionnaire. The head of each of the five schools provided the writer with a list of senior staff and a questionnaire, together with an explanatory letter, was addressed to each person. 113 senior staff were sent forms and 60 completed forms were received, giving a response rate of 53%. Again there was a good spread across all subjects with no subject failing to be represented by at least one response. Science, Maths and English, gave the highest response rate. In total, 119 completed forms were returned from 220 sent out in ten schools giving a response rate of 54%. The scores for these are given in Table 4. An age, sex, role, and faculty breakdown for the 119 respondents is given in Table 5.
Mean Scores and Rank Orders of Perception and Present Experience of Strain and Tension for Heads of Department and Heads of Years in ten Comprehensive Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD HY HD HY</td>
<td>HD HY HD HY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.6 1.3 1.0 0.8</td>
<td>9.0 10.0 7.0 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1.7 1.4 1.1 1.0</td>
<td>7.0 8.5 5.0 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2.6 2.6 1.9 1.9</td>
<td>1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>2.0 2.1 1.1 0.8</td>
<td>4.5 4.0 5.0 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>2.1 2.0 1.3 0.9</td>
<td>3.0 5.0 3.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1.6 1.6 0.9 0.9</td>
<td>9.0 7.0 9.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2.0 1.4 0.2 0.7</td>
<td>4.5 8.5 9.0 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuseness</td>
<td>2.2 2.2 1.5 1.7</td>
<td>2.0 3.0 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1.6 1.7 0.9 0.9</td>
<td>9.0 6.0 9.0 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1.8 2.4 1.1 1.5</td>
<td>6.0 2.0 5.0 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 90 29 90 29 90 29 90 29

Table 4
AGE, SEX, ROLE, AND FACULTY OF RESPONDENTS

( N = 119 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 64</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N = 119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>N = 119</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty ( N = 90 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Table 4 reveals that Communication was the greatest source of strain and tension for both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years both as regards perception and experience. Role diffuseness was the next most important source of tension. There was a similarity in the scoring for most areas, e.g. Communications, Diffuseness, Time, Resources, Personalities, Teachers and Status. Heads of Years perceived and experienced Philosophy as being important and this contrasted with the Heads of Departments' viewpoint. Experience of Options rated higher with Heads of Departments than with Heads of Years. The writer was surprised to find Time was low in both perception and experience for both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years.

The scores for the Catholic and County schools were separated and appear in Table 6 and Table 7. Communications stood out as being the most important area in both kinds of school. Diffuseness was of more consequence in the County sector than in the Catholic. The rank order showed that this area was second only to Communications in the County sector. There was a striking difference in the area of Status between the Catholic and County schools. For Heads of Departments in the Catholic sector it was in the lowest place on perception and experience scores, and for Heads of Years too the placings were much lower than their counterparts in the County sector. Time in the County sector appeared very low in the rank order compared with the Catholic sector, which indicates that teachers in Catholic schools believed themselves to be under greater strain as compared with their colleagues in the County schools.

Similar results were obtained in Resources, Communications, and Philosophy, and there was some variation in the importance of Personalities. Options produced similar results except for Heads of Years' experience in County schools where the scoring was low. The same Heads of Years provided the variation referred to as regards Personalities. Distribution of Teachers as being a source of tension scored higher in the Catholic sector and this may be seen to link up with Time being more critical for the Catholics. Curriculum too was a
Comparison between Mean Scores of Perception and Present Experience of Strain and Tension for Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in Catholic and Ordinary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD*</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>HD*</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuseance</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 46 44 46 44 13 16 13 16

* Catholic

Table 6
Comparison between Rank Order Scores of Perception and Present Experience of Strain and Tension for Heads of Department and Heads of Years in Catholic and County Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HD*</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>HD*</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuseness</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = \]

46 44 46 44 13 16 13 16

* Catholic

Table 7
source of more tension in the Catholic sector than in the County sector.

Throughout, the Heads of Years in County schools appeared to experience less strain and tension than did Heads of Years in Catholic schools. One might speculate that the latter might be involved in promoting an expressive culture which demanded more from them than from their colleagues in the County sector resulting in greater strain and tension for the Catholics. There was not the same discrepancy in the perception scores of the Heads of Years in the two kinds of schools. Nor was there any discrepancy in the scoring of the Heads of Departments on perception and experience in the two types of school.

The writer felt that there was a need for qualitative data to provide understanding and insight with regard to the information which had been collected in Enquiry 3. With this in mind the writer embarked on a series of interviews with senior staff.

6. **Enquiry 4.**

The writer conducted open-ended interviews with senior staff in nine of the ten schools in the investigation. The remaining local authority school refused to take any further part; the explanation given was that none of the senior staff wished to be interviewed. Taking the name of another school from the Area Inspector's list, the writer approached the head who agreed to be interviewed and also agreed to an approach being made to his senior staff. As a result, in depth interviews, averaging one hour in length, were carried out with four senior staff, either Heads of Years or Heads of Departments, usually two of each, at each of ten schools, and these interviews have been written up in Appendix Xlll. A period of nearly two years had elapsed between the exploratory interviews in the Catholic schools and the final interviews with the selected middle management staff. During that time questionnaires had been completed in the schools. The people selected for interview were not the same as were interviewed on the first occasion.
During the first visit, heads, deputy heads, directors of studies and other top management were usually the ones consulted. The second round of interviews were with middle management staff. The staffs in four of the five County schools completed the questionnaires but none of the middle management staff had been seen prior to the interviews. The writer made use of the evidence collected earlier in his investigation in the final interviews with middle management. The particular purpose behind these interviews was to clarify the viewpoints of serving Heads of Departments and Heads of Years with regard to the areas of strain and tension which had been the subject of the enquiry and to endeavour to establish their interpretation of problem situations which were the cause of strain and tension. The interviews revealed a similarity of approach on the part of both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years when confronted with the same type of social situation; they both tended to act under the pressures which followed from their roles. But more important was the finding that social action was also the result of how problem situations were seen and defined by the participants. Further, the actors brought to the different situations the goals of the institution as they interpreted them at that time and also individual motives which were wide ranging. The interviews provided evidence of the importance of role structure upon the behaviour of middle management in large schools and also of the value of the action frame of reference as a means of understanding organisational behaviour. The areas of strain and tension were explored in detail and they will be dealt with in the chapter which follows.

The first four stages in the Enquiry have now been outlined. The exploratory stage of Enquiry 1 led to the identification of conflict areas and in Enquiry 2 to the use of these in questionnaires which produced the results given in Tables 3, 4, 6 and 7. The decision to formulate the research within the framework of Action Theory indicated the need for qualitative data. The approach that was decided upon was to attempt to see areas of conflict between
the two roles of Head of Department and Head of Year through the eyes of the participants. Thus in Enquiry 4 interviews were held with middle management staff in ten comprehensive schools. This led to an investigation into the ways in which conflict situations in the schools might be resolved so that school 'goals' might be achieved. This was the last stage in the collection of data which will now be outlined.

7. Enquiry 5.

Following the interviews with middle management staff, the final stage in the collection of data was to interview the heads of the nine schools concerned to discuss with them their methods of organisational procedures for the reconciliation of the divisions and the resolution of the conflicts which arose from having a social unit and a curricular side in each school. The interview with each head lasted for at least one hour and was open-ended. The interviews were taped and written up later and are to be found in Appendix XIV. The theoretical argument put forward in Chapter 4 regarding conflict resolution in the light of Action Theory will be taken a step further in Chapter 8 when the information obtained in this enquiry will be discussed. Before that the writer will explore in some detail the areas of strain and tension making use of the data obtained from the questionnaires and also the interview material collected in Enquiry 4.
1. DAUNT, P.E., Comprehensive Values, Heinemann E.Bks., 1975, p.16.
CHAPTER 6
IDENTIFICATION OF AREAS OF CONFLICT RELATING HEAD OF DEPARTMENT AND HEAD OF YEAR ROLES IN TEN COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS

1. Introduction.

An attempt will be made in this Chapter to demonstrate that there are identifiable areas of conflict between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years. These areas emerged from Enquiry 1, and were defined in the questionnaires presented to respondents in Enquiry 2. These areas were: Time, Resources, Communications, Personalities, Options and Examinations, Teachers, Curriculum, Diffuseness, Status, and Philosophy. The mean scores and rank orders recorded in ten schools in Enquiry 3 were shown in Table 4.

Reference will be made to the scores in each of the enquiries but the analysis will be concerned in particular with a discussion of some of the relevant points made by the actors in the roles of Head of Department and Head of Year in the interview data collected in Enquiry 4 (Appendix Xlll). The writer will be pre-occupied with the position of the actors and their definitions of the situations. The analysis will be that of an outsider who interprets the conflict situations from a detached position.

Each section of the Chapter begins with the definition of the area of conflict as presented to respondents in the questionnaires (Appendix Xll). The asterisk against some of the quotations refers, as in Tables 6 and 7, to Catholic schools.

2. Time.

Whether the Head of Year rather than the Head of Department could command the use of the child's scarce resource of time is a source of tension.

The exploratory interviews suggested that time would be an important source of tension. When it was included in the first questionnaire, which was sent to twenty four senior staff in the writer's school (Enquiry 2, Table 3) time was perceived by Heads of Years
as being of great importance and was experienced midway between moderate and to great extent. Heads of Departments scored lower and perceived and experienced time as being of moderate importance.

In Enquiry 3 (Table 4) the mean scores for both perception and experience of time for the ten schools in the enquiry were much lower. Time came low down the rank order for both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years, with Heads of Departments scoring slightly higher than Heads of Years. Heads of Years experienced time as a problem to a very small extent. This data indicated that time, as defined above, was not a serious source of strain and tension between the two roles being studied.

The contrasting scores between the writer's school and the ten schools might lead to the conclusion that the former gave inadequate time allocation to Heads of Years in particular to pursue their pastoral role, and to Heads of Departments to pursue their administrative departmental work, and that tension was caused over the different uses to which the child's time was put. Thus, for example, the Head of Department might resent the loss of teaching time caused by an over lengthy Assembly, whilst the Head of Year might object to the Head of Department wishing to organise frequent day trips which, whilst serving one subject, might cause a loss of balance in the children's teaching programme. In fact, the amount of time given for pastoral and departmental duties across the ten schools was similar, and was usually of the order of 8-10 periods out of 40 each week for Heads of Years and 7-8 for Heads of Departments. Another conclusion might be that more was expected of Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in the writer's school which made time a more critical factor. However, it should be pointed out that job specifications across the schools were similar. Other variables might be seen to be more important such
as the head's attitude to his senior staff or their attitude towards him. Certainly the data showed that time was a more important area as a source of tension in the writer's school than in the other schools in the enquiry.

When we compare the scores between the Catholic and County sector in Tables 6 and 7, time was seen to be more important on the Catholic side, both for Heads of Departments and Heads of Years. For Heads of Years in the County sector it was almost no problem at all in their own experience. The rank orders in Table 7 showed that in County schools, for both roles, time was bottom of the lists. What explanation should be offered for this? Could it be that the County teachers were more prepared to work on outside of school hours to complete their work load, and thus did not see time as a problem? Did it mean that the County schools had evolved a better system of working between the two roles so that time was not in dispute between them? The Catholic schools might claim that their colleagues in the County schools must not have been doing their jobs properly if time presented no problem. It should be made clear at this point that a number of Catholics occupied these senior roles in County schools and a number of non-Catholics occupied them in Catholic schools.

The main conclusion to be drawn from the data in the questionnaires was that it did not support the view that time was an important area of conflict between the two roles.

Enquiry 4 which followed was a series of interviews with forty senior staff holding these roles. Statements such as the following appeared in the evidence collected from those interviews:

HY*  "Time is a constant worry."
HD   "Time is a great problem."
HD   "The biggest problem in running my department is one of time."
HY   "Teachers are aware that they often do the job badly because of the time element."
How is it possible to understand such statements when the questionnaires suggested that time was not a problem? The questionnaire had defined time as being a problem and source of conflict between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments, and perhaps this might explain the low scoring; it could be argued that both role occupants saw the time allocated as being determined by traditional and conventional forces, both inside the school, where they would be controlled by the head, and outside where the inspectorate and administrator played their parts.

A number of the ways in which time was seen to be a source of friction between the Heads of Years and Heads of Departments emerged in the interviews. Both felt that they needed more time in order to do their work properly, to keep up with the records, to ensure satisfactory communications, and many stressed the anxiety felt because of this. Both stressed the fact that their administrative and pastoral duties had to be seen in the context of a job that was dominated by teaching. Few had more than 25% of their programme allocated to the administrative side of the department or the pastoral care of students. There was some jealousy expressed by Heads of Departments over the amount of non-teaching time allocated to the pastoral side; in every case the Head of Year had more time allocated for his duties than did the Head of Department, as was indicated earlier. One Head of Department commented:

HD "A Head of Department given more free time could use it better for the department than could the Head of Year use it for his year because often problems (of the Head of Year) arise at different times from that which is free."

There was criticism of Heads of Departments by some Heads of Years who felt that too many problems were passed on to them by teachers who took the view that the pastoral people had been appointed to deal with problems and were paid to do this. A Head of Year spoke of the danger of becoming an off-loading point:
"Heads of Departments, or subject teachers, just send pupils in our direction to sort things out. Troublesome pupils tend to be off-loaded on to you. This will take more time."

The Heads of Years felt that these cases involved them in heavy loads of interviewing, and the time was not available. As a result, frustration was caused and other problems were neglected.

Some Heads of Years pointed out that their pastoral work had to be done in school time, in the majority of cases, as in general it was not possible to keep children at school after hours. Parents could be seen outside of school time and many Heads of Years made arrangements along these lines, though, in addition, interview sessions were built into the daily time-table. A number of Heads of Years claimed that, by contrast, much of the work of running a Department could be done, and was done, outside of normal school hours. Heads of Years claimed that the problem was not just that there was not enough time in total; one could not timetable the many crises that occurred during the week, and problems arose often during time allocated for teaching.

"Occasionally I have to leave my teaching to do something in an emergency - if a child is terribly upset or something requiring immediate treatment, then one has to drop the teaching."

"What so often happens is that a child gets into terrible trouble about two minutes before you're time-tabled to go into class, and it might be a very important class like a seventh year. And this does lead to trouble with the Departments."

"Sometimes you have to leave your class for a long time."

"One does neglect the teaching at times."

"A conflict of interests arises here, if one can avoid a conflict of people."

"Crisis situations come along sometimes when I'm teaching; you can't say you'll have one at ten-o'clock."

"Sometimes you feel 'I can't do both teaching and pastoral duties'"
The practice of Heads of Years leaving classes in order to deal with problem situations was fairly common, though all Heads of Years said that they tried to avoid doing this. Most Heads of Departments recognised the need for such interruptions in teaching time, but it was seen as a possible source of tension. The Head of Year often had to decide on the merits of leaving the class on the basis of the type of teaching going on, and on his interpretation of the urgency of the pastoral need. A Head of Year teaching practical Science was in a more difficult position than one teaching English; a Head of Year teaching Form 6 would be seen to be in a different situation compared with one teaching Form 2. Though the actual teaching might be considered more important in Form 6 because of examination pressures, it would be easier from the point of view of the safety of the pupils to leave that group than it would be to leave Form 2. The Heads of Years pointed out that it was impossible to measure the time that might be necessary to deal adequately with particular cases.

HY* "It's so difficult to weigh off the time against certain problems which arise. You might spend two or three hours with just one child whilst on another occasion the child might take up only five minutes. Once you start to look into something other things come up. I try not to allow this sort of thing to interrupt my teaching but I know that it does happen on occasions and I know that if you were continually out of class, and not teaching, then the Head of Department would have a gripe there. A lot depends on the personality of the Head of Year in what he decides on as his priorities."

The teacher just quoted went on to say that the Head of Year must assess on each occasion what is the priority, and his view might be very different from somebody else's idea or assessment. The need for a good working relationship between the Head of Department and Head of Year was seen to be essential if the breaking out of teaching time was to be at all acceptable.

HY* "One can abuse for example taking children out of lessons, perhaps taking the same child out of the same lesson and not having the courtesy to give good reasons, then friction
is going to arise, but we have to go about this kind of thing in the right way."

There was evidence in the interviews that some Heads of Years became so upset about a particular pastoral problem with which they were involved that their own teaching programme suffered because of it. A teacher might be physically and mentally affected by some crisis situation, and there was considerable stress if a long teaching period followed such an incident.

Part of the time factor was linked with the conflict area of communications, and also with resources, because many Heads of Years and Heads of Departments complained about the lack of office space, the difficulties of getting to a telephone, the absence of secretarial help, all of which increased the pressure under which they had to work when time was limited. Both Heads of Years and Heads of Departments were involved heavily in meetings, in and out of school, and these were seen to be a source of strain.

The main area of strain and tension for the Head of Year appeared to be the difficulty found by these senior staff in combining pastoral care responsibilities with a heavy load of teaching. It must be emphasised that, despite the wide responsibilities carried by Heads of Years, three quarters of their week was taken up with actual teaching duties and these teachers were seen to be particularly concerned with a conflict of interests. They needed to perform well in both roles for a variety of reasons, not least, that concerned with their personal reputations. Their biggest anxiety was the fear of performing badly in one of their roles; though they recognised the possibilities of friction between themselves and Heads of Departments when teaching was neglected, their anxiety was seen to stem from their own feelings with regard to a neglect of duty on the teaching side, rather than from the likelihood of a confrontation with a Head of Department over particular situations. Heads of Departments did not speak of the loss of the teaching as being a source of much conflict. Their main complaint about time vis-a-vis the pastoral system was at a deeper level, in that many of them felt that too many resources, including time, were
being wasted on pastoral systems which had not been needed in the past and which, rather suddenly, had developed into a major part of school life. The issues with regard to time which were argued about at committees, working parties, and staff meetings, were related frequently to the amount given to assemblies, year meetings, and form periods, which were concerned largely with pastoral affairs, in a school week.

The writer concluded from the data obtained from the interviews that time was an important area of conflict and tension between the pastoral and curricular sides of the school. The Heads of Years interviewed did appear to have something of a guilt complex because at times they could only do one part of their work properly at the expense of the other. Whereas both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years expressed their feelings of strain and tension over the amount of time they had to perform their particular functions, they felt that conflict between the two roles over time could be minimised if the participants went about things in the right way. Both stressed the importance of individual interpretation of particular situations, and the part played by the personalities involved.

3. Resources.

One needs an attractive and well equipped work area to carry out the duties of Head of Year and Head of Department and sometimes there is conflict between the two over such resources.

The scores in Table 3 showed that in the writer's school, Resources ranked higher for Heads of Departments both in perception and experience than it did for Heads of Years. The mean scores for Heads of Years' perception and experience were higher than those of Heads of Departments, and for both roles ranged from moderate to great importance (in that school the Heads of Years scored higher than Heads of Departments in every area, with the exception of the area concerned with the distribution of teachers).

Each Head of Year in the writer's school had a well equipped office, with telephone and filing cabinet, and the room was suitably furnished to enable visitors to
be received. Heads of Departments had no such facilities. Certain departmental heads had their own rooms and some had departmental areas. Clerical assistance was not provided for either Heads of Years or Heads of Departments, and each had to make his own arrangements with the three clerical assistants to have work done in the two school offices. This led at times to strain and tension. The lack of clerical help will be referred to later.

In the ten schools (Table 4) there was no significant difference in the scoring of Heads of Departments and Heads of Years. The area was perceived in both cases as somewhere mid-way between a problem of little importance and one of moderate importance, and was experienced to a small extent.

When one contrasted the Catholic and County schools (Table 6) the finding was that Heads of Departments' scores on perception were very similar but Heads of Departments in County schools experienced Resources as an area of strain and tension to a lesser extent than did their colleagues in the Catholic sector. The Heads of Years' scoring in the two sectors was along the same lines, viz. similar scores on perception and lower scores on experience in the County as compared with Catholic schools.

The resources specifically referred to, both in the questionnaire and the interview, were those concerned with the provision of a suitably equipped work area and questions were asked about the provision of secretarial help.

The creation of Head of Year and Head of Department roles in large schools, resulting in an expansion of the decision-makers, led to the need for adequate facilities to allow such procedures to operate. In much of the evidence from the interviews, the lack of
adequate facilities was seen to be the result of forces over which the school authorities had little control.

The school planners built large buildings for comprehensive schools but appeared to ignore the need for facilities to cater for the organisational structures which emerged to run the schools, viz. the need for office accommodation to house those who operated in middle management spheres both on the departmental and pastoral sides of the school.

Where rooms were available they were usually allocated or had been appropriated by either Heads of Years or Heads of Departments.

HY "I consider the possession of a room of one's own to be a very important advantage but in the main these rooms have been taken by the pastoral people rather than been allocated."

HY "I'm fortunate in having a small prep. room which is available for me to interview people in. There is a Head of Year room but I don't very often get in there."

HY "The Head of Year must care for people as people. This is a reason for having accommodation where one can interview. The children must be allowed to relax. They can't do that easily if they're uptight about something."

HD* "In the case of rooms I have got a room because it was free and I got in first. I'm afraid this is the way things work in schools; it was quite legal but I shall lose it soon when the new building comes into use and there will be some re-organisation. I will not get a room, neither will the head of English."

The reference to new buildings prompts the writer to make the point that where schools operated in old buildings it was possible to meet the needs of organisational requirements from the point of view of
middle management positions. Thus the five Catholic schools in the survey were all in old buildings with new accommodation built on to the old, and in all but one of these schools the Heads of Years had their own rooms and in addition some rooms were available for Heads of Departments. In the Catholic sector there was evidence of some resentment felt by those on the departmental side because of the preferential treatment accorded to Heads of Years.

HD* "We went to the head and said: 'Look we haven't got much store space and we would like a room like the Heads of Years.' The head was very sympathetic but since we had this open confrontation I don't think we're going to get it."

HD* "We have recently had criticisms levelled at Heads of Years by Heads of Departments over the allocation of rooms. The Heads of Departments complained that they had no room at all where they could meet students privately, talk to Inspectors, talk to people like yourself. Because of pressure of space they were thinking in terms of one room which would be shared by a number of departmental heads. I think this was a reasonable request though a rather poor show if this turned out to be the final result. I recognise that the Heads of Years have many more people to interview. Obviously you would need this type of accommodation if you are meeting parents. I can see both points of view but I think more could be done for people on my side of the fence."

The Head of Department just quoted went on to say that he had a very small room 'full of files, cabinets and equipment' with no room to swing a cat. This particular interview was held in a classroom because the Head of Department was unable to have the use of a private office.

The lack of suitable work areas for the administrative work involved in running a department was a common complaint in all the schools which were investigated. All the County schools in the survey were in new buildings and the number of small rooms provided in these was clearly inadequate for the needs of middle management staff.
rooms were available they went to Heads of Years, and the only Head of
Department found during the interviews in County Schools to
have his own room allocated to him was one who worked in an
old building which had been retained as an annexe to the main
building and used as a centre for less able students.

HD  "As you can see, I'm almost my own boss.  
The head comes over as often as he can.  I've
got the telephone.  I'm in a very special
position.  This itself leads to a certain
amount of problem."

Typical comments from other Heads of Departments were:

HD  "My work area for running my department is
a cubby hole behind the blackboard where I
have to store my equipment.  I have my filing
cabinet there which contains records, examination
papers, examination results set in the school,
and the assessment records regarding every child's
mathematical ability."

HD  "I have a room but I have to share it with five
other people in my department.  We have a
departmental office rather than a Head of
Department office.  It was only designed for
one person.  It's stupid to expect five others
to disappear and go somewhere else."

HD  "One could do with an office and telephone but
there's no chance of this.  Heads of Years
have one for themselves or share.  Generally
these have carved out these for themselves
rather than been allocated them.  I find it
a great bind not being able to interview
people in proper conditions.  I often interview
along a corridor or outside the staff room.  I
get the impression that as Head of Department
I should not interview people.  This is more
for the pastoral side.  The pastoral people are
supposed to be gifted that way though I do not
think any one of them has been trained for it."

A Head of Year in a County school who was without
a room of his own said:-

HY  "I find the lack of an office in which to do
my work a considerable handicap.  One has to
go to and from the main office for the 'phone
in between picking up the relevant information
elsewhere.  I worked in commerce before I came
into teaching and one didn't move away from a
desk except to go to the toilet because everything
you needed to do your work was at the desk.  The
fileboxes, two telephones, all to hand.  This is
a real problem at this school."
The lucky Heads of Departments were seen to be those who had charge of practical subjects such as Science, Design and Technology, and Home Economics, where there was usually found built-in accommodation for the Head of Department, though invariably this was seen as a centre for the teachers in that Department rather than as an office for the one in charge.

The evidence from the interviews showed that the Heads of Departments did not dispute the need for rooms to be allocated to the pastoral side. Many said that the Heads of Years' needs were greater. But the lack of such facilities for the Heads of Departments was felt to be a factor which did not help the over-all relationships between the two sides. Criticism was sometimes levelled at the head because in some cases it was felt by Heads of Departments that some adaptation of the existing space in the school could be made. The claim was made frequently that the efficiency of the work being done in the departments was directly and adversely affected by the lack of the kind of facilities which would be commonplace in any commercial enterprise.

The Heads of Years had much less to complain about. Seven of the ten schools in the survey had rooms allocated to Heads of Years on an individual basis, and of the others, two had a room allocated for sharing between Heads of Years. One Head of Year commented:

HY "I have a room of my own and I know I am envied because of it. I have some secretarial help. I find the room and telephone absolutely necessary for my work as Head of Year."

Secretarial help specifically for Heads of Departments and Heads of Years did not exist except in the case just mentioned. The others had to take their chance in receiving help from the general secretarial provision in the schools.

The Heads of Years who had to perform their roles without the use of a private office were unanimous in saying how difficult and frustrating their work became as they endeavoured to carry out their necessary tasks. The three schools operating without individual rooms for Heads of Years would appear to be working under grave difficulties,
though a Head of Year in one of those schools took the view that a shared room had certain advantages.

HY "I share a room with other Heads of Years and I see no real need for a room just for myself. I think that it's good for us all to be together because we can discuss things together without making a big deal out of it. If a child is brought in to see one of the other Heads of Years and another Head of Year is listening in (provided it's not something completely private) this can be useful."

This would have to be seen as a minority view in the light of the rest of the evidence.

This evidence indicated the need for adequate provision of resources and facilities for both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years. The matter would not appear to be a great source of conflict between the performers of these roles but it appeared as a source of anxiety and tension which had a bearing on their relationships. At times the Heads of Departments who were working in adverse circumstances showed resentment at a situation which appeared to favour the pastoral side of school life. The Heads of Departments in the Catholic sector in particular compared their lot unfavourably with the Heads of Years who had their own rooms, and this confirmed the finding of the questionnaire in which Heads of Departments ranked Resources higher than did Heads of Years as a source of tension.

It may be said that when many modern schools, built during the last ten to fifteen years, were in the planning stage, the planners appear not to have taken into account the kind of structures of organisation which in fact have emerged. By contrast, a unit consisting of eleven teaching areas being built (1977) in the writer's school includes three interview and tutorial rooms in its standard layout. Because of the large number of departmental heads, compared with the number of Heads of Years, it is unlikely that provision will be made for Heads of Departments to have their own accommodation except when it is built into particular departmental areas such as Design and Technology, Science, and other practical departments.

This is perhaps the major problem between the two posts and the lack of communication is largely the cause of misunderstandings.

Table 3 shows that in the writer's school communications as defined above was perceived by both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years to be of moderate to great importance and experienced by both to a moderate extent.

Table 4 shows that communications ranked highest in Perception and Experience for the Heads of Departments across the ten schools in the enquiry. The scoring on perception and experience was the same for both roles and was similar to the scores in the writer's school with communications being perceived as a problem of from moderate to great importance and experienced as a problem to a moderate extent.

Tables 6 and 7 show that communications ranked highest of all areas of strain and tension between the two posts in both Catholic and County sectors.

The interview material provided a great deal of evidence in support of the questionnaire. Two Heads of Departments on the Catholic side commented as follows:

HD* "Communications are certainly a problem. They are a problem in our school. You can get the situation where the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. One gets the situation e.g. when a child leaves, the first you know of it is from the children, or perhaps somebody has changed groups, and I find that this comes back to the time factor. Before I can get some information round to the Staff something else has happened, pressure of work, so some information is getting round in a unsatisfactory way and people get annoyed and feel that they should have been properly informed."

HD* "The first problem, perhaps the major problem in this school, is the lack of inter-communication between people on the same level and also up and down the scale, especially on the pastoral side where information just does not seem to percolate down. It goes up but it doesn't come back down and you find the most surprising things about the children that would have really helped you enormously in dealing with their siblings in the same school. It's not simply a matter that a fact about a child is communicated but at the same time the way in which that fact is communicated indicates
an attitude. Both levels of communication, the passing on of facts and the sharing of attitudes, are inter-connected."

On the County side there were many critical comments regarding communications in the large schools.

HD "I think the main problem is lack of communication. I do not think we are told enough about the problems of the children."

HD "The big school can be effective only if it's broken down into smaller units but in so doing you bring attendant problems of communication - a unit can become autonomous. The basic problem, as I see it, is one of communication. This is so between departments and between the pastoral and academic."

HD "Space and time militate against the deeper communication which is necessary. Sometimes unilateral action is taken because of space or time which means that people who are marginally but importantly concerned are left out. Rightly this causes upset."

A Head of Year spoke of the attempt being made in his school to redefine procedures, to relook at structure so as to improve procedures of communication.

HY* "The pastoral structure development has happened over the last ten years. I think that a conflict or anxiety might come if one does not ask the question frequently 'Am I telling the right person? Am I telling one who should know? Are those who do know passing the information to me?' My concern is to ensure that any information I have concerning the pupils, pastoral, disciplinary, academic problems, is indeed being passed on, and the Director of Studies and myself have looked at the structure within the school, of the actual method of procedure of passing information and this is where we're trying something afresh, to redefine, as it were, within this school, how information should be passed, to whom, and what type of information, and so on. So that everybody keeps everybody informed."

Heads of Departments and Heads of Years indicated some of the ways in which the schools had organised their communication systems.

HY* "Our system of communication is just beginning to work out. We've got this system where the teacher fills in a slip, whether it's a matter of discipline or work and it's put in my pigeon hole. The teacher will also talk to me; it comes both ways, but I like the slips because you can't remember everything. I keep a diary. I try to remember all the things that happen. They may not seem very important but I'll need..."
them to connect up things later. Once a week I meet the group tutors and we discuss all this."

HD  "Items I need to know that are confidential are communicated on little slips of paper which are delivered to selected points in the school and staff know where they have to go and look. Something new or urgent will come in this way."

HY  "Information doesn't always filter through. We have a resources centre in the school and the one in charge has become the communications officer. There's a box in the centre and if I want information about a child I put a memo in the box and the communications officer, by means of Sixth Formers, will get that letter circulated and I might have the information passed back to me within a day. This saves a lot of time, as previously I was walking from one end of the school to the other to get the information rapidly. We also have pigeon holes in the staff room. There still exists the breakdown."

HY  "Information about particular students' difficulties is sent around to I think seven places in the school but how many teachers take the trouble to read this?"

A number of senior staff made the point that the setting up of structures of organisation dealing with sets of procedures to improve communications sometimes fails because of the perversity of teachers or simply because of forgetfulness.

HY  "Many staff don't know what's going on. So you see, you can set up the system but however perfect the system you still come back to human nature. Some people, no matter what you do, are not going to know. Possibly because they don't want to know. This, I am convinced, is the big problem in the school, or one of them. A lot of the problems are brought about by the staff themselves for refusing to pay attention to the details."

HD  "There is then an attempt to create a structure in which both (Heads of Departments and Heads of Years) can work in harmony, and the break-down is the human one of forgetting to tell somebody, and somebody might take independent action without the knowledge of either side."

HY* "What I'm worst at is following things through. The day's problems are the day's problems. If it isn't completed that day then the next day's problems tend to overlay and you forget that you had asked somebody to do something in two days' time. You can't be single-minded. I use a diary. Well, I ought to use one. I use it spasmodically. This is me. In a space of a minute, two or three things could start. One can go away and have completely
forgotten something important. This must be related to pressures of the job."

The quick passing of information between staff at break times in the staff room, in corridors between teaching periods, or other chance occasions, all still played an important part even in the large schools, but this method of communication was seen to be impossible as a general rule. Staff took the view that each school would have to work out its own salvation. One school had a formal staff meeting every morning and information was given out when felt to be necessary.

A Head of Year thought it was very difficult to inform everyone about details which came from interviews with students, parents, other staff, and Local Authority officials. HY* "It's very difficult to know how much information to pass on and this is a worry that can never be satisfactorily solved."

A Head of Department felt that the major area of conflict was the fact that the pastoral people made decisions without in many cases consulting Heads of Departments where general school policies were concerned. HD "There is an 'us' and 'them' situation."

Another Head of Department felt that there were times where the Heads of Departments felt that they were always being called to task by year tutors. The cross referencing between pastoral and departmental doesn't take place as much as it should. HD* "I don't think there's enough communication coming back from Heads of Years to Heads of Departments and teachers when they refer someone to the Head of Year or want to know about somebody. There's almost an air of secrecy about things. So-and-so is under stress, please treat gently! One would like to know more about it. Or a child is referred to a particular Head of Year for not doing homework, truanting, or whatever, and then you wait and nothing comes back."

The element of secrecy surrounding much of the Head of Year's work was frequently referred to by Heads of Departments. HD "The Heads of Years have separate meetings with the head. I don't know what they discuss. I don't know what is passed on and what isn't."
When speaking of the difficulties encountered by coming across children with problems, a Head of Department blamed his ignorance regarding certain information not on the lack of time for communication by the pastoral side but upon the lack of a pattern of communication that could be integrated into the school.

HD* "We are a diffuse school and this does make personal quick comment, that kind of communication, very difficult."

A Head of Year spoke of the many meetings between the two sides of the school.

HY "Some of the most important work goes on in the staffroom at the various breaks. We have many official formal meetings with tutors, heads of schools, and staff meetings. Working parties. They're all important. The constant meetings are a strain. They must be. We used not to have all these meetings. But we never used to know much about the children."

A Head of Department spoke of the need to pass on information from these various groups.

HD* "Unless what they do in that committee (Heads of Years with top management) is communicated, doesn't matter how scrappily, if somebody just sticks up a bit of paper and says: 'We talked about so and so.' This paper does go up now but there was a period when it didn't."

An attempt to keep the Heads of Departments informed by having one of them along to the Heads of Years meeting did not prove a success in one school.

HY* "We've tried to solve some communication problem by having a member of the departments in with us but it's an inhibiting factor so we tend to discuss the more personal matters at another time."

Parents' complaints with regard to the academic work being done in the school caused difficulties between Heads of Years and some of the departments:

HY "The hardest thing of all is the situation where parents come in and criticise other members of staff, the Head of Department possibly, or the way the subject is taught, and in actual fact you sometimes feel that their criticism is justified, but professionally you cannot say that, so you have to cover up, as it were, and then go back to the Head of Department afterwards and say: 'Look, this has happened in your department, it's the second time..."
the criticism has been made, and will you do something about it? That I think is the hardest part. You can smooth things over for a certain period of time but if there's an area of conflict between the parents and the staff you're in between."

Sometimes conflict arises between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments because parents or pupils convey misleading accounts of problem situations which involve them.

HD* "Very often the Head of Year is approached by a child who has a problem and very often the problem is either exaggerated or the Year tutor tends to believe the child in preference to the teacher. That's in the first instance. When the matter was investigated the opposite conclusion was reached."

The evidence from the interviews showed that misunderstandings easily arose amongst staff at middle management level where heavy responsibilities were held on both the social unit and departmental sides of schools. Group criticism by one side of the other could be very damaging, the 'us' and 'them' situation referred to earlier. Both sides spoke of the need to anticipate the other person's feelings. Both complained of getting 'one half of the story' because of break-downs in communications. Sometimes there were not enough meetings in the school being investigated. Sometimes there were too many so that the strain became almost unbearable. Staff spoke of the situation where too many people went to different meetings where the same ground was gone over resulting in duplication of effort and time.

Most of this section has dealt with communication at the very simplest level of passing information and a consideration of communication at a deeper level, viz. of understanding each other's role, must wait until section 11 which deals with Philosophy. The interview material showed that communication was a most important area of strain and tension between the two roles.

5. Personalities.
In one sphere the Head of Year is superior to the Head of Department and in another he comes under the Head of Department. This is an area where personality clashes arise.

In the writer's school Personalities was perceived
by Heads of Departments and Heads of Years to be a problem of moderate importance and was experienced to a small to moderate extent (Table 3).

The scores on perception were almost identical with those across the ten schools (Table 4) but Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in the ten schools experienced personalities as an area of strain and tension to a small extent only. Despite the low scoring, Heads of Departments ranked this area third in order of importance on perception and experience whilst Heads of Years ranked it fifth on perception and sixth on experience.

A comparison of mean scores between County and Catholic schools (Table 6) showed very similar scores between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in both sets of schools. The only disparity was that Heads of Years in County schools had a very low score on experience; for them it appeared to be no problem at all.

The interview data showed that both sets of role players took the view that problems did not seem to arise as long as personalities got on well together. This comment came from a newly promoted Head of Year:

HY* "Problems just don't seem to arise as long as personalities get on well together. I'm saying that it doesn't matter what the structure is if the personalities are right. If the people get on all right together then they can sort any problem out."

The same Head of Year said later:

HY* "You can bring all problems down to personalities."

Another Head of Year in a Catholic school said:

HY* "Problems are caused by personalities. My view is that if the personality is wrong then you'll have problems. Some people are dogmatic and they can make mountains out of
mole hills but other people take things as they come and adapt to them."

Heads of Departments say much the same sort of thing with regard to the importance of personality:

HD* "What is needed is a little give-and-take on both sides. If everyone has the attitude that we have the children's welfare at heart there is no need for conflict."

"I think that personalities play a very important part. If one is inclined to be bombastic....!"

HD "Personalities play a hell-of-a-part. If you get an RSM or one whose technique is bully and bluster, then that has very limited possibilities in the sort of work I'm doing."

A number of Heads of Years took the view that one had to have a certain kind of personality to make a success of their role which was seen to be very different from that of a Head of Department. The following quotations illustrate this attitude:

HY* "The qualities needed are different. One needs to be a bit more of a smoothy. One has to take into account all the problems, one has to see everybody's problem. The snag about seeing everybody's problems is that one would not deal with them in the same way as does the other person. A fair amount of tact is needed."

HY "Sheer personality defects would ensure that some Heads of Departments couldn't do a Head of Year role. They'd rub people up the wrong way. They're very different jobs."

One may assume from the following quotation from a Head of Department that not all Heads of Years have the requisite qualities:

HD* "There is one very forthright, pastoral Head of Year, who makes decisions right off the top of his head and will fight to have his way irrespective of the basis on which he's doing it, and really this can be very difficult. The informal basis which I'm speaking of will only work if there is the right personality. If not, you would have to put down literally everything one had to do, and there is a danger that this sort of thing might be happening."

Some Heads of Departments think little of the claims
made by Heads of Years with regard to the qualities needed to carry out their functions, and take the view that almost anyone could do their work much of which is trivial. One Head of Year spoke bitterly of this attitude which he had encountered in some of his colleagues.

HY  "I resent being treated as not having a brain because I'm on the pastoral side in the school."

The importance of adopting the right attitude towards others was stressed by teachers in both roles.

HY* "I try to remember that people could get hurt. You have to think about people's pride. They are human beings. It doesn't do any harm to make people feel that they are of some importance."

HD "The personality of the person concerned is so important. A lot of the job can be regarded as treading on people's toes. It's so easy for the Head of Department to think 'The Head of Year is treading on my toes. What's he up to? I'll give him what for.' If the personality of the Head of Year does not convey confidence that he's not usurping your authority then things won't work. A lot of tact is called for."

HD "I do find that if people are inconsiderate that annoys me intensely. If there was an inconsiderate person in a more senior role then I would be annoyed, but it would be with the person not with the role."

A Head of Department suggested that personality problems had been aggravated by the sheer size of the comprehensive schools.

HD "Personality problems are also aggravated by size of school because one can say at times validly 'I was too busy to see you' whereas in the smaller school differences of personality had at least to be resolved sufficiently to allow a working relationship because of the intimacy of the place."

The point was made that in the big school one could remain almost totally detached.

One Head of Department spoke appreciatively of his colleagues on the pastoral side and did not suffer from personality clashes:
"I haven't been particularly involved in personality clashes with Heads of Years or Heads of Departments. I think one can appreciate that Heads of Years do have a lot of the dregs thrown at them. They tend to get problems heaped on their plate. They have to sort them out. Many Heads of Departments do appreciate this. Personalities are involved in that some do a better job than others. Some do it in a far friendlier way. Some people are more approachable than others. There are one or two personalities who are outstanding within the school. They do a good job. They hold your respect."

The data suggests that the area of personalities can cause great problems between the roles of Head of Department and Head of Year. Not one Head of Year referred to any difficulty experienced as a result of being a member of a department and coming under the authority of the Head of Department. No Head of Department referred to any problem on this count. The difficulties between the two roles came from the Head of Year exercising his responsibilities. Before the advent of the Head of Year role the Head of Department not only controlled his subject and those who taught but also entered necessarily into wider areas of school activity. Many of these were now controlled by the Head of Year. If he were blessed with the virtues referred to earlier then it is possible that the new situation might be seen to be acceptable on the part of Heads of Departments. Where there appeared to be defects of personality, on the part of either the Head of Department or the Head of Year, then this could be seen as an area giving rise to strain and tension.

The interview material may be seen to support the questionnaire data with regard to the section in the definition concerned with the Head of Year coming under the authority of the Head of Department in a teaching situation. The low scores registered in the questionnaires in the other part of the definition where the Head of Year is superior to the Head of Department do not appear to be supported by much of the interview data and a possible explanation for this was suggested above.

The very low score recorded by Heads of Years in
County Schools on their own experience appears to be unusual in the light of some of the interviews in those schools which expressed almost open hostility between some role occupants. Perhaps one should regard the interviews as being unusual in what may be seen as a situation in which most middle management staff co-operate with each other in the running of the school.

6. Options and Examinations.

The Head of Year and the Head of Department often differ in their views as to the needs of their students.

In the ten comprehensive schools in this enquiry students were given the chance to choose subjects at the end of Form 3, thus giving a two-year course to 'O' level and CSE examinations. A further choice of subjects was given to students going into Form 6 to study for 'A' level and CEE examinations.

Since the choice made at the end of Form 3 could be critical for the students' future careers, the schools conducted meetings with the parents so that the options taken were the result of consultations between parents, teachers and students. Frequently there was a conflict between parents and school, and sometimes between staff, as to the best interests of the students. Sometimes the subject of conflict was the particular examination that was being suggested, by one or other of the interested parties, and this area of options and examinations was investigated in the schools in this enquiry.

In the writer's school, this area was perceived by Heads of Departments as being a problem of moderate importance, but Heads of Years saw it as a problem of great importance. Both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years experienced it to a small or moderate extent (Table 3).

In the ten comprehensive schools, both Heads
of Departments and Heads of Years perceived the area as being a problem of moderate importance, and Heads of Departments experienced it as a problem of little importance. Heads of Years scored lower than Heads of Departments on experience (Table 4). It should be pointed out that only Heads of Years in Forms 3, 4, and 6, might be expected to meet with conflict with regard to options, and the question of options was connected directly with that of examinations. Once commitments were entered into with regard to options and examinations then the majority of parents, teachers, and students, accepted the situation. Special cases did arise at times, and these often became conflict situations. The most difficult time was seen to be that when choices of options leading to examinations had to be made.

A comparison between mean scores of perception and present experience between Catholic and County schools (Table 6) showed similar scores on perception and experience for Heads of Departments. Similar scores for perception for the Heads of Years were followed by a much lower score on experience for Heads of Years in County schools compared with those in Catholic schools (0.6 compared with 1.2).

A quotation from an interview with a Head of Year indicated the procedure he used with regard to options:

HY* "I'm just moving in on the options for next year. I involve the Heads of Departments. I draw up the lists of subjects. The children indicate their provisional choice and I draw up a curriculum diagram. Then I meet the departments. They moan, groan, are told that some things are possible, some not. They kick it around. Some Heads of Departments do not wish to be paired with another department because they fear that that department will get all the best kids. Finally the departments agree. Then we go to the parents."
A parent might comment on that description that he was the last to hear about what was going on in the matter. In fairness to the school, it might be stated that the staff take the view that some framework of options must be drawn up to show what is possible before approaching parents. If the parents were adamant about the inclusion of certain subjects then the school might have to think again. The school could be expected to have a reasonable impression of what the parents' wishes might be. This was shown in a further comment from the Head of Year just quoted:

HY* "There's always a pressure (from parents) on Physics because any apprenticeship in this area needs that and won't accept Physical Science for example. Doesn't matter if they fail Physics, as long as they have studied it. After that each child is interviewed with his curriculum diagram and then some persuasion is used to get the whole thing to work. All this indicates I suppose the wide areas of decision-making open to the Head of Year. Dissension comes if the Head of Department thinks that his subject is not being treated fairly. Sitting in committee it is difficult for one department to go it alone. They're not actually at each other's throats but they watch each other carefully."

The somewhat critical attitude taken by that Head of Year may be followed by another Head of Year's view:

HY* "From a Head of Year point of view, Heads of Departments count their departments as the first and most important, and sometimes that obscures their view of what is in the best interests of the children or of the school."

The same teacher went to say:

HY* "To be a pretty good Head of Department he needs to have a pretty narrow view; you've got to expect each Head of Department to act this way but ultimately you have to ask him to consider other peoples' viewpoints as well."
A rather different view came from a Head of Department:

HD* "There is a danger that one on the pastoral side is in a position to interfere with our departmental courses, when the person outside the department doesn't understand really what it's all about. We like co-operation but sometimes one gets interference."

The same Head of Department said later:

HD* "There is this danger of power. It is power, isn't it? When someone says: 'You must change this set' or something like that, then it could get dangerous and if it could get there, then something should be done."

A Head of Year who did not suffer any great conflict recognised that it could happen:

HY* "I put children into their sets, it doesn't bring me into any great conflict with anybody because this job has always been done by somebody, the Deputy Head usually. Does it matter do you think who does the job as long as it's done? Well perhaps people do worry about that sort of thing. Yes, it could be a major area of problems."

A Head of Year spoke of exchanging problems with Heads of Departments:

HY* "They pass a lot of their problems to us. We pass some back to them, e.g. it might be a matter of changing the child's group or doing something which is really their (the Heads of Departments) business."

A Head of Year spoke of consultations with Heads of Departments which led to strain:

HY* "I make it my business to consult with Heads of Departments in case they can switch the timetable or do something of that sort to ease the child's position. A certain amount of strain is brought about in cases like this."

Another Head of Year had no conflict:

HY "If it's a case of moving a child from one step to another in the set then it's the Head of Department with his staff but if it's a case of moving a child up or down
A criticism about the way sets may be organised came from a Head of Department:

HD  "If my department is considered to be only suitable for the non-academics, then that is the fault of top management. Sometimes the option system makes it very difficult for the academic child to choose my subject. I think that a lot of quite average children are encouraged by the pastoral people to do too many academic subjects and I criticise those who organise for this."

As stated earlier, the question of examinations was related directly to that of options: the options chosen determined the examinations taken. Thus if a Head of Department was of the opinion that a student would not be capable of taking an 'O' level examination he would not support his entry to an 'O' level option. The Head of Year, taking the part of an anxious parent, might press for the student to be accepted in the 'O' level group, and this could lead to conflict with the Head of Department. The feeling held by many Heads of Departments was that Heads of Years encouraged too many students to enter for academic examination courses and the departments were usually in the position of trying to limit the entry. One interpretation, put by a Head of Department, suggested that the Heads of Years, because their main responsibility was not teaching, were content to allow students into courses in the interests of leading a quiet life in their relationships with the parents. A Head of Year view, at the other extreme, was that Heads of Departments wished to deal only with the brighter students and in this situation it was very difficult to place large numbers of average and below-average students in academic courses. Both sides would claim to be serving the needs of the students.

The interview material was supportive of this area being seen by both pastoral and curricular sides of the schools as being of moderate importance, as indicated by the questionnaire data. The questionnaire results on experience were lower than might have been expected in the light of the interviews. The Heads of Departments and Heads of Years who were interviewed regarded the time for decision-making with regard to options and examinations as one which gave rise to a number of conflict situations. Generally the schools appeared to have established satisfactory methods of
organisation by which differing views were reconciled.

7. Teachers and Student Teachers.

The allocation of teachers and student teachers between years and departments is often a source of strong disagreement.

Table 3 showed that the distribution of teachers and students in the writer's school was perceived by both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years as being a problem of from moderate to great importance, though the scoring on the experience side was considerably lower with strain and tension being experienced from a small to moderate extent.

Table 4, which gives the scores in the ten schools in the enquiry showed both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years perceiving this area to be a problem of little to moderate importance and they experienced it to a small extent.

Table 6, comparing scores in Catholic and County Schools, revealed that the Catholic schools scored higher than the County schools in both perception and experience which indicated more strain and tension in the Catholic sector.

The allocation of teachers and student teachers is carried out by Heads of Departments. They know the strengths and weaknesses of their staff and distribute them accordingly throughout the schools. Student teachers are allocated to departments according to their subject specialisms. The Heads of Departments have to bear in mind a number of considerations in allocating them to their classes, for example, the age of a particular group, whether it is streamed or un-streamed, whether it includes any very difficult pupils, whether the class has had previous experience of student teachers, whether the break in continuity with their own teacher might be detrimental to the pupils, how close the group may be to examinations, and so on.

The interview data showed that the Heads of Years in the lower part of the large schools were the ones who experienced the most strain and tension with regard to the distribution of teachers and student teachers.
The pressures of examinations at the top of the school are such that often the better qualified teachers are clustered in the senior part of the school, and when there are staff absences over a long period of time teachers lower down tend to be moved up to cover examination groups, and the gaps lower down are plugged by temporary staff who may be available. The pressure for this kind of movement of staff usually comes from Heads of Years higher up the school who impress upon the Heads of Departments the examination needs of their students. Heads of Departments themselves, in order to promote good results in their subjects, may arrange this movement and this is likely to bring them into conflict with Heads of Years lower down the school. One Head of Department commented:

HD* "My biggest problem as Head of Department is to decide who's to teach what and where. Some teachers only want to teach the top flight. They're not interested in the weaker brethren. 'This is where we really have to fight it out. You have to take the good and the bad, the rough with the smooth. One has to haggle quite a bit."

Another Head of Department spoke of his distribution as essentially a compromise and of his difficulty in placing weak teachers:

HD* "I feel the Head of Department is responsible to the headmaster for everything that is done in the Department. I distribute my teachers throughout the school. If I distributed them badly I should imagine the Heads of Years would have a quiet word. The whole thing is a compromise. It's a matter of debate where most damage is done by a poor teacher. I can imagine that this is a source of conflict."

A Head of Year spoke of this area of distribution as being an area for consultation.

HY* "The Head of Department determines who teaches the classes. If I found the allocation unsatisfactory I would go to the Head of Department and say 'I don't think this class is being treated fairly.' This is an area for consultation. We've got the over-all
view of the class and the child which the Head of Department can't always get. They don't see their other subjects. The Head of Department looks at his subject. Very often they would like to make their subject important for the child. They think it would be the best thing for that child. I think our job is to look at the whole picture and see whether it's becoming unbalanced."

A Head of Year in the lower part of a school was critical of the fact that so many female staff were allocated to his years:

HY "A problem for me too is that the younger children are having too many female teachers. There are good female teachers but all female teachers - that's wrong. I find that I often get weak teachers allocated to my year as if it didn't matter."

Sometimes there existed strong disagreement between Heads of Years in different sections of the school with those in the senior part claiming to be misunderstood by those in the junior part, and the other way round. One Head of Year commented on this:

HY* "I feel sometimes that staff who mainly teach the Junior side of the school have little understanding of the problems of the senior side."

Another view held by a Head of Year on the junior side of the school was:

HY* "Sometimes I strongly disagree with the allocation of teachers by Heads of Departments and there appears to be too many students given the opportunity to practise in my year."

This is usually the complaint voiced by Heads of Years in the junior part of the school, as student teachers often opt to teach with the younger pupils in the secondary schools when on school practice. Despite supervision of their work, it is clear that sometimes the work done is below the standard expected.
A Head of Department confirmed that sometimes student teachers were weak and were put at the lower end of the school:

HD "Students are difficult sometimes. We have to take them but some of the people who come are weak. There is a tendency to put them into classes at the lower end of the school and sometimes this is a source of conflict with a Head of Year. You can't put them into examination groups and in some of the classes higher up the school the discipline might be difficult. The same thing happens with teachers really."

The interview material appeared to support the data from the questionnaires which indicated that this area of conflict was only of moderate importance. Many of the smaller departments were unaffected as with only two or perhaps three staff in a department, as in Art, Music, Home Economics, the teachers taught across the whole school. Only in the large departments was it possible to allow certain staff to teach mainly in the junior or senior part of the school. With regard to the Heads of Years, the interview data showed that those in the lower part of the school were more anxious about the distribution of both teachers and student teachers than were their colleagues at the top of the school.

8. Curriculum.

The case for integrated studies is often made by Heads of Years in opposition to the views of Heads of Departments.

Table 3 shows that Curriculum as an area of conflict in the writer's school was perceived by Heads of Departments and Heads of Years as being a problem of from moderate to great importance, and experienced by both as a problem of little to moderate importance.

Table 4 shows that, in the ten schools in the enquiry, Curriculum was perceived by Heads of Departments as being a problem of moderate importance, and by Heads
of Years as being a problem of little to moderate importance. The scoring by both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years was very low and indicated a problem of little importance. The area ranked as ninth and tenth in order of importance for Heads of Departments and Heads of Years respectively.

Table 6 shows that the scoring in Catholic schools was higher than in County schools but in the Catholic scores, except that for Heads of Departments' perception, none rose above that indicating a greater than moderate importance. The Head of Department score referred to was unusual in that it put this area as second in rank order as far as perception was concerned whereas in every other case of perception and experience curriculum appeared low down the rankings.

The data collected from the interviews revealed that experimental or innovative courses, such as Nuffield Integrated Science or Environmental Studies, which cross the normal subject boundaries, are frequently a source of tension. Reference has been made (p. 2) to Bernstein's assertion that power is changing hands when innovation of this kind occurs. A Head of Year may feel inclined to further the growth of such interdisciplinary work, whereas some Heads of Departments may object because they feel that their subjects may suffer in the long run. When new curricular material is introduced there is considerable study to be undertaken in re-writing syllabuses. When a Head of Department already possesses a structured syllabus which runs throughout the school, a change to an integrated course in the first school year, for example, would lead to a complete revision of the remaining four or five years of the course. Heads of Department are sometimes suspicious of integrated courses because they fear that the knowledge content will be less than that which
would be available in the separate disciplines and considerable co-operation would be needed with other staff in drawing up such integrated syllabuses.

Bernstein has shown that integrated codes reduce the authority of the separate contents, and this has implications for the existing authority structures (1). In all the secondary schools in this enquiry, the main body of knowledge contained in the curriculum was organised and distributed throughout the schools through a series of well-insulated subject departments which were in competition for resources of all kinds. The following quotations from Heads of Years illustrate this competition:

HY* "As a Head of Department one leads a very narrow experience. The yearly battle of the timetable or capitation or room space, I've heard it described as Empire Building. This is healthy enough but on the side of the Head of Year one is concerned with all departments because the individual child you become concerned with may dislike English or French or there may be friction with a member of staff or whatever."

HY* "They (Heads of Departments) become so involved in their departments. This is their little world and anything that infringes on this is fought off."

Heads of Departments do not appear to dispute this critical view of the way they operate as is evident from some of their comments:

HD* "The danger is that the Head of Department can be very narrow in his outlook. It becomes obvious at Heads of Departments' meetings sometimes where you get the situation that they fight their own battles. They look after their own departments and maybe push it to such an extent that it will damage the school. You have to have a fair amount of give-and-take, an idea of what the other departments are trying to achieve...The Head of Department deals with teachers in his department through
the subject which he might be quite sure of, and as a specialist in that subject he'll find it easy to relate to others in the department. When you take down the subject guard teachers find it difficult. Even a form period is difficult for some specialists. I imagine that teaching in a team situation brings great problems of this kind. Even having another teacher in the room takes some getting used to. . . . . . . Departments are less wary about an approach from one on the pastoral side than from another department. They would think that this will have a detrimental effect upon my department."

HD "One is pushing for one's subject."

By contrast, the integrated code relies on the shared co-operative educational task (2). A move towards this may be resisted by Heads of Departments because it involves a change in existing authority structures and limits the range of decisions in both the discipline itself and in the administrative area associated with its place in the organisational structure.

Integrated work in Science caused difficulties because some scientists who had trained as Biologists or Chemists could not cope with the demands of an integrated course without a considerable amount of reading and practical experimentation. Some teachers do not mind this 're-training'. Others view it with dismay and would prefer to carry on with the traditional approach of separate disciplines. If the Head of Year happens to favour what has in recent years been considered by many educationists to be the 'progressive' approach viz. integrated science, then there is likely to be conflict with a Head of Department who may have specialised in only one of the disciplines.

The evidence provided in the interviews indicated that a small amount of integrated studies was part of the curriculum of every school in the enquiry. This area did not appear to be one of conflict between the two focal roles in this study. In general the integrated work that was being carried out was initiated by one of the Heads of Departments and it appeared as a possible source of conflict.
between Heads of Departments and between subject teachers within the departments. Any attempt to change the curriculum was seen as a possible cause of inter-departmental in-fighting and conflict. Heads of Years were aware that once the subject guard was taken down specialist teachers found the going very difficult, and the team teaching situation which was usually found to be associated with the integrated approach was fraught with difficulties and high tension. The conclusion would be that though curriculum was an area of tension when changes were proposed, it was a problem of little importance between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years.


The rights and duties which make up the roles of Heads of Years and Heads of Departments are sometimes not clearly specified and this leads to some duplication in role performance and in some cases to neglect.

Table 3 shows that this area of Diffuseness was perceived in the writer's school by both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years as being a problem of little to moderate importance and the scores on experience by the occupants of both roles were almost identical. Table 4 shows that this area was perceived in the ten schools in this enquiry by both role occupants as being of moderate importance and experienced as a problem of from little to moderate importance. The mean scores meant that this area ranked high as an area of conflict and tension.

Table 6 compares the scores in the Catholic and County sector and shows that the scoring in County schools was higher than in the Catholic sector, which suggested that the role specifications were better organised in the Catholic sector. The interview data provided some support for this point of view.
This first quotation from a Head of Year in one of the Catholic schools shows that in his school role specifications were only then being formulated:

HY* "We are in the process of formulating role specifications. We devote the occasional meeting to discussing this. Of course, it is changing all the time. There are drastic changes sometimes because of our new experiences. I would like things to be more specific. There's a danger of duplicating and of not doing things at all. This is linked with communications. I would like more definite lines to work to, and I will make this known eventually at our meetings. I think all roles should be fairly clearly defined."

A Head of Department in a Catholic school had only recently received a role specification:

HD* "I have a role specification for my department but I didn't have it when I came. Our new Deputy Head devised this...... The roles are very different (Head of Year and Head of Department), there's overlap obviously.......There's a lot of blurring of the roles here."

Role specifications were found in the Catholic sector and this comment from a Head of Department indicates that some of these were drawn too rigidly:

HD* "If an area of responsibility is defined then somebody fulfils to the best of his ability that area of responsibility but he will obviously in some respects overlap on others. First as a class teacher I impinge on the pastoral side. Then as an English specialist I impinge on the academic side. As a human being I override the whole lot and it's the areas of human responsibility where I feel that highly organised systems like this can break down."
I have nothing against the pastoral heads, so to speak; my deputy in the department tells me what to do with the report forms which I have filled out as a form master. Academically I tell her what to do in the curriculum. We get on amicably because we know our areas of responsibility and because we value each other as human beings, but where the pastoral responsibility is hived off into, yes, a prestige group, you can find that you're tending to disregard your responsibility because it doesn't fall within that particular area. In other words, I feel that a lot of my colleagues have fallen flat, and I'm doing it myself, in not acting as a human being, because that falls under someone else's defined area of activity or responsibility."

The above statement appears to include everything: areas of responsibility are defined, the areas overlap, the system works at times because each knows what he or she is about, and yet one is left with the impression that it would be better if areas of responsibility were not defined because in some way they militate against one's humanity. Perhaps the speaker would have agreed that providing the roles were drawn up with care so that a certain overlap would be allowed, and providing each values the other as a human being, then the system might work. One is left with the impression too that this Head of Department suspected systems of organisation.

The need for a certain amount of flexibility in the drawing up of role specifications was expressed by a number of senior staff interviewed:

HY* "There is definitely an overlap of roles but you need this, and this is a real help when there is pressure. If you work in isolation and nobody else knows what's going on then
if you're sick or not well then none can take over."

HY* "There's quite an overlap of jobs here. There's no real answer to this unless you have very strict guide lines and if you do this then you have the Trade Union element coming in. I saw Charlie Brown smashing three windows but he's one of yours. There's a tremendous overlap in this place...The overlap is a source of tension at times."

A number of these senior staff expressed their fears about trespassing on other people's areas of responsibility.

HY* "When I first started the job I felt I didn't want to tread on anyone's toes. I found the best way was to stay in the background, to weigh the situation up. I didn't want to upset people."

HD* "A lot of the job can be regarded as treading on people's toes."

A Head of Year in the Catholic sector spoke of the duplication of effort resulting from the overlap of roles and also of the neglect which resulted.

HY* "I don't find it happening so much now as it used to, viz., my doing something that has already been attended to. There was an awful lot of this at first. This is now my second year of doing this job. Last year, with a different Head of School who was very keen, we often overlapped in our work. I occasionally got annoyed about this. I had to say, if you're doing it, do it ......

Just as there is sometimes duplication of work there is also neglect. The clever children get themselves deliberately neglected. They fall between tiers. You pass them on to someone else. Someone else sends them back to you and they never arrive. Children can beat any system. The rascals get away with some things. They don't get away with everything."

A Head of Department repeated this description about falling between tiers in the hierarchy:

HD* "There's been some overlap between form tutors who are supposed to do a pastoral job, assistant year tutors, year tutors, and heads of schools. A four tier hierarchy. All doing the same job. They were treading on each other's toes, layers or tiers were being missed out. People felt that
they couldn't do their job properly because somebody else was doing some of it. It's been difficult to get the duties and responsibilities worked out."

None of those interviewed on the Catholic side spoke of having no role specifications and this contrasted strongly with some of the comments from the County schools:

HY  "At the moment we have got no laid-down rules about our jobs. If there are problems we usually get together and discuss it. We come to an arrangement. In some respects I think it would be good to have work specifications written down. These areas of conflict we have are not very much but if we say right it's your job to do so-and-so then there's no argument. If it's not specified there's this little area of uncertainty. I don't think one could be dogmatic about this."

HD  "My role as Head of Department is not written down. I don't think this presents me with any problems."

HY  "There's nothing written down about our roles in the school."

HD  "My role specification is about six lines long and it's as broad as our Constitution. If I were to do all of it I would never get any sleep. I could do hardly anything and still fit the description of the role. I like to be fairly specific, not totally of course as flexibility is essential, but I would like more specific guidance in some areas. By and large, we get along because the roles of most Heads of Departments are outlined by tradition."

A Head of Year in the County sector expressed the wish for a set of specifications which would not be too rigid:

HY  "There is a problem of identification of areas of work to be covered so as to avoid duplication of effort. We have no actual job specifications but I think they would be a good idea provided they were not imposed too rigidly - you can lose out either way. If it's too fluid you find people duplicating the effort done by somebody else whereas if it's too rigid you find that people are so concerned with remaining within their own area of authority that certain students will play one off against another or will end up on the border line and will get no attention. I think it would be a help to have a clear definition
and to have that definition made operative, because in some cases the existence of a definition is no guarantee that it will be operative when the system is applied at ground level."

The interview data supported the finding in the questionnaire that the area under discussion was more of a problem in the County sector than in the Catholic. The conclusion reached following the interviews was that flexible role specifications were desired by all but a few of the senior staff interviewed, and a moderate amount of strain and tension followed as a result of duplication in role performance and the neglect caused by a system which operated too rigidly.

10. Status.

The positions of Head of Year and Head of Department are of high status and power but their relative status gives rise to some jealousy and tension.

In the writer's school status as an area of strain and tension was perceived by Heads of Departments as a problem of little to moderate importance and by Heads of Years as a problem of moderate to great importance (Table 3). Both role occupants experienced it from a small to moderate extent. These mean scores meant that status came low down in the rank order for both roles.

The scores in the ten schools in this enquiry (Table 4) show that status was perceived as an area of from little to moderate importance and experienced to a very small extent by the occupants of both roles.

Table 6 shows the comparison between Catholic and County schools. The County schools scored slightly higher than the Catholic schools for Heads of Departments on Perception and Experience, and Heads of Years scored
almost the same on Perception. Heads of Years in County schools scored very low indicating that status was a problem of very little importance. Some of the evidence which follows, which was collected during the interview stage of this enquiry, would not appear to support the low scoring of the questionnaires.

Strong criticisms were expressed of Heads of Years by some Heads of Departments:

HD* "To be blunt about this school I feel that we have too many bosses on the pastoral side... The head used to have an Advisory Committee composed of senior Heads of Departments. These were replaced by a Director of Studies and the Heads of Years were appointed to the Committee. The Committee does represent status. The Heads of Departments have no such meeting. There is no academic counterpart to the pastoral meeting. I feel there should be one."

This Head of Department went on to speak of 'pastoral responsibility' being 'hived-off' into a 'prestige group' and said that 'the system just seemed to happen'.

Another Head of Department was equally blunt:

HD* "They (Heads of Years) are not as important as Heads of Departments. Anybody could do their jobs...... I think that Heads of Departments could be designated as Heads of Years as a kind of status symbol but their main work would be in their departments. The Head of Year should not be seen as superior to the Head of Department. If they have to be done separately (their jobs) then they should be seen as of lesser rank than
Heads of Departments because their pastoral responsibilities could be done by people with much less experience than that needed for Head of Department. It is unfair to find that the system of promotion operating favours people on the pastoral side in the big schools. The Head of Year has made the Head of Department a second-class citizen and the move has been carried out quietly whilst Heads of Departments have got on with the main task of the school which is to teach."

A young Head of Department (29) spoke of his status relative to Heads of Years:

"Regarding status I relate poorly in my own estimation with regard to Heads of Years, not with regard to pay because I'm in the top group, but as far as status goes I think there are a lot of issues on which the Head of Department should have more say and too many of these seem to be under the control of Heads of Years, for example, deciding on what sort of subjects should be offered in options, that sort of thing. I'm asked to complete lists and lists and lists, about what I would expect a child's ability to be in say two years time, which is a very difficult thing to do, and the Heads of Years go off and take it all away and come back and say: 'This is the finished product, here you are, these are the ones you're teaching next year.' I find this a little bit disturbing but then I have to ask myself whether I would have had time to do that sort of work myself, and I wouldn't, but I would like to have more time to look at the problem, which I think is my problem, rather than the Head of Year's problem."

A Year Head thought that small group meetings with the Head, when decisions were made, would result in conflict:

"I feel that the major area of conflict is in the fact that the pastoral people make
Heads or Departments - this is concerned with general school policies.....The head is the source of power and if you're a member of a small group meeting with the head this is a problem."

A Head of Department confirmed this view:

"The Head of Year can get the ear of the head more easily. They have their own meetings at which they have a much smaller number.....I feel that as a result of the kind of work they have to perform the Heads of Years have more chance of promotion. Obviously I've reached Head of Department very quickly and looking ahead I feel that I could well be restricted in the fact that looking around most Deputy Heads appear to be appointed from people with pastoral experience rather than with the academic experience. I've got time to be a successful Head of Department and then to move into the pastoral side but I think in many respects the system is wrong and as a Head of Department I ought to be able to go on to promotion because I'm bound to come into contact with pastoral work with such a large department."

This Head of Department felt that his pastoral work involved in running his own department was not recognised and the Heads of Years 'appear to carry too much weight.' He went on to say:

"People are more interested to meet people who claim pastoral experience dealing with a whole school, rather than with Heads of Departments who deal only with their own departments.....The progression from Head of Department is not so natural as it used to be, and I feel that it will be a real source of anxiety, when I seek promotion in five or ten years time."

A number of Heads of Departments expressed their fears about future promotion because of the value placed upon pastoral work in the large schools:

"I do believe that for men it would appear to be easier to get a Deputy Headship or a Headship from the pastoral side of a big school. I know of some Heads of Departments here who are very worried about promotion from a department and would like to get in on the pastoral side. I think status is a bit of a problem here."

"Of course, the pastoral side now involves considerable administration work, and I think that because of their involvement with this the opportunities for promotion are increasing. I think that this creates some friction because
teachers, this is a generalisation, teachers are jealous of their status in the community, within the area, within the school, and this has created friction."

Heads of Years, by contrast with many Heads of Departments, felt confident that the nature of their duties in the large schools would stand them in good stead when the time came for them to seek promotion.

HY* "When you look around it's true that a good pastoral Head of Year is a better candidate (than Head of Department) for promotion."

HY* "I haven't noticed greater status from becoming Head of Year after first being a Head of Department. I think one would not progress if one went the other way round — from Head of Year to Head of Department. I should say that Head of Year is likely to stand me in better stead promotion-wise. To a degree, one is a minority person as Head of Year - there are lots of Heads of Departments but only five Heads of Years. One is called in on the administrative side far more than the Head of Department."

There was a realisation on the part of the occupants of both roles that sharing in the administrative task of running the school was a source of power which, more often than not, went to the Head of Year rather than to his colleague on the departmental side of the school.

HY* "We are so new that I don't think people have really realised that we've got the job. This is true really regarding your question of status. People know well enough the job we have but there is a sense in which, because we have held the jobs for only just over a year, some hardly realise just what kind of job we have got. It has been seen as a promotion...... Potentially I see the post as more important than the Head of Department in the big school...... The Head of Department has not possibly become aware of the possibilities of the new situation. It can become quite frightening to realise the power that one could wield. And which one could misuse. We share in the responsibility of top management in the school. We are not quite 'power drunk' yet. Any moment now!"

HY* "Regarding status I was certainly promoted to
my present post and particularly so 
because my department was one of the 
smaller ones. I think some people are 
better as Heads of Departments and prefer 
to stay there. Promotion-wise I feel that 
I am in a better position than the senior 
departments on the same money scale. One 
gets more experience. I'm sure the Heads 
of Departments think this is so, too..... 
Status certainly comes with the weekly 
Heads of Years' meeting..... The Heads of 
Departments are equal in rank on scales 
of pay but with regard to their say in 
the running of the school the Heads of 
Years have an advantage." 

There were Heads of Departments who had no wish 
to become Heads of Years, partly because they were 
dedicated to their subjects, and partly because they did not 
like aspects of the Head of Year role:

HD* "I like my subject a lot and would probably 
not wish to seek a year post or Head of 
School post. I wouldn't particularly want 
to be a disciplinarian, which is involved 
in many of the problems the Head of Year 
has to deal with. The roles are very 
different."

HD "If I were seeking promotion I wouldn't 
necessarily go to Head of Year. I'm not 
very interested in that side. I think the 
posts have equal status......."

This Head of Department thought there might have been more 
conflict if younger men and women had been appointed to the 
pastoral positions. Another Head of Department said that 
he had thought that status-wise the Heads of Years were 
considered to be very senior people when they had first been 
appointed but there had been no conflict in his school at 
that time because only long-standing teachers were considered 
for the posts and no outsiders had received them.

A number of senior staff made the point that they 
had moved over from the departmental to the pastoral side of 
the school because they considered it better from the career 
point of view. Some of these made the point that they 
felt that after a number of years of teaching they had 
exhausted the interest they could have in running departments. 
They were particularly influenced by the fact that there was
more chance of their views being sought with regard to the running of the school if they were on the pastoral side. Some made the point that the head was the source of power, and if one was a member of a small group working with the head then one was in a more powerful position than being one of perhaps twenty to twenty-five departmental heads. One Head of Year said that he moved from his department because he felt that:

HY  "I was drifting away from the centre of power and I wanted to have a say and see how the cogs turned over."

A number of Heads of Departments complained about the way heads now met Heads of Years separately and frequently. These small meetings represented status. Generally Heads of Departments felt that their colleagues on the pastoral side had more influence on school policy than did the Heads of Departments. Some schools gave recognition of the policy-making nature of the pastoral side's meetings with the head by inviting a representative of the departments to attend. Sometimes the Director of Studies was cast in this role, though some senior Heads of Departments resented their exclusion from such meetings.

As stated earlier, the evidence from the interviews suggested that this area of the relative status of the roles gave rise to strain and tension in large schools, despite the low scores registered in the questionnaires.

One might speculate that conflict between the two roles is likely to decline in importance to the extent that promotion is recognised as being from Head of Department to Head of Year before going on to higher posts in the administration of schools. There was evidence in this enquiry that Heads of Years had been promoted in this way. However, some Heads of Departments would not find such a system of promotion as being acceptable, and many Heads of Departments dedicated to their subjects will not choose to move into a more administrative role nor will they accept that this will mean that they will become second-class citizens as compared with Heads of Years.
11. Philosophy.

Sometimes the Head of Year has to take an 'over-all' school view which may differ from the subject view of the Head of Department and this causes tension and conflict.

Philosophy as an area of strain and tension was perceived by Heads of Departments in the writer's school as a problem of little importance and experienced to a small extent. Heads of Years, on the other hand, perceived this area as a problem of moderate to great importance and experienced it to a moderate to great extent. In the case of both perception and experience the scoring was twice as high in the case of Heads of Years as compared with Heads of Departments. As an area of conflict, Heads of Departments put Philosophy bottom of their list of ten areas whilst Heads of Years placed it fourth on perception and second on experience (Table 3).

This contrast between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in the writer's school was confirmed in the scoring across the ten schools in this enquiry in that Heads of Years scored significantly higher than Heads of Department on perception, though the Heads of Years experience Philosophy as an area of strain in the same range viz. to a small to moderate extent (Table 4).

Table 6 gives the comparison between County and Catholic schools. Heads of Departments in County schools scored slightly higher than their colleagues in Catholic schools whilst Heads of Years' scoring was the same on perception and Heads of Years in Catholic schools scored higher in experience than Heads of Years in the County sector.

Table 7 shows that this area of Philosophy ranked high for Heads of Years in both Catholic and County schools.

The statement in the definition of Philosophy that the Head of Year has to take an 'over-all' view was not contested by any Head of Department who was interviewed in the enquiry. The following quotations from them suggest this this description of the Head of Year role was not unacceptable to the departmental side.

HD* "The good Head of Year knows the pupil in
his year and keeps a close check on his work, his movements, his behaviour. This kind of caring means that the Heads of Departments and teachers can get on with their work in a way that is not possible in many large schools which do not have this system. I have visited a number of large schools where there appears to be general disorder, where children can be missing from lessons and not followed up, where subject teachers cannot get sufficient help from the administrative set-up because there is no year system and a senior teacher allocated the general pastoral responsibility cannot cope because of the size of the job. I am now a believer in a strong pastoral framework because this enables the academic work of the school to be carried on efficiently."

HD "I get the feeling that the system works very well. On the philosophical level it's very much accepted I think. It has improved the school situation inasmuch as you know that if there's a problem situation that there's someone who can deal with it. The Head of that Year will know."

Heads of Departments interviewed confirmed that a Head of Department view might be seen to be very much the subject view:

HD* "The danger is that the Head of Department can be very narrow in his outlook. It becomes obvious at Heads of Departments' meetings sometimes where you get the situation that they fight their own battles. They look after their own departments and maybe push it to such an extent that it will damage the school. You have to have a fair amount of give-and-take, an idea of what the other departments are trying to achieve. To have some sympathy with them."

HD* "From a Head of Year point of view Heads of Departments count their departments as the first and most important, and sometimes that obscures their view of what is in the best interests of the children, or of the school. If you're changing say curriculum, then it becomes a case of inter-departmental in-fighting, they don't want to give up more time or they want to organise it this way to suit their department; this can be a case of conflict. To be a pretty good Head of Department he needs to have a pretty narrow view - you've got to expect each Head of Department to act this way but ultimately you have to ask him to consider other people's viewpoints as well."

It was not difficult to select quotations from the
Heads of Years along the same lines:

HY* "As a Head of Department one leads a very narrow experience. The yearly battle of the timetable or capitation or room space. I've heard it described as Empire building. This is healthy enough but on the side of Head of Year one is concerned with all departments..."

HY* "They (HDs) become so involved in their departments. This is their little world and anything that infringes on this is fought off."

HY "I can understand how they (HDs) see children; theirs is a much narrower but perhaps more in depth point of view held by the Head of Department. I have the over-all view. When I came here it was a Grammar school and the existing staff felt that resources, including teachers, were being wasted on the pastoral side. I sensed that the staff wondered what I did for my money. Their role was well established and known. I find the pastoral work exhausting. Some critics feel that much of the work is trivial. It's not trivial to the children."

HY "Some Heads of Departments are totally absorbed in their subjects and simply can't understand the problems. The social role of the school is so necessary."

The Heads of Years appeared to be clear on their own role:

HY* "I think our job is to look at the whole picture and see whether it's becoming unbalanced."

HY "I think the Heads of Years have to bear in mind the over-all picture of what is needed in the school and the departments do not see this."

HY* "I take Assemblies, We deal with the usual things, behaviour, attitudes to others, etc. In my job I have to deal with all sorts of things, problems, growing-up, family troubles. I frequently mop tears."

HY* "The requirement of a Head of Year is different from that of Head of Department. There are obvious similarities in that the Head of Department has to care for his staff and his subject but you can be a Head of Year without being an expert in anything, except caring for people."

Heads of Years spoke of the extent of the
information they received from parents and pupils and of the wide areas of administration and discipline which went with their role in the school.

HY* "I get to know more about children than do Heads of Departments. This can be quite frightening. The extent to which you come to know about people. The parents, the children, and so on."

HY* "We started off here with the idea of our situation being a pastoral one but it has proved to have enormous administrative and disciplinary element. Probably I'm more aware of the administrative element because I deal with the intake whereas perhaps a fifth year head may be more aware of the disciplinary side. Each year has its own characteristics - third year, for instance, is options time and so on."

Comments were made on the division that had arisen between the departmental and social divisions in schools.

HY* "There has been rather an un-natural division whereby Heads of Departments see themselves as being academic people and other people have been regarded as pastoral. There should be some inter-relation between the two roles."

and later

"I still think it's bad policy to look upon some people as academics and some as pastoral. Because every teacher is an educator. No teacher separates class teaching from having an interest in kids. The whole development of the child is involved, spiritual, emotional, intellectual. All staff are teachers, not pluggers of subjects. There was a tendency to throw all discipline problems in the direction of the pastoral staff. The Head of Year still has to be the father figure. Any problems at all must be dealt with. The intention must be to make every child happy. A happy child is a contented child. If you talk out things with a child whatever their problem, let them cry, rage, whatever, and you're half-way to solving the problem."

HY* "There is a danger that kiddies identify teachers as academics or pastoral which shouldn't be."

Heads of Years stated that all teachers should be involved with care and there was no reason why Heads of Departments should not be pastorally inclined.
HY* "Every teacher has to have the caring attitude but the Head of Year has that extra time to take the over-all view."

HY* "The Head of Department is more or less in a cocoon, isn't he? by own feeling is that a good Head of Department who wanted to do more pastoral work could quite easily do so. I've been Head of Department and I'd be doing what I'm doing now in any case. The Heads of Departments appear to feel at times that their roles have diminished. The Heads of Departments are the ones to benefit most from the pastoral system working well. The Head of Year role has to take the over-all view, you must be seen actively to support school policy, to support constructively, you're not knocking the establishment, you don't knock it to anybody else."

The point was made that Heads of Years were often open to criticism because all members of staff were able or felt able to comment upon administrative procedures whereas the individual department was protected in its own discipline.

HY* "The Head of Department may be regarded as 'the' expert with regard to his area of operation whereas all staff can, quite properly, have views with regard to the more general field of administrative matters presided over by the Head of Year."

A critical comment on these procedures was made by a Head of Department:

HD "Much of the work done by these (Heads of Years) could be done by people of lesser rank, even clerical workers. I think it is wrong too to be promoted out of the classroom."

A Head of Year did not see the occupants of the two roles as different kinds of people viz. one a disciplinarian and the other more permissive.

HY "Another source of conflict between the departments and the pastoral side is that very often the academics seem to be disciplinarians whereas the pastoral ones, either through their training or by their nature, will be the more sympathetic. Neither side here would seem to provide the kind of solution needed by the school. I think the idea that the pastoral people are too soft is an idea that is banded about in loose conversation but I don't think that it
represents genuine criticism. I've heard the same thing said about Heads of Departments. The very successful Head of Department could carry out the role of the pastoral person if he were the right type. In fact, I think that he is ideally suited to do so."

A strong criticism of the social unit system in the large school came from a Head of Department who saw the whole task of education in the schools being seen from different points of view by those on the pastoral side as compared with those on the departmental side.

HD* "What worries me is that we tend to look at the whole, linear development of our subject and of a basic set of knowledge and ideas leading towards enlightenment that the children need and we tend to say these are our standards. The pastoral people tend to say, no, let us judge the children not by these standards but by the children's peer group, and by their backgrounds. Now I tend to think that we should put the external standards up and let the children know that they have to reach up to them, rather than say let us judge the children in the light of their backgrounds. There is a difference of emphasis between the two sides, the child must know that there are external standards, you can't judge too much from the kids themselves and their needs. The pastoral side tend to get too involved with the kids and we tend to be a bit further away. After all, are we here to teach? We've got to set up external standards, I think one tends to lower one's standards if one gets too involved. Especially with kids with behaviour problems. The pastoral people sometimes probably because they have so many problem children to deal with tend to put their background first. These kids need an external standard so that they can have a different background. I recognise that no teacher can function unless he cares. Even in the time I've been teaching I've seen discipline go down because the general trend in teachers is to look at background rather than what the good people can do."

Emphasis is placed in much of the evidence from the interviews on the Heads of Years having an 'over-all' view of school matters which conflicts at times with the narrower view associated with Heads of Departments. This polarisation of views enters into all the conflict areas which
have been discussed. Each side would perhaps agree that the other was concerned with both the caring and academic viewpoint. The good teacher in the department is concerned with the whole person who is to be educated and the teacher on the pastoral side is concerned that high standards of academic excellence should be one of the school goals. Yet despite this, the pastoral staff emerge as claiming a 'school' view whilst the departmental staff emerge as teachers who are particularly concerned with their subjects. The participants on each side tend to expect their colleagues to act in this way, certainly in the initial stage of a conflict situation arising between them. In this stage the Head of Department may fear that his colleague on the pastoral side may become too involved with the pupils and, because of an emphasis upon social background problems and their influence on school behaviour, may put too much stress on these factors and perhaps ignore the standards of academic excellence which the departments have set as their goals. Heads of Years may be seen in this context to be too 'soft' in their approach to their pupils and less demanding of them leading to a possible lowering of attainment in schools. These are possible, though they may be extreme, standpoints taken by the role occupants in this enquiry. What may be seen to be necessary are procedures which may make it possible to marry the two areas of school work so that the various goals of the school may be achieved.

12. Conclusion.

This chapter set out to demonstrate that there are identifiable areas of conflict between the focal roles in this study. None of these areas, which emerged in Enquiry 1, were found to be problems of great importance in the questionnaire's results, either on perception or experience. The highest mean score on perception, by both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in the ten schools, was 2.6, which was somewhere between being a problem of moderate to great importance, and the same
score registered on experience indicated that the problem was experienced from a moderate to a great extent.

The data from the interviews was supportive generally of the data from the questionnaires, except in the case of Time, Resources, and Status. In these areas the low scoring on the questionnaire cannot be reconciled with the interview data which suggested that the areas concerned were significant sources of strain and tension between the occupants of the two roles. Even when the interviews may be said to be supportive of the questionnaires, the scoring on the latter appeared to be somewhat lower than might have been expected in view of the statements made by role occupants. There is no adequate explanation for this.

The questionnaire and interview data suggest that the identified areas gave rise to strain and tension and could lead to conflict in the organisational structure. The interview data revealed that incompatible impulses were aroused by role occupants in the face of the same situation. This is demonstrated in the Chapter which follows in which two case studies, relating to incidents investigated in the preliminary enquiry, will be analysed in the light of Action Theory. The studies suggest the need for an organisational structure which would show tolerance of incompatibles which emerge between the two sides of school organisations. This will be the main consideration in Chapter 8 in which the writer will discuss the data which came from his interviews with the heads of the schools in this enquiry following his interviews with middle management staff. That Chapter will be concerned with methods of reconciling the divisions and resolving the conflicts which arose from the existence of a pastoral social unit and a curricular side in each school, leading to the kind of conflict situations about to be described.

2. ibid., p.62.
This enquiry has been an exploration of the strains and tensions associated with the relationship between the Head of Department and the Head of Year, and an investigation into the ways in which such conflicts may be resolved, so that the 'goals' of the school may be achieved.

In the preliminary enquiry eighty particular conflict situations were recorded (Appendix X). An attempt will be made here to outline case studies made in connection with two of these incidents and to analyse them in the light of Silverman's Action Theory, which the writer has used as a method of analysing social relations within the organisation of the school. Though the role structure will be seen to play an important part in the understanding of the behaviour of the actors, the determining factor with regard to behavioural outcomes may be seen to be the various definitions and constructions which the individual actors placed upon the actions of others. These definitions were made by actors who were largely concerned with their own problems, some of which flowed directly from their role specifications which operated at the particular time, and some of which flowed directly from their interpretations of the particular situation in the light of their wants and feelings with regard to themselves and significant others. Silverman's method of analysis was to see the action in an organisation over a period of time. The first phase would be seen as a stable situation, which would consist of arrangements generally acceptable to all concerned, though containing within them forces which would aim at modifying or replacing existing arrangements. This first phase will be described as stability and may be seen to be any existing organisational arrangement. Over a period of time, the interests of the different groups within the organisation will ensure that an attempt will be made to change the existing arrangement by some definite proposal or action which will produce a lack of consensus in the organisation, and this will be described as a period of instability during which different definitions of the conflict situation will be put forward and acted upon by the participants. New patterns of social order will be achieved in time and a consensus or compromise solution will emerge which may be referred to as the new stability. Reference has been made in Chapter 2 to the similarity of this type of approach to that used by Benson.
1. Case Study 1

A Head of Science wished to increase the allocation of time for his subject in the lower part of the school. The reasons that he gave were (a) that he felt that more preparation was needed in the lower part of the school to achieve better external examination results in the upper part of the school and (b) that, because of a fall in the roll numbers of pupils, he found himself with too many science teachers and he feared that some of his staff would be dispersed to other departments to fill gaps in the time-table. He would prefer all his teachers to stay in their own discipline and one way of doing this was to increase their time allocation per class. The Head of Science would quite properly see himself, and be seen by others, to be defending his own departmental staff, none of whom would wish to teach other subjects unless obliged to do so.

The request by the Head of Science was turned down by a top management group which included Heads of Years because (a) no agreement was thought to be possible on the question as to which subjects would be prepared to relinquish time to other subjects and (b) the committee felt that the balance of time already allocated to the various departments met the school's needs.

The Head of Science resented the fact that the matter had been dealt with at a meeting at which he could claim not to have been represented and he received support from other departmental heads because as a group they were not represented at the top management group which made the decision.

After representations had been made to the head, he decided that the departments should elect a representative to sit on the top management committee. This decision was to have unfortunate repercussions as far as the more academic departments were concerned. The position on the committee was seen to be one of considerable power and the person who wanted it, and achieved it, was the head of one of the practical departments, and this caused resentment among his more academic colleagues who could not bring themselves to see that their point of view could be represented.

The end result, following many meetings and discussions which produced open conflict, was the appointment by the head of a Director of Studies to monitor the work
An Action Theory Interpretation, following Silverman, of the above Conflict Situation.

Stability. This period was characterised by the apparent shared orientations of the actors towards the allocation of teaching time. The Head of Science was a middle aged, married man, a specialist in Physics, who had no ambitions regarding further promotion and was dedicated to teaching his subject. He was of equal rank with the Heads of Years involved (Years 2 and 3) and had often voiced his misgivings about the emergence in schools of the pastoral system. He believed that pastoral work took up too much of a school's time and resources, particularly teacher resources. He felt that as Head of a very senior department he had the power to speak out on behalf of departments against the system in which the departments did not appear to be represented at top management. The Heads of Years were of similar age, both married with children, and both hoping to achieve higher administrative posts. One of the Heads of Years was of a rather critical disposition and he could not see how the Head of Science could make a case for improving the amount of teacher time for Science knowing as he did that other departments, though they might support him against the Heads of Years, would not be prepared to give up their own subject time in favour of more Science. Though the Heads of Years could sympathise with the stated aims of the Science department their own aim to achieve a balanced situation between departments did not allow of Science being granted special privileges. The Head of Year 2 had clashed with the Head of Science on numerous occasions. The Head of Science was cynical of the way the Head of Year operated, and resented the allocation of time given him for pastoral administrative work. The Head of Year thought that the Head of Science was one who was disappointed at the way schools had developed but who had little in the way of constructive comment to offer. The Head of Science
led a strong department which used to meet regularly in the Science prep. room and which became a pressure group in the school. The Head of Year was looking for promotion and the Head of Science thought that he was just making use of the school as a stepping stone. Despite these differences, personal relationships were generally good. The school was of the 'open' type in which there was a general acceptance by all of the advantages of the consensual approach. The Science staff was fully occupied and the department was satisfied with the results that were being achieved, particularly in the external examinations. The pattern of expectations by both Heads of Departments and Heads of Years appeared to coincide in that the allocation of time was the decision of the Heads of Years and the Head of Science was satisfied with his pupils' achievements. Presumably there had been no criticism by the parents though clearly, whatever the allocation of time, some pupils would have found it more or less adequate for their needs. The assumption must be that a state of balance had been achieved. Figure 1 illustrates this.

ROLE SYSTEM
Characterised by consensus.

INvolvements
Largely moral but with political and social factors.

DEFINITION OF PRESENT SITUATION
Favourable - achieved following some use of bargaining power.

ACTIONS
Acceptance of role system.

CONSEQUENCES
Intended Actors obtained desired rewards.

Unintended Possible disadvantages suffered by those staff and pupils who had too little or too much time.

SOURCES OF CHANGE
(1) Smaller intake of pupils.
(2) Some poor examination results.
(3) Weaker teachers appointed.
(4) Basic conflicting attitudes.

Figure 1  Stability
Instability. This period was characterised by a conflict of interest between Heads of Years and the Head of Science. The latter wished to increase the amount of teaching time because he found that the examination results had deteriorated over a few years and he felt that more preparation time in the lower school should produce better results, though this was not wholly accepted by the Heads of Years as there was no evidence to support this contention. Some young teachers had joined the department and their teaching ability was being questioned; the Head of Science felt that with more time to teach they could cover the syllabus more adequately. A political consideration was that the intake of pupils had decreased and the Head of Science wanted to keep his staff fully employed in their own subject, and in this action he was 'protecting' them. The Heads of Years had to face the fact that an increase in time for science would mean a decrease in time allocated elsewhere, and other Heads of Departments would not easily give up their existing allocation in order to give more time to other subjects. The other possibilities were either to extend the length of the teaching day or to cut down on time allocated to Assemblies, Form Periods, or break periods. The Head of Science felt that a decision on the amount of time required for the subject could not be taken properly by Heads of Years whose primary concern was an over-all view that might not do justice to Science. He became bitterly opposed to the arrangement which in the past he had accepted as being fair but the situation had changed as far as he was concerned and he was now having to see things in a different light. The difficulties that he was experiencing brought to the surface all the reservations that he felt about the way the Year system was operating. Figure 2 illustrates this period of instability.
**ROLE SYSTEM**
Conflict of expectation and values. Heads of Years were satisfied with system and a Head of Department wanted a change to meet a new situation.

**INVOLVEMENTS**
Head of Department seeking change.
Heads of Years seeking to retain the existing system.

**DEFINITION OF PRESENT SITUATION**
Head of Department thought system unworkable. Heads of Years satisfied. Feelings running high.

**ACTIONS**
Heads of Departments meet to protest.
Send deputation to head to ask for more consultation at top management level and for representation.

**CONSEQUENCES**
Intended Expression of grievances by both sides.

**SOURCE OF CHANGE**
Perceived unsatisfactory situation.

---

**Figure 2 Instability**

**The New Stability**
The incompatibility of the role expectations of the actors meant that the role system was unstable. This instability was disliked by all actors. The form of stability which they would have preferred varied. Some Heads of Departments wanted the Heads of Departments as a group to become the decision makers regarding the allocation of time for teaching, but others, particularly those in charge of 'fringe' or 'minority subjects, preferred to leave the allocation of time to top management as a greater security for themselves. Inter-departmental rivalry was keen and smaller departments did not relish being at the mercy of the larger departments. The Heads of Years wanted to retain their role and their power of control over time allocation as they had to ensure, in their view, an all-round balanced situation.

Discussions at top management level, and at Heads of Departments' meetings, brought about a decision to give the Heads of Departments an elected representative at the top management group. This failed to bring about a stable position because the role of representative was
seen to be one of prestige and possible power and
was secured by a strong character amongst the Heads of
Departments who was Head of Technical Studies. The
more academic departments resented the new position which
had arisen, and the head decided after further consultation,
to appoint a Director of Studies to represent the Departments
and to participate in top management with the rank of
Deputy Head. This change in the structure of organisation
brought a new stability, as illustrated in Figure 3.

ROLE SYSTEM

Shared expectations. A new structure
of organisation. New system provided
more support to Heads of Departments.
Relationship between roles of Head
of Year and Head of Department adjusted

INVOLVEMENTS

Largely moral but with political and
social factors.

DEFINITION OF

Favourable. The Heads of Departments
PRESENT SITUATION
felt that their position had been
improved with the appointment of a
Director of Studies. He could fight
their battles at top management
level. Heads of Years not dis-
satisfied in being able to deal with
one Director of Studies rather than
many Heads of Departments.

ACTIONS

The Head of Science felt that his
case for more time would be
considered fairly when raised at
top management level.

CONSEQUENCES

Intended All actors received a
measure of satisfaction.
Unintended Introduction of outsider
as Director of Studies who might
not live up to the expectations of
those who welcomed the appointment.

SOURCES OF

The Heads of Departments now met
CHANGE
regularly with the Director of
Studies and he could become a source
of change in the system with the
support of the Heads of Departments.
A new and powerful figure had emerged
in the organisational structure. He
was a new source of conflict dependent
upon the way he defined situations.

Figure 3 The New Stability
2. Case Study 2.

It was late on a Thursday afternoon - 3.30 with school finishing for the day at 4. The Physical Education Department was teaching Form 2 - about 150 boys and girls aged 12/13, and the session was being held on the school’s playing fields. Before it started a young lady teacher had inspected the children's kit and found that a number of pupils were short of various articles which were compulsory items in the school's uniform requirements. The items were compulsory for safety reasons. These children were scolded by the young teacher and one who received this scolding was Jane, a West Indian child who was in care at a local authority children's home, where she frequently gave trouble. Jane regularly neglected to bring these items of clothing. Her background was very disturbed; she had never known her parents but she claimed sometimes to remember having met some of her brothers and sisters. She had run away from the home on a number of occasions. The local authority officials had been gratified to get the child into the school because her record of misbehaviour in primary school was considerable. The child was backward in attainment but of average ability. She told lies and was insolent at times to those in authority in the home and school, though she usually apologised afterwards.

The young teacher knew Jane's background but included her in the scolding session. Jane was insolent and the teacher became rather angry and showed it by her rising colour and by her tone of voice. The children were sent off to their various activities on the fields. A girl in Jane's group asked Jane why she was so rude as that only made the teacher angry which spoilt things for everybody. Jane replied by kicking her critic in the shins. Another child intervened and she too was kicked. These two incidents went unseen by the staff. Within seconds the (same) teacher saw Jane lying on top of another girl who was being beaten viciously in the face. Jane was dragged clear and the bleeding victim was escorted to the school and, within ten minutes, was
being driven to hospital by the (same) teacher at £1p per mile to come out of school capitation funds. (The normal rate was £4\text{1/2} p for school business but hospital cases were treated differently). The mother of the injured child was informed by telephone and she agreed to leave her job at another school to attend at the hospital to enable the teacher to return to school. The other victims were treated for minor injuries to the legs by the school secretary. Jane had departed from the scene and was not seen by the school authorities again.

The Head of Year 2 was sent for as the children were in his general care and he knew each child personally. He had been working all day as an oral examiner in German from nine until four. He was fatigued and had a headache. He was interrupted about 3.45 with the information about Jane but he could not leave the student being examined until 4. He had admitted Jane to the school despite the child's record, though it must be emphasised that heads cannot turn away children who have the requisite entry qualifications. He had made the girl's background known to certain senior staff but would not have given this information in the first instance to the young teacher involved. However, all the information available had been given to her when the child had been reported on a previous occasion for having no equipment and for being insolent. The Head of Year had asked the teacher to be tolerant of Jane, and all the facts were given to the Head of Department when she had complained earlier about Jane's conduct. The Head of Department had made it clear that it was not possible for Jane to pursue the work of her department without the necessary kit, and this was recognised by the school which made such kit compulsory. The Children's Home, where Jane lived, knew of these regulations and Jane had been provided for accordingly. Jane had lost her kit, probably intentionally.

Many other people were involved. The Warden of the Home was telephoned by the Head of Year at 4.30
and he was given an explanation of what had happened and told that Jane was missing from school. The Head of Year asked the Warden to keep Jane at home the following day (Friday) which was prior to a week's holiday period. The whole question of the child's future should be discussed before her return to school. Letters of apology and explanation were sent that evening to the parents of the injured children. Two telephone calls were made to the parents of the child taken to hospital. The Chairman of the School Governors was informed by telephone and he agreed to suspend Jane temporarily. The local education authority was informed accordingly by letter. The Welfare Officer for the school agreed to take up Jane's case again; she had dealt with her on a previous occasion. The Deputy Head (woman) had gone to the scene of the incident soon after it happened and spoken generally to the children. The school secretary made the telephone calls and typed the letters. The head saw and spoke to the injured and discussed with the Head of Year his proposals for dealing with the problem. He spoke also to the Head of Department and to the young teacher. The latter made a written report and signed it, and this went to the local authority: this is the customary procedure following an accident involving injury at school. The Deputy Head reported to the head about her conversations with the children involved.

At a case conference held later, attended by the Warden and his assistant at the Home, a local authority psychologist and the Head of Year 2, the latter was impressed by the jargon and form filling which had been going on for years but felt that little love was shown for the child by those who had her in care. It was reported that Jane occasionally visited her grandfather, who had told her a short time prior to this incident that he was also her father. It was stated that Jane had in a previous Home been friendly with a girl who attended a 'free' school in London. Following the conference the local authority official ruled that because of Jane's known tendency to violence she should be removed from ordinary school, and should wait for a
special school place. Jane was transferred eventually to a "home in London, and the head of the school in this case study, enquiring about her welfare at a later date, learned from one of her friends of her claim to have been raped on her first night in London.

An Action Theory Interpretation, following Silverman, of the above Conflict Situation.

Stability This period was characterised by apparent shared orientations of all concerned towards the treatment of misbehaviour on the part of students and the attitude of staff towards the need for high standards in deportment and in performance of those engaged in Physical Education. However the situation contained all the factors conducive to bring about a confrontation.

The Head of the Physical Education Department was young, well qualified, ambitious, and very conscious of her status. She was married but had no children of her own. Her husband was a senior teacher in another school. The assistant teacher, who was directly involved with Jane, was young, attractive, well qualified and highly thought of in the school. The Head of Year was middle aged, highly qualified with a long experience in schools and he played an important part in top management decision making in the school. He was unmarried and devoted a great deal of time outside of school to educational and pastoral concerns. All three were middle class as were the children involved in the incident with the exception of Jane whose background has been indicated.

The Head of Department took the view that the school authorities, whether they might be the head, the Head of Year or an admission panel acting on behalf of the Governors, should not accept children with poor behavioural records into school in the first place, and she thought also that if such children were in school and were giving trouble continually then they should be dismissed. This last assertion is made often by teachers and parents discussing difficult children, even though it is fairly well known that individual schools have little choice about taking a child who comes into the school's catchment area
and that dismissal from the state system is no easy matter. The Head of Department felt that it was an easy decision to admit a child but that the Departments had the problem of trying to teach the child.

The Head of Department was concerned with setting a high standard in the teaching of her subject. She felt that Jane's example of failing to bring her kit would cause problems on a wide scale at some later date. She felt that the Head of Year tended to judge the child, not in the light of a set of basic standards, concerned with knowledge and ideals, leading towards enlightenment and excellence, but in terms of the child's peer group and by her social background. She felt that the school should put forward high standards and let the child know that she had to reach up to those standards. The Head of Department felt that the Head of Year approach was essentially a soft one, which in the long run would harm the majority of children.

The Head of Year emphasised the concern element. He felt that schools generally should recognise that it is not possible for all children to conform to school rules. He believed that in many ordinary school situations it must be made possible for children like Jane to be allowed to by-pass rules which the majority of children must still be obliged to keep. He had given all the relevant information to the staff and had asked for tolerance in dealing with a very disturbed child.

Personal relationships between these teachers were good. The staff in the Physical Education department were sensitive to the fact that their subject was considered by many to be less important than more academic subjects in the curriculum but there was no claim that the Head of Year 2 held this view. Both Head of Year and Head of Department claimed a share in the other's main concern - the Head of Department would claim to be caring and the Head of Year would claim to be concerned about good teaching and standards. Figure 4 illustrates the balanced situation which preceded the conflict situation described above.
| ROLE SYSTEM | Characterised by consensus. |
| INVOlVEMENTS | Largely moral but with political and social factors. |
| DEFINITION OF PRESENT SITUATION | Favourable. The position had been achieved following a number of years during which the system appeared to be satisfactory to all concerned. |
| ACTIONS | Acceptance of role system. |
| CONSEQUENCES | Intended: Actors were able to perform adequately though reservations held by all concerned. Unintended: Because a balance always had to be achieved between over-all aims and standards always a possibility that either (a) standards set too low or (b) standards set too high with some students suffering under (a) or (b) |
| SOURCES OF CHANGE | Individuals who cannot be contained in balanced system. Expectations of role players and past experience of interaction. |

Figure 4 Stability

Instability This period was characterised by the conflict between Jane and the young Physical Education teacher which led to the conflict situation between the Head of Department and the Head of Year. The young teacher scolded Jane along with other children; she knew that Jane was a particularly disturbed child but she decided to make no exception on this occasion. Jane's past insolent behaviour and her long period of failure with regard to the provision of suitable clothing for the subject probably played a big influence on the teacher's attitude. The teacher knew that she would be supported by the Head of Department and she had no idea of the vicious reaction which was to follow her action. The Head of Year came on the scene after the violence and related it directly to the rebuke administered by the teacher. The Head of Year was bitter about the ugly situation which had arisen because he felt that his advice had been ignored. He could point to the fact that
Jane's friends and other children in her group, even the victims of her violent outburst, were not resentful after the incident and indicated that they understood that Jane was different. When interviewed previously Jane confessed that she could not explain her overreaction at different times to incidents in school life. The Head of Department supported the young teacher without reservation because she understood the difficulties of keeping up high standards when working with difficult children. Figure 5 illustrates the instability of the situation.

**ROLE SYSTEM**
Conflict of expectations and values.
Head of Department not satisfied that her department could operate satisfactorily in situation brought about by Head of Year's arrangements.

**INVOlvements**
Head of Department seeking change.
Head of Year seeking to retain the existing system.

**DEFINITION OF PRESENT SITUATION**
Head of Department thought system unworkable.
Head of Year thought system workable but system required tolerance.
Feelings running high.

**ACTIONS**
Head of Department and her staff protest to head asking for support in their attempt to achieve high standards.

**CONSEQUENCES**
Intended Expression of grievances by Head of Department.
Unintended Effect of dismissal of child from school may have had (a) good (b) bad effect on other students. Unhappy consequences for child concerned who had been happy at school.

**SOURCES OF CHANGE**
Perceived unsatisfactory situation.

Figure 5 Instability
New Stability  This period saw Jane dismissed from the school and the Department concerned might feel that the school community had ruled that if a child refused to conform to the rules then that child would be forced to leave. A certain satisfaction was felt by the staff in the Department concerned which had suffered at Jane's hands over a long period of time. However there was recognition too of the fact that Jane had been dismissed not for her failure to conform to rules about special clothing but because of her violent tendencies. The Head of Year reiterated that certain children needed very special treatment and he hoped that when staff were made aware of certain facts about children that they would show tolerance when discretion demanded it.

The conflict situation outlined required the setting up of a special enquiry by the head and all the teachers involved in Jane's case took part. The head was removed from the conflict situation until the actual incident and then took the position of judge in the enquiry. The Head of Department, the teacher and the Head of Year, each stated his/her position and view of the incident and what had led up to it. There was a certain amount of self-justification present but this quickly gave way to a genuine discussion which clarified the position for all concerned. No solution was found which would ensure that that kind of incident would not happen again. No promise could be given by the Head of Year that he would not admit other Janes, no promise could be expected from the Department that the teachers would discriminate in the future in favour of such pupils as Jane. Despite the difference in emphasis between the two sides the various discussions conducted in a serious manner could not fail to have promoted growth in understanding of both points of view. The confrontation was of benefit to both sides in the dispute. In the event, personal relationships were observed to have improved following the discussions as compared with the strained atmosphere which prevailed during the period of instability. The positive and creative aspect of the meeting was considerable. The structure of organisation and the role specifications did not change as
In one sense the definition of the situation made by the Head of Department in this conflict situation was imposed upon Jane and the Head of Year. There is no reason to doubt that the expulsion had some effect upon other students but whether for good or ill, even from the point of view of the organisation of the school, must be a matter for conjecture. The Head of Department had made her position clear though one may surmise that future definitions of similar situations might be influenced by the experience of Jane. The new stability might give way at any moment should another Jane perform as she did. A proposal to change the organisation so that students who failed to bring their regulation equipment should be supervised by staff from outside the department was over-ruled as it might have to apply also to other departments and could encourage pupils who disliked particular subjects to opt out. Figure 6 illustrates the new stability.

**ROLE SYSTEM**
Shared expectations. No new structure of organisation but a deeper understanding of roles and their expectations.

**INVOLVEMENTS**
Largely moral but with political and social factors.

**DEFINITION OF PRESENT SITUATION**
Favourable.

**ACTIONS**
Acceptance of system.

**CONSEQUENCES**
Intended Each actor had made his/her case and was satisfied that he/she could not have improved on performance.

Unintended The dismissal might be taken as a 'way out' in future difficult situations.

Figure 6 New Stability
3. Some Conclusions which may be drawn from the Case Studies.

At the micro-level the action perspective helps to explain the actors' behaviours, not simply as mechanistic reactions to their roles, but as following from the definitions of the situations as they unfold. They are influenced by their expectations which relate to the ends they seek and these expectations will be affected by their statuses both inside and outside the school, by their ages, sex, qualifications, and other personal factors, and by their past experience of interaction with the participants.

In Case Study 2, Jane provoked a range of reactions from the staff concerned in the incident. The Head of Year role demanded a stress on the caring element but it was for the Head of Year himself to define what this meant in particular situations. His reading of the incident was different from that of the Head of Department and the assistant teacher. Both Head of Year and Head of Department would claim a share in the other's main responsibility as was mentioned earlier. The intention here has been to show that in part their behaviour may be seen to result from extra-organisational influences, in part from their role specifications, and in part from the way they subjectively interpreted the situation which finally led to Jane being expelled from the system. Different people would have reacted in different ways. The same forces were to be seen at work in Case Study 1 which resulted in a change in the organisational structure. It has been stated earlier that one needs to accept the fact that there are many disparate goals in the school situation, and not simply one goal which has to be achieved. The argument being advanced in the second part of this enquiry is that, provided a process of consultation is available, then conflict situations may be resolved because the continuous talking-out at different levels in the organisation may establish whether or not the different possible interpretation of the situation may be seen to be more or less in line with what the staff may see to be the school goal in the light of that particular situation.
This study considers the strains and tensions associated with the relationship between the Head of Department and the Head of Year and seeks to explore and to identify those areas. One of these areas has been identified as that of Philosophy which has been defined as follows: Sometimes the Head of Year has to take an 'over-all' school view which may differ from the subject view of the Head of Department and this causes tension and conflict.

The two case studies which have been discussed have both been concerned with this area of strain and tension. In Case 1, the Head of Year took the view that the balance of periods between subjects was correct and could not see which other subjects would be prepared to give up teaching time. The Head of Department was concerned to increase the teaching time for his subject in order to achieve better examination results and to protect his teachers from having to teach subjects other than Science. In Case 2, the Head of Department took the attitude that the requirements of her subject demanded a firm approach to those students who would not conform whereas the Head of Year took the position that a broader, more tolerant, view was required.

The process leading to the resolution of the conflict situation has been referred to in the preceding discussion. In Case Study 1 reference has been made to the Heads of Departments meeting together, to the Head of Science meeting his own teachers regularly, to top management meetings, to a Director of Studies to represent the Departments at top management meetings. In Case Study 2 reference has been made to a weekly meeting between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments, a special enquiry meeting and a meeting of the Head of Physical Education with his teachers.

Discussion at these meetings often concerned itself with the macro issue of the relationship between the various actors in terms of their role specifications. The functionalist approach would claim to have shown how various parts fit together in the school's organisational structure. This view tends to see the system adjusting itself to meet the needs of changing behaviour by the
actors but does not explain why this is likely to happen when an actor seeks to define a situation in a way completely different from another actor involved in the same conflict situation. By contrast, the action approach stresses that the outcome of a conflict situation may be seen to depend upon the relative capacity of different actors to impose their definition of the situation upon others. In Case Study 2, the Head of Department might well consider that she had achieved this, although the decision to expel Jane was taken by an authority outside the school. This leads to an examination of the macro-problem of the system of expectations that is established as actors pursue their ends in the context of the meanings which they and other actors use in their definitions of conflict situations. These definitions may lead to organisational change and to a more sensitive appreciation of the other’s point of view.

The positive and creative aspects of the various meetings were considerable. Whenever groups of teachers come together to discuss their work and its problems, there is the possibility of a growth in understanding between those concerned, and this point was made frequently by teachers interviewed in this enquiry. It is equally true to make the point that such discussions enable some participants to make use of power resources they may possess to further their own sectional aims. A wider discussion of the implications of such procedures is to be found in the conclusion to Chapter 8. It should be emphasised that 'understanding' in this context does not imply that all staff involved will feel that new positions, which may have been reached between the various parties, will be seen to benefit all concerned. It may be that the compromise which has been achieved will be the starting-off point leading to a new conflict of interests to be resolved at another time.

One of the problems concerned with many meetings of senior staff, whether Heads of Departments or Heads of Years, or the two combined, was found to be the way in
which any growth in understanding was passed on to those staff not present. A considerable responsibility was seen to rest upon those whose duty it was to communicate such understanding amongst the staff generally. Heads of Departments have a duty to inform teachers in their own departments, and this was seen to require careful preparation of meetings. Heads of Years were expected to meet their group tutors or class teachers within the Year structure. If these meetings took place then all staff were seen to progress in their knowledge of new positions reached following conflict situations because all staff belonged either to the departmental or social unit sides of the school.

The various meetings at different levels constituted a system of process, and reference has been made to Benson's dialectical theory which was seen as being essentially a processual perspective. The different ways in which people see things mean that the possibility of change is an ever present constituent in organisations. The school world is part of a social world that is in a continuous state of becoming. Through the process of interaction of the people concerned, organisational arrangements previously made are modified or replaced. Benson's principle of contradiction sees every existing organisational arrangement as being subject to many possibilities dependent upon human action, and the way in which the situation may change is problematic. New social arrangements will emerge which for a time will bring about a new stability, but this situation too contains within itself the possibility of change following new definitions by the participants.

Burns' 'mechanistic' type of management, referred to on page 70, may be applied to some extent to the schools concerned in these Case Studies in so far as the tasks of management were broken down into specialisms, and clearly there was a hierarchical structure in the schools. However, the series of meetings at all levels were intended to keep all members of staff informed of
the way the schools were being run, and the heads of the schools were not expected to be in possession of all the knowledge regarding the different situations. Schools in the past may have tended towards the 'mechanistic' ideal, but the large complex modern school tends towards the 'organic' type in which the school is subject to periods of change and development, during which new problems continually arise. In the new situation all members of staff may be expected to be aware of developments in both academic and pastoral spheres as a result of information being fed to them from committees and working parties, department and year meetings, and full meetings of all staff. The heads of these schools may not know the best way forward at any given time. Innovation may occur at any level of the school, or from outside of the school as for example parental pressure.

There was evidence in both Case Studies of Burns' social systems at work. The formal authority system gave Heads of Departments and Heads of Years particular spheres to operate in furthering different goals which had been accepted as necessary by all participating in the school. Thus Science was accepted as a necessary part of the school curriculum, and the attempt to give all students a good grounding in the subject and to make it possible for them to compete in external examinations was a goal acceptable to the Science Department and the rest of the school alike. The Head of Year had the responsibility to care for the students in his year and his duties concerning Assemblies, Registration, Uniform, Liaison with Parents, Liaison with External Agencies, Homework Schedules, and so on, were sufficiently obvious in the large school to make his role necessary in the view of the staff generally. There was still room for disagreement as to the relative importance of pastoral work vis-a-vis academic training, as there was disagreement between the relative importance of Science vis-a-vis the Arts and the Humanities.

The second of Burns' social systems is concerned
with the fact that individuals compete with each other
to extend the control they have over their own situations.
Clearly the Head of Science in Case Study 1 and the Head
of Physical Education in Case Study 2 were competing
with Heads of Years in trying to increase the control each
had over, in one case, the allocation of time and, in
the other, the standard of behaviour demanded from those
who were being taught. The Heads of Years, though they
might claim to be standing back from the problems and
viewing them dispassionately, could be seen to be
determined to have their own readings of the situations
accepted by all concerned, thus increasing their personal
powers.

The third social system described by Burns, the
need of individuals to further their own careers, was
evident in both cases. All the main participants in the
cases studied would have felt that to have emerged
successfully from the conflict situations would have
shown to others their ability to run their departments
or their years. It is likely that most assistant
teachers, which includes all senior as well as junior
teachers, seek to impress the head because he is in a
position to influence their future careers both within
and outside the school.

In the Case Studies considered in this Chapter
the determining factor in each has been seen to be the
definitions made by individual actors in situations whose
outcomes were seen to be problematic. Does the
problematic nature of the resolution of conflict situations
mean that planning and leadership are at a discount?
The head's role of maintenance includes particular
leadership towards certain goals arising from his experience
and expertise. Can the head still lead in the kind of
consultative system outlined in an earlier Chapter and
seen at work in these Case Studies? It may be said that
one would need a strong faith in the basic rationality
of teachers meeting together to discuss the running of
the school if one is to accept the view that, providing
a due process of consultation and participation in decision-making is available, then conflict will be resolved or at least contained. In the Chapter which follows the head's role in such systems will be discussed in the light of the evidence from this enquiry. The evidence suggests a considerable development and a new concept of headship in large schools.
1. Introduction

The first part of this study was concerned with exploring and identifying areas of conflict between middle management roles. The second part was an investigation into the ways in which such conflict may be resolved so that the 'goals' of the school may be achieved. The investigation in the second stage was conducted through interviews with heads of the schools in the enquiry, during which their organisational procedures for the resolution of conflict between social units and the curricular side were discussed: this data will be discussed in this Chapter. The two Case Studies analysed in the preceding Chapter indicated the need for an organisational structure which would show tolerance towards conflict which emerges between the two sides of school organisation. Other conflict areas exist with regard to school organisation and administration, and the heads' responses to conflict between middle management roles would have to be seen as part of the organisational frameworks set up in their schools to deal with conflict generally. The focus will be on the head's role in the resolution of conflict, a role which would appear to be in process of change.

2. The Traditional Role of the Head and Some Recent Research.

Little research has been conducted on the role of the head in the comprehensive school and Bernbaum's study which he discusses in a recent article (1) is valuable in a consideration of a possible reformulation of the role resulting from the many changes that have taken place in secondary schools in recent times. He refers to the pamphlet entitled 'The Position of a Headmaster' produced by the Headmasters' Association in 1960 (2) which sees the head's role as essentially in the tradition of the public school image (3). One must also take note that organisations which represent teachers' views have a different approach. Thus the Interim Report of the National Working Party of the N.U.T. (4) referring to consultation in schools said this:

"There need be no delay, however, in the
achievement of consultation and we recommend, as an interim measure, that the Union immediately declares it should be the right of all members of staff to be consulted on matters affecting the school in general and their own work in particular, and that it should be obligatory for head teachers to make satisfactory arrangements within their schools for such consultation."

The N.U.T. executive was less sure about the participatory processes that were being advocated, and consultation was seen as a step towards the ultimate position of joint participation of all staff in the organisational framework of the school.

Bernbaum notes that, since the late 1950s, the growth of the large comprehensive schools may have challenged the historical definitions associated with the development of the role of head, and he refers to the growth of power bases in the teaching departments in the large new schools which could limit the power of the head. He points out that the heads' professional associations give no advice on the way they should organise the day-to-day task of running the school, or on long term planning procedures that might be adopted. Both areas are important in this present study. Not only the teaching departments have power to influence the head's course of action but also the social unit divisions which are not mentioned in Bernbaum's research. No advice is given to heads about organisational procedures because the heads who manage the associations do not wish to appear to dictate to fellow heads whose legal position makes them autonomous in their schools.

The evidence in Bernbaum's study supports the view that heads of Grammar Schools are more likely than their colleagues in Comprehensive Schools to see themselves, and perhaps to be seen by others, as having qualities which traditionally have come to be regarded as relevant to the task of being a head. The Grammar Schools are supposed to have embodied 19th century independent school traditions; as mentioned in Chapter 1 it is difficult to say precisely in what sense this was ever true. The head being seen as a father figure whose word was law, Houses, Prefects, these, and other resemblances, would appear to be superficial in any comparison between the 'closed' boarding school of the
19th century and the 'open' day grammar school of the 20th century.

The sample of schools used by Bernbaum was weighted in favour of the Grammar schools. There were two and a half times as many Grammar as Comprehensive (190 as against 77) and the Grammar school one would expect to have been smaller than the Comprehensive. In Chapter 1 of this study the claim was made that the size of the new schools was not merely significant but crucial in the development of structured pastoral systems; the size and diversity of provision in the new schools led to an organisational requirement that could not be met by the traditional role of the head. Bernbaum's study showed the differences in social and educational background of those in charge of the three types of schools - Grammar, Secondary Modern, and Comprehensive. The institutions are so different as to make it unlikely that the heads would benefit from similar backgrounds, ideals, qualities, or from seeing themselves as having similar roles. Yet what is striking about his research is the fact that there appears to be so few marked differences over a wide span of activities. There were no marked differences between the heads of different types of schools on the question of delegation. There was little evidence that over a wide range of tasks the heads of the newer schools see themselves as different in their performance from those in the more traditional schools. Bernbaum concludes that even in the large Comprehensive Schools there is no substantive re-formulation of the role of head. He says that it is difficult to see how there could be without a restructuring of the institutional and organisational arrangements within schools, and between schools and other relevant social institutions.

The point may be made however that because of their legal right to organise structures of organisations within schools to meet the needs of the schools as seen by themselves, heads may restructure as they please. Watts' extreme restructuring of organisational process at Countesthorpe to provide for participation by all the staff required no change in the Articles of Government of his school, and any head could move in the same direction if he chooses. Watts and others are legally liable for the conduct of their schools
and a head may feel in a stronger position to accept such legal responsibility for action that has been decided upon by a majority of his staff rather than the situation where he is responsible for a decision that can be seen clearly to be personal.

In his study of 315 heads of grammar, secondary modern and comprehensive schools, reported on in 1973 (6), Bernbaum revealed that in his sample two areas of responsibility were very infrequently delegated; these relate to qualities of leadership which may be seen to derive from the historical view of the role of the head.

The first of these was that of selecting staff to work in the school. The evidence in the present study showed that the task of selecting staff was not delegated, but in a number of schools there was a convention that the applicants for teaching appointments were invited to the school before the day of interview, and the Head of Department concerned was given the opportunity of meeting the candidates and of submitting reports to the head, and possibly drawing up a list of the candidates in merit order as he saw them. The power of appointment lies with the governors of the school, though the head plays an important part in the selection process. It is not uncommon for a Head of Department to sit on the interviewing panel if the staffing sub-committee has no expert on the subject under consideration, and if there is no inspector of the subject available to advise.

With regard to the second area not delegated, that of obtaining the co-operation of staff for new plans, this would appear to be unusual in view of the data from this present enquiry. In the large school, where areas of authority are delegated to a considerable extent, it would not be considered out of place for leading staff in the school, such as the Director of Studies, to initiate proposals for new plans, and to seek the opinion and support of, for example, Heads of Departments; there would appear to be much less emphasis laid upon the uniqueness of the head's role in innovation.

Among the eight areas which Bernbaum found to
be very infrequently delegated were some which the evidence of this present enquiry showed are in fact usually delegated. Thus Heads of Years were found to be concerned with:

(a) obtaining parental co-operation with the school
(b) dealing with special discipline problems
(c) handling parental complaints.

Heads of Departments and Heads of Years were found to be
(d) utilising personal knowledge of the working of the local authority and its officers.

Further, two schools in this enquiry allowed full staff meetings to be chaired by senior staff, and these meetings took place with or without the head being present. The head was not the only one who was seen as representing the school to the parents and to the local community. More and more in the large school, Heads of Years take on this responsibility with frequent year meetings with the parents, which are not attended by the head. These areas have been the head's prerogative in the past but in recent years, with the advent of the large school, there have been changes. Bernbaum's evidence showed that ten heads from comprehensive schools delegated the handling of parental complaints. This would be the result, in all probability, of those comprehensives being divided into social units in which the Heads of Years carry out the interviewing of parents. The present enquiry indicated that the parents' first point of contact with the school is through the head of the social unit, and the heads deal only with those parents who have failed to get satisfaction at Head of Year level and insist on taking the matter further.

The discrepancy between the findings of this study and that of Bernbaum may be explained partially by the sample of schools used. Grammar and Secondary Modern schools did not have pastoral unit systems which developed with the emergence of the comprehensive; less than one third of the schools in Bernbaum's study were comprehensive and some of the development in the pastoral sphere has taken place since Bernbaum's investigation was carried out. Further, the schools in the present enquiry are all in Surrey which took the lead in the provision of pastoral
services within schools (information about this is contained in the interview with the Surrey Inspector of Schools in Appendix 11). This discrepancy will be considered further in the conclusion.

The emergence of the large schools with their new forms of organisation was referred to in Chapter 1. The growth in middle management structures and the spread of decision-making areas may be seen to have increased the power of the head because of the control he has over the distribution of these posts with their special responsibility allowances. The growth in the number and value of these posts emphasised the existence of systems of differentiated power resources in the organisational structures in schools. The complex system needed to satisfy the diversity of curricular and pastoral provision made the traditional role of the head unrealistic. The comprehensive school is too large, the problems, social and academic, too great, for the head to be in the position to know what is going on in all sectors. In these circumstances, the head may delegate because he is not in a position to do otherwise and not because he thinks that it is necessarily a good thing. The new form of organisation may be seen as a response to the needs of the new schools, and the new structures had important implications for the style of leadership required.

The view that heads have tremendous power resources which affect intimately the lives of members of their staffs was put forward in Chapter 1, and Musgrave, Locke and Poster, were quoted in support of this approach. The power of the head for imposing his own will in any social action concerned with the running of the school remains, regardless of the method of organisation which may be introduced into a school. The head uses his power to set up an organisational system which, in his view, meets the needs of the school. He may seek advice on this from his governors, or from the inspectorate, but the decision is a personal one.

This study is not focused on conflict between the head and his staff, but on the conflict identified as existing between middle management roles; one is concerned with power relationships between individuals and units.
that have positions relative to each other that are basically lateral. This was not always the case. Departments came into the schools first and, because of their different allowances, were on a vertical scale in order of importance. Usually English, Mathematics, and Science were high on the scale. Later, with the increase in the number of special allowances, and the emergence of the pastoral system, the departments and houses or years, took on relationships that may be described as horizontal in the organisational structure.

The power variable can become a major part of the total relationship when conflict issues are involved. Power relationships develop out of, and alter, existing structural arrangements, where organisational structures and processes are in constant interaction. Power is an important resource in conflict, and conflict is part of the normal state of an organisation. The power of the head pervades the whole system of power relationships in the school; whatever the system of organisation which is established to deal with conflict, the whole of the procedures will be influenced by the head's definition of the situation, in so far as this is made known or may be inferred. It is in this context that the writer will discuss alternative models of organisation which exist in large schools.

No considerable reformulation of the head's role was indicated in Bernbaum's research conclusions; his evidence led to his view that the role was still within the traditional perspective. He suggests that there may be alternative models to that which had been dominant in the immediate past; some may advocate administrators skilled in decision-making, whilst others may suggest a non-directive role with due recognition being given to the rights and powers of the staff. It was questionable, in his view, whether heads would be prepared to see themselves in these new roles which are opposed to the dominant historical tradition.

Three models of styles of headship may be discerned: the first, that of a traditional head who may
be seen to be an autocrat, and the second and third following Bernbaum's suggested alternatives: one with an emphasis on managerial techniques and the other stressing the collective responsibility of the staff.

3. A Reformulation of the Head's Role.

It will not be argued in this study that important aspects of the traditional role are not retained by the heads who were interviewed. However, it will be claimed that there is evidence of a considerable reformulation of the head's role.

(a) The head as autocrat. As far as this research is concerned this model is not viable in any empirical sense. Bernbaum refers to Goodwin (7) for a prescriptive description of the traditional role of the head. Goodwin is suspicious of democratic forms in schools and believes that the head's authority should be unquestioned. Baron (8) writing in 1956, says that the assessment of the head as the 'autocrat of autocrats' (9) is no longer valid. In the climate of opinion, both inside and outside the schools, it may be considered much less valid today, and no head interviewed in this enquiry took up such a position. As far as models are concerned, it may be acceptable as being seen to be at one end of a continuum which leads to the other extreme position outlined in the third model. Though the third model is extreme, it will be discussed in some detail because the evidence from this enquiry shows that heads of comprehensive schools have moved a long way from the first model and have in their schools much in common with the organisational process outlined in the third model.

(b) The head as manager. This model, outlined by Colgate (10) stresses the management role of the head as being of primary importance. Colgate maintains that the authoritarian role of the head is obsolete and the head must consult with, and above all, listen to, his colleagues. No evidence is given for this statement. It is made as if it may be considered as the common sense position. If this consultation is with the whole staff there would be difficulty in reaching decisions without
wandering into by-ways. However, if the head limited his consultation to the senior staff, it would mean that oligarchy was being substituted for despotism. (This is what Simon claimed usually happened (11). The conclusion is that the problem requires some form of committee structure which would vary from school to school. The structure of committees may be represented in terms of circles, with the head leading from within, rather than in terms of a pyramidal structure which Colgate felt to be closer to an authoritarian organisation. The emphasis, in his view, was on the head leading.

"If the head teachers do not take the lead and set the standards, who else will?" (12)

The need for change was recognised and change was seen to proceed as a result of consultation carried on in a variety of committees, with the head as the innovator, though Colgate, speaking of himself as head, admitted:

"To be perfectly honest, I don't always know what my aims are or were." (13)

Colgate suggests that the head must carry his staff with him otherwise he might just as well not start at all. He believes it to be perfectly right and proper that the head should make the important decisions.

In model 2, the head sets up a committee structure, with consultation being the rule and delegation being widely practised. The head takes the lead in promoting change and makes the final decisions. The committee structure will vary from school to school according to the organisational system introduced by the head. Later in this study, it will be seen that there is a pattern of committee structures but schools differed in their organisational arrangements and there was conflict in particular schools because of the presence or absence of certain committees. The committee structure makes possible a federal type of decentralisation, which, in simple terms, means a number of teams working on different aspects of school life, with the head leading from within. Each team will be drawn widely from the staff, so that the young and inexperienced may contribute their views and ideas, and in return gain experience in decision making. Colgate admits that his own aims and philosophy as head
will be received with varying degrees of interpretation, understanding, and assent. The ideas of school organisation contained in model 2 may be seen as a considerable advance on those of a traditionalist, autocratic head, who would reserve to himself the ultimate decision in all matters of discipline, organisation, and administration, and who would be opposed to all forms of democratic processes in decision making.

(c) The head as enabler. By contrast with the second model, this one emphasises that the major decisions that shape the curriculum and social organisation of the school should be made by the consensus of the staff. As outlined by Watts (14) this model is organised so that the body that establishes the ruling consensus in the school is a general meeting open to all, including non-teaching staff and students. As well as the general meeting, there are many other decision-making groups, either directly or indirectly responsible to it. Change is brought about as part of a continuous process, and an elaborate structure is established to make possible a kind of continuous discussion of all school problems. Watts claims that, although it might appear that structures dominate, in practice all depends upon the attitudes of the participants and their readiness to use, and if necessary to modify, the structures in order to exercise and to take responsibility for powers placed in their hands through them.

In this organisational setting problems abound, with one set being solved only for another to be encountered. In Watts' view:

"Any conflicts can be resolved by open discussion with reference to them, provided all parties learn to tolerate conflict, use it to identify issues and make compromises in order to reach consensus." (15)

He believes that conflict leads to a compromise between the different viewpoints which in turn leads to consensus; the consensus produces a commitment. A criticism of this might be that such a commitment would only come about if all the staff accept that the majority decision should prevail, and were prepared to carry it out. Watts asserts
that the functioning of the organisational process presents grave difficulties only when the staff neglects to get together regularly for talk. He claims that, as a result of his experience in growing to appreciate the strength of consensus, he learned to tolerate ambiguity and delayed decision-making, which accompany democratic processes. The word consensus may be misleading but its meaning here is the achievement of a compromise solution which may be of a temporary nature.

Watts refers to the many important functions which remain with the head in a participatory form of school government such as he established, and he sees his role as being concerned with making possible, and participating in, a school organisation in which teachers and students have determined to a large extent the conditions under which they work.

4. Some Reflections on these Models.

The model of the head as enabler, expounded by Watts, is as prescriptive and ideological as is the other extreme position of the autocratic head as seen by Goodwin. They are descriptions of the way two heads see their roles in schools. They are personal perspectives of the way organisational structures should operate. The value assumption is made by both that an ideal system has been discovered. The trend in recent times has been a movement away from the autocratic head towards the head as manager and enabler. Musgrove (16) says that 'dominative' leadership styles have become as discreditable in schools as in factories and whereas the earlier (more autocratic) head came in to morning assembly like Jehovah, the contemporary head 'sidles on to the platform hoping to remain as unnoticed as possible.' Whatever the leadership style, it may have little reference to actual power positions in schools and Hargreaves' comments which follow, concerning manipulation and social engineering, may explain much of what goes on in schools.

Consultation and discussion in a multiplicity of committees play an important part in models 2 and 3. Clearly the leading participants in the committee structures would be middle management staff involved in the social units and on the curricular side of the school, and areas of conflict between them, which were analysed in Chapter 6, would play
an important part. Heads of Departments and Heads of Years would meet separately and, in a number of schools in the present study, would have joint meetings too, and every school would have internal departmental and year meetings. Middle management staff would play a leading part in full staff meetings, and in some schools in this enquiry, representatives of the pastoral and academic sides joined in meetings of top management. These meetings have been referred to in Chapter 3, and in the evidence outlined in Chapter 6. In model 3, the consultation and discussion are part of a participatory democracy in which the head may be seen to be but one participant, though he cannot be seen to be on the same level as other participants. Because of the power he exercises which has been referred to in Chapter 1 it is impossible to estimate the effect of his particular contribution to any discussion. Hargreaves (17) discusses head and teacher relationships and shows how for many reasons these are affected by the head's power. Thus, for example, the relationships between head and middle management may be seen to be crucial by the latter in respect of promotion. In model 3 the full committee is a decision-making body in the fullest sense whereas in model 2, though consultation takes place at all levels, the final decision may be made by the head. Peters (18) makes the point about the necessity for clarity on this:

"Nothing is more frustrating in democracy than to be summoned to go through making a decision and for it to be revealed, in the end, that the situation is really one of consultation."

The study at Nailsea (19) revealed the danger of the staff feeling that consultative processes may be a means of manipulation, and this impression may be given even though it may be untrue. The danger is that democratic processes may be seen as a sham and a process to secure support for pre-determined policies. Hargreaves (20) is critical of 'consultation' and 'delegation' where heads are concerned; he claims that heads look to industrial experience for 'management techniques' which are more subtle, but at the
same time essentially manipulative, in their approach to human relations. It is his view that heads seek to change their images from being autocrats to being equals with their teachers but since the change is not associated with a shift in power the autocracy survives:

"Autocracy can survive such change of image unscathed; the despotism remains, whether or not it is exercised benevolently." (21)

Thus the head may be seen to be adopting democratic procedures to secure the compliance of his subordinates and in this regard he may make use of co-optation and democratic ideology. The head who constantly seeks to legitimate the school's activities either to the staff or to outside forces, such as the parents or local education authority, may use self-defensive strategies such as giving a share of authority to threatening groups by inviting their participants to take part in new committees which he may establish. In this way he may bring about a period of equilibrium which will enable the work of the school to proceed as before and in the way that he desires. The leaders of the Tennessee Valley Authority co-opted local people whom they saw as threatening, by offering them some executive authority (22). Such co-optation is problematic in its consequences which may be functional or dysfunctional for those who lead. In ways such as this, the head of the school may hold on to his power whilst appearing to be adopting a more democratic approach.

Hargreaves concludes that heads should be abolished in their present form and that if those involved in running the school had more skill in taking the perspective of the 'other', and recognising the meaning and validity of the values, opinion, and conduct of 'others' involved, then, though a single solution to problems may not be found, at least relationships would have been established within which the resolution of conflict has more chance of success. Manipulation may be seen to be possible in all organisational systems, and it is not clear why role allocation, commitment
to institutional objectives, supervision and systematic job specification, and other aspects of a 'management' approach, should leave out of account elements in the life and work of schools that are of enduring significance. Hargreaves' reference to the need to take account of different definitions of conflict situations is in line with what may be termed an 'action approach' to the study of organisations, which takes into account the motivations which actors bring to their work. The 'open' committee, which makes possible the expression of different viewpoints, would appear to be of value in this regard.

Many of the problems and difficulties with which the head has to deal are endemic in human organisation. According to Taylor (23) heads have to live with a great weight of ambiguity and are able to display sound judgement in reconciling and resolving such ambiguity. It is this quality of judgement, in his view, that is central to the resolution of the great majority of the problems that face the head. Watts, too, was concerned with the ambiguity inherent in so many school situations, and he found he had to learn to live with it whilst he sought his solutions through a staff consensus. By contrast, Taylor supports model 2 in seeing the head as the decision maker. He spoke of:

"When it is time (for the head) to compromise and when to stand firm, when a decision is premature and when it is timely." (24)

Taylor follows Hargreaves in expressing his anxieties about the application of management techniques to schools. Thus school situations are problematic and ambiguous; management approaches might offer the possibility of order and control but the procedures could be inimical, perhaps, to values concerned with respect for personality, individual autonomy, privacy and self-development, or the competence of professional colleagues. Why such procedures may neglect human values more than a situation in which the head's authority and power are paramount is unclear.

Commenting on the criticism in recent years of consensus models of society and institutions, and alternative
conflict models which recognise differences in interest
groups within the organisation and seek to explain social
order and change without recourse to assumptions about
shared values, Taylor has suggested that in some hands
this conflict model has been an encouragement to a more
vigorous explanation of the basis of social control, and
of the structures and social processes that are needed
if non-revolutionary change is to take place within a social
and political framework that is both ordered and democratic.
He insists that such process must still be seen to be
essentially rule governed. There must be an agreed
institutional framework for the resolution of conflict. One
of the ongoing tasks of any institution, in his view,
is to identify that minimum of rules that is essential to
its operation, and to ensure that these are incorporated
into structures and principles of procedures and learned
by individual members.

This caution with regard to the introduction of
management techniques in school would appear to be timely,
though it is ironic that one who has encouraged and taught
many heads to 'manage' schools better should now fear the
direction being taken by many in the ways they have
structured their schools. Poster (27) has also referred
to the dangers of the wholesale application of business
management theory and techniques to educational institutions,
and he suggests that such theory can be of use only if it is
first assimilated and then applied. Taylor does not provide
evidence for his misgivings, and admits that his views
in this matter are strongly impressionistic. He feels that
there is much to be gained from a greater awareness of
the value of social processes but fears that such
procedures offer the possibility of order and enhanced
control of difficult situations, but bring with them
unforeseen consequences (26). The response to this might
be that all systems of organisation are problematic in their
consequences, and the least that can be said for a system
that encourages greater participation in decision making
by the staff is that the participants may be seen to have
had some say in the determination of their working conditions.
The particular powers of individuals and groups to define situations in ways favourable to themselves will play an important part in whatever decisions are reached. The problems that arise in reconciling the legitimate interests of different groups, both inside and outside the school, may be seen to be the head's task, and Taylor believes that this is why the heads are paid more and have more power; he regards the head as one with sound judgement, who is aware of:

"the finer nuances of interpersonal feeling and interaction....having the empathy with individual staff and pupils...being able to put together seemingly unrelated facts in a way that reveals their essential connections." (27)

This description is similar to Ree's (28) who summarises the role of the head as someone who:

"is called upon successively and indeed simultaneously to play the parts of listener, encourager, dissuader, reporter, watcher, judge, critic, decision taker and on occasions commander."

There may be more safety in planning a system of problem solving groups, in a management orientated structure, than expecting such leader types to emerge from the present system of appointing heads. Poster (29) refers to the over-stress laid on the charismatic qualities of leadership and the undervaluation of the merits of collective responsibility. The move towards group responsibility for decisions made in the large comprehensive school is indicated by Simon (30):

"It had early been realised that, in the large comprehensive schools, the traditional roles of head and assistant staff were no longer appropriate. Inevitably there had to be devolution of powers - normally from the head to heads of departments on the academic side, and to heads of houses (or 'year groups') to care for the pastoral responsibilities that were seen to be essential from the start of the movement to comprehensive education. Various forms of more or less democratic (or, more usually, oligarchic) structures developed in comprehensive schools throughout the country in the late fifties and sixties, often involving full staff meetings, departmental meetings, year or house staff meetings, with
usually two committees at the top - of heads of departments or heads of houses (years) - who worked directly with the head teacher."

This development was described in Chapter 1.

5. The Structures of Committees and Discussion Groups in Comprehensive Schools in this Enquiry

The means referred to by Simon were the subject of investigation in this study, which was conducted by interviews with the heads of the schools involved. What has emerged has been a picture of a highly complex set of committees and discussion groups in each school, and although each school may be seen to be different and to have its own particular problems, it is not difficult to discern a pattern of meetings as indicated in Table 7.

Seven of the ten schools of this present enquiry held top management meetings weekly and two of the others held Head of Department/Head of Year meetings weekly, which were regarded as top management groups. The remaining school had a monthly cycle of meetings, one of which was of top management. Heads of Department and the Heads of Pastoral Year groups met separately in most of the schools and this highlights the division of the schools along these lines. Full staff meetings occur in all schools once a month; this is an average figure as one school had weekly staff meetings, some met every three weeks, and no school had full staff meetings less than twice a term. The department heads met with their teachers and the year heads with their tutors monthly. This again is an approximation; some departments and years met more frequently, some weekly, and some small departments rarely met. There was some difficulty experienced in holding formal meetings in small departments; there might be only two or three teachers concerned who met informally daily where a suite of rooms were shared, e.g. in Art, Music, Home Economics. Only three schools out of ten reported joint meetings of Heads of Departments and Heads of Years and this was surprising.
In ten comprehensive schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>HY</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>HD/HY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wmt</td>
<td>wmt</td>
<td>wmt</td>
<td>wmt</td>
<td>wmt</td>
<td>wmt</td>
<td>wmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TM = Top Management
HD = Heads of Departments
HY = Heads of Years
FS = Full Staff
D = Departmental
Y = Year Tutors
w = weekly
m = monthly
t = termly

Gaps in the table indicate that no meeting was reported. The table does not give data relating to working parties, and other special groupings of staff, see text p. 236

Table 8
A number of Heads of Departments complained about the absence of joint meetings. Where they were held they constituted large groups of 25/30 members. Gaps in the table indicate that no meeting was reported. The table does not give data relating to working parties, and other special groupings of staff, which were frequently called together to discuss and work out policy documents which could then be discussed at other meetings, either of top management or full staff. These working parties contained usually middle management representatives from both sides of the school. Top management meetings frequently included Heads of Years, whereas Heads of Departments were represented, if at all, by a Director of Studies.

Table 7 indicates a large number of meetings taking place and though the final decisions may remain in the hands of the heads it is clear that the schools in this study have moved a long way from the situation where democratic forms may have been viewed with suspicion, and where the head's definition of a situation would go unquestioned.

Though the over-all impression from the evidence given by the heads was that most schools would be placed in model 2 (because most heads reserved the final decision to themselves) yet it was Watts' comment referred to in the description of model 3 that appears over and over again in this enquiry, viz. his reference to the necessity for the talking out of problems and to his belief that conflict can be resolved through open discussion with reference to the conflict, provided there is tolerance and an agreement to compromise.

6. The Heads' Recognition of Conflict in Schools.

The existence of conflict in the schools in this enquiry was investigated and reported on in Chapter 6 and the interviews conducted in Enquiry 5 (Appendix XIV) contained references by the heads to conflict between social units and the curricular sides in the schools. Thus in School 1:

"There are problems, and conflict between the two sides (curricular and social units) is to be expected at times. There's trouble sometimes about role specifications but we expect some difficulties in this period of change. There
may be some resentment about the year appointments."

Criticism from the Heads of Departments about the way the school was structured was referred to by the head in School 2:

"...there has been criticism about this. There is conflict between the academic and pastoral people. Some departmental heads speak openly about the way the pastoral people have been appointed and there have been remarks about too much structure in the school."

A comment from the head of School 3 that:

"Without any doubt the pastoral people in the school are the most important. The trend is obviously away from the curriculum side to the pastoral side on promotion."

received support from the evidence collected in Enquiry 4, where a Head of Department in that school said:

"The senior departments felt that the pastoral case was being put before their voice."

She talked about the conflict between the two sides being 'out in the open' in the previous few months. However:

"Because we have looked at it at a very senior round table meeting we all feel happier than we did."

This open conflict was referred to by the head who claimed that the structure of organisation spread the areas of conflict. He recognised the existence of conflict between the pastoral and departmental sides and asserted that the system would resolve it if given the chance. The conflict which had been expressed by Heads of Departments was not resolved by the meetings that took place, though the exchange of views, which were very frank, left the Heads of Departments feeling better disposed towards the situation than they had been.

Conflict was found in School 4 and mention was made specifically of it in connection with general philosophy, job specification and time, whilst in School 6, the head spoke in favour of conflict between those on the pastoral and academic sides:
"I believe in some conflict. I think it's a good thing. I believe it can be creative."

The difficulties involved in bringing the curricular and social unit sides of the school together was referred to by the head of School 8:

"We (then) have two complete systems working in the school and I would agree with you wholeheartedly how to make them gel together so that you're not worried about the difficulties is the problem. I have seen in this school that the pastoral side has been in conflict with the departmental heads because they feel that it is difficult to decide just whose job it is at different times to do a particular thing."

The head of School 9 spoke of a strongly developed pastoral side which went back over the years, and was the result of much hard work on the part of teachers and had produced a somewhat unique relationship between staff and pupils and parents. This had encouraged a considerable unity of purpose and in his view the strong pastoral element in his school must have created better conditions for the teaching departments. This may be seen as an assumption in that it is unlikely that any serious attempt at an evaluation would have been made by the head concerned. This is the theory upon which the pastoral system rests, viz. that it enables the work of the large school to proceed because it breaks down the school into manageable units and the teaching departments are likely to achieve better results because the school's social problems are organised through a pastoral system. This head added that some departments felt that too much stress was placed upon the pastoral side, but he considered that these departments may be ones with few problems anyway because they catered for the better motivated pupils. One of the departmental heads in that school confirmed that in his view 'too much went on' on the pastoral side.

The head of School 10 spoke of the historical roots of conflict between the two sides in that the school was once a grammar school; when re-organisation came the Heads of Departments were already in office and the need was for a pastoral structure. He continued:

"The pastoral (side) has come to play such an
important part in the life of the school and there is some resentment felt by some of the senior Heads of Departments who feel that they have been badly treated in some way or other. The departments get the top allowances but they can see that there is less need to consult them about wide areas of school life. Some of the departmental heads have moved over when vacancies have arisen and I think they have been wise from the point of view of promotion prospects.

There was a recognition by all the heads who were interviewed that conflict existed in their schools in the relationships between the pastoral and curricular sides, and that most criticism and resentment regarding the organisational system came from Heads of Departments. Some of the heads made it clear that they relied heavily upon the pastoral side in the running of their schools, and the Heads of Departments appeared to be excluded from consultation about wide areas of school life which previously would have come within their sphere of influence. This gave them more time to concentrate on curricular matters but many felt uneasy about the growth in power of the pastoral side relative to the curricular side.

7. The Heads' Response to Conflict

Conflict between the curricular and social unit sides was acknowledged by the heads and their response to this may be seen to be a complex system of committees to discuss problem situations in an attempt to bring together the two sides in a participatory system of management. What follows are brief quotations from the interview data (Appendix XIv) to illustrate the organisational response to the recognition by the heads of the existence of conflict. The purpose of the committee structure may be seen to be the desire to achieve a consensus by a talking-out process.

It is difficult to define precisely what the heads mean by consensus, which is a term that occurs repeatedly in the interviews. It would be assumed that it has a common usage and does not refer to anything particularly sociological. The writer takes it to mean the agreement reached by a majority of participants about a proposed action in the light of the facts of the situation, in so-
far as these are known. What kind of a majority is not clear; most heads would not accept a simple majority. Some spoke of a good majority. The writer has taken the situation to be that the heads in the enquiry schools endeavour to achieve the situation where a good (variously defined) majority of teachers support any proposed action. (In the writer's school, two thirds of the staff have to support any proposed change of policy before it becomes effective.) Complete consensus is impossible if only because the processes of communication are full of imperfection and, in any case, the definitions of the same situations by different people will vary. Heads still reserved the right to make a final decision even against the majority though this was seen as a purely theoretical situation to satisfy the legal requirements of the Articles of Government of the schools.

The talking-out process was referred to by all the heads in the enquiry. One said:

"It's not just a question of giving a decision but of our reaching a decision on a plan of action in the best interests of all... We talk around problems to achieve consensus."

He spoke of a sub-group formed from the Heads of Departments' group:

"to discuss and bring back suggestions for change and their plan was knocked about and again agreed by consensus."

The head of school 2 said that the committees were so grouped that everyone on the staff had an area in which he could help to frame decisions, and that these decisions were arrived at as a result of consultation.

One heard in school 3 of things requiring a lot of talking out at all meetings and of decisions at policy meetings being taken by consensus. The head went on to say:

"...I couldn't in all honesty go against the wishes of the staff. I think I could say that it is established practice that you need a good majority to make a change in policy."
In talking about a particular situation he concluded:

"The solution came out of discussion. The democratic process had solved it."

The claim was made by the head in school 4 that his task was not easier when large sectors of decision making were shared as they were in his school. He supposed that the easiest thing would be to have an autocratic situation where everyone accepted his decisions and implemented them without question; a structure of decision-making, involving a monthly cycle of meetings with consultation at all levels, which allowed feedback from the various meetings, was a wearing process, but this was the price he was prepared to pay to establish a participatory system which would cater for the conflict that was to be expected when different viewpoints were allowed free expression.

Social change was made possible in school 6 where the head spoke of the house system being disbanded 'with the support of the majority of staff' and of a year system being organised 'with the full approval of the staff.' When talking of the discontinuities in role playing in his school, he commented:

"I feel the strength of open meetings is that these gaps quickly come to the surface and people come to realise their responsibilities."

"When trouble arises between people I expect them to sit down and work out between them what is the best system, what will work."

This school was unusual in being the only one to have a full staff meeting weekly and the head spoke of its value. In an informal way the staff were introduced to all the activities that were going on in the school during that week, and specific problems were raised and given a brief hearing. There was strong support for working parties that were set up frequently following an initial airing of a topic at the weekly meeting.

An attempt was made in school 8 to solve the problem of conflict by careful job specifications and procedures which had feedback systems of all kinds, and the
head referred to smoothing out things through the clearance system, a series of committees which had as their aim the need for close relationships between different power groups in the school. The head spoke of the criticism that had been made that there were too many meetings, and his was not the only school where that complaint was voiced by members of staff including the head. A planned structure of discussion meetings and working parties, which were all seen to be necessary by the head to make possible the talking-out of the various problems that were continually arising in administration and teaching were not seen in the same light by all the staff. Initial organisational systems, in every case, may be seen to result from decisions made by the head. In so far as a democratic system is thereby established it may be assumed that change is possible if a sufficient consensus of opinion in favour of it makes itself heard.

The data from the interviews with the heads reveals a common approach in their attempt to resolve conflict. This involves a structure of organisation in which members of staff freely and collectively participate in a consultative process with regard to the alternative approaches which may be made towards the problems of school life, whether these be pastoral or curricular. What follows is an appraisal of the success of these attempts, making particular reference to Watts, an enabling head who believes consensus is possible, provided the process of talking-out is adhered to, and the situation is characterised by tolerance and the acceptance of compromise as a way forward.

8. Conclusions.

It is crucial to the organisational arrangements which encourage the talking-out procedure that there should be an institutionalisation and tolerance of conflict as outlined by Corner (31). Without this, the multiplicity of conflicts which may characterise the 'open' staff conference would disrupt the consensual basis of the relationships in the school. Watts considers that it is very doubtful whether an existing school could go over completely to a participatory approach; Countesthorpe started with the
head's clear announcement of his intention to run the school in a particular way. With the staff agreed on the framework of rules for the resolution of conflict and the possibility of change any conflict could be resolved by open discussion, provided all parties learned to tolerate conflict and to make use of it to identify issues (32).

Watts (33) described the constant, on-going discussion of new approaches and of the optimal organisational structures that he felt to be necessary to realise the school's objectives. He spoke of the staff as a whole arriving at a consensus as to objectives and procedures, and of the way the initiative for change may come freely from any source rather than solely from the top of the organisation. He admitted that his school staff appeared to observers and to themselves to be a disputatious lot, readily airing grievances and criticising each other's views, and all the time expecting and taking for granted the high degree of mutual tolerance that this required. He said (34):

"It is another outcome of our openness that our differences are laid bare, because we believe that only in this way will attitudes and practices be modified so as to bring us to a consensus."

Model 3 may be considered by many to be the extreme position with regard to organisational structures in comprehensive schools, and yet there is much in the evidence of this enquiry to suggest that schools are moving towards the position that Watts outlined: the resolution of conflict may come about through open discussion in structured groups.

Gilson (35) spoke of a situation in his school where a combined meeting of Heads of Years and Heads of Departments was gradually tending to be the academic board concerned with rule making for his school:

"This seems to work because people have their apprehensions altogether. Heads of Years have got apprehensions, Heads of Department have got apprehensions, and if you can create a situation in which people are free to express their apprehensions, however daft it may sound to everybody else, then nobody bothers to take offence. We are all prepared to say daft things
and nobody is going to take you up and say: 'But yesterday you said this.' It's that state of mind which is the healing balm of insecurity.... Almost any member of staff can come along with his point of view. They're used to talking about it. They know that from time to time they will get the opportunity to talk... I think the thing that's come out of the last ten years of my experience is the tremendous power that comes from group discussion and the readiness to sit down, like we are now, talk off the top of our head and say things. If you're still insecure and defensive then you tend not to listen to what people are saying but to be critical of some of the things that they say.... I know that if a group of us can go on in this way long enough, enough sense comes out of it which is so valuable that if you knew that that would have been the end product you would have gone to an awful lot of trouble to get it. And whenever a group of people sit around and talk, ninety per cent of it is mush but ten per cent of it represents an advance."

Gilson's view of leadership was similar to the views expressed by Watts in that he saw leadership as not being concerned with telling people what to do, but in setting up a situation where they evolved for themselves what they ought to do. He saw this as being important because what people evolved for themselves as a solution to a problem was likely to be more effective than having a decision made for them by others. All conflict situations were to be seen as problematic and there could be no absolutes where solutions were being sought. If people were going to have to make decisions, then they would be concerned in a different way from that in which decisions were made for them by others.

Silverman's view was referred to in Chapter 1: the ongoing consensus between the members of an organisation was the only way in which we can speak of an organisation, like a school, having goals, and the point was made about the difficulty of a school committing itself to a set of goals. In model 2, which has some important resemblances to the traditional view of the head, Colgate was able to admit that, as a head who was expected to lead, he did not always know what his aims were. This would be because many diverse goals were being pursued concurrently. Nailsea's
continuous staff conference was similar to that suggested by Watts in model 3, though the head at Nailsea retained many aspects of his traditional role. The problematic nature of what might be termed 'the good of the organisation' is to be seen in the way the heads in this enquiry refer to the need to achieve a consensus which would produce a plan, in the words of the head of School 1: "in the best interests of all."

Clearly a staff consensus need not be in the best interests of a number of participants. The discussion might have enabled certain actors to use strategies to further their sectional aims and power. Some of those who participate have greater relative ability to impose their definitions of situations on others. Groups support each other for their own reasons. A conscious drive from the head, with the support of some senior colleagues, may achieve success and this drive from the top may be resisted or have undesired or unforeseen consequences. The response by lower order participants may be unexpected. The power of the individuals involved, as determined by their status in the organisation, is no guarantee of a particular response from the rest of the group. What may be claimed for this talking-out of problem situations as a method of determining goals is that active participation in the process of decision-making is taking place. Control over vital information is a power which may be held by many who have power in the organisation; the head has an obvious advantage in this respect though, in an open situation, relevant information may be teased out by questioning. Unions and other groups have access to much information from the local education authority and, because all maintained schools have standard allocations with regard to such matters as staffing ratios and finance, there is not a great deal that may be considered to be confidential. The attempt to achieve solutions to problems between the curricular and social units, as indeed to other areas of conflict in school, was seen to take place through a democratic process in which every member of staff had an area in which he could help to frame decisions.

It is not possible to say whether the solution
achieved at any time by consensus is 'right' for the organisation in any objective sense. If it is seen to be the best solution by the majority of those involved that would be the most that could be claimed. The solutions may be seen to be part of an on-going accommodation. Silverman's approach, which considers the action of an organisation over a period of time, was described in Chapter 7, and the stages of stability, instability, and new stability, showed how each new stage of the action was an accommodation of interests which would eventually lead to new conflict and a renewed search for alternative arrangements. Coser (36) pointed out that conflict indicates a rejection of a previous accommodation between groups. Once the respective powers of these groups have been ascertained, a new stability, or equilibrium; will emerge, and the relationships can proceed on a new basis. The Case Studies analysed in Chapter 7 illustrated this.

A constant modification of power relations is proceeding in an organisational structure which tolerates conflict as a means of re-adjustment of norms and power relations. No organisation may allow any, and every, antagonistic claim immediate expression, and a screening procedure in the form of groupings of staff at different levels has been referred to in Chapter 4.

In no sense was the multiplicity of committees seen to be an easy way forward, and the process of talking-out, which so often involved acrimony and bitterness, must be seen itself as an important area of stress for those involved. The reconciliation of the different interests, through a system of interlocking work groups, was seen by the heads to depend on the value of collective responsibility of all who participated, rather than on the charisma of the head. The heads claimed that it was in this way that the power and energy of the staff may be involved. Reference has been made to the possibility of the head manipulating his staff in a democratic setting. Other staff, too, may engage in this activity. In Chapter 2, a quotation from Crozier was used to indicate that an individual is
free to play his own game in any organisational system. Middle management staff, who are in dominant positions with regard to various kinds of resources in a school, may make use of the democratic setting to impose their definitions on situations to seek advantages for themselves. Burns' three social systems, referred to in the same chapter, indicate various modes of self-advancement for one who may adjust the ends of the organisation, more or less, to serve his individual interest. The head remains the one with greater opportunities in this regard.

The on-going consensus between the participants about the purposes of their interaction may be seen to determine at any time whether particular interests and goals may be functional or dysfunctional. Those who represent the different interests may define their goals in their own ways but the consensus of a decision-making group, which includes their representatives, was seen to be the determining factor. The school may be seen then, in Benson's (37) terms, as in 'a continuous state of becoming.' The organisation and its goals may change as a result of the interaction of the people who participate.

A reformulation of the role of the head would appear to be taking place in the light of the evidence of this enquiry. The complexity of the organisation of the large school requires considerable delegation of decision-making. The head was seen as seeking harmony in the relationships in general, and in particular, between the curricular and pastoral sides of the school. Confrontation was not seen as damaging when it took place in decision-making groups which set out to seek solutions to conflict in the light of the facts of the case. Problem solving groups were found in every school in the enquiry, and the writer found a toleration of non-conformity which would appear to be a comparatively new phenomenon and allowed for individual definitions of particular situations. Solutions were found to problems by a democratic process of talking-out the alternative courses of action. The existence of the groups, committees, and working parties, indicated a co-operative approach which may have done much
to limit the amount of destructive conflict. The

group meetings did not make interpersonal rivalry between
individual staff and groups impossible, and at times
the heads referred to the ease with which some staff
made use of the group to express personal attitudes. The
key role of the head was seen to be maintaining the staff
as a group by ensuring that suitable structures were allowed
to operate, and by acting at times as mediator between
conflicting interest groups.

Coser's (38) views on the toleration and
institutionalisation of conflict were seen to underly much
of the organisation of model 3. The many meetings at all
levels were seen to represent a screening procedure of the
sort that enabled some heads to say that the final
meetings of full staff groups were relatively quiet because
so much had been talked-out at earlier stages in the
procedure. It must be stated, however, that schools are
still in the early stages of such open meetings, and
many staff, particularly those more senior in age and
experience, may feel inhibited in such new situations.
School goals were being clarified at each stage of the
talking-out process. The opportunity remained, in all
full staff meetings, to raise any topic, and this
meant that no 'realistic' demand could be blocked at earlier
stages. The majority view would express itself at such
full meetings with regard to whether the topic should be
referred back to an earlier stage for discussion.

Though the heads may not be aware of the kind of
theoretical analysis outlined in Chapter 2, in particular,
that of Silverman and Benson, their pattern of organisation,
based on their experience in running large schools, laid
emphasis on organisational process which enabled the
individual to define particular conflict situations, and
through problem solving discussions advance to new definitions
which are productive of change.
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CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

The educational world has been divided over the issue of the school being seen as either pursuing academic goals or other ends and purposes. Critics have claimed that comprehensive schools tend to relegate academic goals to a lower place in their educational priorities as compared with the requirements of pastoral care; this may be said to follow from what may be described as a deeper understanding and recognition of the human element in the community of the school and in the learning situation. It may be accepted that learning is an individual process and that education takes place in the stress of a community of individuals. Authority and arbitrary decisions have become inappropriate in society generally and in schools in particular, and consensus seeking appears to have become the order of the day.

The evidence from this enquiry may suggest that the critics have a good case and that a dichotomy between the academic and pastoral sides exists. Certainly this study has revealed the danger of such a situation appearing in a school. The position taken by the writer is that academic and pastoral care are interdependent; we need to take account of the human arrangements that we are functioning within if we hope to convey a body of knowledge with some degree of efficiency. The way people feel about a learning situation is more important than we have been led to realise in the past. A communication of concern for the person may encourage all staff to realise that they will pursue their functions better if they spend part of their time being concerned with the human variabilities of their clients.

The emergence of middle management structures concerned with departmental and social responsibilities has been shown to be associated with tensions in the school community between the values which focus on personal relationships and those which focus on a rigorous training of the mind and, in a sense, the issues of the debate in
society over the purposes of schools have been a source of conflict within each school where the two sides of the school's organisation have competed for scarce resources.

The move to large school units introduced the need for new strategies of human management and the resolution of conflict has been seen to be an important function of the head's role, which, it has been claimed, may be in process of reformulation. The large school has a diversity of goals and it has been asserted that an on-going consensus between the members of staff is the method used by the schools in this enquiry to establish particular goals. Solutions to conflict situations have been seen to be problematic and the subject of continuous discussion by those involved in the school's system of consultation and decision-making bodies. What appears to be happening is that a move is being made by many heads to adjust organisational procedures in the direction of sophisticated social arrangements in which individuals, both staff and pupils, evolve for themselves what they ought to do. The head has been seen as one who organises so that harmony may be established in relationships within the school community so that conflicting interests may be reconciled. Organisational change may be expected to follow a process of problem solving exercises in a complex structure of decision-making groups.

The allocation of power and different status positions within the school has a tremendous influence upon behaviour, and power may be exerted by those in middle management positions though pre-eminently the advantage lies with the head. The head's structure of organisation may be seen to involve a toleration of incompatibles which allows social change to take place. Such toleration may exist in a system of procedural process which will determine whether the particular conflict is functional or dysfunctional in the view of those who participate in the process. If power is shared does this mean that the head becomes redundant? In so far as he is seen to be the sole decision maker in a wide area of administration the answer must be in the affirmative. But there are areas of administration that may belong to a head even in the most democratic school, and this
study has found that, whatever the democratic nature of the organisation of a school, the legal power of the head remains and his position as first citizen is unchallenged. His access to information and his control over promotion with regard to his colleagues gives him great power.

Democratic organisation in schools, involving consultation and participation, in every case results from the head's decision and no evidence was found which suggested that staff had forced such procedures on reluctant heads. It may be assumed that, in so far as such procedural process which aims at consensus is in keeping with the signs of the times, whatever they may be, the heads have been among the first to read them. Some of the evidence in this enquiry showed that there were experienced staff who looked back with nostalgia to the days when autocracy prevailed.

Perhaps the heads, in reading the signs, have done so in the hope that they may hold back more far reaching legal changes which may make possible staff participation in school government as a matter of right belonging to each member of staff. Richardson (1) was particularly concerned in her study at Nailsea to search for a greater understanding of the nature of leadership. She spoke of the central issue being the nature of authority and the exploration of staff relationships. She saw the structural division of the pastoral and curricular sides, which grew up to cope with the expansion taking place in schools, as a threat to the integrity of the teacher's task. To her there was danger in the apparent fragmentation of the leadership roles exercised by the head and his senior colleagues, though she recognised a possible creative aspect where organisational procedures were adequate. The finding of this enquiry would be that in so far as the schools have become orientated towards pastoral considerations, at times at the expense of curricular concerns, that the heads are responsible and may take credit or blame accordingly.
In his historical outline of the role of
the head Bernbaum (2) asserts that those who choose to
emphasise the administrative features of a headmaster's
role as being new are not strictly accurate. He points
out that administrative work, ranging from low level
clerical record-keeping to the general planning and
implementation of the whole work of a school, has a
long history. However, he notes the growth during the
1950s in the size of the schools, and the accompanying
developments in their educational provision, as factors
in the increasing importance of management skills which
relate to managers in commercial and voluntary organisations.
Bernbaum accepts that the task of administration which
now confronts headmasters is very different from the past,
though the concept of the head as a manager of a large
business receives little support from the evidence in his
investigation. In fact, he speaks of heads scornful of
approaches to being a headmaster based upon management
techniques. For them management is equated with personal
relationships, but the writer would suggest that this is
a management technique.

Bernbaum (3) quotes from a letter, which he
describes as giving an extreme view, to the Times
Educational Supplement in which the correspondent speaks
of the head's role as being analogous to that of a business
manager influenced by objectives and adopting a conscious
style of management to achieve such objectives, and admits
that this view represents a broad band of current academic
and educational opinion. What is clear is that heads
in the past, as today, are powerful figures. Power is
at the heart of the head's role. This would appear to
have been the case at all times in the relationship existing
between the head and those who work in the school which he
manages. The head who displays charismatic qualities
is secure in the knowledge that he may resort to coercion
should the occasion demand it. The move towards a model
of headship which is to be found at Countesthorpe (4) is
one towards a sharing of power as a result of a head's
own decision, for whatever reason. Legally it is not
demanded. The reference by Bernbaum (5) to a head taking
the line that he is indispensable to a school and would not leave on that account is a conceit which may exist only in the head's mind.

How do we explain that generally speaking the heads in Bernbaum's enquiry rarely delegated certain duties which have always been associated with the head's role? Largely, one would suggest, because his sample was weighted in favour of the Grammar schools which may not have greatly increased in size, were not so complex in their make-up, and did not have the pastoral/curricular divide which is characteristic of the re-organised large comprehensive school. His investigation was conducted only amongst members of the Headmasters' Association and ignores members of the National Association of Head Teachers and other Associations. He asserts that there is a sense in which this is not a real problem as the Headmasters' Association has the largest membership amongst those 'traditional' secondary grammar schools, and represents the heads of those schools which emerged towards the end of the nineteenth century as embodying in the public sector traditions which had been developed in the independent schools. Bernbaum claims that the Headmasters' Association since his investigation has broadened its membership so that it combines not only nearly all the headmasters of grammar schools, but about half the heads of comprehensive schools and a few heads of secondary modern schools. It is not clear to the writer whether it has broadened its values alongside its membership or whether the implication is that it has converted those who have joined from the comprehensive and secondary modern schools. All three categories are represented in Bernbaum's sample, with the balance strongly weighted on the grammar school side. The writer found that not one of the heads in his enquiry is a member of the Headmasters' Association, according to its published Register of Members for 1977. Since 1977, the Headmasters' Association has merged with the Association of Head Mistresses to become the Secondary Heads' Association. In its register of members, 1978, none of the heads in this enquiry
referred to earlier (p.222) may help to explain the discrepancy in the findings between this investigation and Bernbaum's.

The findings with regard to the identified areas of conflict between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years have been discussed in Chapter 6. The writer has relied on the interview findings preferentially because the main burden of the investigation rests upon visits to schools which involved forty one hour interviews with senior middle management staff, and a further nine hour long interviews with heads of schools. These interviews followed the initial series of interviews with nineteen senior staff described in Enquiry 1. As a participant observer in his own school, the writer felt himself in a strong position when interviewing other heads and staff because his own experience helped him to have a 'feel' of the situations in other schools, and he was helped to generate hypotheses which could be revised as his knowledge increased. The danger was that what was found in other schools merely confirmed the preconceptions of the observer. The interviews were supportive generally of the questionnaires except in the case of Time, Resources, and Status. Bernbaum (8) spoke favourably of the depth interview as a method of investigation, but pointed out that these may lead to truth or distortion of the truth. The same is true of questionnaires, or of any other method of enquiry. In this investigation, the depth interview brought the writer face to face with Heads of Departments and Heads of Years in interviews which revealed human care in institutional circumstances. The interviews appear as almost a universal statement about the value and almost commonplace existence of human caring in the school situation. Denzin (9) has advocated the combination of methodologies in research studies and in this enquiry the combination of participant observation, questionnaires, and interviews, was found to be of value.

The point has been made (p.29) that the Head of Year is particularly concerned with the 'expressive' culture and its derived norms of conduct. Consensual
rituals, such as Assemblies, are almost a daily feature in his way of life, and they are a means for the transmission of values which have a cohesive character. One of the heads interviewed (Appendix XIV, p. 262) maintained that the Head of Year always appears to be the more powerful figure (by comparison with the Head of Department) because he is very much the front man dealing with the organisation of the pupils on a day-to-day basis. He is well known to the parents and pupils and the disciplinary aspects of his role set him apart from other senior staff. Large groups of pupils and their attendant staff are regularly to be found listening to the Head of Year outlining arrangements and procedures to be followed. This situation has no parallel where the Head of Department is concerned.

The Articles of Government of a Catholic school state that the religious observance and instruction in the school shall be in accordance with the practices, rites, and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Catholic schools in this enquiry stressed the importance of an expressive culture and religious Assemblies play an important part in this. Reference has been made to the fact that the Diocesan Authorities strongly recommend to Catholic Governing Bodies that senior pastoral posts should be filled by practising Catholics (p. 60). The Catholic schools may be seen then to have placed a special emphasis upon this aspect of education, and for this reason the Heads of Years in those schools may have achieved greater status compared with their colleagues in the County schools. By contrast, the Heads of Departments in the Catholic schools may be seen to have gained little as a result of re-organisation which has led to larger schools. Departments are larger, with more resources, but the Heads of Departments are unlikely to have been given rooms of their own, nor secretarial help. New appointments on the pastoral side have taken on many of the responsibilities that used to belong to
the Heads of Departments, and the Heads of Years may be seen to have a larger share in school organisation because of the many administrative arrangements that belong to the year structure. Reference has been made (p.143) to the fact that all the buildings of the Catholic schools in this enquiry were a mixture of old and new, and all these schools had rooms available which were unsuitable for teaching purposes. These had been made available as offices for the pastoral heads; this was a further sign of status. By contrast, the County schools were all housed in new purpose-built accommodation and, as has been indicated earlier (p.149) very few Heads of Years and one Head of Department received rooms of their own. The greater status achieved by the Heads of Years in the Catholic sector may account for the greater incidence of conflict found in that sector.

The evidence from this enquiry indicates the existence of a variety of bureaucratic structures of organisation in secondary schools, and reference has been made to a pattern of committees and discussion groups in the schools being investigated (p.234) suggesting a democratic character in the working of school government and administration. The complex structure may be seen as a limitation on the power of the head in the matter of decision making, and an acceptance by the head of a situation which encourages the talking-out of problems. Deutsch's problem-solving exercises have been referred to in Chapter 4 as an alternative to a process of confrontation between conflicting interests, and there was support for this approach amongst the heads who were interviewed. Dahrendorf's method of structural change (p.52), which involved the incorporation of proposals and interests of the one party to the other in the dispute, may also be seen as close to what actually occurs when consultation and discussion take place. It would be unlikely that any change of personnel would take place following such consultation except over a period of time when possibly dissatisfied participants may leave or transfer within a school to a
different role. The evidence supplied by the heads in this enquiry was along the lines that the school needed to find an accommodative balance between the different interests as suggested by Selznick (p.52). The heads appeared to encourage the utmost consultation, though the final decision in any particular instance remained with them.

The heads recognised the presence of conflict between the curricular and pastoral sides of the school and, whilst one head welcomed conflict, another made the point that the kind of organisation which has been referred to earlier, viz. the multiplicity of meetings and discussion groups, spreads the areas of conflict and made them more manageable. The point has been made that all pastoral and curricular divisions were introduced initially by the heads who controlled the organisational arrangements in their schools. The writer found some bias in favour of the pastoral units on the part of the heads in defending such units against the criticism which they anticipated would come from Heads of Departments. The heads acknowledged that the Heads of Departments had lost ground in the matter of status in relation to Heads of Years. Some heads stressed that there was a need to strengthen the position of the Heads of Departments. The heads took the view that the pastoral posts were necessary in the large schools but the departmental side had suffered because resources were limited.

The committee structures were set up by heads to ensure that all staff would have some say in the way the school was run, and curricular and pastoral middle management staff were to be responsible for their own areas of activity, which involved a considerable delegation of decision making, and to take the lead in the talking-out procedures. The structures made possible a democratic process which sought to clarify, by this system of process, the alternative courses of action. Conflict was found at all stages, and conflict resolution was seen by all the heads in the enquiry as being an important part of their role. Because of the general finding of a large
number of committees and discussion groups in these schools, the head's interpretation of his role was seen to be that which involved a movement away from an autocratic standpoint and towards the position of a supportive and enabling agent. There was considerable evidence in the schools of a move towards a system of school government based upon consultation and participation, and in this sphere the focal roles in this study were seen to play a vital part.
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Under the terms of the present Teachers' Salaries Award, the annual "unit totals" of schools are determined by reference to the number on roll as returned on Form 7 (Schools) for the years concerned. For the purposes of the main provisions of the Form 7 (Schools), pupils are classified according to age on 1 September 1976 but for the purposes of "unit totals" only classification is according to age on 31 March 1977. Part A of the form records the additional information required to calculate the "unit total" of the school, namely the number of pupils who attain the ages of 14, 15, 16 and 17 years from 1 January 1977 to 31 March 1977 inclusive. As a very approximate guide these numbers will normally be approximately a quarter of the corresponding age group in Section 3 of Part B ("C" totals). IT IS TO BE NOTED THAT THE RETURN RELATES TO 20 JANUARY 1977. PUPILS ADMITTED TO OR LEAVING SCHOOL BETWEEN THAT DATE AND 31 MARCH 1977 WILL NOT AFFECT THE "UNIT TOTAL".

The "unit total" for 1977 may be calculated by taking the sum of (a) to (i) below. (For Primary Schools, other than Middle Schools (a) only).

(a) Twice the number of pupils in Section 3 of Part B (Column C) aged up to 13 years inclusive.

(b) Three times the number of pupils in Section 3 of Part B (Column C) aged 14 years.

(c) Four times the number of pupils in Section 3 of Part B (Column C) aged 15 years.

(d) Six times the number of pupils in Section 3 of Part B (Column C) aged 16 years.

(e) Eight times the number of pupils in Section 3 of Part B (Column C) aged 17 and over.

(f) Once the number of pupils in Part A with dates of birth 1.1.63 to 31.3.63.

(g) Once the number of pupils in Part A with dates of birth 1.1.62 to 31.3.62.

(h) Twice the number of pupils in Part A with dates of birth 1.1.61 to 31.3.61.

(i) Twice the number of pupils in Part A with dates of birth 1.1.60 to 31.3.60.
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Interview with Senior Area Inspector on the growth of Middle Management in Surrey Schools, 1956-1976.

19th January 1977

In 1956 the schools were so much smaller. They bear no comparison with schools today. One or two of the older heads will tell you of this. Take A.N. He was first head of a secondary school of about 250 students. Now he has 1200. R. School has just had its Silver Jubilee. It started, I would say, with about 200. You could get this information about individual schools which have just grown. Others, of course, are amalgamations and new schools. F.H. started with 90 children in a house which I remember. It's still used as an annexe. 1500 students go there now. Some staff have been there the whole time.

You want to know why these systems of middle management grew up. Only the heads know really why it happened at any particular time. Twenty years ago the secondary schools I knew, which were in the North West Area, were small and one or two of them were trying to build up something in the school like a school spirit with things like House systems. They were not given big posts for this. It was a pastoral duty you did alongside your teaching. Capital letters TEACHING. Sporting activities were a strong feature. In one or two schools they would use some sort of points system. For good work and that sort of thing. There was an attempt to keep House loyalty. Sometimes they tried to keep a family in a house. Others did the opposite.

What it meant to the majority of kids I do not know. We were not at the stage when we asked kids that. Well, we have not got to that stage very well yet. I think they tell us more, whether we ask them or not. In terms of subjects against the House system there were not
that many allowances so that you got people named as being in charge of something but they did not get paid for it. Until 1956, graded posts had been movable. A head could give it for a year. It had its advantages in some ways. Only a small amount of money was involved but it mattered. There was no continuity then, necessarily.

The first worry for heads undoubtedly was growth in size. The older heads will tell you categorically that they did all the pastoral work. They were helped by their deputies. The men did the boys and the women the girls. Tied up with this was the idea of discipline. Depending on the area and the head, one could say whether this type of organisation was of value to the children. I remember one very pastorally minded head and he knew a lot about his kids. It depended too on how much the children made themselves a nuisance and thereby got known. There were small numbers. You had as many in a school as now these people who are Heads of Years, never mind a Lower or Middle School, have in their Years. The growth in the size made heads think again. If they were honest they had to admit they did not know the kids. Nor have they the time to deal with the problems. More kids, more problems. Partly because there were too many kids and partly because the head's role was changing. This is very significant. I mean, a head who walks round the school, and in and out of the classrooms, is not frequently found today. This is because he has other things to do. The head becomes an administrator unless he fights against it. If he can delegate a lot of the administration then I think he has done well.

I think growth in size has been the greatest factor in bringing about changes in organisation. In the early days of the small school the head was not only expected to oversee the pastoral work in the background but he was also expected to oversee the teaching. There was almost the assumption that he could do everything
himself. He would certainly have the right to criticise what any teacher would be doing. The answer for the head who knew he could not do everything was to look for good teachers, because he had to leave it to them, and that was a bit of a break-through I think.

There were these other things that happened to heads apart from the fact that they could not know all the kids. Things became more complex, perhaps assisted by the raising of the school leaving age to 15. You had a little bit more expectation, although in a large part of the country I do not think anybody worried too much about it as long as kids could read and write and were respectable citizens and could hold down a job.

In parts of Surrey certainly, the structure of the school was being affected by the raising of the school-leaving age and the possibility of pupils staying until 16, and in some schools children were beginning to take GCE, but mainly in Craft Departments. That really altered the curriculum structure. When you could get teachers who could get kids through an external examination you began to get parental interest, and you got a certain amount of internal competition in the school, so that the head had to look for keen teachers because now the school was getting prestige.

At the same time as this curriculum developed a number of schools started a House system thus adding to the idea of the school: it was becoming like a Grammar School! Now the secondary school became a possible alternative for those who might not be able to get into the Grammar School. A lot of secondary schools aped the Grammar School structure in its House system for its pastoral work, as well as gradually building up an academic staff. Little money was available at that time, certainly as far as Surrey was concerned. It was just the head's determination that counted, and there were one or two outstanding heads. These schools began to take more GCE subjects and that became the all-important thing.
Secondary schools had to make a name for themselves. They began to see that they could compete. They began to see that Grammar Schools were not the only things for kids, and so did parents. It was very much a pressure situation. I think this happened more in the South-East of England than in the North - so the Times Ed. used to say.

In a sense for that period I was not conscious of any great pastoral work going on. There was a little bit of concern about the remedial end because that was where I was working before I did counselling. But in most schools they were at best contained because the emphasis was on achievement. By that I mean 'O' levels. This was backed up strongly by the boys in the Craft and the girls in Home Economics. So the kids came out with really passable results. Then employers began to take notice. Only in the background I would say was the pastoral side. There were always caring teachers, and always caring heads and deputies. This did not set up any system. There was none. What happened did so because teachers cared.

The House system did not amount to much. I think there were one or two authorities which actually built schools in four blocks for the House system, copying the Public School idea. Some of these systems were utter failures - I remember hearing a head who came to talk to us once. You then began to get your chief people concerned in schools being concerned with subjects - Heads of Subjects, Heads of Departments. This would be in the early sixties.

We did a study in the County on the non-academic pupil and it is still on record, it's a booklet somewhere. This showed up the needs for quite a lot of consultation within a school about individual problems and pupils, but it was all concentrated on the non-academic on the basis that the non-academic often threw up more problems than others. I suppose this set many heads thinking of problem children. I know of one head who began to hold
meetings of his staff to discuss not only curriculum but also pastoral problems, and this must be looked upon as the basis of counselling - to make sure that kids can benefit from what the school offers. When they are in a mess one has to get them back to working conditions. That would be about 1962-63.

In the meantime all schools in Surrey were still growing. Building meant more people coming in, people became a little more financially secure and probably had another child whereas they might have had a smaller family. That is only a guess. But it is mostly housing. A number of schools were now on more than one site which meant that without any reference to curriculum or pastoral problems you had to have someone in charge of another building. Therefore somebody was in a sense a lower tier head or mini-head. What was his job? Really to look after the people in that building. It was a pastoral job. So that as soon as the money allowances began to come along these were the ones who were paid for what was essentially a pastoral job, whatever it was called, Head of Lower School or in charge of the annexe. So in a sense the pastoral role inevitably developed. It had to do so.

Then I can think of some schools where the Head of House and the Head of Subject got combined which led to some concern on the part of those doing the job because of the time element. As the school was getting bigger the English Department, for example, was getting large and the pastoral needs were growing with the problem children. Then you got the situation where it was said that the Form tutor ought to have a responsibility to the children which was stated, instead of just being the one who registered them. So you began to get form periods, usually half an hour on Friday afternoon, the last thing. A lot of teachers did not know what to do with them - it was all hell let loose. Yet the form period has always been considered to be the basis of all
counselling because it is a small group in contact with one teacher. This became ever more important as the school got bigger.

Then along came other types of arguments, again rooted in the size. You got a House in a school of a 1000. Four houses made 250 kids in each. How could a teacher with the responsibilities of a subject know 250 children? Right, then it became clear that we had better have a separate Housemaster. One who is better at that than at subjects. That is a bit of a slur, but never mind. The teacher could only really get at the pupils through the Form tutors, so teachers began to be allocated to Houses just as were the children. It then began to be clear in many schools that the vertical arrangement was not the best. The horizontal one of bringing the children of the same age and interests together became more popular. I think all this was very reasonable. Certain teachers were obviously more suited to particular age groups. You had the situation which was very complex in some schools where you had Year, House and Departmental systems, and it must have been very difficult for a child to know which would provide the best help if needed. We began to feel that all was confusion in this situation. There became the feeling that perhaps the House system was useless except in the competitive business, particularly Sports. So I think the House system was allowed to die and more attention was paid to the other systems in the school.

Though I have described what might appear to be a natural and reasonable progression, I would not claim that it happened without opposition. There were many staff who objected to the changes which were taking place, particularly those who had worked out for themselves satisfactory positions on the House side of the school. I know of at least one large school where
the head did not feel able to get rid of the House system right up until he retired, because he faced such strong opposition from the teachers involved. It was not money. The House existed for some competition—tidying, collecting things, flowers, all sorts of things.

There is a problem today because the Heads of Departments can see that to some extent they have been left out of a lot of the organising work that is being done in the school. If the Heads of Departments pushed themselves a bit more to be involved in terms of—well, let me start that again—if you are pastorally interested, if that is your job to get to know kids and not just the ones who are going on to Grammar Schools, you are looking at all sorts of things, surely then you have something to say about curriculum. Out of pastoral interests you get changes in methods, e.g. integrated studies, team teaching, and so on. That is why I would say that the Heads of Subjects on their side must recognise that the pastoral side will have these insights, and they should say: 'Let's get together and see if our combined knowledge can lead us on to new developments.' This approach would give the Heads of Departments renewed strength.

Fundamentally pastoral work is a supporting system. It is not on top of the curriculum people. I suppose we in the inspectorate have not helped matters by asking people who go up for deputy head: 'What pastoral experience have you had?' I am not saying that is wrong either. We have had one or two highly academic men who have become heads and they have not turned very well. They have not got a grasp of the life of the school. This is because they have determinedly stuck in their own sphere, and what they see a school as being is a large box out of which you get academic achievement and you cannot break through that sort of approach. The department is not adequate for the training of management
for the large school. The combination of an academic or curriculum orientated person together with pastoral concern makes such a lot of sense for the role of top management. It takes a very enlightened Head of Maths to move from that Department to head of a school, when he might not know much about the running of any other department, apart from all the other work of running the school. The basic work of running a Department may be seen as the same for different subjects but the kind of problems and organisational matters that come up that have to be chaired, and sometimes decided upon, by the head would make it very difficult for any but a very broad-minded Head of Maths. What contact has he had with parents especially those not much involved in the Maths Department? What contact has he had with people outside the school?

So much comes in on a school now that unless you are in on the sort of pastoral role that I'm discussing things could be very difficult. There is so much to learn and it seems to me that if you do want to be the head of a large school these days you really ought to take the time from your subject and get into one of these posts where there is a chance of getting a wider experience. I honestly think so. After all, a Head of a Maths Department could perhaps become a Senior Teacher and retain some Maths or become a Deputy — it depends whether the head is prepared to help him learn because there is so much to learn as a Deputy. I think it is reasonable.

The growth of all these posts is natural and closely related to size. A number of small schools have merged in effect into a large school. I would say there has been no direction from the DES. There have been a lot of national conferences, of different kinds, and a lot written in the TES about trying to work different systems. But size has been the thing. The moan now is if only we could be half the size. A lot of heads would
like to get back to the stage when they knew people. This system has happened because we have been pushed into it. So it is not a great belief that has sprung up. It has been of necessity. If you could keep the same money and have a school of 500 would you do it?

The head's role is quite autonomous. You can organise your school in any way you like. You have to face the criticism of advisers and inspectors if they think it is a poor system. There has been criticism growing of the amount of non-teaching time enjoyed by the pastoral and counselling side. Up to a few years ago staffing was improving. So even though someone in the Maths Department might be critical and resentful over the non-teaching time given to say a Head of Year there could be very little justification because the Maths person was not being overworked. He was getting his marking and preparation time, whereas the time given to the pastoral staff was necessary because their particular type of work had to be done in school time and that was a fair argument. That could now become more difficult with the reduction of time table areas for pastoral work because of the pressures on teaching time. Some schools have maintained the time allocated for pastoral duties.

There is an increasing possibility of friction when these hard-worked teachers of subjects see anyone having non-teaching time allocated to sit down with a kid to talk over his problems. Some teachers do not see what it throws up. With staffing restrictions I do see an increase of friction. There could be more unrest coming from the academic side.

There have been many courses repeated all over the place on systems of organisation. The HMIs did a series of COSMOS courses for Education Authorities and though there was no pressure it was indicated to Surrey that places should be taken up on them. Some pressure would be brought on to Inspectors to nominate heads for
these courses. Which is what we did. But there was no follow-up. It was a course which offered suggestions. I know of no school which has no structure of a pastoral kind to deal with this kind of work. I cannot think of one. It is a pity that there is a danger of the school being divided into pastoral, curriculum and administrative areas. But I recognise that on the pastoral side that there is a great need for administrative work that directly involves the children. Only the head used to do this.
Appendix 111
List of specifications for the role of Head of Department found in the schools in this enquiry

Rights

1. To have a say in the appointment of new staff. Application forms and candidates to be seen prior to interview by the Governors. Where there are a number of candidates to be interviewed the Head of Department will put them in merit order. The candidates should be shown around the area in which they will be expected to work.

2. To distribute staff within the Department (allocation to classes, years, teaching periods, etc.).

3. To spend the money allocated to the Department, whether capitation or grant.

4. To see student teachers before they begin their practice and to allocate their time in the department and through the years.

5. To control ancillary staff and to distribute duties, work areas, etc.

6. To deal with the Inspectorate regarding the teaching of his subject, though it appears that the Inspectorate prefer the initial request for visits to be through the head.

7. To be consulted by the head, Heads of Years, or other colleagues on any matter concerning the teaching or organisation of his subject.

8. To be consulted regarding examination dates and to decide on entries from his department for external examinations.

9. To be free to participate in any lesson in his own department and to welcome other staff by arrangement.

10. To control visits made by the department in consultation with Heads of Years.

Duties

1. The provision of a syllabus for the school's work. To outline the decided options.

2. The pastoral care of the Department generally and in particular the care of probationary staff.

3. To hold meetings of departmental staff to discuss aims and teaching problems.

4. To provide syllabus and advice and pastoral care to student teachers on teaching practice within the department.

5. To keep records of text books, reference books, or equipment belonging to the department and to have reasonable checks made. To organise collection of books, etc., at the end of the year.

6. To ensure that staff in the department set and mark homework.
7. To be prepared to explain to parents just what is involved in the various courses in the department.

8. To be responsible for the upkeep and running of departmental areas.

9. To co-ordinate where possible with other disciplines.

10. To attend meetings of examination boards with regard to his subject.

11. To be acquainted with the content of syllabuses in operation in the school in order to avoid over-lapping and to encourage co-operation.

12. To keep abreast of new knowledge in the subject and new ideas and methods in teaching it.

13. To encourage junior staff in the department to make full use of courses for the benefit of the department as a whole.

14. To understand the possibilities of all the equipment in the school and to assist junior staff in its use. To consult junior staff about future needs of equipment and materials for projects and display.

15. To be responsible for providing material for the classes of teachers who are absent. This to be in the form of a bank on which the teacher on replacement can draw. To arrange for a temporary re-arrangement of classes within the department when long absences of staff occur.

16. To compile a record of work done in the department.

17. To make the acquaintance of members of the profession in charge of similar departments in the areas nearby.

18. To visit middle schools on whom we draw pupils, to discover the materials and equipment in use and the teaching methods and syllabus in operation.

19. To advise the librarian on the supply of books in the relevant sections of the library, and to ensure that all junior staff are aware of the resources of school, public and film libraries available.

20. To be aware of the changing demands of Examination Boards and their varying suitability.

21. To be prepared to offer advice to students and parents on the relative merits of the courses offered by Further Education courses.

22. To be able to offer advice on careers which could follow study at a higher level in the subjects concerned.

23. To offer a liberal studies course at V1th Form level which is wide in content and relevant to the students' interests.

24. To offer to take a liberal studies group at V1th Form level, outside one's own subject, which would involve joint research on the part of both students and staff, thus to encourage a wider approach to school life.
List of specifications for the role of Head of Year found in the schools in this enquiry

They are heads for their years. They should endeavour to establish a natural and friendly relationship with each child and should be aware of their children's needs: religious, academic, practical, social, and endeavour to organise accordingly. Particular care should be given to those who have suffered bereavements, or who are ill or have had accidents, etc. The Year gains an identity by having a separate weekly Assembly and the Head of Year establishes his position and authority by conducting this Assembly.

The work connected with a Head of Year may for convenience be divided as follows:

1. Parents.
   (1) Interview parents of new entries and of those children who are unsatisfactory in work, behaviour, or attendance.
   (2) Keep parents informed of progress by letter and report.
   (3) Conduct parents' evenings at regular intervals.
   (4) Have referred to him all matters concerning parents and children in his year.
   (5) Visit a child's home, in the last resort, if no other contact can be made and there is a need.
   (6) Refer special cases to the School Counsellor.

2. Studies.
   (1) Arrangement of courses to suit the needs of the pupils.
   (2) Arrange homework time-table and see that homework is given regularly and where journals are given that they are kept up to date.
   (3) Consult with Form Tutors and subject teachers when problems of work or behaviour arise.
   (4) Consult with departmental heads and advise on examination entries where this applies.

3. Discipline.
   (1) Over-all discipline for year group - ensuring school rules are kept. Duty lists to be arranged and substitution organised. Make arrangements in the case of Form Tutors being absent.
   (2) The authority to punish a child and in the last resort to suspend a child for serious anti-social behaviour.
   (3) Give permission to telephone or to leave school early.
4. Records.
   (1) Maintain a personal file for each child. Keep records up to date, filing reports and providing references when required.
   (2) Read and sign school reports.

5. General.
   (1) Use discretion in informing colleagues of special circumstances of home background or health. (This might be done at a special meeting when a whole year's pupils can be dealt with in a reasonable time.)
   (2) Choice of Form Tutors. Encourage form representatives to get the Students' Council working. Hold meetings of Form Tutors and Form Prefects when necessary. This is perhaps best organised as a regular weekly meeting of Form Tutors with the Head of Year in the chair. A formal meeting of this kind has some advantages over a more informal unstructured situation. Matters to be dealt with include teachers' problems, individual children, etc.
   (3) To provide leadership and to delegate particular responsibilities to his assistant in the year organisation. (The training aspect is important here.)
Appendix V

Enquiry 1

Questions to the head

1. Could you outline the way you structure your decision making processes to achieve the school task?

2. Would you describe some of these as first order management tasks and others as secondary? What constitutes your first order of management? Do you organise pastoral and curricular roles separately? Have you planned specific boundaries around these tasks? Do you provide 'job specifications'?

3. In your experience have curricular heads invariably been the ones who have proceeded to Heads of Year posts and Heads of Houses? Does this mean that the main structure of subsystems of decision-making in the school largely depends upon curricular divisions within the school in that Heads of Departments find themselves in important decision-making areas in charge of subjects and that they move 'up' from those positions to Heads of Sections and Houses?

4. A source of tension in the newer expanding secondary school is that between the concern for special areas of knowledge and skill and areas of pastoral care. Would you comment on this?

5. Do changing situations regarding the curriculum bring about tension?

6. A case can be made that progress and innovation depend upon change, and that change is likely to follow decisions made after the emergence of conflicting ideas. Do you think that the head should at times set out to produce this kind of situation?

7. What links have you structured in your system between the 'curricular' and 'pastoral' sides?

8. One would expect 'discontinuities' (Elizabeth Richardson) where one sub-system of management ends and another begins. How do you regulate relations between the two sides?
Questions to Head of Department

1. What is the task of your Department?
2. Is your role clearly defined?
3. Though your role is clearly defined do you have some flexibility in operating it?
4. Is your role concerned with (a) territory (form rooms, bases), (b) time (what say have you in the time allocated to your subject?), (c) technology (equipment)?
5. Do you experience any strain in carrying out any of these duties?
6. Is your work specification geared to the task? Are the boundaries properly set?
7. Are you autonomous in your own department?
8. Is your main responsibility the management of one area of knowledge?
9. Is there a possible source of conflict between your curricular responsibility and the responsibilities of others associated with pupil groupings (house or year)?
10. In what way might the different responsibilities of say department and head of year or house be brought into closer relationship?
11. How do the members of your department relate to each other and to the task?
12. Do you hold regular meetings of your department? Are these meetings minuted? Are the meetings a source of strain?
13. As a leader of a team how do you see your responsibilities?
14. What happens if a member of your team is not interested in following the rules you have laid down?
15. Do you play a dual role? (e.g. Do you operate as a Form Tutor and does this provide tension vis-a-vis the Head of Year, who could be a member of your own Department?)
16. How do you cater for innovation in your subject?
17. How do you make your department 'flourish'?
18. What provision is made for you to participate in school leadership in more general school management?
19. What areas of responsibility give you most strain?
20. Do you participate in team teaching situations and have you found this difficult?
Appendix Vll

Enquiry I

Questions to Head of Year

1. Do you know your 'task' in the school organisation?
2. How was this task worked out? Is it fairly rigid or do you have some flexibility?
3. What are the main areas of your responsibility?
4. What are the main strains and tensions associated with your role in the school?
5. Have you 'dual' responsibilities by being also a member of a department? Is there much conflict here in trying to fulfil both roles?
6. Do you find it difficult to lead a team of teachers in your Year?
7. To whom do you look for guidance in fulfilling your task?
8. Are you part of the top management structure in the school?
9. Have you any training programme for those staff in your Year?
10. Do you feel that consultation or decision-making is the more important part of your work?
11. Do you have frequent meetings with your pupils and with your year tutors?
12. Is there a source of conflict between your pastoral concern for your Year and the curricular responsibilities of other groupings, e.g. Departments?
Appendix Vlll
Enquiry 1
Structures of Organisation in some Catholic Comprehensive Schools

(Document circulated for information to heads in nine schools following exploratory interviews with nineteen senior staff)

One is concerned with means employed rather than with ends (although the two must always remain inextricably intertwined). There must be structures of organisation in any school and the larger the school the more complex the structure. Some of the schools visited were small, in a period of transition, and looking towards future growth. Though these had something to offer in the way of structure, and some of the interesting ideas their organisation employed are contained in these notes, in fact they are likely to learn more from a consideration of the larger, more complex, organisation than the other way round. Some of the bigger schools had periods of preparation before coming into their own as large organisations, and they were enabled to take a long hard look at their structures to work out what might be needed. Even in these cases, the process of development with regard to organisation is an ongoing activity; the whole process is dynamic.

Regarding this last point, a strong case appeared to be made out by some schools for an annual day closure to look again at one's organisation. Some schools are considering closing early on one day each week (last period) for in-service training which would then almost certainly go on after normal school finishing time. Such time appeared to be necessary for curriculum development purposes, for weekly departmental meetings, for visiting speakers, and so on.

Principles Underlying Organisation in School
1. Each school has its own needs and circumstances. Thus three of the schools are on two sites and this has an effect upon pastoral and academic organisation. In one case, the school has boys on one site and girls on the other; in two cases the Junior section of the school occupies one site and the Seniors the other. The organisation takes account of physical circumstances. The powers and responsibilities given to a Deputy Head or Head of Year in a building a mile away from the main school will reflect this
situation. There will be difficulties with regard to many meetings of staff, Year Groups, or Departments, in a case of this kind.

2. The organisation must be such that it does not depend upon any one individual or even one group. Responsibility must be so distributed that it devolves upon known individuals in the absence of the one with first responsibility. In particular, the head of the large school must expect to have his attention diverted from the day to day running for long periods. There were instances in the schools visited of heads who needed more administrative help, and who were not able to function efficiently because they were too much involved in the day to day running of the school.

3. The evidence showed that in all the schools visited the curricular policy is broken down into manageable units, whether known as Departments or Faculties. The pastoral care of the big school is divided up between Heads of Schools or Years (or both in the very large school) with these being in charge of groups of Form Tutors. The role of the Form Tutor was highly rated. Many schools have a policy making committee, usually small in number, composed of the head and his deputies, and perhaps a Director of Studies who represents the Department Heads, though in some cases it is considered preferable to have Heads of Faculties attending this committee. It appeared to be important that whilst Heads of Schools and Heads of Faculties or Departments should have clearly defined roles, it is also necessary that the head, his deputies, the senior mistress or second master/mistress should have their roles clearly outlined. The one likely not to have this clear role definition might be the senior mistress, who was sometimes cast in the role of a mother figure in charge generally of the pastoral care of the girls. In the bigger schools it appeared to be necessary to have the various roles clearly set out and for the information to be known to the whole staff. Some schools make this information available to the parents through handbooks for parents which appear to be appreciated. Job specifications in the past have tended to be given out for roles on the pastoral side and not so often for departmental
positions because it has been generally felt that Heads of Departments were found to be fairly autonomous in their own subjects, spending their capitation, planning their syllabuses, distributing their teaching staff, though their decisions would have to be within the limits of broad School Policy, e.g. the Head of Department could decide on Mode 1 or III examinations but not as to whether there were to be examinations.

4. In the big schools visited most role specifications had been drawn up through consultation with staff. In one school the role specification is included in the personal file provided and held by every member of staff, and the staff are encouraged to bring their files with them to meetings for notes that should be made.

5. Even when the roles are clearly specified it was clear that one always had the problem of personalities. Some monitoring of Departments for example would appear to be essential despite the general acceptance of a carefully drawn role specification, and this is done by the head himself or possibly by a Director of Studies. Minutes taken at Departmental meetings can help here. The Directors of Studies found in four of the large schools are probably those best suited to initiating discussions on curriculum development because of their close contacts with Heads of Departments. Heads of Years appear to be such senior people in their schools that the head is the one best suited to observe their performances.

6. There were two views found on the way roles should be cast. Some heads felt that they should be cast finely, provided the staff knew and understood the specifications: others saw an advantage in blurring the roles to some extent. Most senior staff will have dual functions in that they follow their primary role as say Head of Year as well as a secondary role as subject teacher within a Department (or a Head of Department acting as a form tutor and so coming under a Head of Year) and obviously there is a sensitive area of activity where staff have to learn to change role frequently. A blurring of roles would provide for a recognition of the need for co-operation but against that is the danger of strain when two people believe a matter to be dealt with falls within their spheres. One head thought there was no necessity to specify the roles as this
would make the structure rigid and lead to a situation where nobody did a particular job because it had not been included in someone's specification. But, in the large school, if jobs are not clearly specified, some may be pulling in different directions from others, too many may be pulling at one time and jobs are duplicated, and there is little doubt that staff prefer to know their own responsibilities.

In the large schools, middle school management is clearly in the hands of Heads of Schools/Years and Heads of Departments and clearly in these schools the Heads of Schools/Years were higher in rank and status than the Heads of Departments, and had achieved their positions as a result of being successful Heads of Departments who had achieved promotion. The Heads of Years are seen to be dealing with the 'whole' person and usually receive between 10 and 15 periods out of 40 for their special work. Heads of Schools (First, Middle and Upper) have considerable power and usually teach about half time. Deputies teach between 10 and 15 periods in the large schools. Heads of Departments, who have been so important in the past in working closely with the head and his deputies, may have to give way to a considerable extent in the larger schools to come to the new posts being created on the pastoral side; the holders of these soon become 'mini' heads in the big schools because of the administrative work which soon builds up in their roles. If the schools in transition appoint 'co-ordinating' teachers in the early days to cope with a small amount of administrative work these may naturally succeed to the larger roles leaving the Heads of Departments high and dry. Ideally it would seem that the big school requires pastoral heads who have successfully coped with the demands of running a department. Initially in the transitional school it may be necessary to combine the posts of Heads of Years and Departments though this constitutes a considerable strain upon the one performing both roles. Some Heads of Departments wish to stay out of the Head of Year structure because they see their future career in terms of their specific subject discipline and aspire to the local inspectorate or College of Education world. Some do not leave their subjects because they are happy enough in their jobs. Heads of Departments are being
invited in an increasing number of instances to participate more fully in running schools by being invited to give their opinions on applicants for posts in their departments and in some cases they sit in on Governors' staffing sub-committees.

7. There was general support for the idea that all staff should have some share in the formulation of policy. Every member of staff presumably could participate in policy regarding curriculum when they attend meetings called by their own Head of Department, provided, that is, that the Department has meetings of its teachers. Such meetings are taken for granted in the role specifications for the Head of Department, though this may not be written down and it may not be put into action. Schools vary in their experience of staff participation in general policy making. It could be claimed that the ideal solution would be that everyone on the staff, right down to the one on probation, will have the chance to participate in decision making at some level in the many meetings held in school. Most heads felt that regular meetings of staff led to fruitful and honest exchange of opinion. It is necessary for leadership to be shown but it was felt that this could come from many different quarters besides the head.

8. The schools varied in their approach to staff meetings. In some these were always held in school time, sometimes starting during the lunch time break and in others by shortening the day, let us say, once a month. Other schools always held staff meetings after school time. Some schools reported difficulties because of the size of the group and one school commented that the large meetings of the whole staff tended to be rather passive affairs because a number of committees previously held had more or less determined what the final decisions would be. One extreme case was found where no controversy ever found its way to the staff meeting because the head felt that too many would be hurt and anyway such meetings tended to go on and on. Taking votes at staff meetings is not often done. Some heads strongly objected to the idea. They felt that such a method encouraged teachers to take sides when there was no need. Polarisation and hardening of views is encouraged they claimed and anyway a consensus was usually forthcoming.
without taking votes. It was felt that often in large meetings many matters that were discussed were not related in any way to the experience of many of the staff attending. 9. The role of the Form Tutor was seen as vital in bringing to bear upon the general welfare of the pupil the school's knowledge and expertise. The Form Tutor takes into account the pastoral and academic requirements of each pupil. Some heads felt that it was unfortunate that a very good form teacher cannot in the ordinary course of events be rewarded for that role alone but it is likely that such a one could find a place in the large school structure which has posts of responsibility for over half the staff. The usual practice is to have Form Tutor, then Heads of Years, Heads of Schools in the very large schools, and so up to Directors of Studies and Deput yHead level. Heads of Years will have a special allowance of time for their pastoral responsibilities and they are seen as leaders of teams caring for the children in each year. Thus the pastoral care in broken down into units and it is necessary to have clear lines of communication and consultation between the Form Tutors and the Heads of Years. A record system has to be kept which provides a continuous process of building up a picture of the child as he goes through his course at the school.

10. One head has a system whereby every parent, who is interviewed by a teacher in school, will have a brief summary of his interview recorded in duplicate in note fashion and one will go to the head and thence to others who are likely to be interested, like the Form Tutor, and finally to Records. The Records System is playing an increasingly important part and more schools are having one person, sometimes of quite senior rank and at other times a Welfare Officer, who keeps a record of every child and interview in a central place for easy reference. A daily diary is kept in one school in which children's problems (illness in the family, domestic stress, truancy) are entered when they occur, and staff are asked to read the entries regularly. The entries are transferred from there to Central Records. This confidential book is kept in the deputy's room and it is not to be removed. This is all concerned with the vital matter of communication. How to let the people involved in teaching or pastoral work have
the information so that true care can be provided is a major problem in the big school.

**Summary**

In summary then we need to know first what is being aimed at or attempted (this is dynamic and has to be regularly re-assessed by the whole staff at intervals), second a clear understanding and acceptance and commitment for the responsibility on the part of the staff (and actual role specifications play their part, though they do not, of course, mean that role performance is adequate) and third a structure of organisation which will make it possible for policy to be achieved in practice.

A diagram might be useful to indicate all this and a number of schools visited had one showing structure, lines of communication, consultation, delegation and administration. Clearly the organisation will be no better than the quality of those who operate it. Structures can help to produce a good system of education and they can hinder it. It may be said that a good structure of organisation will allow the aim of the school to be fulfilled, and a bad structure will make it impossible. Structures can be changed but people can be changed less easily. For example, the Tutor system will break down in the absence of the right person in charge of the class. Schools depend upon people but, as one head put it, personal relationships are not an end in themselves - there is a job to be done. Together with the formal structure of people in positions of authority there is an informal one. Some teachers come to exercise positions of trust and natural responsibility and the school's resources will be made to go a lot further where these informal power structures are made use of.

It is clear that most heads consult a good deal and all retain the right to make the final decision. In many cases it is clear that decisions in many sectors have been made by various groups or individuals in senior roles and the head is merely informed and this is bound to be the case in the large school. Heads expressed the desire to know of anything that is important and this is a responsibility which is carried by those Heads of Schools, Years, Departments, who take important decisions. The head's
task is not made easier when large sectors of decision making are shared. The regular meetings tend to be exhausting, with the continual debating and consultation which has to go on before the implementation of action, and some heads who have embarked upon all this sometimes felt that the whole thing would be that much easier under the kind of benevolent despotism of the kind one knew in the past.

The small school in the transitional situation should plan its organisation so that the framework of roles is already present and ready for development when the school increases in size. The possibility of in-service training has been mentioned. There was no formal training in the various roles going on in schools but there was obvious training on the job where seconds in command had been established in Years and Departments. There is an obvious difficulty in creating these posts in that teachers may feel that they have the right of succession but advantages too in the absence of the holder of the post on courses or through illness.

There is a sense in which it can be claimed that the forms of organisation in the school are as important as curriculum content in conveying a school's message. The need would appear to be to devise an organisation which involved the whole staff and all connected with the school in helping to solve the problem of what should go on there. In one school, governors have the right to attend Staff Meetings as do representatives of the Student Council, and the teacher who is chairman of the Staff Conference, together with the Parent who is Vice-Chairman of the Parents Association, may attend Governors Meetings as observers. These experiments indicate some possible growing points in school structures.
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1. **Purpose of Memorandum**

This Memorandum is addressed on behalf of the Bishops of England and Wales to the Governors and Managers of all our Catholic Schools. Its purpose is to help and guide them in fulfilling their most important and sometimes difficult responsibility concerning the appointment of teachers.

2. **Essential Qualities of Catholic Teachers**

We all recognise how necessary it is to preserve and deepen the Catholic character and environment of our schools. We depend very much for this on the faith, practice and standards of the teachers. Managers and Governors will naturally not neglect to enquire carefully into these aspects of applicants, as well as into their educational qualifications and experience.

The Managers or Governors of Catholic Aided, Direct Grant and Independent Schools are the Employers of the teachers to whom they should give clear guidelines about the Catholic character, education and life of their school. Governors of Special Agreement Schools also have this right and duty even though they are not the employers.

3. **Ideal for which we aim**

Although it is not always possible to find a Catholic teacher who combines personal conviction and practice of the Faith with the required professional qualifications and experience for a particular teaching post, especially in specialised subjects, this is the ideal for which we aim. We all acknowledge with gratitude the devotion and service given by many non Catholic teachers in our schools and we recognise our obligations to them. Nevertheless, everyone should appreciate that in the nature of things it is our desire to staff our schools as far as possible with good and well qualified Catholic teachers.

4. **Teachers not acceptable**

Where no acceptable Catholic teacher, such as one who is Catholic only in name, has applied for a vacant post it may often be necessary or appropriate to readvertise more widely. Where an appointment cannot be delayed and there is no suitable Catholic applicant, Governors and Managers will naturally seek to appoint a teacher whose faith and quality and standards come nearest to the ideal. They would, of course, be careful not to appoint any teacher who is not in sympathy with or who does not at least respect the aims and objects of a Catholic school, much less one who is hostile to the Catholic faith or who is a professed atheist or agnostic.
5.(a) Posts to be held only by Catholic Teachers

The more senior posts which carry responsibility for the organisation and life of the school, namely Headship, Deputy Headship and Senior Master or Mistress or equivalent, should be reserved for those Catholic teachers who correspond to the ideal. It is only fair to intending applicants to state clearly in advertisements for these posts that applications are invited from suitably qualified Catholic teachers.

(b) Teaching posts which carry pastoral responsibility in the school are also of great importance; e.g. in Secondary Schools, the Head of Upper, Middle or Lower School; a Senior House Teacher; Counsellor etc.; or in Primary Schools, Head of Infants Department. Only in very exceptional circumstances should such posts be held by non Catholic teachers.

6. Religions Education Department

The Head of the Religious Education Department in our Secondary Schools is specially important. Governors are urged, in consultation with the Head Teacher, to give the highest possible status and scale to this post. This will encourage Catholic teachers to specialise in Religious Education and attract the best candidates. If one is not available immediately it is better to defer an appointment until a good applicant can be found. The Religious Education Department should have at least parity of esteem with any other subject department.

7. Representatives at short-listing and interviews

On those occasions when an invitation is extended; o the Chief Education Officer of the Local Education Authority to be represented at a meeting of Governors or Managers, they are recommended to extend the same courtesy to the Bishop of the Diocese to nominate a representative to be present, especially at meetings at which candidates for the more senior posts are to be short-listed or interviewed.

8. Delegation of power of appointment

When Governors or Managers delegate to a Sub-Committee their power and right of appointment of teachers, it is advisable to make the terms of reference explicit. The power of appointment should rarely be delegated to one Governor or Manager alone, since this does less than justice to the teacher being appointed. Appointment to the more senior posts in Aided and Special Agreement Schools should normally be made by the full Governing or Managing Body.
9. **L.E.A. approval of educational qualifications**

It is advisable in the case of Aided and Special Agreement Schools to seek the agreement of the Local Education Authority that a vacancy may be filled and to obtain its approval of the educational qualifications of short-listed Candidates prior to an appointment by Governors or Managers. This obviates any question of confirmation by an L.E.A. post factum, and emphasises the fact that Managers and Governors have the power of appointment.

10. **School Chaplain**

When a Priest is appointed by the Bishop of the Diocese as Chaplain to a Secondary School, the Governors, in co-operation with the Head Teacher and staff, will be anxious to give him every help and encouragement in carrying out his spiritual and pastoral duties. The Chaplain will be greatly helped by being accorded recognition and status in the school and much encouraged if he is invited by the Governors to at least one of their meetings each year to report on and discuss the spiritual life and religious activities of the school community.

11. **Conclusion**

The Bishops' Education Commission fully appreciates that Governors and Managers are already striving to comply with the intention and spirit of this Memorandum. It is the wish and purpose of the Bishops to encourage and support Governors and Managers in the important responsibilities they undertake in accepting their office.

+GEORGE ANDREW  
+JOHN  
+MICHAEL  
+JAMES McGUINNESS  
+GEOFFREY BURKE  
+ANTHONY EMERY  
+DONAL MULLINS  

Archbishop of Liverpool  
Archbishop of Cardiff  
Bishop of Arundel and Brighton  
Auxiliary in Nottingham  
Auxiliary in Salford  
Auxiliary in Birmingham  
Auxiliary in Cardiff

11th February, 1974.
Appendix X

80 conflict situations derived from exploratory interviews with 19 senior staff in 9 schools and including some situations observed in the writer's school.

These situations have been written up as evidence of the kinds of problem situations which arise when key roles in middle management are in competition with each other for scarce resources in areas which may be defined. These situations are classified in the text in Table 2.
Conflict Situation 1
Heads of Years and other staff over teaching time

Heads of Years have time allocated to them for the pastoral work which can be planned, such as visits to other schools, meeting outside agencies, interviewing parents, and so on. Naturally, one cannot plan for much of their pastoral work which may be needed at any moment. Crises occur without any warning. Sometimes Heads of Years feel that they have 'spare' time available where they are able to go around the school, visiting classes in their years, seeing their tutors, and showing themselves to be in charge of their years. At other times, they are presented with a variety of problem situations which all appear to require immediate attention. Interviewing children is often a long arduous experience, and on occasion when pressure is on the Head of Year, the tension is considerable and is bound to affect the ordinary teaching programme which the Head of Year has to fulfil. Sometimes substitute teachers are required and this does not help relationships with other teachers.

One school reported that the conflicting demands of pastoral work on school time led to the decision at a combined Heads of Years/Heads of Departments meeting to have one evening every week devoted to pastoral work when the pastoral staff all agreed to return to school, or to remain at school, to be available for visiting parents. Many parents were required by the school to attend for interviews where students' behaviour had been unsatisfactory. There was evidence that this partial solution was appreciated by the Heads of Departments who were, as a result, more prepared to allow time during the school day to be given up for pastoral purposes.
Conflict Situation 2
Conflict between Head of Department and Head of Year
over use of secretarial time

A Head of Department, organising an examination for the following week, wished to have his examination papers typed and duplicated well in advance. The office staff were under considerable pressure because an Easter Production was planned and, as well, there were a number of parents' evenings planned for the following week. In the event, towards the end of an afternoon session, the decision had to be made between producing a letter for the parents and duplicating it in preparation for its distribution the following day, and typing out the examination papers. The parents' letter took preference and the Head of Department was annoyed and critical of the arrangement.
Conflict Situation 3
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over time-table time

It was found to be the case in many schools that breaks into the ordinary time-table of teaching time were resented by some Heads of Departments. Often these breaks were initiated by Heads of Years who gave permission for outside visits, visiting speakers, school performances, and the like. Frequently the request came to the Head of Year from a Head of Department, often a department on the practical side, e.g. Music, Physical Education, Drama, to have time allocated to particular activities or trips and, therefore, in one sense, the Heads of Departments who seem to resent the intrusion of these activities should perhaps complain to the departments organising the activity. However, the person at the centre of things, who actually gives permission for the break in programme, is often the Head of Year, and some of the more traditional departments feel that permission for this extra-curricular activity is given far too frequently, to the detriment of their own work with the children. School performances, such as those at Christmas or Easter, are occasions when, almost invariably, great strain and tension enter into inter-departmental activities, and the Head of Year is drawn into this.
Conflict Situation 4
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department
over pupils' teaching time

A subject teacher, who was a Head of Department, was annoyed when three students arrived fifteen minutes late for class saying that one of them had been sick and the others had escorted her to the Head of Year, who had kept them waiting, and as a result they were late for class. The Head of Department kept the sick child in his class and told the others who accompanied her to report back to the Head of Year for being late for his class. The Head of Year was interviewing a parent and was slightly irritated by the reappearance of these two pupils. She wrote a short note to the Head of Department asking him to excuse their lateness, and to forgive them for the trouble they had caused. The Head of Department sought out the Head of Year later and was rude about the whole matter. The Head of Department felt that this kind of pastoral caring was completely unsuited to the children's needs. He felt that the danger was that children took advantage of a soft attitude, and would probably take the opportunity of feigning sickness, in the hope that they would miss lessons. Children, in his view, should only be away from teaching for a serious reason, and the Head of Department resented any intrusion during teaching time of Head of Year business. In this kind of situation, Heads of Departments sometimes asked that Heads of Years should take a strong line with the pupils and not be 'soft-hearted'.
Conflict Situation 5
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over pupils' teaching time

The Head of Year has the authority to take people from their lessons if he finds it necessary when pursuing some enquiry, but he has to take care that the subject teacher is properly informed as to the reasons for the pupil's absence from class. It sometimes happens that an enquiry started in a break period carries over into lesson time and there is no opportunity for the subject teacher, who may be a Head of Department, to be informed. This can easily lead to conflict, particularly if the teachers concerned have found fault with each other on other occasions. Some teachers, who are more tolerant of this situation than others, accept it as being unavoidable, but others take offence and construe the matter as further evidence of the Head of Year's lack of sympathy for either themselves or their subjects. There is evidence that pupils, missing from lessons because of dealings with the pastoral staff, cause tension between Head of Year and Head of Department.
Conflict Situation 6
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over teaching time

The Head of Year has a considerable teaching programme. She makes it her general rule not to interrupt her teaching programme, except in the last resort. Sometimes a crisis situation arises, a lot of interviewing is necessary and it becomes completely impossible to carry out her teaching. In this position, she has to request replacements for her teaching programme from the deputy head. In a particularly bad week, when crisis followed crisis, some concerned with behaviour problems at school, and some with truancy and theft outside school, she was forced out of teaching for a number of occasions in one week. Her Head of Department was critical though he recognised that she was genuinely and necessarily engaged elsewhere. He brought the matter up at a staff meeting as a defence against adverse criticism he had heard expressed regarding the teaching of his subject.
Conflict Situation 7
Conflict between Head of Department and Head of Year
over allocation of subject time

A Head of Department wished to increase the allocation of time for his subject in the lower part of the school. The reason was partly that he felt that more preparation was needed in the lower school to achieve higher standards at the top, and partly that he found himself with too many teachers of his subject in the school; he feared that some of his staff would be dispersed to other departments to fill gaps in the timetable. He would prefer all his teachers to stay in their own discipline and the way of doing this was to increase their time allocation with each class. The Heads of Years, who planned the allocation of subject time in their years, refused this request as they could not see which subjects would be prepared to give up time to others.

This conflict situation was used as one of the case studies in the text, Chapter 7.
Conflict Situation 8
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over time available for them to perform their roles

The Head of Year 6, during the Spring Term, has to establish the approximate numbers of students who will be following particular courses in Form 6 in the following year. He seeks this information from Heads of Departments who have to see every Fifth Form pupil to give information and answer questions regarding his subject, and then ascertain the pupils' intentions. There are many courses on offer in Form 6, every subject is represented a number of times with 'A', 'O' and 'CEE' examinations. This represents a difficult task for Heads of Departments and it is also a trying time for the Head of Year who has to wait for the Heads of Departments to provide this necessary information. Invariably a certain amount of feeling enters into the matter, as one or other of the Heads of Departments finds it difficult to acquire the information because of other things which have to be done. There is no clash of interest, but anxiety and stress are present on both sides at times like this, when deadlines have to be made and people may have too much to do at one time. The pastoral and academic administrative work has always to be seen in the context of a school situation where teaching for both Head of Year and Head of Department takes up the majority of school time.
The Head of Form 6 objected strongly to the fact that he regularly found a number of 'A' level Art pupils using their study time allocated for their other subjects working in the Art Studio. (Each 'A' level subject is allocated a certain amount of teaching and study time) The Head of Year felt that the danger would be that, through the enthusiasm for Art, the remaining 'A' level subjects chosen by the pupils would be neglected. The Head of the Art Department had indicated to his students that they were very welcome to spend any of their study or recreational time working in his studio. He was pleased with the interest shown in his subject. The Head of Year was anxious to make the point that the students needed a well balanced curriculum and there was a danger of the growth of a small inward-looking clique of students spending much of their time in school in the Art world. He felt that he would prefer to see these students socialising more generally. He asked, therefore, that the Head of Art should encourage his students to go to the studio only for their teaching and allocated Art study time, and insisted that they spend the rest of their time in the general sixth form study areas and recreational common rooms.
Conflict Situation 10
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over pupils' teaching time

The Head of Year frequently finds that arrangements have to be made for various functions such as parents' evenings. In a perfect society all this would be well planned beforehand with the caretaker being well briefed, and so on. On this occasion this had not happened and in the middle of the afternoon session the Head of Year approached the nearest classroom with a request for some boys to help move furniture into place in the Hall. Perhaps through bad luck, he stumbled into the Head of English Department's fifth year group, who were struggling in their 'O' level course. The situation was an impossible one. The Head of Year was under strain because he had not made satisfactory arrangements, and the Head of English was annoyed at the interruption and incensed at the request that the students be asked to miss some lesson time. The Head of English appeared to imply that it was this kind of behaviour on the part of the pastoral side in the school, that must take some responsibility for low standards in work in his subject. The request by the Head of Year was turned down and the Head of Year retired with little grace to try his luck elsewhere. There are so many meetings with parents that they do constitute a strain on the Head of Year and those teachers who have to attend. In this case the Head of English might have been under stress not only because of the pupils in front of him but also because he did not relish another evening at school.
A Head of Science Department was due to attend an important meeting of examiners in a nearby town and planned to go on from there to a private function in the evening. The Head of Year had planned a parents' evening, and the Head of Department was asked to attend because he was not only Head of Science but taught the subject in that year. As Head of Department he might be expected to contribute to discussions which often took place on these occasions. The Head of Department indicated that though, in the normal course of events, he would have no hesitation about attending a meeting of parents, on this occasion, for private reasons, he begged leave of absence. The Head of Year complained bitterly and talked about duty coming before private interest. The Head of Department offered to provide written notes for a substitute teacher with regard to the class interviews, but this was not considered acceptable by the Head of Year. The matter was referred to the head. He accepted the general principle outlined by the Head of Year but felt that in this case it was up to the Head of Department to make his own decision. He chose to stay away from the meeting.
The Head of Science, who was the co-ordinating teacher of an integrated inter-disciplinary course overlapping the ordinary subject departments in one year, required help from sixth formers who sometimes took charge of small groups of students researching various areas of local history. The Head of Form 6 approved of this use of Sixth Formers' time but was perturbed to find that at times other than those which had been agreed, the Head of Department had asked Sixth Formers to co-operate by leaving their own studies and preparing work for the following week for their young student groups. The Head of Year objected to this intrusion in the organised work planned for Form 6. He wished to dispel the notion that because Form 6 are not always being taught that they were available to Departmental staff who needed help. The Head of Year 6 objected also to subject teachers who were involved in the teaching of his year trying to increase their own amount of teaching time with their students as this might threaten the balance of their programme. A teacher of practical subjects invited his students following his sixth form course to be in his department whenever they might be free. As they were often free from actual teaching they spent too much time in that department, and their other subjects suffered in that they had less time for private study.
Conflict Situation 13
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over teaching time

A request was made to the Head of Year for time to be allocated to a visiting speaker. The request was for a double period of teaching time, but when the request had been granted, and the visit arranged, it transpired that more than the double period would be required, and as a result other arrangements which had been made for the period immediately following had to be scrapped. The Head of Year felt that he had been misled, if not deliberately, then at least treated in a rather cavalier fashion by the one who organised the visit. She had been a little careless in not determining just what she required from the Head of Year but she had acted in good faith. The Head of Year felt that in future he would not grant requests so easily, particularly if made by that individual.
Conflict Situation 14
Conflict between Head of Year and subject teacher
over teaching time

A teacher running an external RSA examination, which could be set at any time to suit his own convenience, approached the Head of Year to make time available out of the timetable. The Head of Year offered two suggestions but the teacher felt that neither date was suitable and requested a different time altogether to suit his own programme of work. The Head of Year refused to agree and pointed out that whenever the examination should take place some people would be inconvenienced and that the times he had offered were in her view the best possible compromise. The subject teacher felt that his subject was not receiving sufficient consideration and blamed the fact upon the person of the Head of Year, with whom he had never been able to identify.
Conflict Situation 15
Conflict between Head of Department and other Departments over pupils' privileges

A Head of Department in a practical subject finds it necessary to teach her subject at lunch time, and because of its popularity a large number of students take advantage of the offer to do further study. Difficulties are caused because there is always a long queue of pupils waiting for lunch. The Head of Department felt that her students should have the privilege of going straight into lunch, whatever the length of queue, so that they could attend her class without too much delay, and she reasoned that, because the main purpose of the school is to be a learning institution, then students who are prepared to give up part of their lunch break time to attend classes should be encouraged to do so by allowing them first place at meal times. Other staff felt that such classes were voluntary, that they benefit the student as well as the school, and that they should not confer special privileges. Students who choose not to participate, for all sorts of good reasons, considered it unfair when these privileges have been granted in the past for those with special commitments and the matter has been raised frequently at Students' Council. The Head of the Department concerned felt that there was a lack of support and co-operation from other staff and as a result she felt less inclined to take on additional classes.
Conflict Situation 16
Conflict between Head of Department and Heads of Years over pupils' teaching time

The Head of the Remedial Department withdraws pupils from all years according to their needs with regard to basic subjects. Because he has to organise his teachers within his department according to their limited time with remedial pupils, it is necessary that children be released from subjects other than English and Mathematics, and this causes concern both to the teachers of the other subjects and to the pupils, who often would not wish to miss subjects they like doing in order to catch up on basic work. The situation requires a lot of organisation, and perhaps even more tact, so that the best arrangement might be achieved. Inevitably some compromise is necessary. The Heads of Years receive the complaints from the teachers and pupils and have to deal with the Head of the Remedial Department. Where there is a personality clash the matter is aggravated.
The Head of Year wished to interview three pupils from his year as a result of an incident at a local shop which had been reported by the shopkeeper. The Head of Year had to leave school during the afternoon to visit one of the local 'feed' schools and that time was his usual 'free' time for interviewing purposes. Because he felt there was urgency in the situation, he broke his normal rule with regard to interrupting subject teachers and sent for the pupils concerned who happened to be in the same set. The pupils welcomed the diversion, though they did not know the nature of the business to be dealt with, and the subject teacher complained at the first opportunity she had during the afternoon to her Head of Department. She took up the matter with the Head of Year.
The Head of Physical Education proposed at the weekly Heads of Departments Meeting that every Wednesday twenty boys and girls be allowed to finish afternoon school at ten minutes to four to enable them to attend a training session at a swimming pool in a neighbouring school. There was some discussion and the Head of Physical Education was upset to find that some Heads of Departments objected in principle to permission of this kind being granted. He felt that it revealed a lack of co-operation on the part of his colleagues. Their objection was partly on the grounds of interference with the organised timetable, and partly because the swimming programme had been entered into without their opinion being invited at the planning stage. They felt that they were being presented with a 'fait accompli' and asked to acquiesce or be accused of being unco-operative.
The subject was the need for some departmental time to be given to extra curricular activity. Some Heads of Departments were concerned directly with the extra curricular work in question and there was a feeling by some other Departments that Empire building was going on. The immediate conflict arose because the same day was being chosen each week for the change of programme, so that children were losing the same subject time and these were 'O' level candidates. A second conflict concerned the Head of the First Year who pointed out that the extra-curricular activity was damaging to her annual examinations which had been properly publicised before the start of the year. Some children in the Show being planned were her pupils and the effect of the disruption of their work would affect their performance in the examinations. A third source of conflict was the view held by some that all extra-curricular activity should be done outside of school time as it was not strictly part of the children's education. The criticism about the same time being chosen each week was considered by most to be valid, and it was decided to offer the 'O' level candidates some additional time in their subjects to the exclusion of some other departmental time, which might not be considered as important, e.g. games. The criticism about examinations as being more important than extra-curricular activity was not considered generally to be valid because the third point, that extra-curricular activities were not strictly educational, was strongly refuted. No 'decisions' were necessary on the latter two points but the first point was satisfactorily dealt with in the discussion. The conflict brought into the open problems of personality, and the whole matter became rather emotive when the Head of one Department walked out on the discussion because he felt so strongly about the criticisms voiced. The extra-curricular participants, both staff and pupils, had put many hours into the production of the Show during evenings and weekends prior to the meeting.
Conflict Situation 20
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over communication and teaching time

The Head of Year's commitment to meetings with pupils and parents means that on occasions he is unable to attend Departmental meetings. For the same reasons, the Head of Year is also obliged at times to miss his own teaching lessons. It can be very frustrating for a Head of Department to have a Head of Year in his department as, though he is a senior member of staff and likely to be a good teacher, there is a sense in which he might be seen as being unreliable. His pastoral duties sometimes directly conflict with his teaching. Sometimes communications break down between the Head of Year and Head of Department and an explanation which would have helped to ease the position fails to arrive.
The Head of Year received a complaint from a parent to the effect that a member of staff was continually absent either from school, through illness, or from class, because of some other activity which he felt to be more important. The teacher concerned was Head of Humanities and he was a leading figure in the school's dry ski slope. The administration concerned with the ski-slope was considerable and, though the master was entitled to great credit for this work, in and out of school time, it was evident that his normal teaching programme at times suffered. The Head of Year was aware of this and therefore to some extent he sympathised with the parent's viewpoint. The Head of Year was loyal to his colleague in his conversation with the parent, but promised to deal with any problem that he might find upon investigation. The Head of Year did not relish the prospect of seeing the Head of Department concerned, because of his seniority, but he felt duty bound to tell him that he was neglecting his primary duty of teaching his subject in favour of his extra-curricular activities.
Conflict Situation 22
Conflict between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments over accommodation

Schools on extended or split sites have great problems regarding movement, and accommodation for Heads of Years and Heads of Departments, if provided, is often badly positioned for communication purposes. Even purpose-built new schools are rarely planned so that enough office areas are available to enable Heads of Years and Heads of Departments to receive visitors, interview staff, or speak to students. Often there is competition between those who need this kind of facility. In most schools the most that Heads of Departments are able to achieve is storage areas for books and equipment. Heads of Years are luckier though they often have to share rooms; they can usually make the stronger case for having a room because of their administrative work. Heads of Departments are often annoyed at this and in some schools one met with the situation where Heads of Departments had to move out of their rooms to make way for Heads of Years. When schools had some old buildings, it was usually found possible to accommodate Heads of Years and senior departmental heads, but difficulties often arose which related to the geography of the school buildings. In one case the Head of Year had his office about a hundred yards away from the main teaching area used by his tutors and pupils. It was accepted that there was no solution to many of the problems. Heads of Departments of practical subjects were found to be better served in this respect than other departmental heads, and in most cases had rooms giving them some privacy for their administrative work.
Conflict Situation 23
Conflict between Heads of Departments regarding the use of equipment

Some of the work being done in an integrated study had begun to extend into other departments, particularly Science. The teachers were pursuing a topic which required the use of valuable equipment from both Physics and Chemistry Departments whereas the only scientist involved in the project was a Biologist who himself had been a strong advocate of separate sciences when it was a matter of capitation and equipment. The co-ordinator for the integrated work had approached the Head of Science for the loan of equipment but she pointed out that the equipment was charged to her responsibility, there were safety factors involved, and she objected to the possibility of losing materials from her own department. The Head of Science felt that she was not sure that her colleagues in the integrated work project were really competent to handle the scientific part of the work. She felt too that the equipment might be mis-used and would not then be available when she required it for her own work.
 Conflict Situation 24  
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over communications

The Head of Form 6 had given permission for a student to attend at a Technical College in the town on one morning a week to receive tuition in Physics which was not available in the school. At a later date a new Physics teacher was appointed, and the Head of Science made arrangements for the boy to receive extra help in his subject. He did not inform the Head of Form 6. When the parents met the Head of Form 6 at a parents' evening, one of the parents referred incidently to the new teacher of Physics and his work with their son, and then both apologised in some confusion saying that they should not have mentioned the matter. The Head of Year felt aggrieved that an arrangement, however satisfactory, should have been made without his permission, because he had the responsibility for seeing that the boy's courses were suitably organised, and he was unaware of the change in programme. The arrangement with the Technical College had been made because the Head of Science had said that it was impossible to meet the boy's needs.
Conflict Situation 25
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department
over communications

A third year boy was involved in a scuffle with another boy, who was injured by a knife. The matter was reported to the Head of Year by a Head of Department who was nearby when the incident occurred. The Head of Year, after a brief investigation, suspended the boy with the knife from school, and arranged for the other boy to be attended to in the medical room for a slight injury. During the absence of the suspended boy, further enquiries by the Head of Year elicited the fact that the knife in the incident was stolen property. More enquiries established the fact that the boy was a thief, who had indulged in selling his wares in the school and his behaviour was fairly well known to his peers. When the parents brought the boy to school following his period of suspension, the boy confessed to the Head of Year a variety of misdemeanours, all of which was added to the records. The gist of the matter was reported to senior management, and also to the boy's form tutor, but the Head of Year did not think of reporting back to the Head of Department who had started the whole enquiry by reporting the boy. This boy, soon after his re-appearance in school, gave trouble in the Science Department and the Head of Science, who was the one concerned in the above incident, was annoyed to hear all that had happened subsequently. He felt that the Heads of Years generally were far too secretive about such matters, and this made life that much more difficult for those who had to teach. Heads of Years are in some difficulty in knowing just how much to offer staff in the way of information. Too often bad reports on children strongly influence teachers' expectations.
Sometimes conflict is caused by students deliberately playing off one authority against the other. The student is told by the Head of Year that he will deal with the matter, and the student goes ahead armed with the knowledge that he has 'informed' the proper authority. The Head of Department then discovers that a student's programme of work has been changed by the student, before the Head of Year has had the time or opportunity to consult with the Head of Department. Sometimes this is deliberately misleading on the part of the student who has anticipated a favourable decision following consultation between Head of Year and Head of Department. Sometimes the misunderstanding is caused accidentally through pressure of work, absence of one or other of those who have to take the decision, or sometimes, through the inexperience of a new Head of Year or Head of Department who has inadvertently neglected the correct procedure. Such a breakdown in communication or consultation can lead to tension. This is made worse if there are personality clashes involved which knowingly or unknowingly affect the issue.
Conflict Situation 27
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department
over communication

A foreign child, who speaks very little English, and who does not understand always what is said to him, was sent by the Head of the Physical Education Department to report to the Head of Year because he has again appeared for class without his equipment. The Head of Year, who has seen the boy regularly with regard to the matter, establishes that the boy has his equipment at home, that his mother is at home, and that home is a stone's throw away across the playing field. The Head of Year tells the boy to go home to collect his things and the boy, thinking he has been expelled, disappears for the rest of the day. The Head of Year in desperation goes to the boy's home in the evening. Explanations follow with the parents. The Head of Year, seeing the conditions at home, volunteers to provide the boy with the necessary kit. He returns to school to discuss with the Head of Department. The latter feels that if his department is to operate efficiently he must be firm about such matters as equipment and it is up to the Head of Year to bring pressure to bear upon those who fail to keep the rules. The Head of Year feels that there is a lack of imagination here on the part of the Head of Department. Throwing the boy out of class is no answer and is psychologically disastrous for the boy who is in no position to supply his own equipment. The nature of the functions of Head of Year and Head of Department suggest a conflict path.
It became clear following an interview between a Head of Year and a parent that the child had been given detention on a number of occasions for minor offences by members of staff. There was no question about the fact that the members of staff had every right to use their discretion and to give detention, but the fact that the Head of Year was not informed on each occasion meant that his knowledge about the child was not being kept up to date. In the case concerned with this particular incident, the Head of Year knew of particular circumstances about the child which would have made it unwise in normal circumstances to keep the child after school hours. The child caught a special bus and lived a considerable distance away in a fairly remote village, which had a very limited bus service. The Head of Year was concerned to discover that it was not clear to the subject teacher that there was a responsibility upon him to keep the Head of Year informed on matters like this, as a note would have been added to the child's personal file which is used to help in the general guidance procedures operating in the school. The teachers felt that this was yet another duty imposed upon them, though they recognised, on reflection, the need for this kind of information to be passed on.
The Head of Year interviewed a parent who asked that his daughter be excused Physical Education for an indefinite period. Because the child was rather retarded in some basic subjects, the Head of Year agreed to a request for some extra work to be set in those subjects which could be done during the time normally allocated to Physical Education. The Head of Year spoke to the Head of Department who verbally agreed with the arrangement but when, a fortnight later, the Head of Year asked the pupil about the extra work, she discovered that no work had been set. The Head of Year followed up by speaking to the Head of Department concerned. He now objected to the arrangement that extra work should be set on the basis that his Department was already overworked and to take on individual tuition was impossible. It was not clear whether the Head of Department had forgotten about the arrangement and in his annoyance at being approached decided to object, or whether the Head of Department had taken the request to one of his teachers and discovered then that the teacher was too busy. Another explanation might be that, on reconsideration of the matter, the Head of Department had decided not to go ahead and had neglected to inform the Head of Year of his change of mind. The Head of Year felt 'let down' as she had come to an agreement with the parent which obviously had not been adhered to. It must be noted that the original agreement between the Head of Year and the parent preceded any consultation with the Head of Department though the latter did not make this point.
Conflict Situation 30
Conflict between Head of Department and other staff
over communication

A visiting speaker had been arranged by a Head of Department and unfortunately it was not until two days before the visit that it became clear that it clashed with a school medical which could not be postponed. Everyone was very upset. The proposed visit had to be cancelled and this was serious as the speaker was touring the area and had fitted in his talk as part of a programme arranged by the Local Education Authority. The information regarding both events was well known beforehand but through an oversight the clash had been missed. Such situations may be inexcusable in the well ordered society but they happen, and cause tension and worry.
The Director of Studies was appointed to monitor the work being done by Departments, and to suggest ways of encouraging curriculum development. The post of necessity had to be of a flexible character, particularly in its initial stages, and the possibility of strain and tension resulting from the ensuing relationships between the Director and the Heads of Departments was considerable. The intention was for the Director to seek permission to attend Heads of Departments' meetings with their teaching staff which included senior staff like Heads of Years, to have a copy of minutes where these were taken, and to interview at their convenience any one or all of these individuals to find out what was happening, so that at a later stage recommendations and suggestions would be made. The Director of Studies was of the rank of Second Master which was on the same management level as Deputy Head. It was felt necessary that the post should go to one outside the school and therefore the Director of Studies would be expected to have the usual difficulties experienced by one going into an established school and taking up a senior appointment apart from the special strain involved in this type of post. (Reference has been made to this case in Chapter 7 - Case Study 1)
Conflict Situation 32
Conflict between Head of Department and Head of Year
over communication

The Head of Form 6, at a Heads of Departments' Meeting at the beginning of the year, asked for support from his colleagues during the first few weeks so that the first year sixth might be helped to choose the best choice of programme. Flexibility would be needed in initial plans for each student so that by the end of the fortnight each might have the best possible course provided for him. The Head of History, anxious to get on with his work, made an initial list of those who presented themselves on the first day and proposed to keep that group. Unfortunately, some of those who decided to attend did so on their own initiative without informing the Head of Form 6. Some students should have been present in the History class, as they had been approved by the Head of Form 6 for the course, but they had not returned to school from overseas holidays, and so they were not on the History teacher's list. One or two who were present were advised by the Head of Year, during his counselling in the first week, to switch from History to some other course more suited to the over-all course being followed, yet their names remained on the History list. Confusion followed and the Head of Form 6 complained that if he had the support of his colleague as asked for at the Heads of Departments' meeting there need have been no ill feeling or confusion. The Head of History pointed out that he had not been present at the early part of the meeting, when he had been busy with a telephone message, and he had seen no minutes asking for this kind of flexible programme to begin the term. Anyway he had a lot of work ahead and the quicker he got on with it the better. Further, with the numbers now being presented he was not sure that he had enough texts and there was no money. Would the Head of Form 6 be prepared to withdraw some students and how did he plan to do this?
Conflict Situation 33
Conflict between Heads of Years
over communication

A fifth former, with a poor record of behaviour, wished to enter Form 6 but omitted to put his name forward when applications were requested. This led the Head of Form 6 to think at first that the boy was not interested. Later the boy intimated to the Head of Form 5 that he wished to stay in school and this information was passed to the Head of Form 6. Then the boy was given permission by the Head of Form 5 to go on holiday early because of the parents' request. The Head of Form 6 did not realise that the boy had gone from school with permission and assumed when the boy did not appear for interview that he had changed his mind again all of which was in keeping with the boy's previous behaviour. When the boy returned to school after the holiday, and presented himself to the Head of Form 6, he got a distinctly cool welcome and his excuse that he had permission to be absent from school at the time of the interviews which had been conducted by the Head of Form 6 was received with some reserve and a promise that the matter would be looked into. The boy got the impression that he was not wanted and went home to convey this message to his parents who, irate, telephoned to the Head of Form 6 to complain and wrote to the head in protest. The Head of Form 6 felt that he had been let down as he claimed he had not received a message about the boy's original absence with permission, and also because the boy had carried home a less than accurate account of his interview when it did take place. The Head of Fifth Year claimed that a message had been conveyed verbally and further felt that the Head of Form 6 had brought the matter upon himself because he was inclined to be an academic and did not welcome the less able and even more so those who might be behavioural problems.
A Head of Mathematics cannot communicate with a newcomer to her department, one who is quiet yet very confident, one with considerable expertise and experience, determined not to be put upon, one who manages to take on the work allocated to him but to do it almost as if he has chosen to do it and conveys an independence of attitude that irritates so that the Head of Department feels unable to accede to his quite reasonable requests with regard to classes. In checking his work she becomes critical. When it comes to distributing teachers for the following year she chooses to allocate few classes to him so that the timetabler finds that the man is underemployed and unless the Head of Department changes her deployment of her forces the newcomer will have to be found work in another department.
Conflict Situation 35
Conflict between Heads of Years and Head of Department
over communication

The Heads of Years 2 and 3 asked at the Heads of Years' Meeting for permission to hold Sports Day towards the end of term. This was agreed: The two Heads of Years then spoke to the Head of Physical Education and agreed that plans should be drawn up. The agreement referred to a half day to be given to each year. The next thing that happened was that a notice was published by the Physical Education Staff giving the date and time of the Sports Days and it was found that full days had been planned and not half days. The deputy head in charge of the day-to-day running of the school complained because he had not been informed. He would not have allowed full days because of staff shortages on those days with visits previously booked. The Head of Physical Education claimed that since he had been asked to organise the events he had naturally expected the Heads of Years to arrange with the deputy head. The Heads of Years felt that since the general rule was that if someone organised an event he had the responsibility to let the deputy head know, so that he could plan for the whole school, they had assumed that the Head of Physical Education would take the necessary steps. In any case, until the notice was published they did not know the dates and times chosen. The Head of Physical Education resented being told by the deputy head that he had failed to carry out standard procedures.
Conflict Situation 36
Conflict between Head of Year and Subject Teachers over communication

A student's father died and the Head of Year was informed. She saw the boy and sympathised with him and wrote to his mother. She did not inform his form teacher nor the subject teachers. The day before the funeral the boy was spoken to about his dress and he then said that his clothes were being cleaned for the funeral. The matter was referred to the head, who told the form tutor and subject teachers by notice. The Head of Year pleaded the amount of work since she had been informed drove the matter from her mind. It is a case of a bad communications system within the year on this occasion and is no criticism of the actual system in the school. The teaching or academic side could well claim that they had been seriously let down by the pastoral side and the boy had certainly not received the kind of care to which he was entitled.
Conflict Situation 37
Conflict between Head of Year and staff over personalities

In the year structure the Head of Year is responsible for the general welfare of each child. He is considered to be the one best qualified to counsel the pupil in times of stress and anxiety. Obviously children relate better to some teachers than to others, and the fact that a Head of Year has his particular role is no guarantee that the child will confide his problem to him. One accepts that too rigid an interpretation of role procedures will not work in a school situation. Having said that, one meets frequently with the position of subject teachers, sometimes Heads of Departments, particularly in relation to older pupils, who foster special relationships with individual students so that in times of stress the pupil will turn to the friend for help and guidance. This has a good side to it but special relationships of this kind between teacher and taught can produce very unsatisfactory situations, which are neither good for the teacher nor the taught, and these can cause conflict and anxiety between staff with regard to their respective roles in the school. A typical case was met of a young graduate teacher on probation, the only teacher of his subject, teaching Form 6 and being quickly on first name terms with students, spending leisure time together, and causing anxiety to a very experienced Head of Year and to parents. Another case was of an experienced member of staff, a Head of Department, taking on a voluntary counselling role which caused tension between the Head of Department and the Head of Year. When the Head of Year, who has access to information not generally available, and a Head of Department are together involved in counselling the same student, things may go wrong and the situation can become a source of tension.
It happens sometimes that an extrovert, thrustful Head of a small Department (particularly one on the practical subjects side) anxious to court the limelight for his subject which otherwise would appear to be on the fringe of the academic power structure and reaching out for a place on Working Parties or Management Groupings, has trouble within his department because, by contrast, the other member(s) is quiet and diffident. Such a Head of Department, if invited to help in the selection of his own staff, will often support someone who is different from himself. When the Head of Department finds himself at odds with other Heads of Departments and Heads of Years the position of the staff within his department is made very difficult. The one within the department may not wish to go along with his Head of Department but he cannot openly question his methods and it makes relationships very difficult with other staff. The Head of Department may be able to cope with this kind of situation because he expects such a response to his own behaviour.
One teacher had been both Head of Year and Head of Department. A new teacher was appointed to be Head of Department and as a result the Head of Year became merely a teacher in what had been his Department. The new Head of Department, who visited the school prior to his appointment and met the existing members of Department, took decisions regarding the distribution of his staff throughout the school which caused the previous Head of Department to be bitterly upset. She claimed that the new Head of Department was deliberately giving her the worst classes and refusing her any class which was close to examinations. In particular she had been withdrawn from Lower Sixth 'O' level retakes in her subject, after teaching those students during their fifth year. The Head of Department thought that a change of teacher would be beneficial to the pupils. The ex-Head of Department thought that she had been insulted. There was little doubt that the new Head of Department's views were coloured by what he had heard about his predecessor. Clearly, too, the ex-Head of Department was only slowly coming to realise the difference between giving decisions and accepting somebody else's rulings. Personalities came into the matter in that the new person was a young man and the ex-Head of Department was a lady of many years experience. The position had been aggravated because the new teacher was not well during the early period of the term, probably because of the strain caused in the taking up of a new important post. The Head of Department had the last word in saying who would teach what and where in his subject but the problem would be the animosity which had emerged between staff at the level of Head of Year and Head of Department.
Conflict Situation 40
Conflict between Head of Department and member of Department over personalities

A Department included two examination subjects. A teacher within the Department taught one of these by herself and prepared her students for the examinations. The Head of Department controlled entries to external examinations and was in dispute with the teacher over the entry of two students. These were not particularly able in their work and, in particular, had performed poorly in the Head of Department's own subject. The Head of Department in monitoring their mock examination papers concluded that they had performed as badly in his colleague's subject as in his own and though they had been provisionally entered for the external examination he put a veto on this. The person in charge of teaching the second subject was annoyed at what she considered to be interference with her professional role, as the Head of Department, except for monitoring the mock examinations had taken no other interest in the teaching of the subject. The subject teacher felt that to make a judgement on the basis of one test was invalid, and further called into question her own judgement. The Head of Department had the right to decide on examination entries and felt a principle was being attacked. Principles were at stake on both sides but personalities were probably the major factor.
A highly efficient Head of Department, well qualified and experienced, finds it very difficult to cope with the various personalities of those within her department. Her staff are happy to get on with their work, as laid down by the Head of Department, but they resent being supervised in any way and particularly object to departmental meetings. These are usually held outside of the timetable, either at lunch time or after school, and teachers in the department find excuses to be absent. The Head of Department is irritated by what amounts almost to a refusal on the part of some of her staff to co-operate in meeting her to discuss their work. One of the Staff concerned is a Head of Year. The Head of Department complained to the head about their conduct but the matter is delicate as the head cannot be sure that the staff might not have had good reason to be absent on any particular occasion. The strain is beginning to tell upon the Head of Department and she would appear to need some support. The matter appears to be one of personality. There is evidence that the teachers in the department resent the rather strong directive attitude which they feel the Head of Department is inclined to take in their professional relationships.
A Head of Department hesitated to call a Departmental Meeting because three of his staff were holding senior positions in the school and included the Second Master and two Year Heads whom he knew were very experienced teachers who were very involved in a large number of meetings. Senior staff are to be found teaching in many departments and in some cases the Head of a Department may be a relatively young and inexperienced teacher. The senior teachers in these situations need to be very flexible in their attitude and approach to the discussions that are promoted in the meetings. Provided the role of Head of Department is clear-cut, there need be no real problem, but it is natural that personalities will play a big part in whether or not the meetings will be valuable, and strain on the part of the young Head of Department will be considerable. The senior teachers will be under strain particularly when they find that their views may not receive the attention which they may think they deserve.
Conflict Situation 43
Conflict within a Department
over personalities

An over-all Head of Science has a person appointed to the Department as Head of Chemistry who is ambitious, well qualified, and anxious to have his subject recognised as a separate department. Better qualified and with a wide experience, he resents having to seek approval for matters relating to his subject. The Head of Department does not call frequent meetings of his department and finds himself in disagreement with the majority of his science colleagues in that he prefers an individual approach concerned with separate disciplines, as opposed to the integrated science group approach advocated by others in the department.
The Head of English approved of a pupil being withdrawn from his class to attend a music lesson. The teacher of Music was under the impression that the boy was otherwise engaged, as there was a visiting party of children in the school and the boy's year was acting as hosts. When the boy failed to appear, the teacher, who was feeling tired, felt that she should go home early, as it was the last period of the day. The Head of English was incensed by what he considered to be unprofessional behaviour and he reprimanded the teacher concerned when they next met because the boy, having finished his duties as host, turned up for his music practice to find his teacher missing. The teacher contended that she had acted properly as the boy was over a quarter of an hour late for his lesson and she refused to be spoken to by the Head of English in that way. She considered the latter to be acting unprofessionally.
Conflict Situation 45
Conflict resulting from Team Teaching
over personalities

A team teaching situation presents many problems in tension and possible conflict situations. The leader of the team plays a most important role in co-ordinating both the team and the task they have to perform. Young members are likely to be strongly influenced by the co-ordinator who is likely to be the one best versed in the activity that has been proposed, and possibly has had experience of similar work. The leader is likely to have had meetings with an inspector and to have visited schools in the area which have set up such situations previously. The obvious danger is that the one in charge might dominate discussion in the planning stages of the operation, and younger teachers will not feel able to put forward their points of view and will generally feel themselves to be inhibited. The danger would appear to be that tension thus caused after the initial enthusiasm of the first month of the course, will bring conflict quickly to the surface. Older, more experienced, teachers may be slightly cynical of the whole proceedings even though they will have volunteered to take part in the experiment. The leader will have to be extra careful of the personalities involved and make every effort to encourage the members of the team to participate in both the planning stage and in putting the plans into effect.
Conflict Situation 46
Conflict between Head of Department and other staff
over personalities

The Head of English Department suggested to the staff that the production of a school magazine should be supported and this was agreed. The book was produced and sales were poor. The Head of English blamed particular years for this failure, and he used a Heads of Departments meeting, attended by Heads of Years, to indicate to some Heads of Years that they should do something about the poor sales. The Heads of Years mentioned the matter in their meetings with Form Tutors and subsequently the Head of English put up an unsigned notice saying something to the effect that people on the staff should get a move on with pushing sales of the magazine. The Tutors of one year in particular were incensed because they felt that they had taken the normal steps required in this kind of situation, and felt that they were being abused and treated as mere salesmen; they resented the manner in which they had been criticised. There were other factors at work, viz. the magazine was a rather trendy artistic piece of work, very much reflecting the personality of the Head of English who had sought little co-operation from the Tutors in the preparatory work that was done.
Conflict Situation 47
Conflict within a Department
over personalities

A female Head of Art newly appointed, brash, confident, considerable expertise, strong powers of organisation, young, inexperienced but determined to succeed. Within the Department a middle-aged man, mature, highly sensitive, lacking some expertise, devoted to his task but overawed somewhat and unable to cope with the new ways being suggested of teaching his subject. He found himself not being asked to do things in the department. He felt a lack of involvement and support, and believed his contribution to be belittled by the head and staff generally who appeared to compare him unfavourably with his new colleague. Signs of strain and tension were soon evident.
The Head of Department felt that five students in Form 6 should not enter for 'O' level, at the end of the first year, because their standard of work and their general lack of interest showed that they had little chance of success nor even that they deserved to succeed. The policy of the school was that the staff should not enter students for examinations unless they had a reasonable chance of success. The Head of Form 6 felt that this was not a good decision by the Head of Department as these students had not been referred to her for lack of work. If this had happened she felt that she could have applied pressure which might have produced a better response from the students concerned. She also felt that when students come into Form 6 to retake 'O' levels, or to sit them for the first time after passing at CSE, that provided they followed the course, they should take the examination. She felt that to be told at the entry date in February that they would not take the examination would show them they had been 'written off' half way through the course, and might make for a difficult discipline situation in that these pupils, knowing they had no examination commitment, might give bad example to others who had plenty of work to do.
Conflicts Situations 49
Conflict between Head of Year and Deputy Head
over allocation of teachers

Heads of Year use their Form Tutors, and some other teachers allocated to them by the Deputy Head, to form a team which takes charge of all school duties on one day a week. Because the school is on two sites it often happens that there is great difficulty in distributing the staff to the various areas to be supervised at various times before, during, and after school sessions. The difficulty is increased when some members of staff are teaching in one building and of necessity have to perform duties in the other. Ideally, each team should contain almost an equal number of staff who teach on each site, but this is impossible. It then becomes necessary to ask some staff to do more than their share of duty, or possibly to exchange staff between years. Heads of Years who are responsible for seeing that the duties are performed satisfactorily are loath to lose one or two of their best staff, but sometimes these are the very ones who, because of their timetable, could most easily move from one to the other site before or after their duty. The duty day itself is a difficult one for the Head of Year who has to plug any gap that appears through sickness in the team, which often only becomes known just before the start of school, and who has to accept responsibility for school supervision on the duty day. It is the Deputy Head's duty to allocate teachers over and above the year tutors who form the basis of the duty team and sometimes the Heads of Years may think that his allocation could have been better thought out.
The Head of Fifth Year was disturbed to discover
that comparatively inexperienced teachers had been
allocated by certain Heads of Departments to do examination
work. The Head of Year had already seen the parents of
the students in his year and assured them that they would
get the best teaching possible. The Head of Year stressed
that he felt that all teachers have their strengths and
weaknesses and perhaps more care should be exercised by
Heads of Departments in assessing these. This is an
extension of the conflict situation between Heads of Years
and Heads of Departments regarding the allocation of
teachers and resources. The Heads of Departments contend
that they have taken all the relevant factors into account,
and their allocation has taken account of the needs of the
students in all years and not merely the examination years.
The matter is delicate because the teachers concerned would
be under considerable strain if the Head of Year's concern
became general knowledge.
The Head of Department had a formal academic approach. His teaching background had been in the grammar school dealing with selected pupils. He felt that he was particularly suited to dealing with more academic pupils and though in sympathy with less able children he did not feel competent to deal with them. This led to his decision to replace a young teacher with little experience, who had previously been offered sixth form work, by himself. The young teacher was disappointed and upset because he felt that the move was a reflection upon his ability, and he felt that even in the future the same situation might apply. Even with more experience in teaching, the sixth form represented a special approach which he was unlikely to learn if not given the opportunity. The sixth formers would gain from the move because the Head of Department was a most experienced person when it came to examination preparation, but obviously he was limited in what he could offer to a wide range of children.
The Heads of Departments have the right to distribute their teaching staff wherever they choose in the school. However, the Deputy Head, in charge of the timetable, had stipulated that, because of setting and options in Forms 4, 5, 6 and 7, it would be unwise for the same teacher to be allocated to teach in all of these years. Notwithstanding this warning, some Heads of Departments did this and found that the timetable could not possibly include such a distribution. This meant that Heads of Departments were asked to re-distribute their staff and promises and arrangements made within departments had to be withdrawn, which upset many teachers. As a result, the Deputy Head promised that when the next timetable was drawn up he would provide Heads of Departments with a plan to be completed by them which would be so organised that it would make it impossible for clashes to occur as they did when it had been left to Heads of Departments to distribute their staff.
The Head of Mathematics is entitled to allocate his staff throughout the school. The general school policy worked out by the staff towards the beginning of the school, some four years previously, had been to have mixed ability groupings in the first, second, and third years, except for Mathematics and French which were setted. The Head of Mathematics distributed his staff so that one man was teaching three groups in Form 2. The Head of Year complained because this made setting impossible. There was a referral to the Heads of Departments' meeting where the ruling previously adhered to was upheld and it was stated that the Head of Mathematics had no right to allocate his teachers in such a way that this procedure of setting was made impossible.
There is often tension between Heads of Years in the junior part of a school and those in the senior part. Sometimes, when there are staff shortages, gaps which appear in the programme for the top of the school are filled by switching specialist teachers from lower down the school where the time table permits. This is usually done on the argument that such a transfer is needed because Heads of Departments are approached by Heads of Years at the top of the school and told of the urgency of the position regarding examination courses. Forms 4 and 5 must exert pressure to prepare for 'O' level and time lost through absence of staff could have disastrous effects on the students' performances. Heads of Years lower down the school recognise the needs of the examination candidates but are concerned with the loss of specialist teaching which will have serious effects in the long term and in the short term might lead to discipline problems because the replacements cannot cope with different situations. Sometimes the replacements might be students on practice who can do quite a bit of harm even when carefully supervised. In another case it has been pointed out that students in any case often do their practice in the lower part of the school. A balance has to be struck of course in both these situations but in both cases it is likely that the lower part of the school will suffer.
Conflict Situation 55
Conflict between Head of Year and Heads of Departments over allocation of student teachers

Students on teaching practice are distributed throughout the various years by the Heads of Departments. For many good reasons, not least because the students often express a desire to teach younger children, they tend to find themselves allocated to Forms 1 and 2. As a result, the Head of First Year discovered that one form had experienced ten changes of teacher in just over a term, across a range of subjects. The individual Heads of Departments had not liaised with regard to the forms to which they allocated students. The Head of Year did not realise until fairly late in the proceedings just how many students were being introduced and in part felt that perhaps it was not a Head of Year's responsibility to interfere in Departmental teaching decisions. Eventually the matter was raised at a Heads of Years' meeting, in the form of a rather bitter defence of the children's interests. It was felt that the Head of Year should have intervened earlier. This conflict situation arose because there was no arrangement between the Heads of Years and Departmental Heads to rationalise the distribution of students, and because the Deputy Head, who was in charge of students on practice, merely intimated to the Heads of Departments the subjects offered, and left the distribution to them.
The Head of Fourth Year, in co-operation with the Head of Third Year, places the students in their options, following meetings with parents, and after the pupils have made their own choice. The list of options presents the problem; some schools give pupils their free choice, after a certain allocation of time to a basic core which varies slightly but usually includes Religion, English, Mathematics, Physical Education and Games. (Some subjects are added to this list in some schools but the basic core is rarely less than this) The options, where there is not free choice, and this itself is unusual, are usually grouped in sets of subjects, and the student has to choose one subject from each set. Sometimes the sets are so arranged that the academic child is unlikely to be able to opt for say technical or home economics subjects, and as a result a conflict situation arises. In many schools the pressure of parents makes it difficult for the Heads of Years to have for example a practical subjects set, which ensures that the full range of students opts for one of these subjects, because of the demand by parents that their children take a certain number of academic subjects for their examinations. In some schools, the options themselves are offered in broad bands which are aimed at the more able or the less able students. There is a constant effort being made by Heads of Departments of the 'practical' subjects for more 'recognition' and whilst the Heads of Years are sympathetic they have to meet the parents and try to satisfy them. This situation has been improved with the examination courses now available in practical subjects, but still parental views are biased in favour of traditional 'O' level subjects.
The Environmental Studies experiment and the relationships between the various departments who were approached, and in particular the decision which had to be made regarding the choice of co-ordinator, were the cause of strain and tension. There was conflict between the Head of English, who was chosen to lead, and the Head of Biology, who, though not desiring to be co-ordinator, was ill at ease in a situation where someone else was chosen. The Head of Biology, a traditional rather formal but excellent teacher, was anxious to learn all about the new enquiry method of teaching but feared the possibility of being placed in a situation that for him would be essentially insecure. The same teacher, whilst supporting enthusiastically the experiment in Form 1 objected to the suggestion that it might continue into Form 2 when it became clear in discussion that if Environmental Studies was to expand other areas of study must contract. It had not be seen initially that integrated work of this kind necessarily meant less resources and time being available for established departments. The departments which were not approached to join in the experiment resented the fact in some instances.
The Head of Fourth Year has to decide on suitable courses for his year group which is at the start of options and at the beginning of a two year run-in to 'O' level. The Head of Year is not satisfied with the Mathematics programme outlined by the Head of Department. Out of 130 students only 28 are considered suited to an 'O' level course, and this forms one group. The remaining 102 students are divided into four CSE groupings. The Head of Year is in a difficult position because, as a Mathematics teacher, he is a member of the Mathematics Department but he feels that a difficult situation will arise when the next Departmental Meeting is due and the fourth year programme is discussed. He has to be careful not to speak as Head of Fourth Year at that meeting, though both Head of Department and Head of Year know the clash of interests that are present. The Head of Year wishes to increase the number of 'O' level courses from one to two, and he is strongly influenced by what he knows of the parents' wishes. Many parents would prefer their children to 'fail' an 'O' level course than to pass at CSE. The Head of Year recognises the absurdity of this view, but feels that there is something to be said for the Head of Maths not taking too strong a line with regard to 'suitability' of children at the margin. Two 'O' level groups would satisfy him and he thinks probably satisfy the parents. The Head of Mathematics resents interference in his plans for his Department.
Memorandum from the Head of Mathematics to head:

Bernard Johns (4J) has been given permission by his Head of Year to do some work for the fete. I have not been told of this by the teachers involved. He is due for Maths during periods 7 and 8 today but I am told by the boy that he will be kept occupied with the fete work all the afternoon. He is a reasonably good student whose work in class and homework is irregular because of his sporting activities. His mother complained to me about this at the last parents' evening. At that time I said that the boy should ask to withdraw from some of his extra-curricular activities but I did not wish to upset the staff involved.
The Head of Form 6 considers that his entrants, even when they have 'O' level Mathematics, find it very difficult to cope with the demands of the 'A' level syllabus in Science. The Head of the Sixth is a Physics specialist. He has tried to persuade the Head of Mathematics to organise the Fourth and Fifth Years so that the top group might be creamed off and given special mathematics training to prepare them for the demands of 'A' level work. The Head of Department complains that this would necessitate a demand for more staff, and this will not be possible. This is the answer given though the Head of Mathematics is not short of staff nor has he made a request for more. He is not entirely sympathetic to the Head of Year's problem, and feels that his existing organisation is adequate to the needs of the Years in question. There has been no pressure from the Heads of the Fourth and Fifth Years, presumably because they are neither Maths nor Science specialists, nor do they feel the problems of the 'A' level requirements. There is perhaps no adequate machinery for dealing with this conflict situation. The head is unlikely to interfere in the planning of the Maths Department though the matter might well be talked out between the three senior people with the Mathematics Head having the last word.
The Head of Mathematics is concerned because of pressures being brought to bear on him by the Head of Form 6. The latter is anxious to introduce Modern Mathematics into his year to run alongside traditional Mathematics, pure and applied, at 'A' level. The Head of Maths has every intention of going 'modern' in Form 6 in two years time when the present third year, who have done modern maths since their entry into the school, reach that level. The Head of Form 6 is an enthusiastic Maths teacher himself and intends teaching the new Maths and at the same time do a little 'Empire Building' for himself and his sector. The Head of Maths has the last word because he has to organise his subject and distribute his staff (including the Head of Form 6) and he is not convinced that the time has come for a change. At the Departmental Meeting there was support for the Head of Form 6, and the Head of Department found that he had to oppose the majority in reaching his decision.
Classes were 'setted' in French in Form 3 and the organising teacher, in the absence of the Head of Modern Languages, decided towards the end of the final term to prepare for the fourth year, when 'O' level and 'CSE' options would be taken up, by re-arranging the sets in Form 3 with the known 'O' level candidates grouped together in the top two sets, which were rather large, followed by the CSE sets which were smaller, followed by a small group of students who were known to be giving up the study of French in Form 4. The organising teacher, knowing that the classes were setted, and thinking that the movement between sets could not affect other staff and subjects, went ahead with her plan. It misfired because the change of class and teacher affected the pupils, who resented a change in the middle of term. A considerable amount of discontent was generated which made itself felt in other subjects. The Head of Year had not approved the change and was upset at not being told. The head ruled that such movement was out of order because it fell to the Head of Year to decide on such a matter. The movement between classes was stopped and the status quo restored.
The Head of Science is responsible for his syllabus. Science receives three modules in Forms 2 and 3 and has been following an integrated science course which has caused considerable difficulty for some of the Department who have been trained in the individual disciplines and feel they have neither the time nor the inclination to 'read up' on fairly new ground. The Head of Science has received conflicting advice. One inspector, considered progressive, advised him to continue the integrated work and by encouragement and advice to carry his department colleagues with him. The other Inspector advised that in the circumstances of staffing (some of the teachers are a bit long in the tooth and good specialists in their own fields) and in view of the wide range of ability in the school, it might be advantageous to retain the integrated work in Form 2 and to change to the separate disciplines in Form 3, which would provide the pupils with the advantage of a three year run-in to 'O' level in the different subjects. The Head of Department held a meeting of his team and discovered that he was in a minority of one in wishing to retain the integrated approach in Forms 2 and 3. As a result, and to some extent against his own judgement, he decided to give way to his staff.
Conflict Situation 64
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over curriculum

The Head of Form 6 heard from one of his students that he wished to drop Mathematics, and the teacher in charge had said that he might do this as his standards were low and his chances of passing at 'A' level were very slight. The Head of Form 6 approached the Head of Mathematics Department for a report on the student's work and he had to wait a few days before this was forthcoming, as the days in between were heavy teaching days for the teacher in charge. When the report was handed to the Head of Form 6 he heard with concern that the student had already stopped attending his Maths lectures as he had assumed that since his teacher had supported the idea there would be no question of the Head of Form 6 raising any objection. The Head of Year was annoyed to find that his curricular timetable had been changed in this way before his decision had been given. The Head of Year felt that this rather casual approach to a serious decision could set a bad example to others and, in any case, he was not sure that the student had not deliberately worked at less than his full capacity to force a decision. The position that would arise if the decision was in favour of the boy dropping the subject would be that he would have eight free periods to be filled, as the Head of Form 6 objected to his students having too free a programme as he felt that they were not sufficiently motivated towards private study and needed at least half of their timetable to be taught. The teacher was at fault in encouraging the student to give up Maths before checking the whole matter with the Head of Department who would then have taken it up with the Head of Year. The latter made it clear to the staff teaching in his Year that the proper procedure had to be followed in future.
The Head of Form 6 is an academic who does not rate the practical subjects like Technical Studies and Home Economics very highly in the priorities he puts before his sixth formers. His 'sets' are so organised that one who chooses a practical subject is at a disadvantage. Further, in his frequent exhortations to his students, he tends to allow his own prejudices regarding these subjects to become known. As a result, despite a flourishing area of practical options in earlier forms in the school, the sixth form throws up very few candidates for these subjects to the chagrin of their Heads of Departments.
The Head of Form 6 is the one in charge of sixth form curriculum, and many teachers feel that the teaching groups contain too many students unsuited to the courses being followed. The teachers feel that they should have more say in choosing those whom they teach. The Head of Form 6 has to provide an over-all programme for all those who wish to stay on in Form 6, and it is necessary at times to offer a student a subject when his 'O' level or 'CSE' result might suggest that he would have considerable difficulty in following that particular course. A more damaging criticism suggests that, with regard to the Head of Form 6's own particular discipline, the standard of entry required is maintained at a high level and teachers cannot but compare this with an apparent lack of regard for standards with their own entries. The real problem which the Head of Form 6 has to contend with is the necessity to operate an open Form 6, with no requirement made regarding standard of entry, and having to fit these students into what is still fundamentally a traditional Form 6. The full range of 'A' levels and a good sprinkling of 'O' levels, repeats and one year courses, together with a small dosage of Religion, Physical Education/Games and Liberal Studies, does not provide a suitable programme for some of the less able students, and until more work is done on curricular development there will remain the difficulties referred to by subject teachers. The subject teachers should perhaps have aimed their darts at their Heads of Departments who neglected to provide them with lists of students agreed upon between the Head of Department and the Head of Form 6, but the basic complaint is not one of communication but is concerned with the curriculum.
The Head of Department claimed that an Open Form 6 is incompatible with high achievement in external examinations. He suggested that a school policy to encourage as many students as possible to remain in school after 'O' level is in the nature of a confidence trick in that the staff knew well that some of those staying would have little hope of obtaining further external examination success, and that if this had been made clear to the students then fewer would have stayed. Further, the addition of many less able students diminishes the prospects of better students because scarce teaching resources have to be shared out and the strain on teachers is considerably increased. A high failure rate does little to enhance the status of the school and the staff in the eyes of parents and local authority. He pointed out that a poor pass in 'O' or 'CSE' levels is no recommendation for the student to be encouraged to go in for higher studies and he contended that ignorance of the gap between the requirements of O and A levels may be one of the reasons for students staying on. Until the curriculum of the Sixth Form is considerably widened to include subjects which suit the needs of less able students then a tighter control of entries is necessary, such as is practised in closed sixth forms.
The Head of Year has had a number of complaints from parents regarding the personal relationships between the Head of the French Department and the pupils in one of her classes in his Year. The parents requested that the Head of Year should move their children from this teacher's class because she was continually 'picking on them' because their standard of work was unsatisfactory. The subject was 'setted' for that year and the children concerned were in one of the lower sets. The Head of the French Department controlled the sets and allocated children within them. The Head of Year had approached the Head of French to seek her support in making more allowances for the children concerned, but the French specialist denied that there was any victimisation and refused to re-allocate the children to another set because their standard of work was so poor that they could not be moved higher up the sets. The Head of Year had had no complaints about behaviour or standard of work performed from any other staff teaching these children, and he felt that there was a case of personality conflict which would only be resolved by a change of class. It would appear that in the interests of the children's over-all education some change was desirable, even though it might mean a misplacement as regards French. He considered therefore the possibility of asking the Head of Department to accept this as a necessary arrangement that should be agreed upon.
The Head of the Department for Remedial Studies was upset when she found a Head of Year sending far too many students (so she thought) in her direction. There is an obvious clash of interests between a Head of Department which relies on a very high teacher/pupil contact (ideally one to one) and a Head of Year faced with many requests from Form Tutors and subject teachers to deal with difficult pupils. The form or subject teacher often feels that a particular child is so troublesome and disturbed that it is unreasonable to expect him to be taught in an ordinary class. The Head of Year has to bear the brunt of the criticism, and sometimes sends the child on to the Remedial Department, which is already having problems of its own.
Conflict Situation 70
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over curriculum

A Head of Year is anxious to start a programme of environmental studies in his year, and has endeavoured to gain the support of a number of departmental heads. One of these resents the pressure that is being exerted as she feels that her subject will suffer in the long run. She feels that her present syllabus is constructed in a structured way which would require it to be completely rewritten if the first year is to be changed by being absorbed in an integrated study situation. There is some resentment felt that the matter is not being dealt with in sufficient depth and that administrative considerations are being put forward which do not take into account the needs of the academic discipline in question. She feels that much more planning is required and that a much firmer indication needs to be given of the type of integrated programme which would be taught, so that she could work out its implications for the full four year course which she has at present in operation.
Conflict Situation 71
Conflict between Head of Year and Senior Master
over role specifications

An overlap in duties can be particularly helpful should a member of staff be absent for any period of time. It can also cause considerable irritation and frustration if two people spend a lot of valuable time being busy about the same thing. This situation arose when a Head of Year 6 was appointed in a school which already possessed a Senior Master who had responsibility for careers work in what had been a small Form 6. In what was becoming a much larger school, the Head of Year 6 frequently found that, in working with his sixth formers with the UCCA forms and general guidance procedures, he was often going over much the same ground as the Careers master. The Senior Master was anxious not to lose his office, record cabinets, and so on, which had been provided for his work as Careers master with Form 6, but the new Head of Year felt that time was being wasted if they both interviewed the sixth formers. Sometimes a proposal to a sixth former by the Head of Year met with the response: 'Oh, I've already discussed that with the Senior Master.'
It is necessary, sometimes, to have one person holding a Head of Year pastoral post whilst retaining a Head of Department position. This can happen upon the promotion of a departmental head to a year post, whilst no teacher within the department is fitted for promotion at that time. Allowances would not be combined as each post has its own level. There is a danger that the Head of Year in such a position will be biased in favour of his subject, in particular with regard to the allocation of teaching time. A further danger might be the distribution of better teachers from his department to his own year. A dual Headship of Year and Department means that the Head of Year does not have to play a minor role in other spheres such as the academic, and this would be detrimental perhaps to the balance of the allocation of work in the school: a Head of Year finds it a salutary experience to play a minor role in a department and vice-versa. Flexibility of this kind would appear to be necessary if innovation and change is to prosper in a conflict situation which may be seen to have its creative aspect.
Heads of Departments of practical subjects are frequently found to be on the defensive and suffering from insecurity in their relationships with other, more academic, departments. A Head of Design and Technology was found to be particularly bitter because, though he was on the top scale for assistant teachers, he believed that his subject was not accepted by the academic Heads of Departments as being of equal status and importance as their own subjects. He felt also that the pastoral or guidance Heads of Years frequently discriminated against him when they discussed his subject with parents and pupils. When an advisory group was established in the school to help the head and the group was formed of Heads of Years and Heads of what have always been considered to be the senior Departments: English, Mathematics and Science, he protested strongly that in such a group his own position, and that of his subject, would be neglected and he asked that he should be allowed to represent the practical subjects at future meetings. The request was granted, more perhaps because of the strong personality of the person concerned than because the course of action was considered to be right.
Conflict Situation 74
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over status

A senior Head of Department was seconded to university for an advanced diploma course. During his absence, a vacancy occurred in the school for a Head of Year post. This was considered by the Governors to be an internal school matter and a Head of a fairly junior department was appointed to the Head of Year post. When the senior Head of Department returned from university it was clear that he resented the new situation. He considered that, though he was now better qualified, he had suffered a loss in status through the appointment that had been made. Relationships between the two people concerned were strained and the new Head of Year felt that his position was difficult because the Head of Department made it clear that he felt that an injustice had been done.
The deputy head called a meeting of Heads of Years and also invited a teacher who was second in one of the Years. The Head of Year did not know of the invitation until he arrived at the meeting and though he made no issue of the situation at the meeting he was bitterly hurt and disappointed and communicated these feelings the following day to the head. He was assured that his own role as Head of Year was not in question and, though the deputy head had called a meeting to which only Heads of Years had been invited, except for this one teacher, it was not in fact an official Heads of Years meeting. It may be pointed out that, since the teacher had received a proper responsibility allowance for pastoral care as second in the year, in the informal structure of the school, the teacher was being treated with particular respect, and invariably her opinions were being sought in various meetings. The Head of Year was a sensitive person who felt his role to be part of his personal property; anyone who made inroads on it was suspect. The Head of Year sought assurance that his own role was not being questioned and also indicated his wish that such invitations should be withheld in future. He felt that his deputy was not in fact attempting to undermine his authority, and that the responsibility for what had happened and what was happening in other areas of the school with regard to criticism and comment regarding his year, was the fault of others who did not really know what was happening in his year.
Conflict Situation 76
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department over philosophy*

A Head of Department put a girl on detention after school and due notice was given to the parent (24 hours). The parent telephoned the Head of Year to point out that this would entail a loss of money, as the girl normally travelled on a special coach which went to outlying villages, and there was also some danger involved with the girl travelling in this way. She would have to get two buses and there would be a waiting time. The Head of Year was sympathetic to the request made by the parent that the detention be transferred to one or more lunchtime break periods. The Head of Year agreed to look into the matter and saw the Head of Department who took a defensive attitude with regard to his own position. He had suffered at the hands of this girl on a number of previous occasions, and he felt that his discipline was being put in jeopardy if decisions he had made publicly were to be set aside. He felt that the Head of Year was letting him down and he refused to agree to the idea of varying the punishment. The Head of Year overruled him and said that she would see the child, explain that the punishment was fair but that to allay the fears of the parent the detention would be set during two lunch time break periods. She would give the girl a serious warning about her future conduct. The Head of Department was disgusted.

* philosophy as defined in the questionnaire as being concerned with differing views on school problems which relate to pastoral or curricular roles.
Duties, over and above the teaching load, are always a source of tension. Duty teams are organised in many cases by Heads of Years, each of whom takes a day to organise the supervision of the school. The head and his deputies may have differing views from the assistant teachers who have to carry out the supervision, and the Head of Year in charge of the duty team may find himself in the middle of conflicting sets of expectations with regard to the way supervision is to be carried out. He may not agree with either view himself, but the method of supervision, however it may have been decided, has to be uniform from day to day, so that the school runs along established lines throughout the week. The general tendency is for the upper management to require more in the way of supervision than the teachers are prepared to give. The assistants stress the importance of the teaching function in their roles, whereas the head is likely to make the point that teaching is not merely passing on content but has to be seen in a very wide context that includes pastoral, caring, and supervisory duties.
The Head of Year and Head of Department have their regular group meetings with their own staff. The Head of Year meets his Form Tutors and the Head of Department meets the teachers of his subject. Sometimes these Departments include as many as fifteen or more staff who represent a very large cross section of the whole staff, and will include senior administrative teachers. It was clear that in one school these meetings began to assume the function of criticising general school policy in a number of areas of work, and the Head of Department or Head of Year felt obliged to carry these criticisms on to the meetings higher up in the structure of organisation: Heads of Departments meetings, Heads of Years meetings, or meetings with the head and his deputies. The Head of Department and Head of Year in this situation tended towards the position of being spokesmen on behalf of the staff to senior management, and they felt they had to report back to their teachers. This situation was resented by the head and his deputies because they felt that school policy should be supported by those in senior positions like Head of Department and Head of Year. The whole position of middle management, and its function in the administrative and policy making decisions of the school, gives rise to considerable conflict of interest. The head saw middle management as necessarily supportive of school policy whereas some Heads of Departments and Heads of Years were tending to dissociate themselves from responsibility for school policy in their meetings with their tutors and assistant teachers.
Heads of Years are concerned for much of their time with putting into effect the expressive culture of the school: standards of conduct, values, rewards and punishments, and so on, and through their assemblies and general organisational procedures are much concerned with ritual. Sometimes they object to the fact that an individual member of staff appears to behave with pupils in a way that is not consistent with the general procedure which they would like to see followed. One incident concerned a Head of Department who went into the dining hall, found some conduct that was not to her liking, interfered quite properly and gave a punishment which she felt suited the occasion. The Head of Year considered that the punishment - a detention after school - was unreasonable in the circumstances and he felt that it would have been better if the pupil had been referred to him for his action. The conflict was really concerned with differing standards, and the Head of Year felt that generally speaking this was more in his area of activity. The Head of Department felt that as a teacher she had every right to take action herself as she saw fit and she resented the attitude of the Head of Year as being itself an interference.
Conflict Situation 80
Conflict between Head of Year and Head of Department
over philosophy

The Head of Year is often concerned with a very difficult child who causes trouble to staff generally. Jane neglected to bring her Physical Education uniform regularly and was often insolent when told about it. Because of her very disturbed background the Head of Year asked the Head of Department to be tolerant of her. The Head of the Physical Education Department took the view that Jane should not have been admitted to school because of her known behaviour record and to ignore her persistent refusal to bring her kit was to take a soft attitude which could only lead to further trouble and would give a bad example to other pupils. When reprimanded by the Physical Education teacher on the occasion reported Jane was insolent and later on the field she kicked and punched other students who had rebuked her for making the teacher angry. As a result Jane was suspended from school and after an enquiry removed to another town. The Head of Year felt that the teacher and the Department had not followed his advice in their treatment of Jane and an ugly scene of violence was the result.

(This case is dealt with in Case Study 2 in Chapter 7)
Appendix XI
A study of Middle Management Roles in Secondary Schools
and the incidence of strain and tension

**Perception** of strain and tension to be measured as follows:

I feel that, for Heads of Departments in general, this is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A problem of little importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A problem of moderate importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A problem of great importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A problem of very great importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual Experience** of strain and tension to be measured as follows

I have experienced this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To a small extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To a great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To a very great extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There is insufficient time to do the departmental work properly
2. One is exposed to comment and criticism on both a personal and a professional level
3. Information is inadequate between staff and the lack of communication between HY and HD is largely the cause of misunderstandings
4. A democratic structure, encouraging initiative on the part of many staff makes life more difficult for senior staff in focal positions
5. One is faced with the need to conform to the expectations of others
6. One's own teaching suffers from interruptions concerned with departmental work
7. Meetings with one's tutors within the department are a source of strain
8. The need for confidentiality and the danger of creating adverse expectations in others with regard to one's pupils
9. Sometimes the HD has to take the subject view which may differ from the 'over-all' school view of the HY and this causes tension and conflict
10. Everyone assumes a certain predictability about the way a teacher performs his role
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The HD has to interrupt classes to interview students</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The position of authority gives rise to jealousy</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>One can become exhausted with too much involvement with other peoples' problems</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The case for integrated studies is often made by HYs in opposition to the views of HDs</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The HD may face conflicting sets of expectations from staff above or below his own position</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The HD's arrangements for educational visits affects other staff adversely</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>An ambitious HD seeks the limelight</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>One's deep involvement in a narrower field may cause one to miss out on much of school life</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Integrated work gives rise to disagreements</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sometimes the teacher will have more than one role and they may be incompatible</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Many meetings cut into staff free time</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>In one sphere the HD is superior to the HY and in another he comes under the HY and clashes of personality occur</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Staff absences leave many duties and responsibilities to be covered</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Team Teaching means teaching before other staff</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The structure of organisation within the school may not suit some staff</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Some teachers feel they must appear to be successful</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Some teachers feel that their pupils' lack of effort or underachievement to be a reflection upon themselves</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The teacher has to fit his personality into the role cast for him</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>To some extent the teacher must feel that he is apart from, and superior to, his role</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The HD and HY role specifications may not be clearly specified leading sometimes to duplication of work and sometimes to neglect</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Time needed by HY for pastoral work, such as Assemblies, reduces time available for Departments to teach in

32. The HD's administrative centre may be badly-sited relative to his needs

33. Many meetings have to be held with parents outside of school time

34. One's teaching suffers because of the need to allocate non-teaching time to departmental activity

35. HDs suffer sometimes from the way their programmes are timetabled

36. The HDs where options or exams occur may differ with HYs in their views as to the needs of their students

37. Whether the HD rather than the HY can command the use of the child's time is a source of tension

38. Sometimes the HD has to withdraw from his own teaching duties

39. The HD has to investigate complaints against other staff

40. Communications break down between HD and his staff when pupils truant, miss classes, etc.

41. The allocation between Years and Departments of teachers and student teachers is often a source of strong disagreement

42. The HD sometimes wishes students to enter for examinations and is in conflict with a HY

43. Sometimes there is conflict between HD and HY over the work areas and resources provided

44. The general behaviour of the pupils in his department is a source of anxiety

45. The HD has to ensure that his teachers are carrying out their responsibilities

46. Having student teachers allocated to one's department is a source of strain

47. The HD sometimes finds that he is expected to be a focus of teacher discontent in relation to upper management

48. Upper management expects the HD to be the focus of management aims in relation to teachers
49. The HD may wish to exercise moral sanctions in dealing with pupils whereas other staff may wish to see more coercion

50. To some extent the HD always recognises that his work is being monitored by the head

51. LEA support services are not always what they should be and time and effort are wasted

52. There is sometimes a lack of contact with other staff because of site problems, geography of school, etc.

53. Other agencies outside the school, such as the parents, the preceding school, and others, provide too little in the way of information

54. Parents sometimes insist on providing too much information and in seeking assurances

55. In a team teaching situation there is always competition to see who will be the co-ordinator

56. Some staff participating in team teaching do not seek to lead but fear others doing so

57. There is the danger that the strong personality will take over in the team teaching group and will dominate rather than lead

58. In a team teaching situation the member of staff who knows more than the others about the way things should be done is resented

59. In a team teaching situation there is a tendency for an umbrella department to be formed with a dominant person in charge

60. There is a sense in which the HY may look more favourably upon the expressive - more practical, aesthetic, emotional subjects in the curriculum and less favourably on the academic subjects which have always held first place

61. At option time it has long been a complaint by the Head of Practical Departments that they have had to play second fiddle to the Academics

62. The HDs in following the wishes of parents may find it difficult to follow their own inclinations in academic and pastoral matters
63. Compromise is always needed in dealing with parents

64. HDs holding the post of HY meet separate and competing responsibilities

65. Where HDs and HYs meet separately one should not have a foot in both camps

66. The HD is continually open to the criticism of other staff

67. The need to be an individual clashes with the expectations of others with regard to one's role

68. One is anxious to please those in upper management

69. One's role performance is often marred by one's loyalty to some sub-group in the school

70. The plurality of roles makes it difficult to play one role properly

71. Sometimes there is open criticism of one's performance by others on the staff

72. The positions of HDs and HYs are of high status and power but their relative status gives rise to some jealousy and tension

73. Sometimes one hears of criticism by colleagues or parents behind one's back

74. Team leadership is difficult

75. The individual needs to be allowed to fulfil his role without the interference of his superiors in upper management

76. The need to present a favourable self-presentation is present in the face of conflicting pressures

77. Misunderstandings abound in the school situation

78. The HD has more demands being made upon him than he can satisfy

79. The HD, to spare himself, may shut off communication with some of his associates thus perhaps reducing some of the pressure upon himself though directly increasing the strain felt by those who have been cut off from such communication

80. Most conflict is created in schools because of relationships between roles rather than the failure on the part of one person to fulfil his role
I would be grateful if you would indicate any area of strain and tension which has not been included and which you think ought to be mentioned.

Please could you let me know the following personal details:

age
sex
years in teaching
subject

Thank you for your co-operation
Appendix XI (contd.)

A study of Middle Management Roles in Secondary Schools
and the incidence of strain and tension

Perception of strain and tension to be measured as follows:

I feel that, for Heads of Years in general, this is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
<th>A problem of little importance</th>
<th>A problem of moderate importance</th>
<th>A problem of great importance</th>
<th>A problem of very great importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual Experience of strain and tension to be measured as follows:

I have experienced this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
<th>To a very great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There is insufficient time to do the pastoral work properly</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>One is exposed to comment and criticism on both a personal and a professional level</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Information is inadequate between staff and the lack of communication between HY and HD is largely the cause of misunderstandings</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A democratic structure, encouraging initiative on the part of many staff makes life more difficult for senior staff in focal positions</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>One is faced with the need to conform to the expectations of others</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>One's own teaching suffers from interruptions concerned with pastoral work</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Meetings with one's tutors within the year are a source of strain</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The need for confidentiality and the danger of creating adverse expectations in others with regard to one's pupils</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sometimes the HY has to take an 'over-all' view which may differ from the subject view of the HD and this causes tension and conflict</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Everyone assumes a certain predictability about the way a teacher performs his role</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. The HY has to interrupt classes to interview students
12. The position of authority gives rise to jealousy
13. One can become exhausted with too much involvement with other peoples' problems
14. The case for integrated studies is often made by HYs in opposition to the views of HDs
15. The HY may face conflicting sets of expectations from staff above or below his own position
16. The HY's arrangements for educational visits affects other staff adversely
17. An ambitious HY seeks the limelight
18. One's deep involvement in a narrower field may cause one to miss out on much of school life
19. Integrated work gives rise to disagreements
20. Sometimes the teacher will have more than one role and they may be incompatible
21. Many meetings cut into staff free time
22. In one sphere the HY is superior to the HD and in another he comes under the Hd and clashes of personality occur
23. Staff absences leave many duties and responsibilities to be covered
24. Team Teaching means teaching before other staff
25. The structure of organisation within the school may not suit some staff
26. Some teachers feel they must appear to be successful
27. Some teachers feel that their pupils' lack of effort or underachievement to be a reflection upon themselves
28. The teacher has to fit his personality into the role cast for him
29. To some extent the teacher must feel that he is apart from, and superior to, his role
30. The HY and HD role specifications may not be clearly specified leading sometimes to duplication of work and sometimes to neglect
31. Time needed by HY for pastoral work such as Assemblies, reduces time available for Departments to teach in

32. The HY's administrative centre may be badly sited relative to his needs

33. Many meetings have to be held with parents outside of school time

34. One's teaching suffers because of the need to allocate non-teaching time to pastoral activity

35. HYs suffer sometimes from the way their programmes are timetabled

36. The HYs where options or exams occur may differ with HDs in their views as to the needs of their students

37. Whether the HY rather than the HD can command the use of the child's time is a source of tension

38. Sometimes the HY has to withdraw from his own teaching duties

39. The HY has to investigate complaints against other staff

40. Communications break down between HY and his tutors when pupils truant, miss classes, etc.

41. The allocation between Years and Departments of teachers and student teachers is often a source of strong disagreement

42. The HY sometimes wishes students to enter for examinations and is in conflict with a HD

43. Sometimes' there is conflict between HY and HD over the work areas and resources provided

44. The general behaviour of the pupils in his year is a source of anxiety

45. The HY has to ensure that his teachers are carrying out their responsibilities

46. Having student teachers allocated to one's year is a source of strain

47. The HY sometimes finds that he is expected to be a focus of teacher discontent in relation to upper management

48. Upper management expects the HY to be the focus of management aims in relation to teachers
49. The HY may wish to exercise moral sanctions in dealing with pupils whereas other staff may wish to see more coercion

50. To some extent the HY always recognises that his work is being monitored by the head

51. LEA support services are not always what they should be and time and effort are wasted

52. There is sometimes a lack of contact with other staff because of site problems, geography of school, etc.

53. Other agencies outside the school such as the parents, the preceding school, and others, provide too little in the way of information

54. Parents sometimes insist on providing too much information and in seeking assurances

55. In a team teaching situation there is always competition to see who will be the co-ordinator

56. Some staff participating in team teaching do not seek to lead but fear others doing so

57. There is the danger that the strong personality will take over in the team teaching group and will dominate rather than lead

58. In a team teaching situation the member of staff who knows more than the others about the way things should be done is resented

59. In a team teaching situation there is a tendency for an umbrella department to be formed with a dominant person in charge

60. There is a sense in which the HY may look more favourably upon the expressive - more practical, aesthetic, emotional subjects in the curriculum and less favourably on the academic subjects which have always held first place

61. At option time it has long been a complaint by the Head of Practical Departments that they have had to play second fiddle to the Academics

62. The HYs in following the wishes of parents may find it difficult to follow their own inclinations in academic and pastoral matters
64. HYs holding the post of HD meet separate and competing responsibilities
65. Where HYs and HDs meet separately one should not have a foot in both camps
66. The HY is continually open to the criticism of other staff
67. The need to be an individual clashes with the expectations of others with regard to one's role
68. One is anxious to please those in upper management
69. One's role performance is often marred by one's loyalty to some sub-group in the school
70. The plurality of roles makes it difficult to play one role properly
71. Sometimes there is open criticism of one's performance by others on the staff
72. The positions of HYs and HDs are of high status and power but their relative status gives rise to some jealousy and tension
73. Sometimes one hears of criticism by colleagues or parents behind one's back
74. Team leadership is difficult
75. The individual needs to be allowed to fulfil his role without the interference of his superiors in upper management
76. The need to present a favourable self-presentation is present in the face of conflicting pressures
77. Misunderstandings abound in the school situation
78. The HY has more demands being made upon him than he can satisfy
79. The HY, to spare himself, may shut off communication with some of his associates thus perhaps reducing some of the pressure upon himself though directly increasing the strain felt by those who have been cut off from such communication
80. Most conflict is created in schools because of relationships between roles rather than the failure on the part of one person to fulfil his role
I would be grateful if you would indicate any area of strain and tension which has not been included and which you think ought to be mentioned.

Please could you let me know the following personal details:

age
sex
years in teaching
subject

Thank you for your co-operation
Appendix Xll

A study of Middle Management Roles in Secondary Schools and the incidence of conflict

The following are possible areas of conflict between the roles of Head of Year and Head of Department: TIME, RESOURCES, COMMUNICATIONS, PERSONALITIES, OPTIONS AND EXAMS, TEACHERS, CURRICULUM, DIFFUSENESS, STATUS, and PHILOSOPHY.

On the following pages, under these headings, there are ten statements which have been taken from taped interviews with Heads of Years and Heads of Departments. I would be grateful if you would score against each statement on page 2 your perception of this as an area of possible conflict for secondary schools in general and on page 3 your actual experience of this as an area of conflict. I would be grateful if you would indicate any area of strain and tension which has not been included and which you think ought to be mentioned.

Please could you let me know the following details:

Age Sex Years in Teaching Subject Head of Year/Dept. *

* Delete one that does not apply

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP
**PERCEPTION** to be measured as follows:

I feel that this is 0 Not a problem at all
1 A problem of little importance
2 A problem of moderate importance
3 A problem of great importance
4 A problem of very great importance

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>TIME</strong> Whether the HY rather than the HD, or vice versa, can command the use of the child's scarce resources of time is a source of tension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>RESOURCES</strong> One needs an attractive and well equipped work area to carry out the duties of HY and HD and sometimes there is conflict between the two over such resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>COMMUNICATIONS</strong> This is perhaps the major problem between the two posts and the lack of communication is largely the cause of misunderstandings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>PERSONALITIES</strong> In one sphere the HY is superior to the HD and in another he comes under the HD. This is an area where personality clashes arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>OPTIONS AND EXAMS</strong> The HY and the HD often differ in their views as to the needs of their students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>TEACHERS</strong> The allocation of teachers and student teachers between Years and Departments is often a source of strong disagreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>CURRICULUM</strong> The case for integrated studies is often made by HYs in opposition to the views of HDs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>DIFFUSENESS</strong> The rights and duties which make up the roles of HYs and HDs are sometimes not clearly specified and this leads to some duplication in role performance and in some cases to neglect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>STATUS</strong> The positions of HYs and HDs are of high status and power but their relative status gives rise to some jealousy and tension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>PHILOSOPHY</strong> Sometimes the HY has to take an 'over-all' school view which may differ from the subject view of the HD and this causes tension and conflict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACTUAL EXPERIENCE to be measured as follows:

I have experienced this  
0 Not at all  
1 To a small extent  
2 To a moderate extent  
3 To a great extent  
4 To a very great extent

1. **TIME** Whether the HY rather than the HD, or vice versa, can command the use of the child's scarce resources of time is a source of tension.

2. **RESOURCES** One needs an attractive and well-equipped work area to carry out the duties of HY and HD and sometimes there is conflict between the two over such resources.

3. **COMMUNICATIONS** This is perhaps the major problem between the two posts and the lack of communication is largely the cause of misunderstandings.

4. **PERSONALITIES** In one sphere the HY is superior to the HD and in another he comes under the HD. This is an area where personality clashes arise.

5. **OPTIONS AND EXAMS** The HY and the HD often differ in their views as to the needs of their students.

6. **TEACHERS** The allocation of teachers and student teachers between years and departments is often a source of strong disagreement.

7. **CURRICULUM** The case for integrated studies is often made by HYs in opposition to the views of HDs.

8. **DIFFUSENESS** The rights and duties which make up the roles of HYs and HDs are sometimes not clearly specified and this leads to some duplication in role performance and in some cases to neglect.

9. **STATUS** The positions of HYs and HDs are of high status and power but their relative status gives rise to some jealousy and tension.

10. **PHILOSOPHY** Sometimes the HY has to take an 'over-all' school view which may differ from the subject view of the HD and this causes tension and conflict.
Appendix XIII

Interviews with 40 middle management staff in ten comprehensive schools.

The interviews with each Head of Department and Head of Year lasted about one hour. Those interviewed, with the exception of the staff in one County School (see text in Volume 1, p.134) had completed the questionnaire in Enquiry 3 (Appendix XII). At the beginning of the interview the member of staff was given a blank copy of the questionnaire and asked to comment on the areas of strain and tension which had been the subject of the enquiry. Those being interviewed selected, in their own order of preference, the areas of conflict they wished to discuss.

What follows are edited versions of the interviews which include the actual words used by the actors with regard to particular areas of conflict.
School 1  Interview with Head of Year

Problems just do not seem to arise as long as personalities get on well together. I am saying that it does not matter what the structure is if the personalities are right. If the people get on all right together then they can sort out any problem.

Life in school has its problems. One can abuse, for example, taking children out of lessons, perhaps taking the same child regularly out of the same lessons, and not having the courtesy to give good reasons. Then friction is going to arise but we have to go about this kind of thing in the right way. This possibility of friction is reduced if you have the right kind of personality. You would not keep taking the child out because you would know that would cause trouble. You can bring all problems down to personalities.

I have not noticed greater status from becoming Head of Year after first being a Head of Department. I think one would not progress if one went the other way round, from Head of Year to Head of Department. I should say that Head of Year is likely to stand me in better stead promotion wise. To a degree one is a minority person as Head of Year - there are lots of Heads of Departments but only five Heads of Years. One is called in on the administrative side of the running of the school far more than the Head of Department.

I was very conscious of my position when I was given the chance of being Head of Year in a Catholic school because I am not a Catholic. I would do my utmost to support the principles behind the school being here. I would encourage the children fully to participate in school life from the religious point of view in particular.

When I first started the job I felt I did not want to tread on anyone's toes. I found the best way was
to stay in the background, to weigh the situation up, as I did not want to upset people. I felt that established fifth form teachers might possibly resent my new position. There was one senior member of staff who had a sabbatical year and she came back and found it very difficult. I have gone out of my way to try to accommodate her but I get the impression that she thinks that I am trying to undermine her position. Possibly it is my bad handling of the situation. I do not know. I consciously try to help. She must have felt that now she was lower in status than she was before she went away.

As Head of Year I have been expected to organise Reports, Year Tutor Meetings, and so on. At meetings of other Year Tutors we formulate our role in the school. Then we have to put it into practice. I feel that I could do my Head of Year job better if I had more time. I find that I have to give up a considerable amount of my spare time. I cannot do the job as well as I would like to. Obviously one does one's best. I did not realise until I became a Head of Year just how difficult and demanding the job could be.

As a Head of Department one leads a very narrow experience. The yearly battle of the timetable or capitation or room space used to go on - I've heard it described as Empire Building. This is healthy enough but on the side of the Head of Year one is concerned with all Departments, because the individual child you become concerned with may dislike English or French or there may be friction with a member of staff or whatever. Any part of the school could be involved. This is why I feel I am learning so much. I did not realise there would be so much involvement, and to such a degree.

I do not think the departments yet realise the importance of the Head of Year role. Perhaps we have not yet got the job into perspective ourselves. There is a danger of becoming an off-loading point. One has to get these things balanced. Heads of Departments or subject teachers just send pupils in our direction to
sort things out. Troublesome pupils tend to be off-loaded on to you. This will take more time.

We are in the process of formulating role specifications. We devote the occasional meeting to discussing this. Of course, it is changing all the time. There are drastic changes sometimes because of our new experiences. I would like things to be more specific. There is a danger of duplicating and of not doing things at all. This is linked with communications. I would like more definite lines, which would make the work easier, and I will make this known eventually at our meetings. I think all roles should be fairly clearly defined.

I am feeling the pressure of time a lot lately because we had Mocks and Reports and now references seem to be flooding in. I have done too much of this and I think I will have to pass on more to the tutors within the year. They know the members of their forms in many cases better than I do.

I have not got a room to do my work and I have made a point of telling the head that this is really necessary. You have to be somewhere outside the classroom situation. Usually one can borrow a room from one of the senior staff. It is surprising the amount of information you build up, and there is a real need to store all this somewhere. A tutor area might be the answer.

Sometimes one does things with the very best of intentions but with the pressure of work one realises that one should see somebody but to contact a person at that point in time is very difficult and this is where problems arise. I tend to suffer from a poor memory — well perhaps not that, but one has so many bits and pieces of information that it is so easy to forget.
I feel I need to know much more about the options. I have told the Heads of Departments this at our meetings.

We are still a fairly small school and we know each other well so that communications are generally good. I tend to forget some things that should be passed on. Often letters which have gone out should be seen by the Form Tutors and I forget this sort of thing occasionally. I have a diary but sometimes it gets muddled up with my shopping list.

I try to remember that people could get hurt. You have to think about people's pride. They are human beings. It does not do any harm to make people feel that they are of some importance.

I think some of the Form Tutors are saying: "Where is our place in the school? We know the children better than anybody else." The Form Tutor has three registration periods during the day: ten to fifteen minutes in the morning, a brief one at lunch time and last thing in the afternoon, but then the children are anxious to get home.

I have seven free periods a week. I have to spend quite a bit of time out of school catching up with some of the administrative work. This goes with the job.

I take Assemblies. We deal with the usual things, behaviour, attitudes to others, etc. It's my job to deal with all sorts of things, problems, growing up, family troubles, and I frequently mop up tears. I chat to the children at break times. I deal with boys and girls.

The most difficult part of the job for me is the giving of orders of any sort, to have to tell somebody to do something else. I am talking of staff now. Basically I do not want to dominate, and I do not
get any satisfaction out of a situation where I have to give orders as this does not appeal to me. The thing that does appeal to me is the fact that I am dealing with children. It could be that I will learn to live with giving orders and adapt and gradually it will come more easily to me.
The requirement of a Head of Year is
different from that of Head of Department. There
are obvious similarities in that the Head of Department
has to care for his staff and his subject but you can
be a Head of Year without being an expert in anything,
except in caring for people.

When we went to X School to study their system
of organisation, one of their teachers said: "Oh, there
is too much pastoral work done here, and not enough
teaching." We are still evolving here. I can see that
it is possible to have many problems not only with the
Head of Department but also with the subject teacher.
Often it is the desire on their part to move children
from here to there because they are a nuisance in some
way to them, whereas over-all one realises that this
child has got to stay there either because he is less
trouble than anywhere else or because there is a
desperate need for his own sake to remain there.

Communications are a problem in any school. This
is in everything, of course, not just between Head of Year
and Head of Department. I get to know more about
children than do the Heads of Departments. This can
be quite frightening, the extent to which you come to
know about people, the parents, the children, and so
on. It is not a hard job for me. We are so new that
I do not think people have really realised that we have
got the job. This is true really regarding your question
of status. People know well enough the job we have to
do but there is a sense in which, because we have held
the jobs for only just over a year, some hardly realise
just what kind of job we have got. It has been seen as
a promotion.

I address parents' meetings, I put children
into their sets, but I would not say that it brings me
into any great conflict with anybody because this job has always been done by somebody, the deputy head usually. Does it matter do you think who does the job, as long as it's done? Well, perhaps people do worry about that sort of thing. Yes, it could be a major area of problems. Potentially I see the post as being more important than the Head of Department in the big school.

Wherever there is promotion or status or power, or anything like that, it is a possible source of conflict or jealousy, whether it is just rumbling underneath or direct confrontation. The first is sometimes worse than the second. In my own case the problem has not so much been with Heads of Departments but rather with the Form Tutor, who has sometimes felt, not always rightly, that he is losing his role. His pastoral care for say thirty children is being taken over by his becoming a mere registrar. This is an area for a careful, tactful, delicate approach. I think that in this school, which is in an emergent position, that the Form Tutor has felt himself to be in the most vulnerable position, and not the Head of Department. "Am I losing part of my job, my position, my status, to this new overlord?" The Head of Department has not possibly become aware of the possibilities of the new situation.

It can become quite frightening to realise the power that one could wield. And which one could misuse. We share in the responsibility of top management in the school. We are not quite 'power drunk' yet! Any moment now! The actual problems I have had have been more from underneath rather than from alongside. We started off here with the idea of our situation being a pastoral one but it has proved to have enormous administrative and disciplinary elements. Probably I am more aware of the administrative element because I deal with the intake whereas perhaps a fifth year head may be more aware of the disciplinary side. Each year has its own characteristics - third year, for instance, is options time and so on.
I think there is no need for great problems. What is needed is a little give-and-take on both sides. If everyone has the attitude that we have the children's welfare at heart then there is no need for conflict. I have no problems at all.

I helped to start the careers work in this school and this involved a lot of pastoral work but this has now passed to the Heads of Years though I still co-ordinate the information. I am therefore in close contact with the work of the Head of Year.

I think that personalities play a very important part. If one is inclined to be bombastic........ Our way of doing things here is to suggest, and usually the majority view prevails, but it is possible that one person might stick out against the policy. A sore thumb, so to speak. One has to anticipate the other person's feelings. If there is a way round this, if you want to put your case forward, we'll try and get around it. Sometimes we beg to differ about the way to do things on the staff.

I think very much along the same lines as the Head of Fifth Year for example but sometimes I cannot see eye to eye with some of the ladies on the staff. They feel, for example, with regard to discipline, that we should treat the children more softly. I feel that a good telling-off, and a detention or two, does the trick, and this may be a conflicting opinion with the ladies. But nothing really major you know.

My biggest problem as Head of Department is to decide who is to teach what and where. Some teachers always want to teach the top flight. They are not interested in the weaker brethren. This is where we really have to fight it out. You have to take the good and the bad, the rough with the smooth. One has to haggle quite a bit.
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The first problem, perhaps the major problem in this school, is the lack of inter-communication between people on the same level, and also up and down the scale, especially on the pastoral side where information just does not seem to percolate down. It goes up but it does not come back down, and you find the most surprising things about the children, that would have really helped you enormously in dealing with their siblings in the same school, have passed you by. It is not simply a matter that a fact about a child is communicated but at the same time the way in which that fact is communicated indicates an attitude.

Both levels of communication, the passing on of facts and the sharing of attitudes, are inter-connected. To be blunt about this school, I feel that we have too many bosses on the pastoral side: head, deputy head, senior mistress, three Heads of Years, all male each with a junior female. Now that is the pastoral side.

There are two levels upon which one might be affected as Head of Department. First as an academic Head of Department, in charge of my subject, and I must say that the pastoral side does not affect me in this area. My problems in the Department are those of its efficiency as a teaching thing, where we are concerned with the transmission of skills and knowledge. Second, I may be affected as a Form Tutor and there is a very definite overlap there. If one does come across a problem with a child one is rather disturbed for a start with where one should go for information. Why has child X suddenly turned rather awkward, why is child Y truanting now when she has never done it before, why has child Z picked up with that girl and suddenly become a shoplifter, and I am talking about three problems which have come up at the moment. What has happened to so-and-so, and you find out, and you think why doesn't somebody say that the poor kid was pregnant. I blame all this not on the lack of time for communication by the pastoral side, but
upon the lack of a pattern of communication that can be integrated in the school. We are a diffuse school and this does make personal quick comment, that kind of communication, very difficult. A lot of the sort of things that I have been dealing with could be dealt with on a quick personal level. Like "If you get any trouble with so-and-so please remember that her mother went into hospital last night." A quick word on the corridor, it does not need anything formal, it does not need anything detailed, it just needs communication to be there but with the school spread out over this rather large site, there being no fixed centre, you saw the coffee room today, well that's not much help because at least half the staff never come up for morning coffee anyway because it is geographically inconvenient for them and so communication on that level just does not happen. You therefore cannot check up very quickly, you suspect somebody is playing truant from your class but you cannot check up quickly because you may not see the Form Tutor. It is not possible to systematize this because classes are set across the year and Form Units are really only registration units. The informal method of communication is the best sort, otherwise you are going to spend a lot of time writing messages, and one does not have the time. In any case it is difficult to write what you have to say.

One hears of one school which has a formal staff meeting every morning and you get this informal chit-chat passed round. Every school is going to have to work out its own salvation. This is so, particularly with regard to the inter-relationship between the pastoral and the academic side. I must say that I feel the distinction to be largely an artificial one in that a class teacher is as much concerned with the pastoral side as vice-versa. I do not think that one can differentiate.

The head used to have an advisory committee composed of what he called senior heads: head, deputy, director of studies, and the heads of the major academic departments: Mathematics, English, Modern Languages, and Design. Then the pastoral system was introduced and
almost immediately everybody bar the director of studies on the academic side went out overnight, and Heads of Years replaced them on the committee. This has led to a certain amount of disgruntlement and was rather a bad political decision. You cannot say to the same man you are relevant and then after half term you are irrelevant when he is doing actually the same job as he was before. Effectively we have got now a far closer relationship between the non-represented staff and the represented staff but it does tend to be a little power community, and this again, coupled with the problems mentioned before, means that things just do not come down the scale and this is the major source of problems in this school.

Unless what they do in that committee is communicate it does not matter how scrappily, if somebody just sticks up a bit of paper and says we talked about so-and-so, then things go wrong. This paper does go up now but there was a period when it did not. That has been a problem. The committee does reflect status. The Heads of Departments have no such meetings. There is no academic counterpart to the pastoral meeting. I feel there should be one.

I feel that personalities play an important part. I am a believer in personal rather than collective responsibility. I feel the danger of the system here is that one gets group responsibility and Parkinson's Law; committees tend to defeat themselves and they achieve rather less than you thought they would. They tend to grow, they tend to proliferate.

If an area of responsibility is defined then somebody fulfils that area of responsibility to the best of his ability, but he will obviously in some respects overlap on others. First as a class teacher I impinge on the pastoral side. Then as an English specialist I impinge on the pastoral side. Then as a human being I override the whole lot and it is in the areas of human responsibility where I feel that a highly organised system like this can break down. I have nothing against the pastoral heads, so to speak. My deputy in the Department
is on the pastoral side and she tells me what to do
with the Report Forms which I have filled out as a Form
Tutor, and academically I tell her what to do in the
curriculum. We get on amicably because we know our
areas of responsibility, and because we value each other
as human beings. Where the pastoral responsibility is
hived off into, yes, a prestige group, you can find that
you are tending to disregard your responsibility because
it does not fall within that particular area. In other
words, I feel that a lot of my colleagues have fallen
flat, and I am doing it myself, in not acting as a
human being, because that falls under someone else's
defined area of activity or responsibility. All systems
tend to become dehumanised and I think that is what I
regret most of all that we do tend to lose the human
touch, that we cannot say to, say a girl; "Look, I'm
sorry about so-and-so losing a parent or someone," because
the information does not come down and you find that is
the biggest trouble. The collective responsibility must
deny essential humanity, and that denies responsibility
before God, and this is a Church school where we have to
think about our responsibilities as Christians first, and
I feel that our responsibilities as members of a system
tend to come in between.

I recognise that the system was conceived of
as better serving the pupils, or was it? The system
just seemed to happen. I never quite knew. I must
admit that when it was introduced I was going through a
terrific personal crisis and I was not particularly aware
of what was happening. I am just waking up. The theory
I understand to be that the Year System breaks down the
very large school into manageable units but in practice
the hiving off of that unit destroys inter-relationships
with other units, and all sorts of other parts on the
same, I hate this word, isn't it a lousy word, campus.
You just cannot do it. I feel that this is a political
move which has happened, in the sense of the right wing-
left wing sense. I feel we went into comprehensive
educational systems as a matter of politics, a doctrinaire
political decision. Systems were imposed from above and that meant we had to make the best of them as possible. The little God of economic efficiency was to be the be-all and end-all of everything, instead of human values.

Are the children getting an education as distinct from a schooling? The Americans are always twenty years ahead; they went into comprehensives, found the break-down of personal responsibilities, the gang wars, blackboard jungle, and they are now going right away from it and getting back to smaller schools. We did the wrong thing for the right reason. What is wrong with us is that perhaps we tend to simplify down our problems, we tend to define them, to pigeon-hole them and most of the problems that we come to are that human nature per se is not rigidly definable. On average we know what is acceptable within certain limits. We like the occasional crankiness in our neighbour because it makes him more of an individual, but when we try to define rigidly you come into dire trouble and we are into semantics really. Is the quart jug with a pint in it half full or half empty? The answer is that it is both. In pure research one can set up a hypothesis and prove it, but variable human nature can spoil things.
I think the time factor is an area of friction because we are all heavily committed, though the Head of Year has not got much more time for administrative duties than the Head of Department (seven periods as against five out of forty). As the school gets bigger one would need more time.

I work in two departments, Mathematics and Science, and I do not find this to be a difficulty. It often comes down to the question of personalities. My view is that if the personality is wrong then you will have problems. Some people are dogmatic, and they can make mountains out of molehills, but other people take things as they come and adapt to them.

From a Head of Year point of view, Heads of Departments count their departments as the first and most important responsibility, and sometimes that obscures their views of what is the best interest of the children, or of the school. If you are changing say the curriculum then it becomes a case of inter-departmental in-fighting; they do not want to give up more time, or they want to organise it this way to suit their departments and this can be a case of conflict. To be a pretty good Head of Department he needs to have a pretty narrow view. You have got to expect each Head of Department to act this way but ultimately you have to ask him to consider other people's viewpoints as well.

Communications are certainly a problem. They are a problem in our school. You can get the situation where the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. One gets the situation for example when a child leaves and the first you know of it is from the children, or perhaps somebody has changed groups and one is not informed, and in my view this all comes back to the time factor. Before I can get some information around to the staff something else has happened, pressure of
work, so some information is getting round in a very unsatisfactory way and people get annoyed and feel that they should have been properly informed.

It is so difficult to weigh off the time against certain problems which arise. You might spend two or three hours with just one child whilst on another occasion the child might take up only five minutes. Once you start to look into something, other things come up. I try not to allow this sort of work to interrupt my teaching but I know that it does happen on occasions and I know that if you were continually out of class, and not teaching, then the Head of Department would have a gripe there.

A lot depends on the personality of the Head of Year in what he decides on as his priorities. The Head of Year must assess on each occasion what is the priority and that may not agree with somebody else's idea or assessment of it. If you feel there is somebody else who can deal with it say perhaps the deputy head, with whom I work closely, we often cover the same ground, then I would happily leave it to him if he has the time available. Failing this, I would set some work for the class and ask someone to sit in for me. Again it is a matter of give-and-take. You have to be prepared to do the same for someone else. If you keep passing things off to other people then you are a bit of a parasite, and you will be treated as such when you ask for help.

Personality must be seen to be the most important factor because if confidence starts to build up personally then it can be taken into other things. Some people appear to carry a grudge over a long period of time over some small incident and it gradually builds up until those people are hardly talking to one another, and they have got to work closely together and in this situation they cannot work properly.

One of my problems is that having been promoted from Head of Department to Head of Year many still look
upon me as still being in charge of that Department and
the new Head of Department resents that, but it is
something I cannot help.

I think contact with the parents can be the
hardest part of my new job. The hardest thing of all
is the situation where parents come in and criticise
other members of staff, the Head of Department possibly,
or the way the subject is being taught, and in actual
fact you sometimes feel that their criticism is justified,
but professionally you cannot say that, so you have to
cover up as it were and then go back to the Head of
Department afterwards and say: "Look this has happened in
your Department; it's the second time the criticism has
been made and will you do something about it?" That,
I think, is the hardest part. You can smooth things
over for a certain period of time, but if these complaints
occur and conflict arises between the parents and staff
you are in between.

Regarding status I was certainly promoted to my
present post and particularly so because my department
was one of the smaller ones. I think some people are
better as Heads of Departments and prefer to stay there.
Promotion-wise, I feel that I am in a better position than
the senior departments on the same money scale. One
gets more experience. I am sure that the Heads of
Departments think this is so too.

We have a Heads of Years' meeting once a week
which is a fairly routine affair, and we have a staff
representative because people think there's something
secret going on that we are planning, things they do not
know about. The head and his deputies are there, of
course, with the Director of Studies, and it is top
management, but basically it is just discussing some of
the problems in the school. It is very routine but that
is not how it seems to be seen by some of the staff; they
think we are sitting together, talking and planning
things, and they do not know what is going on, so we
have off-set this by having a staff representative.
Previously the senior Heads of Department were in on this but it was too unwieldy so it was trimmed down and some Heads of Departments resented it. The thing is that although not much goes on in there you are involved and able to participate. The Heads of Departments' meeting is large and meets perhaps once a month. Status certainly comes with the weekly Heads of Years' meeting. The Heads of Departments are equal in rank on scales of pay but with regard to their say in the running of the school the Heads of Years have an advantage.

A big problem is getting the staff together just to talk either at break times or after school, to tell them of anything that might have come up at the meeting. This is invaluable to staff. There is definitely an overlap of roles but you need this and this is a real help when there is pressure. If you work in isolation and nobody else knows what is going on then no one can take over if you are sick or not well.
I think the main problem is the question of communication. This is an area of concern. This is for the staff as a whole, as well as Heads of Departments. Appreciating the kind of service I am providing for the school and particularly for the Heads of Departments is something that depends upon good communication. Keeping everybody informed is difficult.

The development of Heads of Years has happened over the last ten years and though areas of responsibility have been defined in many schools I feel that if you keep things within these little squares you will not get the communication. I think that a conflict or anxiety might come if one does not ask the question frequently: "Am I telling the right person? Am I telling one who should know?" Or again: "Are those who do know passing the information to me?" My concern is to ensure that any information I have concerning the pupils, pastoral, disciplinary, academic problems, is indeed being passed on, and the Director of Studies and myself have looked at the structure within the school, of the actual method of procedure of passing information and this is where we are trying something afresh, to redefine, as it were, within this school, how information should be passed, to whom, and what type of information, and so on. So that everybody keeps everybody informed.

Time is precious and very limited and the situation will only get worse with the cuts to come.
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I was happy being Head of the Science Department. I enjoyed the job and was getting the same money as Head of Year but I think that as this school was developing I felt that I was drifting away from the centre of power; not from the point of view of having more money, but from sheer interest in having a say and seeing how the cogs turned over. I slid into a dual post which happened to be going and, as a result, I am a senior staff member by virtue of my department, and I can go into the head's study and say my piece at the Head of Year meeting every Friday. So I have a foot in both camps.

There are some rumblings about this from other Heads of Departments, e.g. the Craftsman who, though on Scale 4, is not looked upon as an academic Head of Department, although he covers an awful lot of syllabus (Art, Domestic Science and Craft are all under his umbrella). He does not go to these meetings and he feels that he is not in contact and he has more or less pushed himself into the Friday meeting as a Staff representative. This is for the same reason that caused me to move, so as to be in at the centre of things to see what is going on and to influence the decision making.

I think the Heads of Departments have suffered in this school. There used to be senior Heads of Departments' meetings in the same way as we now have the senior pastoral people meeting with the head but this has not carried on. An attempt has been made to restart it but it has always petered out and I think it is basically because the head was not 'nudged' or reminded of it, rather than because he did not want it. This seems to show to me that although they grumble and want to be in on this, they do not make the effort to cross the line.

There is a line there, I think, that has built up in the school. They become so involved in their departments. This is their little world and anything
that infringes on this is fought off. If the school gets bigger it would be impossible for me to do both jobs and I would go over to the pastoral side. I think this is because of the career point of view and also because I think, at my age, I have exhausted the interest I could have in running my own department. Up to two years ago I was enjoying my work and at that time I was asked if I was interested in Head of Middle School, which would have been a complete commitment, but I declined it. Perhaps then I felt too secure in my department and afraid to move out - it meant burning my bridges, you know, but now I feel differently.

I feel the major area of conflict is in the fact that the pastoral people make decisions without in many cases consulting Heads of Departments - this is concerned with general school policies. I think we have to talk about members of staff in private, all in connection with organisation, and you cannot do this openly in a full staff meeting or even an enlarged committee which included some Heads of Departments, as you could set up a tremendous amount of conflict. Criticism is very difficult of one department in front of other Heads of Departments however nicely it is done. This is one of the major causes of friction.

The head is the source of power and if you are a member of a small group meeting with the head this is a problem as far as relationships go with other senior staff.

Communications are a problem. There is an 'us' and 'them' situation. It is more difficult for me because I am a Head of Department too. I suppose the Heads of Departments think that because I am in with them, that I will not be criticised as they are. We have tried to solve some communication problem by having a member of the departments in with us but it is an inhibiting factor, so we tend to discuss the more personal matters at another time.

Personalities are part of the system. We have
some very difficult personalities on the staff, some very able, very nice, but often sources of conflict between the Head of Department and the pastoral set-up. I should think 70 or 80% of the problem is personality. The Head of English, whom you may meet, is a very good example.

I think the jobs are so different. I have learned an awful lot in the past few years about handling people and talking to parents and sixth formers. I was very hesitant about all this when I started. I believe now, rightly or wrongly, that I am getting a certain facility with this work.

Perhaps it would be better if the reasons why certain people get certain jobs was made more apparent and this might cut out some of the resentment. In a nice way, you know, as I do not think that many people are aware of this. There is some feeling in this school that we may have a number of non-Catholic Heads of Departments but if you are a Catholic then you will be all right on the pastoral side, you are in. The Diocesan ruling about the need for Catholics in pastoral roles has not helped. The philosophy, religion, and the need to establish contact with the parishes make it very important for the pastoral person to be a Catholic. This is certainly a bone of contention.

There is also the feeling that men get the plums rather than the women. This is smaller but there is an undercurrent of this. This is probably the head's own personality. I am not quite sure of that.

There is quite an overlap of jobs here. There is no real answer to this unless you have very strict guidelines and if you do this then you have the Trade Union element coming in. I saw Charlie Brown smashing three windows but he is one of yours. There is a tremendous overlap in this place. First we are still relatively small. We have a pretty big structure. We have a Director of Studies who takes on a lot of work normally done by the Deputy Head, like organisation and
timetable. Then we had people with jobs before the new structure came in. There was a senior master who looked after a very small sixth form; I inherited him and now there is an overlap there. Then there is a Careers man and he has got his patch in Form 6. The overlap is a source of tension at times.
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You ask about tension in the role. There has in fact been out in the open in the past few months a great deal of difference between the academic Heads of Department and the Pastoral Heads. The Head of Mathematics, the Head of Science and the Head of English, felt it necessary to come together to protect their own mutual interests because they felt that they were at a disadvantage even though they had such a large hunk of the curriculum. It was brought home to the head that we were not happy and to give him his due he realised that there is a big problem here and talked to us and we had a special meeting and there is a big wide gap between us. This is very clear but because we have looked at it at a very senior round table meeting we all feel happier than we did.

We were not at a disadvantage financially but this being considered a democratic school, there are a lot of meetings, the Heads of the senior Departments felt that their voices were not being heard and if you get swamped in various committees and one has to go away and follow a policy agreed in this way it does not seem right. I am responsible for say one eighth of the time-table in the school. There are thirteen who teach my subject and there are five periods per week for every child up to Form 5, and yet I am expected to carry out policies about which I feel I have not got sufficient voice in its determination.

The senior departments felt that the pastoral case was being put before their voice. The pastoral system has been very good and we work on the whole very well together but for example in the case of rooms I have got a room of my own because it was free and I got in first. I am afraid this is the way things work in schools. It was quite legal but I shall lose it soon when the new building comes into use and there will be some re-organisation.
I will not get a room, neither will the Head of English. We went to the head and said: "Look, we have not got much store space and we would like a room like the Head of Year." The head was very sympathetic but since we had this open confrontation I do not think we are going to get it. He said we have got a point. You cannot be expected to run a big department if you have no base, somewhere one can take someone like you.

The other thing that immediately strikes me is the question of tension. You are asking about status. Don't forget you are talking to a reasonably young woman, Head of a big Department. I do not think that promotion will be a problem for me. I do believe that for men it would appear to be easier to get a deputy headship or a headship from the pastoral side of a big school. I know of some Heads of Departments here who are very worried about promotion from a Department and would like to get in on the pastoral side. I think status is a bit of a problem here.

There is a danger that one on the pastoral side is in a position to interfere with our departmental courses, when the person outside of the department does not understand really what it is all about. We like co-operation but sometimes one gets interference. One appreciates co-operation between the two sides. Today you saw me in the staff room filling in a form for the pastoral people; the problem was in my control but I was letting the Head of Year know in case the matter should come his way. It seems to work as long as it is informal. Someone told me today that a child's grade was wrong. I checked with the subject teacher and found that it was wrong and I wrote a note to the Head of Year putting the matter right. Now if the Head of Year had come to me and said, and this could so easily happen: "You must do this or that" instead of: "What do you think about this?" then it could turn out to be a problem.

There is this danger of power. It is power,
is it not? When someone says: "You must change this set" or something like that, then it could get dangerous and if it could get there, then something should be done. I do not think this matter can be resolved by another meeting. Quite frankly we have too many. This is a very friendly school. It works well on the good will and the hard work of the staff. You can talk to anyone and it works on that basis. It breaks down as soon as you have to say: "I am Head of Department, I think this and therefore we are going to do it." Generally we manage to avoid this.

Well, I have had one stand-up row. There is one very forthright, pastoral Head of Year who makes decisions right off the top of his head and will fight to have his way irrespective of the basis on which he is doing it, and really this can be very difficult. The informal basis which I am speaking of will only work if there is the right personality. If not, you would have to put down literally everything one had to do, and there is a danger that this sort of thing might be happening.

What worries me is that we tend to look at the whole linear development of our subject and of a basic set of knowledge and ideas leading towards enlightenment that the children need, and we tend to say these are our standards. The pastoral people tend to say: "No, let us judge the children not by these standards but by the children's peer group, and by their backgrounds." Now I tend to think that we should put the external standards up and let the children know that they have to reach up to them, rather than say let us judge the children in the light of their backgrounds. There is a difference of emphasis between the two sides, the child must know that there are external standards and you cannot judge too much from the kids themselves and their needs. The pastoral side tends to get too involved with the kids and we tend to be a bit further away. After all, are we here to teach? We have got to set up external standards. I think one tends to lower one's standards
if one gets too involved, especially with kids with behaviour problems. Sometimes the pastoral people, probably because they have so many problem children to deal with, tend to put the children's backgrounds first. These kids need an external standard so that they can have a different background.

I recognise that no teacher can function unless he cares. Even in the time I have been teaching I have seen discipline go down because the general trend in teachers is to look at background rather than what the good people can do. We have a caring staff. Some of our problems come from staff who are left-wing and strongly disagree with everything that smacks of elitism and they fight this but this is because they care too.

I think too much structure makes for rigidity but the personality can override the structure, whatever the role. I think the greatest stress in my own role is sorting out the day-to-day problems that just have to be done, and if my own staff need help then that comes before sorting out the children's problems. If one teacher is helped then thirty children benefit. The pressure of work I would say, of meetings, it is not so much the teaching, of sorting out the problems, some of policy and knowing that I have got to go and fight for some things, is a great strain. A big problem is knowing what I can fight for, and what is worth fighting for, whether I should fight on principle, or would it be better to leave it and bide my time.

Interaction with staff gives me trouble. There is one who is causing me a lot of trouble in my own department, again it is an authority thing. In running a department you have pressures from above and pressures from below. I am not a good politician. I try to speak the truth as I see it. I tend to open my big mouth and put my foot in it. This is my fault. I tend to run an open department and if you like one where people go their own way within the structure. I think it is better that way. I like the responsibility. I cannot stand
other people making a mess of a job that I can do better myself.

I have access to top management in the school but we were complaining of the lack of influence we felt we had in policy making. You see there is such a big hierarchy before you get to us. There is the head, three deputies, three Heads of Schools, then Heads of Years and ourselves. We were thinking all this was being pushed against us. You cannot give people the power to organise a whole section of the school without giving them the power to have an important say in the policy within which you have to work. One doesn't want the same say as seventy or eighty other people if that is what is meant by democracy. Democracy then does not work. It is nice to have it, and to be able to get up and have your say, but in the end someone has to be responsible.
With regard to communications between Head of Year and Head of Department one of the difficulties here has been that the Heads of Departments, some of them anyway, feel that they should take part in the pastoral side of the school. There has been rather an unnatural division whereby Heads of Departments see themselves as being academic people and other people have been regarded as pastoral.

There should be some interrelation between the two roles. The Heads of Departments have only been given time to organise their own departments. Personally I think they should be pastorally concerned. Perhaps this is part of the Head of Year's role, to keep the Heads of Departments informed of any difficulties in their departments. I make it my business to consult with Heads of Departments in case they can switch the timetable or do something of that sort to ease the child's position. A certain amount of strain is brought about in cases like this. The Year Tutor will get hold of it first then I would investigate and advise the teachers about the best course. I still think it is bad policy to look upon some people as academics and some as pastoral because every teacher is an educator. No teacher separates class teaching from having an interest in kids. The whole development of the child is involved, spiritual, emotional, intellectual. All staff are teachers not pluggers of subjects.

There was a tendency to throw all discipline problems in the direction of the pastoral staff. The Head of Year still has to be the father figure. Any problems at all must be dealt with. The intention must be to make every child happy. A happy child is a contented child. If you talk out things with a child whatever his problem, let him cry, rage, whatever, and you are half-way to solving the problem. Of course, there is
always two sides to a question and I always see the teachers too. The more experienced teachers do not normally get the confrontations.

There is a danger that kiddies identify teachers as academics or pastoral which should not be. I make a special task to get to know all who are in the Remedial Department because so many of the pupils have problems which often find their way to me.

We have regular meetings between Heads of Years and the form group tutors to go over problems. I have little to do with the Heads of Departments. I teach History and therefore have my own Head of Department, but as Head of the First Year in one building with all the Heads of Departments in the other building across the road I do not have many dealings with them. I have the right to attend Working Parties on curriculum matters or other Policy Meetings. The thing that does get me down is the idea that I am the one who has to be dealing with discipline. We have now a more positive approach in that it is now recognised that I am concerned with the spiritual, emotional development. Meeting children on one to one basis in my room, or sitting at table with them in the Dining Room, means that much of the discipline problem has naturally disappeared because of this more positive approach. We tended to have more young teachers over on this side and I have seen it as part of my role to care for them.

Every teacher has to have the caring attitude but the Head of Year has that extra time to take the over-all view. I have found the staff very co-operative if I have wanted to break into lessons. You have to establish the right relationships with your Form Tutors or subject teachers. The children have not enough time together as Form Groups. There are certain people who would never make a Form Tutor nor a Year Head. They have got it or they have not. They may be good subject teachers but they cannot create a Form or a Year spirit.
The Form or Year Tutor has to have a charisma.

You never establish a perfect system but we are getting much better. The system is no better than the people who work it. You need to create good relationships. When I mentioned the feeling by the Heads of Departments that they should have more pastoral concern I feel it was because they felt they had not got sufficient status. They felt that pastoral people had more status because they were being more consulted. Of course, consultation between Head of Year and head is a natural one. You are reporting back all the time. The Head of Department is more or less in a cocoon is he not? My own feeling is that a good Head of Department who wanted to do more pastoral work could quite easily do so. I have been Head of Department and I would be doing what I am doing now in any case. The Heads of Departments appear to feel at times that their roles have diminished. The Heads of Departments are the ones to benefit most from the pastoral system working well. The Head of Year role has to take the over-all view; you must be seen actively to support school policy and to support constructively. You are not knocking the establishment. You do not knock it to anybody else. Similarly when a kid is sent to me, I do not knock the teacher.
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I think the biggest strain is just keeping up with it all. I have fourteen periods for my pastoral activity. I have twelve classes to care for. One needs a lot of time for the pastoral work but one hesitates to give up teaching time because that is so important for learning about the children. I think you need to teach. I do not like the idea of administration being separated from teaching. I have to discipline myself and say I have to teach these lessons. The big temptation would be to take some of your teaching time, and to be thinking of your pastoral work during it.

Occasionally I have to leave my teaching to do something in an emergency. If a child is terribly upset or something requires immediate treatment then one has to drop the teaching. I have a good working relationship with my Head of Department and I seldom have to ask for a substitute. The Reports last week forced me to seek a substitute. I have twelve sets to look after which cannot be done in the time available. I am reluctant to do this as it is not fair on the children. It is not a terrible source of anxiety. It is there.

It is fitting everything in that worries me the most. I know I am neglecting things that I want to do. There are lots of children that I want to speak to, not urgently but about some problem that I know they need some help. Our system of communication is just beginning to work out. We have got this system where the teacher fills in a slip, whether it is a matter of discipline or work, and it is put in my pigeon hole. The teacher will also talk to me. It comes both ways but I like the slips because you cannot remember everything. I keep a diary. I try to write down all the little things that happen. They may not seem very important but I will
need them to connect up things later. Once a week I meet the group tutors and we discuss all this. I keep all my records in my room. Some things we think important are referred on to the Head of School, or I deal with the case. It might necessitate a detention, a good talking to, but it is all talked about and then a return slip is made out to say what is being done and one of these goes to the teacher who made the report. Another goes in to the register to be seen by the group teacher.

I do not find it happening so much now as it used to, I mean my doing something that has already been attended to. There was an awful lot of this at first. This is now my second year of doing this job. Last year, with a different Head of School, who was very keen, we often overlapped in our work. I got annoyed occasionally about this. I had to say: "If you are doing it, do it!" He was promoted to deputy head in a school in Wales. He was only Head of School for a year.

Just as there is sometimes duplication of work there is also neglect. The clever children get themselves deliberately neglected. They fall between tiers. You pass them on to someone else. Someone else sends them back to you and they never arrive. Children can beat any system. The rascals get away with some things. They do not get away with everything. With the ones who are a continual nuisance you cannot pick on everything they do wrong. You could not possibly. It would be a full time job.

Some people might find all this wearing, but it is a matter of personality. It would drive you round the bend if you were not the right type. Head of Department is a completely different job from Head of Year. I know the Head of Department has a certain amount of pastoral responsibility but it is limited. They pass a lot of their problems on to us. We pass some back to them, e.g. it might be a matter of changing the child's group or doing something which is really their business. I might be able to see this looking at the over-all view, and I
would recommend it to a Head of Department. The Head of Department will often act on that recommendation. If he cannot he will not.

The Head of Department determines who teaches the classes. If I found the allocation unsatisfactory I would go to the Head of Department and say: "I do not think this class is being treated fairly." This is an area for consultation. We have got the over-all view of the class and the child which the Head of Department cannot always get. They do not see their other subjects. The Head of Department looks at his subject. Very often he would like to make his subject important for the child. He thinks it would be the best thing for that child. I think our job is to look at the whole picture and see whether it is becoming unbalanced.

I did not come up from being Head of Department. I had done a lot of supply teaching which I think gives you a very varied experience. Most Heads of Departments, I would think, are good at their subjects and go on because of this. When you look around it is true that a good pastoral Head of Year is a better candidate for promotion. The head's role is, of course, an over-all view. He has to be able to see the complete picture and not just that of a department.

I think the big departments retain their status compared with Heads of Years and Heads of Schools. The smaller departments do not. I think the experience that we get as Head of Year or Head of School is so wide and so varied that this is what you need really. To do the over-all job of running a big school the rather narrow view of the department is not such a help. There should be more scope for the departmental people to get their fulfilment in that sphere. Perhaps the pay scales should allow for this. I think most Heads of Departments would need more experience than they have got. They would have to do a course of some sort. The answer might be to raise the ceiling for the very gifted Head of Department.
The influence of the good Head of Department is enormous. I think we in the schools are only in the stage of working all this out. We have not realised the problem until fairly recently. The connection between the roles is a problem. I am still learning on the job. If I step out of line and interfere then someone will soon tell me. You have got to be flexible. I think you should overlap. Some of the most important work goes on in the staffroom at the various breaks. We have many official formal meetings with tutors, heads of school, and staff meetings. We have Working Parties. They are all important. The constant meetings are a strain. They must be. We used not to have all these meetings. But we never used to know much about the children.
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We have recently had criticisms levelled at Heads of Years by Heads of Departments over the allocation of rooms. We have a Review Committee which was specially called. It consists of Senior Management. The Heads of Departments complained that they had no room at all where they could meet students privately, talk to Inspectors, talk to people like yourself. Because of pressure of space they were thinking in terms of one room which would be shared by a number of Departmental Heads. I think this was a reasonable request though a rather poor show if this turned out to be the final result. I recognise that the Heads of Years have many more people to interview. Obviously you would need this type of accommodation if you are meeting parents. I can see both points of view but I think more could be done for people on my side of the fence.

What we are very very short of is storage space. I have a very small room as Head of Humanities. It is full of files, cabinets, equipment; there is absolutely no room to swing a cat so what I need is that room converted to something like this (room) and we need better storage space. But I can see the head's priorities on this and the priorities that are put forward. One or two criticisms of this sort were thrown about at this special meeting. There was tension at that meeting.

Very often the Head of Year is approached by a child who has a problem, and very often the problem is either exaggerated or the Year Tutor tends to believe the child in preference to the teacher. That is, in the first instance. Now the sort of criticism that I am thinking of, to give you the illustration. They have in the French Department a lower ability group which has French studies involving nothing to do with the spoken
language but including manners, customs of the 
country, and so on. One child went home to tell his 
parents that he was made to write an essay in French. 
The parents went to the Head of Year and complained that 
it was beyond him and that the teacher concerned was 
very harsh. Now taking the problem was fine but the 
exaggeration that took place created a problem for the 
Year Tutor. She came searching out the Head of 
Department and the latter was particularly upset about 
the way in which it was done. This made it look as 
though the child was right and the Head of Department was 
wrong. Whereas it was the other way round.

On that occasion there was some feeling between 
the Head of Department and the Head of Year. There are 
times when the Heads of Departments are feeling that they 
are always being called to task by Year Tutors. Yet the 
reverse does not take place. Some Heads of Departments 
complained at this meeting that they felt that the head 
was preoccupied with pastoral matters, and that the 
Departments suffered as a result. There are a number of 
the Departments, particularly the larger ones, who feel that 
points and time would be better spent dealing with 
academic work and departmental situations rather than 
looking at the pastoral side. There does seem to be a 
rift between the two sides at places.

The head realises that this does occur and that 
there is a little bit of Empire Building going on. Of 
course, the larger departments tend to be Empires in 
themselves. The cross referencing between pastoral and 
departmental, and also interdepartmental, does not take 
place as much as it should. I think part of this stems 
from the fact that the Heads of Years tend to be given 
a slightly higher status in the general hierarchy of the 
school. They tend to have a far greater say with 
parents. They meet with parents more often. They tend 
to be in meetings with the major heads of schools and 
therefore the Heads of Departments tend to feel that they
are cast aside a little bit. I think the pride of place in the hierarchy and the kind of standing does play a big part.

Over the four years I have been in this school there has been a gradual merging. When I first came the differentiation was particularly bad between the role of pastoral and the role of the academic. Now it is merging a lot more. I do not feel there is enough communication coming back from Heads of Years. This applies to the Heads of Departments and to the teachers generally. When they refer someone to the Head of Year or want to know about somebody, there is almost an air of secrecy about things. "So-and-so is under stress, please treat gently," is the kind of remark that comes back from the pastoral side. One would like to know more about it. A child may be referred to a particular Head of Year for not doing homework, truanting, or whatever, and then you wait and nothing comes back. I think the Heads of Years are trying to improve on this more than they used to but they're so involved with trying to solve the problem in hand, in dealing with the parents and so on, that they tend to forget the teacher who made the original referral.

Time is a very important problem. This was another bone of contention. Heads of Departments felt that Heads of Years had a similar work load to that of a senior Department. You may have people with fourteen or sixteen staff under them; they have little free time, say perhaps four, six, or eight free periods a week, and you have your Heads of Years with twelve or fifteen. There was jealousy there. I think this was understandable from the academic point of view, even though one recognises that it takes a Head of Year a long time to follow up things, co-ordinating with outside agencies, etc. But Heads of Departments must carefully organise their departments otherwise the best work is not forthcoming from the whole team of teachers. If you tend to let syllabus, administration, looking at junior teachers within the department, if you let these things go then you will end up
with just bad results.

I haven't been particularly involved in personality clashes with Heads of Years and Heads of Departments. I think one can appreciate that Heads of Years do have a lot of the dregs thrown at them. They tend to get problems heaped on their plates. They have to sort them out. Many Heads of Departments do appreciate this. Personalities are involved in that some do better jobs than others. Some do it in a far friendlier way. Some people are more approachable than others. There are one or two personalities who are outstanding within the school. They do a good job. They hold your respect.

I see two lines of promotion. You either follow a pastoral line and end up with a Head of School, possibly going on to Deputy Head or Head, or you remain in the academic line and you go on to a Deputy Head, tending to miss out the Head of School, and picking up instead things like Director of Studies, Curriculum Organiser, or the one in charge of TimeTabling. There appear to be these two lines but I've found that in the short lists I've had they have tended to look for people along the pastoral side. I think that this is the emphasis in education at the moment. It's the trendy thing. It's important but I think it's exaggerated, to a certain extent. Most of the people appointed to the heads' jobs are pastorally inclined rather than being concerned with curriculum matters.

In this school the two lower Heads of Schools are almost completely pastoral. That is their role. The Deputy Head then deals with curriculum co-ordination and timetable. It's easier to get up the ladder if you go by the pastoral side. The danger too is that Heads of Schools' jobs are being given to Heads of Years which cuts out the Heads of Departments.

As a Head of Department in a growing school I find my biggest source of anxiety to be resources, I mean money which is so needed by a Humanities Department which is trying to establish itself. That has nothing to do with
the pastoral side. Except of course that some of the resources do go to the pastoral side. Certainly some Heads of Departments feel that money and points should go more to the departments, rather than developing the Year system further by putting in assistant year tutors. There was a lot of argument when this was first raised by the head. There were a lot of departmental people opposed to this. They felt the pastoral side was becoming overloaded and lopsided. The expertise and competence of the departments should be built up instead. Providing higher posts and higher grades and thereby attracting teachers with good experience to come in to the departments would be the best way forward for the school. It got through to a great extent because the people offered these posts came from the departments. They said "Yes" quite happily and accepted the extra posts. The ground was thereby taken away from the Heads of Departments.

I don't think the whole system is quite working properly as yet. There's been a number of meetings to try to iron it out. It's beginning to get off the ground. I'm referring to the new posts and their duties. There's been some overlap between Form Tutors, who are supposed to do a pastoral job, assistant year tutors, year tutors, and Heads of Schools. This makes a four tier hierarchy. They all seem to be doing the same job. They were treading on each other's toes. Layers or tiers were being missed out. People felt that they couldn't do their jobs properly because somebody else was doing some of it. It's been difficult to get the duties and responsibilities worked out.

There's a working party at the moment on communications. This is a bugbear here. It's got better and better. It's still got a long way to go. This is especially so when you're on a split site. I think we could benefit by more after school activities. This is so in the lower school particularly. I think a youth club situation
could fill a real need. I think Year Tutors might do something on these lines. A youth club within the school. Time might make it difficult for the pastoral people to organise this. The pastoral people are very often in conflict. They're handed the conflict situation. To work best they have to work in conditions of sympathy. You can get to know students better outside the classroom.
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Time is a pressure when one has a heavy teaching load (34 out of 40). If one has to see Heads of Years or Heads of Schools it is very difficult, and a lot of it has to be done out of school time. During the day one feels pupils are in school to be taught. There are teachers in the department to be seen, one has to get round the classrooms, so when do you discuss points with Heads of Years? It has to be out of school time which adds to the pressure.

My main experience with Heads of Years is in Form 6 where I am a tutor. I am therefore fairly heavily involved with the Head of Upper School. The career side is much to the fore. I am helped in my Departmental work knowing what the pastoral side wants. It is very important that on the pastoral side they let the Heads of Departments know what their job is all about. I think the Heads of Departments know this but the subject teachers may be dubious.

We meet together at meetings with Heads of Years. We meet together with Heads of Schools at Departmental meetings. There is no time when the pastoral people have the chance to override the views of the Head of Department with regard to his own subject. I hope that this situation will never arise. I feel the Head of Department is responsible to the head for everything that is done in the Department.

I distribute my teachers throughout the school. If I distributed them badly I should imagine the Head of Year would have a quiet word. The whole thing is a compromise. It's a matter of debate where most damage is done by a poor teacher. I can imagine that this is a source of conflict.

I would see a line of promotion through Head of School rather than Head of Year. I would look for a Head
of Upper School. It does enable you to get out of your subject. I'm doing a lot of work in the Form 6 at the moment so I have already made a start. To get a promotion to say a deputy head's job one would need to have done a job encompassing the whole of the curriculum, and so I would go for a Head of School post first. The danger is that the Head of Department can be very narrow in his outlook. It becomes obvious at Heads of Departments' meetings sometimes where you get the situation that they fight their own battles. They look after their own departments and maybe push it to such an extent that it will damage the school. You have to have a fair amount of give-and-take, an idea of what the other departments are trying to achieve. One needs to have some sympathy with others. I feel that a Head of School would have the opportunity of looking at a wide range of the curriculum and also deals with a wide range of teachers. The Head of Year also is very much involved with this work.

The Head of Department deals with teachers in his department through the subject which he might be quite sure of, and as a specialist in that subject he'll find it easy to relate to others in the department. When you take down the subject guard teachers find it difficult. Even a form period is difficult for some specialists. I imagine that teaching in a team situation brings great problems of this kind. Even having another teacher in the room takes some getting used to.

The Head of Year/School structure is a useful asset in a number of ways. Personally I think discipline is still the responsibility of the department and the subject teacher. That's one of our major problems. The number of teachers in a department makes it difficult for the Head of Department.

The movement of students between groups is very much the work of the Head of Year; without him how would the departments agree between themselves over such a
move? Departments are less wary about an approach from one on the pastoral side than one from another department. They would think that this will have a detrimental effect upon my department.

The pastoral system has taken a lot of strain out of the classroom. The class teacher would not have the time to deal with the problems. One always wants the class teacher to be more involved but their response is that they have no time. You do the job. You're paid for it. You're the Head of Year. You look after that. The teacher has to have some idea of what the problem is in order to know a child's difficulties. But how far the teachers can follow it up is very limited.

One source of friction is the number of meetings. Some assistant teachers have heavy teaching loads and many meetings together with duties produce heavy pressure. The pastoral people have more time but I recognise that the process of getting information is long and difficult.

The personalities of the people concerned are so important. A lot of the job can be regarded as treading on people's toes. It's so easy for the Head of Department to think that the Head of Year is treading on his toes. What's he up to, I'll give him what for! If the personality of the Head of Year does not convey confidence that he's not usurping your authority, then things will not work. A lot of tact is called for. I find my work in Form 6 exceptionally useful in giving me insight into problems.
The main problem is not so much whether one has time as the distribution of time. When something happens, if a child needs help or gets into trouble, he needs to be dealt with then. What so often happens is that a child gets into terrible trouble about two minutes before you're timetabled to go into class, and it might be a very important class like a seventh year. You really haven't got time to deal with the child. I find with my time that I have periods when I don't know which way to turn because I have so much to do, and periods when I'm running around the school looking into classrooms to see if everything is all right, because I haven't anything better to do. I realise that this is itself an important part of my work. The work comes in bursts.

With teaching you have a timetable. On the pastoral side there is no timetable, and you may find that the pastoral side is clashing with your teaching timetable even though in theory you should have time to do both. This does lead to trouble with the departments. Sometimes you have to leave your class for a long time. I have one particular class that I couldn't possibly leave. In that case I would have to send the child elsewhere to some other senior staff. We do tend to work along that basis of co-operation at different times. Most crises whether emotional or disciplinary are immediate. It has to be dealt with at the moment. A conflict of interests arises here is one can avoid a conflict of people. This conflict of interests is at times a source of anxiety. One does neglect the teaching at times.

The classroom teaching represents at times a nice retreat. You shut the door, you have the class, and no-one interrupts you, or no-one ought to interrupt
you. There is a sense in which the department can close its doors and get on with its own work. It depends upon the teacher whether the problems in the classroom are dealt with or sent outside to the pastoral side. Some teachers can and will cope, others will not. It seems to me, perhaps I'm becoming too sensitive, that far too many teachers are concerned with teaching subjects rather than with teaching children. Big problems should be sent to the pastoral people, but often big problems would not arise if teachers did their own job better.

I get little trouble with people, perhaps because I've been here a long time and others have had to adjust to me. I used to be Head of Science, one of the biggest of the departments, and as Head of that Department one had a certain standing in the school. On moving sideways on to a pastoral job again I was first in the post. I wouldn't say I was particularly more important in the school than a Head of English or Science. My job is so different. I suppose when one is working on school curriculum and that sort of thing you certainly have to take a more over-all view. I suppose that when I first started I had the feeling that anything that interfered with the running of the Science Department shouldn't be done. I didn't worry too much about other departments but I've got over that. One has to take a more over-all view.

I would think that with promotion in mind the Head of Year has the better chance than a Head of Science. This is because we get a wider experience of administration. Heads of Years have this advantage over the Heads of Departments. One still finds the departmental head who would not think of moving outside of his subject and sometimes he would find it difficult to do so. The qualities needed are different. One needs to be a bit of a smoothy. One has to take into account all the problems, one has to see everybody's problem. The snag about seeing everybody's problems is that one would
not deal with them in the same way as does the other person. A fair amount of tact is needed.

The hardest part of my job in relation to other staff is getting people to do extra duties. Occasionally I have to ask people if they will take on something extra, and that I find most difficult. Asking my tutors to do extra on the pastoral side does not bother me. What I'm worst at is following things through. The day's problems are the day's problems. If it isn't completed that day then the next day's problems tend to overlay, and you forget that you had asked somebody to do something in two day's time. Following things through can be very difficult because so much happens. You can't be single-minded. I use a diary. Well I ought to use one. I use it spasmodically. This is me. In a space of a minute, two or three things could start. One can go away and completely forget something important. This must be related to pressures of the job.

I'm just moving in on the options for next year. I involve the Heads of Departments. I draw up the lists of subjects. The children indicate their provisional choice and I draw up a curriculum diagram. Then I meet the departments. They moan, groan, are told that some things are possible and some not. They kick it around. Some Heads of Departments do not wish to be paired with other Departments because they fear that the others will get all the best kids. Finally the departments agree. Then we go to the parents. There's always a pressure on Physics because any apprenticeship in this area needs that and will not accept Physical Science, for example. It doesn't matter if they fail Physics, as long as they have studied it. After that each child is interviewed with his curriculum diagram and then some persuasion is used to get the whole thing to work.

All this indicates I suppose the wide areas of decision making open to the Head of Year. Dissension comes
if the Head of Department thinks that his subject is not being treated fairly. Sitting in committee it is difficult for one department to go it alone. They're not actually at each other's throats but they watch each other carefully. There is not much Empire Building. Sometimes one could do with a bit more than we have. Some prefer to opt for the easy life.

I think the teacher's job over the past ten years has got very much more difficult. They have to use a lot more mental energy in merely keeping order. Twenty years ago every subject had its own club in the school. People don't do it now. People are exhausted at the end of the day.
I took over a Department which was in rather a mess actually because the previous Head had rather an unusual philosophy about the teaching of Languages. There were lots of loose ends to be tied up. This was a source of great strain in the beginning. We now have regular meetings in the department and as well because we are a small group of four we get together every day. We communicate a lot.

There are Year Tutors' meetings and I come into contact with Heads of Years because I am a form tutor. I've not found many problems, I've always been backed up very well. By a Head of Department when I was not Head, and now by a Head of Year in my role as form tutor. I like to feel that I have someone to fall back on in case of emergency. I try to deal with problems myself initially with tutorial difficulties and similarly in the department.

I have a role specification for my department but I didn't have it when I came. Our new deputy head devised this. We're consulted about the amount of homework that we want to give, and the number of nights we would like. The form teacher is responsible for seeing that it is done initially, and then it would come to me.

I am lucky in having a very strong department. We do tend to think alike. The strain that I find comes from overwork basically. It's not from contact with any particular person who annoys me because of his role. I don't find this at all. I do find that if people are inconsiderate that annoys me intensely. If there was an inconsiderate person in a more senior role then I would be annoyed but it would be with the person and not the role.

I like my subject a lot and would probably not wish to seek a Year post or Head of School post. I
wouldn't particularly want to be a disciplinarian which is involved in many of the problems the Head of Year has to deal with. The roles are very different. There is overlap obviously. The Head of Department deals mainly with the subject and its organisation. The Head of Year deals mainly with the distribution of forms within the year, the pupils' problems, and discipline. I would regard the move from Department to Year as a sideways move. There is a lot of blurring of the roles here.
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I have to look after the general academic standard of the year, to see that the homework is done, and that the right quantity is set. I shall have to act through the Heads of Departments to try to improve that. If homework is not being set this will go to the Head of Department. He will deal with the member of staff concerned. If the Head of Department was not setting work himself it would have to be put to him. This would have to be done diplomatically.

One has to care for the children pastorally and see also that they are doing their work. We do this through the team of tutors. They do this research for me. Usually it is the parent who first spots the lack of homework. Some interesting things came up following an investigation on this matter.

In every instance of difficulties between staff, I'm sure you must have discovered this, it's the personalities involved which either create the problems or make them worse. Some trouble that immediately comes to mind was the occasion I trod on Head of Lower School's toes; it was rather a violent occasion actually, so I've been very careful ever since.
The Head of Year has the more stress-full position because he can be criticised on the fairly wide administrative front which covers everything from Assemblies to smoking in the toilets. The behaviour of children in a particular year is a constant worry for the Head of Year and his responsibility lies with parents, staff and pupils, and is 'open' to all sorts of complaints.

The Head of Department, especially if it is small and geographically compact, can be much more private, self-contained, and less open to criticism. The Head of Department may be regarded as 'the' expert with regard to his area of operation, whereas all staff can, quite properly, have views with regard to the more general field of administrative matters presided over by the Head of Year.

Personalities make life very difficult at times. You can speak to some and not to others.

The Departments feel at times that they're being neglected. Some of them should stir themselves and then they would have more say. Some Departments here have been outstanding and nobody questions their importance.

Dealing with parents' complaints gives me the most problems. One has to approach the Head of Department and it can be very difficult when he is the one who is the subject of the complaint. One gets tired at times of listening to other people's problems.
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I know the task connected with my role. This was worked out between the head and myself. It is fairly clearly defined but I have some flexibility in operating it. Sometimes there are 'discontinuities'. I thought for example that when one of my year tutors brought to my notice the fact that Science was not being set for Homework in one of the groups in my year that the group tutor had seen the Head of Science. In fact, he had not. I now realise that was part of my responsibility.

I have the last word in many areas of school activity concerned with my year. I can say "Yes" or "No" to an application by a pupil to join the school. I can suspend a pupil from school for disgraceful behaviour. I deal with parents directly. I decide on the allocation of teaching time in consultation with Heads of Departments but I have the last word. I am a member of a Department but because I am a Head of Year I do not act as a Form Tutor.

I attend Heads of Years and Heads of Departments meetings. I represent the views of the teachers who are group tutors in my year and those meetings, and the general Staff Conference, give me the opportunity to present them when occasion arises. Naturally I am also concerned with the school view as a member of the senior management of the school.

Role strain is felt as a result of criticism which is not 'open' in the sense of a direct personal approach but is carried on in groups in various parts of the school. I know of these criticisms which are reported to me by colleagues. Often such criticism arises from misunderstanding of the nature of a particular problem. For example, I feel sometimes that staff who mainly teach the junior side of the school have little understanding of the problems on the senior side, and vice-versa.
Time is a constant worry. To do the job properly requires an adequate allowance of time free from teaching and replacement duties and in some years the load of teaching is too heavy.

Communication is perhaps the main problem as this is largely the cause of various misunderstandings. Sometimes professional jealousy enters into it because the job of Head of Year has status giving access to power in the school. There is tension sometimes when I have to intervene in the matter of the setting and marking of homework, especially following a complaint from the parents.

Sometimes I strongly disagree with the allocation of teachers by Heads of Departments, and there appears to be too many student teachers given the opportunities to practise in my year.

I find no difficulty in being a member of a department and accepting a different role during meetings to discuss the teaching of my subject.

As head of a team of teachers it is difficult at times to present the school view of my colleagues in senior management, as opposed to the perhaps narrower view of my tutors in certain matters, but I am prepared to take to top management views that I receive from my tutors at our meetings.
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I do not like the system which has developed in the large schools whereby people are appointed to senior posts in the school structure which gives them some important decisions which should not be given to them. They are not as important as Heads of Departments. Anybody could do their jobs. The most important figure on the pastoral side is the Form Tutor and if he does his work properly the pastoral side of the school will be well catered for. I realise that some Form Tutors do not keep a close enough check on their children but ideally they are the ones who count and there would be no need then for the big pastoral responsibility posts to be paid for.

I know my form group better than does the Head of Year. It’s true that sometimes he might have a background picture of the parents, the home, or some special information, but I think it would be a good thing if a lot of this kind of information was not known in the school. I think that Heads of Departments could be designated as Heads of Years as a kind of status symbol, but their main work would be in their departments. The Head of Year should not be seen as superior to the Head of Department. If they have to be done separately (their jobs) then they should be seen as of lesser rank than Heads of Departments, because their pastoral responsibilities could be done by people with much less experience than that needed for Head of Department.

It is unfair to find that the system of promotion operating favours people on the pastoral side in the big schools. The Head of Year type anyway is bound to be something of a dogsbody because he’s often to be found filling up the gaps not covered in the timetable by the departments. I would not like to be Head of Year in this position. I would not like to come out of my
department which has played such a big part in my teaching life. I would not be prepared to come under somebody else teaching my subject in this school as is necessitated in a structure which keeps Head of Department and Head of Year separate.

The intrusion of Heads of Years into the structures of the big schools has damaged the position of Heads of Departments and caused bad feelings and created posts which are filled up with small tasks which any young teacher could carry out. The Head of Year has made the Head of Department a second class citizen, and the move has been carried out quietly whilst Heads of Departments have got on with the main task of the school which is to teach. I get very fed up when I consider the way things have gone.
I have changed my mind on this question. When I first started in a comprehensive I felt that too much time was allocated to Head of Year and too much importance laid upon pastoral activity. I have now had time to see the workings of the Head of Year system and to experience the results and I feel convinced that this system offers a great deal.

The order and discipline owes much to the continuous interest and persistence of the Head of Year. The good Head of Year knows the pupil in his year and keeps a close check on his work, his movements, his behaviour. This kind of caring means that the Heads of Departments and teachers in the classrooms can get on with their work in a way that is not possible in many large schools which do not have this system. I have visited a number of large schools where there appears to be general disorder, where children can be missing from lessons and not followed up, where subject teachers cannot get sufficient help from the administrative set-up because there is no year system, and a senior teacher allocated the general pastoral responsibility cannot cope because of the size of the job. I am now a believer in a strong pastoral framework because this enables the academic work of the school to be carried on efficiently.
I think I have sufficient time to run the year. I have nine free periods a week. I find I can cope with that all right. I find that that nine is taken up with Head of Year's work. All marking and that sort of stuff I have to do at home.

Crisis situations come along sometimes when I'm teaching. You can't say you'll have one at ten o'clock. I think that we are one of the very lucky schools that doesn't have too many crises; this is quite a good school in that respect. Generally if it's bad behaviour by children then the teacher concerned will bring the child to me at break or lunchtime, or sometime like that. I might deal with the matter at four. I'm not often called out of lessons.

Communications do not present a problem. We have a general staff meeting every Monday and I push information out at that meeting if my tutors need to know. Otherwise I go round and speak to my tutors or other staff individually.

I don't think the introduction of the Head of Year system was a source of friction to the Heads of Departments when it was established. I was approached and asked if I would take on the job and I said "Yes" and as far as I know the post wasn't advertised. I think this was the same with the other Heads of Years. When the system started about five years ago I was appointed with a lady to be assistants to the Head of Upper School and then gradually as time went on the name changed and I became Head of Fourth Year. I believe the Heads of Second and Third Years were Heads of Years straightaway. Myself I've gradually worked up to this. I didn't come to it straight away. I'm a late entrant to teaching and have been on this staff eight years.

For myself in the Fourth Year I don't think there's been any conflict between me and Heads of
Departments. The Heads of Departments run their departments and I don't interfere at all in any way. I teach Mathematics and come under the Head of that Department for my subject. In that respect I'm an ordinary teacher and Mr. X tells me what to do. If it's a case of moving a child from one step to another in the set then it's the Head of Department with his staff who have to take the decision but if it's a case of moving a child up or down a Form then I would decide with the help of the teachers. Everything works very amicably.

The only conflict I do have is with the Director of Studies and the Counsellor. We don't see eye-to-eye on all things. They might treat somebody one way and I might treat him in another. I refer people to the counsellor if I think it necessary. I had a case of a girl in my form yesterday. I referred her to the counsellor. When it's a case of a child truanting then I tend to be more discipline-minded perhaps and I want to see that child punished though not for the first offence. I would give a warning on the first offence and then I feel that child ought to be punished. The counsellor might say: "Let's chat it over." The other area of conflict is perhaps if we have a new child in the school and the Director of Studies would ask the child the subjects he would like to take, and the child will be placed in a certain form to do them. Myself, looking at it from a different angle, might say: "No, that's not the best form for that child." This is where the child is within my year group.

You can always get a conflict of personalities of course. This would not be to do with the role.

It's difficult to answer questions about status. At the moment we have got no laid-down rules about our jobs. If there are problems we usually get together and discuss it. We come to an arrangement. In some respects I think it would be good to have work specifications
written down. These areas of conflict we have are not very much but if we say: "Right, it's your job to do so-and-so then there's no argument." If it's not specified there's this little area of uncertainty. I don't think one could be dogmatic about this.

I look upon it as my responsibility, when a new person comes into school in the fourth year, to put him into his little niche but then I wouldn't do that without consulting the Director of Studies. We must work together because our structure is such that if they want to do a certain area of studies then they have to go into a certain selection of forms. This is where we had a conflict the other day over the placement of a certain girl. The Director of Studies is on the curriculum side of the school. The area of conflict is whether he has the last word in the placing of the child. I gave way in that case but I think I have been proved right since. This is, of course, a very minor thing.

As a school staff we are very well informed with regard to any major decision that has to be made. I share a room with other Heads of Years and I see no real need for a room just for myself. I think it's good for us all to be together because we can discuss things together without making a big deal out of it. If a child is brought in to see one of the other Heads of Years and another Head of Year is listening in (provided it's not something completely private) this can be useful.
I think the main problem is lack of communication. I do not think we are told enough about the problems of the children. To give you an example, a child in a form that I teach left at Easter and I only found out last week. I thought that he was just away. I thought he might be sick. But he'd gone! He'd left! This does happen on quite a number of occasions. I don't find that it's so much as a Head of Department that there's conflict. This is a problem that most members of staff face. It's not just me. A lack of communication definitely.

At a deeper level I don't think Heads of Departments resent the pastoral side. I don't. After all, Heads of Years tend to have to deal with problems as they arise. I get the feeling that the system works very well. On the philosophical level it's very much accepted I think. It has improved the school situation inasmuch as you know that if there's a problem situation that there's someone who can deal with it. The Head of Year will know; he will know all there's to know.

Status-wise the Heads of Years are considered to be very senior people and I think that this was known when they were appointed. The people who were appointed as Heads of Years weren't appointed from outside. They came from within the school. Therefore they were all people whom we knew and got on with anyway. Perhaps if somebody had come in from outside it might have affected people. It's difficult to say. They were all long standing teachers. All had been here longer than I have. As far as I can judge they would have been appointed on their personalities.

If I were seeking promotion I wouldn't necessarily go to Head of Year. I'm not very interested in that side. I think the posts have equal status.
The biggest problem in running my department is lack of time. I have no major problem. I have quite a young department and it's stable. We get on well together. There's too much to do. I think the Heads of Years need more time off from teaching than they get. A Head of Department given more free time could use it better for the department than could the Head of Year use it for his year because often the problems arise at different times from that which is free.

I wouldn't say there's no conflict. I distribute my teachers throughout the school in co-operation with the Director of Studies and there's conflict there. Between he and I, and other Heads of Departments. I get on with him very well but one is pushing for one's own subject. He's got to give a general over-all view.

My role as Head of Department is not written down. I don't think this presents me with any problems.

The Heads of Years have separate meetings with the head. I don't know what they discuss. I don't know what is passed on and what isn't. There might be more conflict if the Heads of Years were younger men and women.
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We've had a certain amount of friction because of the annexe situation. Very often I get half of the story because of a break-down in the communication system. Today I've had to try to analyse a problem with only half the information I need. The Head of Year who should have provided this is teaching. I do understand this. This fairly often happens.

Another area of friction is concerned with my attitudes towards certain pupils. I feel it is all important with some students to ensure attendance, and I am not so bothered about their dress for example as might be the Head of Year. Heads of Year, who are pastoral and disciplinary, will come over here and really go for them and perhaps create an upset which to me, wrongly I agree, because the uniform is laid down, is not worth it. I'd much rather have the kid here, where I can do something about it gently but firmly, than have him at home because he's unsuitably dressed. This doesn't cause friction. It causes a lot of discussion.

Status? As you can see, I'm almost my own boss. The head comes over as often as he can. I've got the telephone. I'm in a very, very special position. This itself leads to a certain amount of problem. My remedial group is over here for 28 out of the 40 periods. I don't want them to feel cut off from the rest of the school, with regard to standards, uniform, discipline. It's particularly difficult at that bloodminded 4th and 5th year levels. They're not destructive. They're out there now in five rooms and they're working; they don't want to return to the main building because they know there will be increased friction for themselves and for staff. The atmosphere we try to create here will
not go down well with three quarters of the staff over there. We do make a bit of a noise. Our discussions do get a little heated.

I have three teaching in my department. We're not inhibited space wise. Noise wise we're not inhibited. Therefore we don't get the frictions which otherwise would exist. You've got to toe the line in the main school. There's a strain there. I probably would be fighting far more if I were working in the main building. Atmosphere, dress, uniform, and so on, would be very difficult. My priorities are different.

I see the point of view of the Head of Year. In a massive school I feel you cannot really avoid having friction over standards. We have one Head of Year who is very, very rigid. There's no sort of: "I'll accept a grey area between black and white." Traditional teachers teaching traditional subjects to examination level do not agree with any of the methods that we use over here. For him, right's right, wrong's wrong. We often have differences of opinion which do get a bit heated. I couldn't operate on that basis.

My status and scale are as high as anyone in this school.

Time is a great problem. I have to leave my teaching group sometimes to deal with special cases that arrive to be seen from the main school. I have pupils attached to me for literally every teaching period. Then I have all these other personal attachments - another is due to come next week. Time is really a pressing problem. I'm seeing you now because all the fifth year have gone and life is somewhat easier.

I don't think I would want the job of Head of Year. Although you're involved with a lot more people you're a lot less involved with individuals. I know this is not quite true because you do get the odd breakdown case where the Head of Year is very involved. I think there is another person creeping in who is likely to
create a lot more tension and a lot more dissipation of energies and that's the school counsellor. There is a case for suggesting that the break-down case should go to the counsellor rather than being referred to the Head of Year, and it may affect a remedial department far more than anyone else. So a referral to the counsellor or the Head of Year, with no information to the remedial department would create a real breakdown and could cause some real difficulties. The Head of Year could have trouble here too. As long as the Head of Year or the counsellor keeps me personally in touch with the situation...... The major things they can take on but with minor things we have a good set of relationships over here and we can deal with problems.

There's obviously going to be waves over here if things are mishandled in the main school. A real outburst could take place. We've got to agree with the staff in the main school but we have to soothe characters down and we have to be kept in the picture.

Personalities play a hell of a part. If you get an RSM or one whose technique is bully-and-bluster then that has very limited possibilities in the sort of work I'm doing. Our kids feel themselves to be failures. Half our battle is to overcome this. Bad or thoughtless handling on the other side of the road could damage what we do.

We have long discussions because talking-out is the only way. Sometimes things happen late in the day. There's no time to talk it out; it festers all night and you come back next morning looking for blood! As soon as you start talking, you think: "Oh for God's sake, it's not worth it." The departments can do a lot together for individuals but there's the problem of time. Teachers may not be available just when they could be most useful in explaining something. So although we tried to spread the contact for these kids, all the Heads of Departments were in favour of it, the time element came in. Friction can be caused in practice.
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Obviously at times my work as Head of Year and as a teacher conflict because a parent is very anxious about some problem and wants to see me in school time and then I have to choose between who should come first, the parents or the teaching. That rarely happens and it's only in an emergency. Normally they make an appointment to come in after school.

The Heads of Year system was introduced here when this was a fairly small school. I don't think those of us who were made Heads of Years knew quite what it involved. It was like Topsy; it just grew. I'm not really aware of much friction except that there's a lot to pack in to the time. The thing has just mushroomed up as the school has got bigger. My year has grown enormously with the Raising of the School Leaving Age. Previously there wasn't a great deal to do but after ROSLA there were numerous conflicts with the girls who resented staying on. One girl consumed enormous amounts of time when I should have been teaching. It really was a most frustrating experience. Important teaching was interfered with. We are lucky in that generally speaking we have fairly good children in the school. It could happen again of course.

Nobody is full-time Head of Year. We all teach and obviously if we had a lot of pastoral work to do the teaching could suffer. The time factor is the most crucial one for me in my job. That occurs only in patches. Sometimes you feel: "I can't do both teaching and pastoral duties." This is particularly difficult when one has 'O' level classes to care for. I'm fortunate in having a small preparation room which is available for me to interview people in. There is a Head of Year room but I don't very often get in there.

Communications are reasonable. Geographically we're a bit out on a limb here and I suppose it's not ideal but I'm used to it and I don't think much about it.
To put it bluntly, I could probably do a better job if I was nearer the Head of Year room, or in it, but I think the children are used to having to come over here. There's nothing one can do about the shape of the school.

There's nothing written down about our roles in the school. The co-operation at the top of the school between the Fourth and Fifth Year Heads and the Senior Master and the Deputy Head is very much a matter of chatting informally together in a group.

The friction that is more important than that between Head of Year and Head of Department, we've lived with that one a long time and I think it's fairly well sorted out, the friction that now appears possible is that which has come about with the introduction of a School Counsellor. This is going to take some time to get used to. This could well be a matter of personality as to whether the new person will fit in. You always take time to get to know a person. You get little resentments building up which are probably quite unjustified. We thought here that our pastoral set-up was operating satisfactorily without the introduction of a counsellor. We tend to think: "What is this that we have now got among us?" The head is very enthusiastic about the counsellor.

I tend to try to help the problem child to fit into the community of my year. The counsellor tends to want to withdraw the child and to give help. This is the conflict. You must not withdraw the child to help him. This may be a lack of understanding on my part. I don't know enough about the aims of the counselling work.

We have less trouble here than many places I suppose because all the Heads of Years were appointed from within the school and we have all, as it were, grown up together. The problem would be that a young man might be appointed to come in from outside to do this job, and he might not fit in. Nobody has come in over anybody. I've noticed that wherever staff from within
the school are promoted it's more fair as far as people's feelings are concerned. The person who has done a good day's work for the school has got his just reward. It's not easy to decide because I see the advantage of bringing people in. You can bring friction into a school with one appointment.

The Head of Year must care for people as people. This is a reason for having accommodation where one can interview. The children must be allowed to relax. They can't do that easily if they're up-tight about something. I had no training for my job. Personality is all important.
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The Head of Year has higher status than has a Head of Department. It must be said though that, in any case, they are very senior people in this school. I don't think one can divorce the caring aspect from the curriculum side, they are so interlinked. An analysis of the standards of the children in my year would inevitably lead one to a consideration of their backgrounds, their problems, and so on.

I find the lack of an office in which to do my work a considerable handicap. One has to go to and from the main office for the 'phone, in between picking up the relevant information elsewhere. I worked in commerce before I came into teaching and one didn't move away from a desk, except to go to the toilet, because everything you needed to do your work was at hand at the desk. The fileboxes, two telephones, all to hand. This is a real problem in this school. To my mind it's not that we don't have enough space for everybody; it's just that we do not properly use the space we've got. There are offices, there are spaces which could be converted to places where we could have bases and this would bring more efficiency.

Only this morning, I just couldn't possibly go into the staff room to discuss on the 'phone some of the things relating to a child. It meant going to the school office and that's like Piccadilly Circus. Since we're losing our Form 6 this year through re-organisation there's a possibility that there will be more room along the line somewhere. There are smallish areas in the Sixth Form unit that perhaps could be converted.

Time is better now than it used to be because we are given more free periods; I have ten non-teaching periods. I think the ideal teaching stint for me would be twenty six, as I can do a lot of my pastoral work while I'm teaching. I take all those I'm responsible for for some teaching period. I suppose my biggest anxiety
with my job is the fact that the people I most want to see are not available when I'm free. I leave school at about five-to-five and it would be superb if the people I wanted to see were around after three thirty because I tend to leave a lot of things until then. I don't like setting my class work and then nipping off to see somebody. That's not on as far as I am concerned. If I have to then of course I will do it. There's a lot I can do in the ten periods I get. I like to do a lot after school. Then I work most evenings in the week.

I think the job I'm trying to do is too big for one person. That's my problem. A problem for me too is that the younger children are having too many female teachers. There are good female teachers but all female teachers - that's wrong. I find that I often get weak teachers allocated to my year as if it didn't matter.

I tend to push myself a little bit. I've twice slipped a disc. There were other problems which affected me last year. I was working under strain. This was caused by my job. There are many things I tend never to say "No" to. I appear in the local operas. This is a relief from teaching. The evening institute is always asking for help. You are here on the premises so there are extra things that come on that side. I'm mainly responsible for staff social functions. We now have a staff committee. There's no other member of staff here to say it, so I'll say it: "I am the ginger man on the committee." I liaise with the school's psychological service and the social services. As a result of all this, my children have a representative voice throughout every aspect of school life.

I like to think that I know what's going on in the school. Nobody knows better than the head but I like to think that I have a good working relationship with her. I get on well with the Heads of Departments because it's my experience here that they're only too pleased to have
somebody who cares and looks after the slow-learning children. Only a small number push too much work in my direction. Sometimes it's the problem children who reach me rather than the less able.

I think the social side of staff life here is quite agreeable. I believe that it is most important in informing the structure of organisation. This is why the extra things that I do are so much part of my job. They may be part of my make-up and enable me to do my job better. I don't know. I'd like some psychologist to step outside of me and take a look. I don't think the formal structure can work without a good social life. There are several levels at which this works. There is the head and that kind of strata to the rest of the staff. I think there has to be this kind of informal relationships between Heads of Departments and Heads of Years, and the rest of the staff. You get a new member of staff and in less than a week first names are the rule. Those barriers are broken down, and I think rightly so. If we had a different set-up then we would have Mr. So-and-So. Sometimes it's an age problem if first names are not the rule. We do meet socially quite a lot off the premises. We have swimming galas, we've had athletics with tea laid on afterwards. Many of us are friendly with one another. Our wives are friendly to each other. We have dinners, dances and so on. Every machine needs oil. I go out of my way to provide this.
Communications can be very difficult in so far as information doesn't penetrate through from one body to the other. The system we have is that, if there is a problem within a department, then the Head of Department deals with it. If he was unable to deal with it, it was then passed on to the Head of Year. This would be a disciplinary problem rather than a pastoral one like a personal crisis in the family background. This is the system as we hoped it would happen. At the same time, for information purposes, the Head of Department would pass on the news to the Head of Year so that the Head of Year could perhaps co-ordinate the problems of various departments.

Unfortunately we've broken down here a bit. Subject teachers have immediately said: "Right. I've got a problem here - straight to the Head of Year," and we've had a lot of difficulty trying to make the various parts of the school work within the system. I think the feeling has come from form teachers and others that people are being paid for that job so let's throw everything over to them. I've expressed this strongly a number of times. Form teachers tend to abdicate their responsibilities and become purely markers of registers. It should be something for a pupil to be sent to the Head of Year. The pupil then would feel: "It's important because I'm going to the Head of Year." Too much has been thrown back at the year system.

Fortunately I work fairly well with my form teachers because many of them are senior people, some Heads of Departments and one the Senior Master, and I've worked with them for some years. We have formal meetings but I generally see most of them around the school and pass on information that way. We can chat about our problems. But I've met this problem in my year and seen it happening in other years. Information doesn't always
filter through. We have a resources centre in the school and the one in charge has become the communications officer. There's a box in the centre and if I want information about a child I put a memo in the box and the communications officer by means of sixth formers will get that letter circulated and I might have the information passed back to me within the day. This saves a lot of time as previously I was walking from one end of the school to the other to get the information rapidly. We also have pigeon holes in the staff room. There still exists the breakdown.

Generally the year structure is considered desirable. The work of the children is being co-ordinated. The staff feel that they have certain responsibilities taken away from them. It enables the Head of Department to concentrate more on the administration of his department and the teachers on teaching. It gives them more time there. In the smaller schools of the past the problems were not as great as they are now. Even then the Heads of Departments didn't have a great many problems.

The tiers in the structure do not help. We have section heads as well as Heads of Years and sometimes information that comes to the head or to his deputies goes to the section head or Head of School (Upper and Lower) and stops there. Things get lost in the strata of organisation. There's perhaps too many pigeon holes. Too much to go through. I do not think the Heads of Sections are really needed. Here they were introduced to give status to some senior staff.

As Head of Year I very rarely deal with Head of Upper School. If there is something I cannot deal with I usually go to the head. The Head of Upper School has no powers to carry out punishments, such as caning or suspension, any more than I have as Head of Year, so I've always to by-pass him in cases which need action of this sort. If these powers belonged to the Head of School then I would go to him obviously. Five years ago the
Head of Year had the power to send a child home but as
the school has got bigger the head has drawn back to
himself these final powers. This would be the greatest
criticism of the structure of the school.

A personal anxiety as Year Head is time. Most
of this work has to be done within school hours. You
have to get hold of the children then. I teach 30 periods
a week. I teach in Form 6 and I cannot leave Form 6
in the same way as I might Form 2. I might give the
latter a map to get on with for a quarter of an hour
but I lecture a lot in Form 6 and I cannot spare the time
to break off. The time factor is a big strain, the
running around the school, picking up children, coming
down here, getting the file out, and so on.

Regarding my relationships with others I can
get on with most people but I find it difficult at times
to get others to understand my role and theirs. Some
Heads of Departments throw everything across. I try to
make them understand. "Look, you try and deal with
that first since it's in your department. Then it comes
to me afterwards." Sheer personality defects would
ensure that some Heads of Departments couldn't do a Head of
Year role. They'd rub people up the wrong way. They're
very different jobs. You're dealing with people all the
time as Head of Year. As Head of Department you've got
your small group.

Some departments never have meetings. Everyone
goes his own way. Some meet frequently and have formal
meetings.

Status-wise I think the best plan for promotion
is through the Year structure. One can grow into roles,
of course. I can see good Heads of Departments here who
would make good Heads of Years. I think that status-wise
we are above the Heads of Departments in this school because
we have our separate meetings with the head. Whereas
the Heads of Departments just meet together, the head joins
in with us. I've always been able to get into the head
and been able to discuss policy. I think the Heads of
Years have more influence on policy. I don't know of any
resentment over this. The Heads of Departments' meetings weren't really policy meetings. They were more information meetings.

I don't have a lot of conflict with staff. I think it's purely time, time to get everything done.

A small office would be very useful. There are few offices available. I do my interviews in the M.I. room, otherwise I have to find somewhere else. Frequently it's been in the entrance hall. I'd like a telephone as well. There's one in the Sixth Form office and frequently if I'm teaching up there I nip into the office and get three or four 'phone calls done. It's so difficult in the staffroom. There's always conversation in the background. You can get three times the work done in the same time with a little office. I would like a duplicate filing cabinet. We keep the files outside so that the staff can have access. This is part of the time factor. The school wasn't built with this type of structure in mind.
I could do with more time to do my work. On the timetable I have eight free periods but none of those is sacred and if a member of staff is away any of those could be taken. I would like to have two blocks of double periods when I knew that my work would not be interrupted. I lose about three periods a week so that I don't have enough time, and I'm frustrated sometimes because sometimes when you're engaged with work that cannot be left a child comes up and seeks help or advice and you want to have a chat with that child and you can't because you have a lesson. You have to say: "Come and see me after school." The child replies that he has to go to the dentist or something. If it seems absolutely necessary I have to leave my class and get someone to stand in for me. The only thing is I teach science and it's more difficult than other classes to leave. Time is a problem. Parents can be seen at times before or after school. It would be nice if there was some special time during the week when one could talk to the deputy or one could leave some work during the week, perhaps an interview, and know that one could deal with it say on a Thursday afternoon.

I would like to have a little room of my own. There is no hope of that. When parents come I go to the medical room or anywhere where there is room. If I talk to kids then I usually talk in the laboratory because there isn't really anywhere else to talk. Making telephone calls is difficult if it's in the staff room. There's a 'phone in the Head of Department's room in the science block but all the teachers of science go in there; I suppose you could ask them to leave whilst you make a telephone call. One gets frustrated.

The things I found most frustrating are connected with the system here whereby one moves from first to second year with the same pupils and because of the change of entry from 11 to 12 years of age I've been with most of
mine for three years. I know them very well and I know the parents very well, and as a little unit it's a good unit. I find it frustrating sometimes when a parent says to me: "Why do you insist on this rule when the rest of the school doesn't insist on it?" But you can only do your job within your unit. I try to keep my standards with regard to manners, uniform, etc. The Heads of Years can get together on this but you get certain groups of people who find it very difficult to conform. If you're in charge of such people I suppose you're unlucky.

The Heads of Departments seem to have more meetings than the Heads of Years and I've cribbed sometimes because things have come up at Heads of Departments' meetings which really should have come to me as a Year Head. In some cases here where the Head of Year is also Head of Department he hears about things like this and often doesn't pass it on to me. I think it must be very difficult to have the two jobs to do. I don't think I could do them both. I think the situation came about because the head wanted to keep some of his very senior staff so he gave them both jobs as an incentive to stay. They were happy to accept the new grading. One would have to be a very calm unflappable person to do it.

I don't often hit the roof myself. I like people and I like the communication with parents. That's why I like what I'm doing. I will have to make a complete restart next year when I revert to the new entry. I shall be sorry to lose my present year. There are so many things that aren't on files. I know my parents and children. I understand them. I feel strongly about losing them. I would have liked to have seen them through the school. I recognise I'm lucky in having a good year.
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My work area for running my department is a cubby hole behind the blackboard where I have to store my equipment. I have my filing cabinet there which contains records, examination papers, examination results set in the school, and the assessment records regarding every child's mathematical ability. That's the limit of my space. Certainly an area which could be a maths centre if not an office for me, where all the maths staff could go if they wanted to refer to a child's previous ability or wanted to refer to the maths resources in the school, would be a very useful thing to have. All this at the moment is scattered about various classrooms. If we had such a centre one could liaise that much quicker with one's colleagues.

This is my biggest problem I think keeping in touch with my own departmental colleagues. If there are problems with the children within my department I like the matter to come to me first from my own teachers. This doesn't always happen because maths is taught in various parts of the school and if a maths teacher has problems with a child in the science block and the Head of Year happens to be in the room next door it's a jolly sight easier to pass a child straightaway to him than risk the child not arriving if he's sent over to me on the other side of the building. So I don't always get to hear of all the problems that there are in my own department. The procedure is for me to deal with these and if I find I can't deal with it or I suspect it goes deeper than just maths I immediately pass it on to the appropriate Head of Year and ask them to look into it. Because of the geography of the place I don't get to hear of all the problems as they arise or alternatively I don't hear of the problems soon enough. Perhaps the teacher doesn't see me for half a day and when he's had time to track me
down the urgency has gone out of the situation and the child has got away with it. It's too late to deal as forcefully with the situation as one could if one was on the spot.

I've not encountered any great friction with the Heads of Years. Now and again I've felt that they have known something about a situation which I should have known about. Problems have arisen in various years and people have mentioned things to me after someone else has dealt with it and I would have welcomed feedback from them. On the other hand, I tend to think sometimes that the matter has been dealt with and I've not had to waste time on it because I would rather have carried on with my teaching anyway.

Student teachers are difficult sometimes. We have to take them but some of the people who come are weak. There is a tendency to put them into classes at the lower end of the school and sometimes this is a source of conflict with a Head of Year. You can't put them into examination groups and in some of the classes higher up the school the discipline might be difficult. The same thing happens with teachers.

Regarding status I relate poorly in my own estimation with regard to Heads of Years, not with regard to pay because I'm in the top group but as far as status goes I think there are a lot of issues in which the Head of Department should have more say and too many of these seem to be under the control of the Head of Year. For example, deciding on what sort of subjects should be offered in options, that sort of thing, I'm asked to complete lists and lists and lists about what I would expect a child's ability to be in say two years' time, which is a very difficult thing to do. The Heads of Years go off and take it all away and come back and say: "This is the finished Report, here you are, these are the ones you're teaching next year." I find this a little bit disturbing but then I have to ask myself whether I would have had time to do that sort of work myself, and I wouldn't, but I would like to have more time to look
at the problem which I think is my problem rather than the Heads of Years' problem.

It's still possible for a Head of Maths to be considered next in status to say the deputy head but it's very much a matter of personal relationships. I suffer somewhat from being rather young, in terms of years and teaching experience compared with many older but less important people on the staff. I've been in the school seven years and Head of Maths two years. I'm not complaining, don't get me wrong, but I feel as far as status goes I haven't got the kind of status a lot of Heads of Maths Departments do have and particularly concerning the Heads of Years and also Heads of smaller departments. In fact, because of the geography of the school, I have much poorer facilities than others. We have Heads of Departments' meetings when one can have a good say but what I find rather difficult is that one can get the ear of the head better through private conversations than at such a meeting. Those who shout loudest at the meetings don't appear to be taken that much notice of in the long run.

The Head of Year can get the ear of the head more easily; they have their own meetings and in fact they meet separately as Lower and Upper School, which is a very satisfactory arrangement, and it appears to me that it is from the Head of Year meetings that the policy of the school concerning attitudes of the children to work, discipline, etc., is formulated, rather than by the Heads of Departments. I feel that as a result of the kind of work they have to perform the Heads of Years have more chance of promotion. Obviously I've reached Head of Department very quickly and looking ahead I feel that I could well be restricted in the fact that looking around most deputy heads appear to be appointed from people with pastoral experience rather than with the academic experience.

I've got time to be a successful Head of Department
and then to move into the pastoral side but I think in many respects the system is wrong and as a Head of Department I ought to be able to go on to promotion because I'm bound to come into contact with pastoral work to be done within my own department with staff and pupils. It's my personal feeling that this is not really recognised and that the words of Heads of Years appear to carry more weight. People are more interested to meet people who claim pastoral experience, dealing with a whole school rather than with Heads of Departments who deal only with their own departments. The progression from Head of Department is not so natural as it used to be and I feel that it will be a real source of anxiety when I seek promotion in five or ten years' time. My aim is to develop my department to the full and then perhaps to extend my repertoire to the rest of the school as well. I'm not too worried about the status position here because I've come up through the school but if I were to be in another school I think I would be very upset with my position.

The Heads of Years appear to get more free time than the Heads of Departments. As a Head of Department I ask myself what work they're doing that I'm not doing. They argue that their work is dealing with the pupils whereas I can do a lot of mine at home.
Mine is a practical subject. In favour of the pastoral side here I must say that we are never ignored by them; we are always informed of any material that would go out to anyone else and we're always asked for our opinion. The influx of pastoral people to the schools has been a good thing. Yes, the answer simply given would be yes, but from experience I must say that the class teacher did a very good job in the past. I would think that before I became Head of Department, when I was a class tutor, I got to know the children very well. The pastoral care was dealt with in that way. It would be true to say that more staff now know of the problems of the children. I see that in the larger school today it would not be possible to manage on the older system. The head and deputy of the small school have been increased to say six people and this is needed to deal with the crises arising from 1300 pupils. In essence you're keeping to the same principle. The information must still come from and go to the form tutors which make up the broad base.

Information does pass satisfactorily, much more so than when it was the ordinary class teacher system. In the smaller school the staff room was the crux of the pastoral side of the school; problems were discussed and passed on at lunch time or at break because you met people daily but this is now impossible with a staff of eighty plus, the geography of the school, and so on. Now we have a printed system which is sent to various centres and it is a hopeful thought that all staff read these notices. On Wednesday, I go through with my staff all the pastoral care notices of the previous week but things can go wrong there because if there's one for the immediate day then you've missed it, but I like the system very much. That I get to know of the problems of children whom I never teach is important as I may come
into contact with them, particularly as Head of Department.

I have a particular relationship with Heads of Years because of the history of this place. Once the school was divided up into departmental areas or faculties, and I was thus a major Head of Department. This year the organisation has reverted to individual departments and so in a sense I lost some seniority but the Heads of Years still come to me to discuss wide areas of school life because tradition dies hard. Other staff may be discussed and their relationships with other teachers and pupils. The major Heads of Departments ranked on the same level as Heads of Years, probably because of sheer numbers. There were only four major Heads of Departments whereas there must be about thirty on departmental level now. The scarcity value gave rank to the major departments, as it does to Heads of Years. There was a close association between those who held these senior positions in the school.

I could see there being more opportunity for development and promotion in being Head of Year. I think the breaking down of the school into individual departments has a lot to be said for it but the representation of the departments is another thing. When there were four people representing four major areas of the school they were in roughly equal numbers representing so many points of view. Certain subjects allow themselves to have many Heads of Departments because there are different branches of the subject, so you can get within a school structure a misproportion of opinion perhaps if for example I speak for four people in my department whereas in some subjects the Head of Department only speaks for one or two.

There may be in a subject a Head of the total area, and then Heads for three or four constituent areas all of whom have the Head of Department authority. Now this is a source of anxiety. I worry about it. I feel that it has not come to any conclusion or been put to
the test. I worry about this for the sake of the people I represent. This is a part of structure that I find worrying. I can influence school policy by raising a matter at Heads of Departments' meetings, and the Chairman would take that to the Administrative Council, which is the head, his deputies, and the senior master, five in all. Unfortunately, the Heads of Years and Departments are not in on this meeting. I see this as a problem. Everybody seems to be meeting separately. The full Council attends meetings of Heads of Years and Heads of Departments' meetings. Therefore they are in the know about what's going on all the way round. This has been raised at Heads of Departments' meetings. I see this as a problem. It has also been discussed at our termly meeting of the four ex major departments' meeting which comes together to discuss general educational matters.

If there is not to be representation on each others meetings then there should be more information provided in the form of minutes, or matters discussed, so that you go to your meeting knowing what has happened before. This is the area where a lot of unrest creeps in. A feeling that things get decided before you know it's been discussed. When the Administrative Council included the heads of the major departmental areas, information was disseminated easily. Reporting back and feeding back did take place. Communication was more direct.
School 8  Interview with Head of Year

There are many problems concerned with the relationship between Head of Year and Head of Department. This is one of the problems of the comprehensive school. This is a problem which has made it worse; everyone thought that to be big is to be beautiful and more efficient. Unfortunately, one of the biggest problems when you have a large unit is this matter of communication. In the first place it can be that there is not enough communication. In the other, too many meetings going over the same ground, too many people going to different meetings where the same ground is gone over resulting in duplication of effort and time. Communication between members of staff, between students and staff, is the cause of most of the problems we get, I think. A lot of the problems with children is lack of communication. In dealing with older children particularly with problems, the first thing to do is to try to establish some kind or form of communication and without this listening to each other no relationship can be formed. Until I can form a relationship I can do nothing.

Misunderstandings can easily arise between staff. We have been forming a small unit here of twenty children who are reluctant learners, and there has been a lot of misunderstanding because of lack of information. It's been discussed at Head of Department and Head of Year level, but it hasn't got through yet to the ordinary run-of-the-mill teacher as to what it's designed for, and the result is that some think it's a punitive and some a remedial measure, and some something else. The whole ideal is of helping the children concerned but also to help the children in the classroom situation who want to get on with work to do so, and therefore the demand has come from the departments. The unit has been in operation for some time on a different basis from next year's plan, and sometimes problems have arisen
when I've decided to remove pupils from classes and the Form or Class teacher has felt that it's a reflection on him.

If there's a conflict between teacher and pupil, and often there is, then this has to be accepted and action taken, but the teacher may not like my removing the pupil. In the same way that each student is different, so is each member of staff. In the minds of the teachers often there is the idea that someone is criticising their work. It's the same with treading on anybody's toes. Personalities play a big part. I have no trouble with any children. I have high standards and I try to give reasons for my actions, even to the students. I like them to have confidence in me. I'm not seeking popularity, I'm seeking respect. This is the main thing, and because of that I'm well known in this school for my strictness.

Friction does arise however well intentioned you are, and you can make mistakes. Where you have human nature you're going to have greed, people who look out for themselves, no matter what they might profess. In teaching, some are ambitious, some, especially the women, are content to soldier-on because it's not critical what they do because they have other responsibilities, and these things all play their part in school life. I think that this has got far more to do with problems than has the structure of the school.

It seems to me that our teaching method is wrong for the bottom people in the school. We're somehow trying to turn the comprehensive school into a second-rate grammar school. I'm at the period of my career when it doesn't really matter. We assume too much. We assume that all students are going to be motivated for examinations. Before we went comprehensive about 80% of students stayed on for exams. Now I happen to think that only a very small proportion of the rest are concerned with that sort of thing. They're content to do their own little thing, like some of the staff are. I don't
think you're going to alter that. We need to devise a syllabus that will suit the mentality of the lowest 20%.

My whole approach to teaching is based on my belief that people are more important than structures. Some things that are built into our structure, like homework for the students, does more harm in destroying good relationships between teachers and students than any good.

Information about particular students' difficulties is sent round to, I think, seven places in the school, but how many teachers take the trouble to read this? In that room there are held all the records of all the students but I dare say that only about fifteen or twenty staff out of eighty bother to go there. Many staff don't know what's going on. So you see, you can set up the system but however perfect the system you still come back to human nature. Some people, no matter what you do, are not going to know. Possibly because they don't want to know. This, I'm convinced, is the big trouble in a school, or one of them.

A lot of the problems are brought about by the staff themselves for refusing to pay attention to the details. The biggest anxiety I have about schooling today is the large number of staff, some of them senior staff, who cannot control children at the lower end of the school. There are many behaviour problems. What worries me in my job actually is the fact that I receive so many referred to me for discipline offences and I get to know the staff concerned. It seems that many of the teachers today are highly qualified, too highly qualified, and they don't mix with the reluctant learner. When they were at school they were in the top groups; they have never been out to work, they don't understand these kids, so they can't serve their needs. They live in different worlds. I'm not a radical. I'm more conservative than anything. But I do think that some
of the staff ought to get out and meet these students outside, in their home backgrounds and this is where the pastoral care people score. They come into much closer contact with the children than do the Heads of Departments. They're meeting parents, in some cases going to homes, seeing the backgrounds. They can then understand.

In this school, where we have had a new head about four years ago, there has been a move in emphasis in favour of the pastoral ideal, and pastoral people have become more important in consequence. I think there is a change in atmosphere. This has happened I believe throughout the country. The caring, social side has been emphasised. In some places it may have gone too far, but not in this school. We try to keep a balance on that, and, of course, most members of staff are tutors.
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Time is very, very critical. I teach 37 periods a week. It should really be 80% teaching. Time is a terrible thing. When I have administrative work to do it's very frustrating. First I have to look for a 'phone, or I have to find the paper, or find the book or catalogue. That could take several days, just getting it. There are those frustrations of not having adequate facilities.

I have a room but I have to share it with five other people in my department. We have a departmental office, rather than a Head of Department's office. It was only designed for one person. It's stupid to expect five others to disappear and go somewhere else. If I need to get work done I have to go along to the General Office and take a chance. When something critical comes along there always seems to be a problem. Time is the biggest problem.

Communications are no problem in the department because we're always together. With the pastoral side if I want to communicate then I either find the person or I put a note in a tray or I come over to this office where everything is and I use the records. The biggest problem there is finding the time. We are advised or recommended, with regard to pupils who have dubious behaviour, to be guided by the records, sickness or probation, and so on, but finding the time to keep up with these is quite a problem. Fortunately we have a news letter in the school which is delivered once a week and covers a lot of routine stuff. An argument we have had for a long time is that the pastoral side, with all their information, is rather a separate entity in the school, and putting information in the records does not really satisfy the school's needs.
Heads of Departments have met separately from Heads of Years and Houses in the past. Recently as Chairman of the Departments I invited the pastoral people to sit in with us. Some came and we discussed the reluctant learner. It was useful to get their point of view as well as that of the Heads of Departments. There were some antagonisms because of the conflicting duties, if you like, of these people. Vice versa, it doesn't work. I thought the Heads of Departments should be represented on the pastoral side, so I went. The kinds of things which they discussed could (a) not have been put on paper and circulated because they were pretty confidential and (b) it didn't do me a great deal of good to hear what was being said. I couldn't carry it back to anybody. For me to go there was no use. I didn't really need to know about the things they were discussing. Items I need to know that are confidential are communicated on little slips of paper which are delivered to selected points in the school, and staff know where they have to go and look. Something new or urgent will come in this way.

My role specification is about six lines long and it's as broad as our Constitution. If I were to do all of it I would never get any sleep. I could do hardly anything and still fit the description of the role. I like to be fairly specific, not totally, of course, as flexibility is essential, but I would like more specific guidance in some areas. By and large, we get along because the roles of most Heads of Departments are outlined by tradition. The snag between my Department and others is the tradition that my subject is well suited to boys who are not academic, and this has always been a bit of a problem because some Departments seem to lose the "bads" and we inevitably gain them, which puts extra burdens on the staff with me, even though, to be fair, it's better probably for the kids because they would probably enjoy themselves more. We find the view
distressing from the department's point of view. The new notions of Craft Education, as they have now been formulated means that things have changed and now we're getting a better intake. The subject is now more acceptable in Form 6, because the 'A' level is now accepted by seventeen universities.

Promotion is difficult from my subject as compared with those who are engaged in pastoral roles or administrative roles in the school. Much of the work done by these could be done by people of lesser rank, even clerical workers. I think it is wrong too to be promoted out of the classroom. I don't agree with that. I think that the administrative jobs should be spread around more people so that more could stay in the classrooms. I know of a friend of mine who became a deputy head and told me after eighteen months that he could never go back to the classroom. He just couldn't stand the strain of it.

Another source of conflict between the departments and the pastoral side is that very often the academics seem to be disciplinarians, whereas the pastoral ones, either through their training or by their nature, will be the more sympathetic. Neither side here would seem to provide the kind of solution needed by the school. I think the idea that the pastoral people are too soft is an idea that is bandied about in loose conversation but I don't think that it represents genuine criticism. I've heard the same thing said about Heads of Departments. The very successful Head of Department could carry out the role of the pastoral person if he were the right type. In fact, I think that he is ideally suited to do so. The routine pastoral jobs should be shared out, though more time would be needed for each teacher to be out of the classroom. Then the really difficult cases only would fall to the Head of Year or House, who would be in the truly counselling role. This is better than for the Head of Year to be trying to see all and sundry for five minutes at a time. The burden needs to be
The ordinary teacher could do a decent job of counselling but he cannot do it for one whilst twentynine others are raising hell. Sometimes one has to say: "Shut-up" to a person who needs help, not because one doesn't recognise that help is needed but simply because one has a class. Some pupils resent being in school; they are anti- what we are doing for the majority. They need attention for themselves, but how?
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There is a problem of identification of areas of work to be covered so as to avoid duplication of effort. We have no actual job specifications but I think they would be a good idea provided they were not imposed too rigidly - you can lose-out either way. If it's too fluid you find people duplicating the effort done by somebody else whereas if it's too rigid you find that people are concerned with remaining within their own area of authority so that certain students will play one off against another or will end up on the border line and will get no attention. I think it would be a help to have a clear definition and to have that definition made operative because in some cases the existence of a definition is no guarantee that it will be operative when the system is applied at ground level.

My subject in the school is Languages and I enjoy teaching. Equally I enjoy the individual contact with the pupils which derives mainly from the pastoral side. I think one of the evils of the profession is that promotion generally means movement away from ground level contact in teaching. The most able teachers in theory are promoted to administrative posts. I think that pastoral people are more likely to be promoted these days and this is not a bad thing provided the school is not seen primarily as a place for social development. I think there is a danger of that occurring. There are now so many posts of responsibility in the pastoral area and this change of emphasis tends to exaggerate the importance of the pastoral side.

I would say that the only essential part of the definition of a teacher is that he teaches. The rest is negotiable; it may be valid but I don't think the rest is absolutely essential. Most teachers in any case take a personal interest in the students. They don't regard them as being only an academic concern. Where
factors relating to students' progress in academic matters are closely aligned, as they are usually, with personal problems or personal development, then I think most teachers will want to share that responsibility. It's true that in the large schools there are so many crisis cases that pastoral people are acutely needed. The development of the pastoral side of schools is to some extent a reflection of something beyond the school, something created outside the school. I'd go along with that, but at the same time, I do see cases where we seem to be fostering problems because of the very emphasis we put on them. I think it can become unproductive and I think this is the danger of the over development of the pastoral side. The danger of the opposite situation is that problems were either not recognised or ignored because teachers didn't want to know.

I think that perhaps the balance is coming down presently rather heavily on the school as a social, caring community, and the raising of the school leaving age has made the need for pastoral attention at that level more acute. A lot of those staying on are those who would have left for reasons which are personal to them and this means that their presence in the ordinary classroom situation is very unproductive. Sanctuary units and proposals for more practical work have often come from the pastoral side as seeing the need for this sort of activity for these children.

We take the line here that should problems arise during the lesson the matter is referred to the Head of Department in the first instance and he may wish to refer it to the Head of Year. If he feels he can deal with it adequately he will only refer it as a matter of information. There is then an attempt to create a structure in which both can work in harmony, and the break-down is the human one of forgetting to tell somebody, and somebody might take independent action without the knowledge of either side. Problems are aggravated not only because of the division between pastoral and academic but by the fact of the size
of the staff. Here we have a problem of communication based on the sheer size of the school.

There are a number of staffrooms, one might be almost five minutes apart. You often don't meet the member of staff you need and communication between departments sometimes is poor. Personality problems are also aggravated by size of school because one can say at times validly: "I was too busy to see you" whereas in the smaller school differences of personality had at least to be resolved sufficiently to allow a working relationship because of the intimacy of the place. In the big school you can remain almost totally detached. The big school can be effective only if it's broken down into smaller units but in so doing you bring attendant problems of communication. A unit can become autonomous.

The basic problem as I see it is one of communication. This is so both between departments and between the pastoral and academic sides. I know of no teacher who would claim that the pastoral side is not important but it is a question of emphasis. Most staff recognise the need for some structured pastoral system so I don't think the pastoral people need to emphasise their role.

The question of resources might be a source of contention or an individual teacher might see himself as a teacher rather than a group tutor. Most teachers have a foot in both camps in that they are tutors as well as teachers. A teacher might see himself as a teacher first. Another might see his tutorial role as being particularly significant, if not in terms of time then in importance.

Of course, the pastoral side now involves considerable administration work, and I think that because of their involvement with this the opportunities for promotion are increasing. I think that this creates some friction because teachers, this is a generalisation, teachers are jealous of their status in the community, within the area, within the school, and this has created friction.
The main problems then are time and communications. These need to be improved. This would show the greatest benefit for students. Space and time militate against the deeper communication which is necessary. Sometimes unilateral action is taken because of space or time which means that people who are marginally but importantly concerned are left out. Rightly this causes upset. Teachers are aware that they often do the job badly because of the time element.
I don't think there's very much conflict in this school. The pastoral staff seem to get on very well with the Heads of Departments. Personalities clash but that happens whenever you have a large number of staff working together.

Time is a big problem for both sides I think but particularly for the Head of Year. It's difficult to control the amount of time you can give to the problem cases that are thrown-up almost daily. If you have a senior year as I have you have many more problems than at the lower end of the school. Some of them just don't want to know and they're a trouble in all their classes. An awful lot of talking goes on with that type of child and you know they're going to appear again and again. It's very frustrating and the whole school suffers because of such pupils. As well as these you have to care for the genuine types: those who desperately need care and guidance. Clearly we are doing a good job in helping these children. We know a lot about the children today, much more than we used to know, but it all takes time.

I suppose communications are always a problem. So much happens and it's difficult to keep up with letting people know. I suppose we do a reasonable job in this area but there's always complaints and room for improvement.

The pastoral side is accepted in this school because it's been going on a long time, and we have good relationships with our parents. Our roles are clear but there again there are misunderstandings. There are some departments that will not take less able pupils and this causes some tension but this is not a big problem.

I have a room of my own and I think that this is a necessity as so much of my work is confidential. This gives me an advantage over the most senior of the
Departmental Heads. On the departmental side only the practical departments have their own rooms, and these are often used as departmental centres.
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There are four main areas of decision making. Within my own department I have numerous meetings with my teachers and we take minutes and these are distributed so that we do not forget what has been decided.

I am Head of Department but I act as a tutor in one of the Years and therefore I have to attend Year meetings with the Head of Year, and we take decisions there with regard to running the year. Problems are raised here if there is trouble with particular children or if the allocation of teaching rooms is wrong because of the size of class and that sort of thing. There is a certain amount of conflict at these meetings but I don't think this applies particularly to the relationships between myself and the Head of Year.

I am also a member of the Head of Departments' meeting which is chaired by the deputy head, and there we take decisions about the curriculum. I suppose that this for me is the most important meeting because things that come up there are concerned with the teaching side of the school and that for me is most important.

Naturally I attend also the main staff meeting which is chaired by the head, and that operates in quite a democratic fashion with plenty of consultation. Sometimes Working Parties are set up from the staff meeting and I have sat on some of these in the past. Votes are taken at some of the meetings mentioned but I do not think a vote at the main staff meeting is very helpful as I do not think equal weighting should be given to all members of staff. I think the more experienced teachers have the most valuable contribution to make in discussions. I would accept that the head should have the last word, but clearly consultation at all times is necessary.

I see no difficulty in carrying out different roles as I have outlined. Of course, there is some conflict going on all the time. Personalities play an
important part I think. There's never enough time but I don't think that is a problem between Head of Year and Head of Department.

Communications are a big problem. In an attempt to bring the pastoral and departmental side together we now have joint meetings of both sides and I think this makes a big difference. It gives us a chance to understand the other point of view, and it's obvious that we are faced with the same kind of problems basically.
School 9 Interview with Head of Year

The Head of Year sees himself as a pastoral figure though of course he has to spend most of his time teaching in the classroom. It is always difficult to find time to do the pastoral side properly, and sometimes one has to break in to the teaching and this cannot be good for anybody. Sometimes in a crisis two or even three senior people may be engaged in dealing with a child who has a severe problem, and the best school system cannot cope with this sort of thing. A lot of co-operation is needed when this sort of situation arises.

Personalities can cause great problems and the understanding of all teachers is necessary if the work of running the school is to be done properly. The Heads of Years meet with the Heads of Departments and I think that this is a good thing as when one meets with Heads of Years separately there is bound to be some Departmental Heads who think that something is going on that they should know about.

Communications are a problem in every school and sometimes these break down between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments, and then there could be trouble. There is the feeling by some Heads of Departments that too much attention is paid to pastoral matters in the school structure, and it's obvious that a good balance must be achieved but I think we do quite well.
School 9 Interview with Head of Department

Committees on which sit Heads of Departments and Heads of Years take away the sense of competitiveness. You sit down and discuss the school as a whole. You're discussing how your department can contribute. I think it allows people to evaluate for themselves what departments are really doing. I've been in schools where the only people who can contribute anything to the school are the Mathematics, Science and English Departments, because they are the academic subjects. In actual fact, when we talk we talk as a body of people. We're not talking as Departments but as people discussing what is best for the children, and I think this gives us all a sense of security and it takes away this feeling that his department is better than mine, or he's getting more money for his department. It just makes us all feel that we are working towards one end. This makes for a smooth running school. We all share responsibilities then particularly if things are going wrong.

There are many meetings going on all the time within the departments and among the year tutors and other groups. The staff meet regularly about twice a term and there's plenty of opportunities to give your views. Many of the staff do not bother to join in on the discussions but just being there and listening must make a difference. There's bound to be some conflict mostly because of the different personalities who have to work together. The pastoral system is accepted by most teachers I think as necessary in the big school, but there is some feeling that too much goes on on the pastoral side.
School 10  Interview with Head of Department

I find very few difficulties in working with the pastoral side in the school. Perhaps it's because I am Head of a Department which is very self-contained and I teach a very large cross-section of the children. In a way my department is run on an individual basis but I find no noticeable barrier with the Head of Year system. They used to have their own meetings but there is now a joint committee. They have a say in a lot of the administration in the school. Sometimes there is conflict but it does not happen often.

If my department is considered to be only suitable for the non-academics then that is the fault of top management. Sometimes the option system makes it very difficult for the academic child to choose my subject. I think that a lot of quite average children are encouraged by the pastoral people to do too many academic subjects, and I criticise those who organise for this. I have suitable facilities to do my own organisation in my department. The biggest problem and worry of all is that of finding qualified staff to join my department, but this is because of the national shortage of technical staff and not any reflection upon this school.

The next worry is that of money but again that is a general factor, and I have no particular grievance at all against those who organise here.

I believe that when the pastoral people were first introduced into this school their position raised some doubts but all that has passed and I've found that they do not interfere at all with my work, and they must be of help to the children in having time allocated to them to help out with problem children. Reports have probably provided one of the sources of conflict between the two sides but really this is only a fairly trivial disagreement.
There is always some friction between the two sides. At times we are poles apart in the view we take of things. We have started having joint meetings as a way of getting together, but there's always been friction. I'm probably biased in this matter. I resent being treated as not having a brain because I'm on the pastoral side in the school. It's true that I'm in a senior position in the school which does help, and it's difficult to say whose to blame for the friction between the two sides.

I consider the possession of a room of one's own to be a very important advantage but in the main these rooms have been taken by the pastoral people rather than been allocated. There is resentment felt by many departmental heads because so many top people in the school have so much time away from teaching. The pastoral people see the parents if they wish it every Wednesday evening, and this is a very good arrangement which works very well.

I find it a great strain chasing people who have to be seen all over the place. I try to make it a policy to see the majority of the children twice a year at least, but of course I see some many more times than this. I think the friction between the two sides has historical roots in that most of the pastoral side have come up through the secondary modern school, whereas the Heads of Departments have come from the grammar school. This difference in background is not forgotten. I think the Heads of Years have to bear in mind the over-all picture of what is needed in the school, and the departments do not see this.
When I first came to this school I was very concerned at the division between the pastoral and curriculum sides of the school. The situation during the past eighteen months has much improved. There is now a much happier give-and-take between the two. I can understand how they see children. There is a much narrower but perhaps more in-depth view held by the Head of Department. I have the over-all view.

When I came here it was a Grammar School and the existing staff felt that resources, including teachers, were being wasted on the pastoral side. I sensed that the staff wondered what I did for money. Their role was well established and known.

I find the pastoral work exhausting. Some critics feel that much of the work is trivial. It's not trivial to the children. It's very time consuming. The grammar school academics could not easily move over into my role. They would not easily tolerate all that one has to tolerate. It's essential to be flexible. Really the pastoral side forms the bridge between the students and the academic side.

Communications are improving and now we inform the Head of Department in person if we can but if not then we send memos. We do what we can to solve some of the children's background problems which otherwise would come out in class in behaviour problems. Resentment does arise from the Heads of Departments when we keep the pupils out of class so we try to avoid this if possible. Some Heads of Departments are more pastorally inclined than others. Some Heads of Departments are totally absorbed in their subjects and simply can't understand the problems. The social role of the school is so necessary.

Time is the biggest bugbear. My teaching load
is 50%. One day without teaching is the best day for the Head of Year. Sometimes very prompt attention is needed for students.

I have a room of my own and I know that I am envied because of it. I have some secretarial help. We are on three sites and the head places a lot of responsibility upon me since I am the senior one in this building. I find the room and telephone absolutely necessary for my work as Head of Year. For most of the week I am my own boss. I was Head of Department and then thought of taking a sideways step into administration. When these pastoral jobs came along I was advised to go in for one because it combined teaching with administration and I'm very glad that I did. Most of the pastoral people are graduates. I would think that promotion is bound to come.
School 10  Interview with Head of Department

I have twelve teachers in my department and I teach 27 out of 35 periods. I am expected to teach a lot because as Head of Department I am expected to be the best teacher in my subject. I meet my Department once every half-term. I see most of them individually daily. Though we have two staff rooms I can see eight in one. If I can't see someone and I need to pass information I send a memo.

As a staff I do not think we are terribly well informed. Personalities have a lot to do with it. We have a hundred odd staff and communication is not easy. Sometimes information from the pastoral side is not passed on. There are 1700 pupils and the size of the school exaggerates all problems.

Status-wise I come below the Head of Lower, Middle and Upper school, though I'm on the top pay scale.

One could do with an office and a telephone but there's no chance of this. Heads of Years and Schools have one for themselves or share. Generally these have carved out these for themselves rather than been allocated them. I find it a great bind not being able to interview people in proper conditions. I often interview along a corridor or outside the staff room.

I get the impression that as Head of Department I should not interview people; this is more for the pastoral side. The pastoral people are supposed to be gifted that way, though I do not think any one of them has been trained for it. Most of them are non-graduates or Physical Education types who can't reach Head of Department status but who have found a good line of promotion. Is mine a loaded view?

My own promotion line I would see as to Senior Teacher and then to Deputy Head, academic or administrative.

One of the main strains of my job is trying to get to grips with the pecking order in the school which
is complex. One gets frustrated with the lack of decision making, for example, trying to decide on a particular week for examinations. We've sat for hours arguing and still no decision. The whole thing is clumsy and if you're not careful you get that way yourself. One is supposed to go into a discussion with an open mind and compromise must be accepted but I feel sometimes: "Why should I keep having to give way to other people?" Some people can only see their own little Empire. These people cause all the trouble. I construct the timetable and I see all the staff. I know them. Some staff pester all the time. They're pester ing people.

Parents are interviewed every Wednesday evening. Extensive records are kept in the school, and I have to search through them to extract information important to my department. It all takes time. I teach right across the school to give me the experience of meeting all sorts in the classroom, so that I can better lead my own teachers. I have to keep in touch. We work on three sites and movement makes for more difficulties.
Appendix XlV

Interviews with 9 heads of comprehensive schools to discuss their methods of organisational procedures for the reconciliation of the divisions and the resolution of the conflicts which arose from having a social unit and a curricular side in each school.
School I

The top management group of head and two deputies meets weekly. We discuss as equals. I like to think that we think alike. My deputy has been here for a long time and has a good memory, and sometimes her view is coloured by this fact. I accept her views. There is evidence of hidden conflict.

We meet as a staff about once each half-term and we seem to have been able to reach decisions collectively without votes. We try to achieve a consensus. There have been occasions when staff have approached me for a decision. I'm constantly being asked for decisions. I've told them it's not just a question of giving a decision but of our reaching a decision on a plan of action in the best interests of all.

The Heads of Departments meet monthly, usually the first Monday of each month. There's a fair amount of routine business, dissemination of information, but I think that this may be seen as a decision making body when curriculum matters are discussed. I hope to put before the Heads of Departments a list of the courses we hope to put on, and the requirements from each department, and also they will be told the list of teachers they can call on and the number of periods they will have; horse trading is likely, of course. The Heads of Departments will then be asked to allocate teachers to courses. This should bring home to them the constraints of the situation.

The pastoral system has not been long under way. There are problems, and conflicts between the two sides are to be expected at times. There's trouble about role specifications sometimes, but we expect difficulties in this period of change. There has been some resentment about the year appointments. If there are problem situations within years the rule is from subject teacher to form teacher, and then to Head of Year. Another
possibility is for the subject teacher to approach the Head of Department. It's all rather a matter of personal relationships between staff. I've made it clear that I'm always available.

We try to encourage the Heads of Departments to join in on staff appointments by having pre-interview meetings and then consultation with senior management. I feel that the part my staff could play in promotion of our own staff might be considered by them to be too delicate a matter though I would not rule it out. I ask my cabinet of senior management whether they think that anyone has been left out of promotion suggestions. I ask Heads of Departments if they think one of their own departments should be considered.

Tension is likely to arise if curriculum changes which are vertical are made in a system structured on the year tutor horizontal system.

Boundaries of the various roles need to be flexible. The caretaker, for example, tends to be rule book minded (anything above 11 ft. has had it!). The way the role specifications are introduced is so important. The situation is not autocratic. It cannot be. Everyone here is doing something for the school and the hierarchical aspect should not be emphasised. Roles are flexible. If the head has responsibility in certain areas in others he takes a back seat. (For example, if the head teaches a little English, he does not have the responsibility held by the Head of Department)

Would the Head of Department have the last word in his Department? The last word? I think that in this situation I would discuss the matter with the Department Head and other staff. If possible, I would canvass the children on their reactions to the proposed change. If possible, though this might appear cumbersome, I would try to find out what the parents think about the proposal. Then I would allow the Head of Department to go ahead with his proposal with the possibility of review
after a year.

There was very little structure of formal meetings when I came. The staff now meets preliminary to the year, and then on the evening of the day following any long break. The head does not require the staff to come, but prefers them to do so. Apologies would be expected. There is no voting: we talk around problems to achieve consensus. I'm not officially chairman but I find that I'm the focal point.

Heads of Departments meet monthly after school. I've never said any particular time. There's been many changes in the school and new appointments made. When individual departmental meetings are held they tend to be informal. Sometimes departments do not meet regularly. Maybe the informal meeting over sandwiches at lunch time is enough. One department might make such a thing of meetings, leading on to social rounds, that one gets a school within a school. Such a department attracts teachers to it. It should be a task-directed exercise but there are elements of the club too.

There is no formal training in roles. I encourage outside courses. There's the beginning of training in the departments. I've had to train staff on the pastoral side to realise gradually the duties of the Head of Year. Every week I have a cabinet meeting with my deputies and once a month the Year Tutors join us in that meeting, so there's some training there. This invitation to the Heads of Years may be resented by the Departments.

The large staff meeting has a function of community and communication. The smaller group certainly has more involvement whereas the larger groups switch off visibly. Even in the Heads of Departments' meeting a sub-group was found necessary to discuss and bring back suggestions for change and their plan was knocked about and again agreed by consensus and no vote. Polarisation is possible by voting and also a hardening of attitudes when this is not needed.
School 2

Most of the role specifications have been drawn up through staff consultation. We had about a year's planning before the school was actually recognised as a comprehensive. A re-appraisal of the school took place. A copy of all the role specifications has been duplicated and issued to every member of staff. Each member of staff has his own personal file. The information issued in this form goes into that. We must ensure that each member of staff understands the system we're operating.

We have a top management meeting weekly - head, deputy, senior mistress, director of studies, and pastoral heads. We have a quick lunch and start early during the lunch period; unfinished business continues after afternoon school. Any decision can be taken there but generally speaking, if consultation with staff is obviously required, a statement is issued and comments invited from the staff. If there is no great urgency then the matter will be held back until the monthly staff meeting.

The staff meeting starts early lunch-time. Five minutes is cut off each morning lesson and school finishes early for lunch and, after a short time for eating, the meeting starts and auxiliaries look after the school. The same day every month is used for the meeting which I chair. We don't have a lot of disagreement at these meetings. They tend to consist of a lot of people listening. This is unfortunate but it's very difficult to draw thirty or forty people into a discussion. If there is a measure of disagreement then a vote would be called for but it just doesn't happen.

In the senior management group I wouldn't make any decision that would not be generally supported. Obviously the head has to retain the right to make the final decision. I think that possibly the head might
have to take a decision with the majority of staff against him; it has never happened but possibly it could. In the way I organise the school, I cannot see it happening. Decisions are arrived at as a result of consultation.

Middle management breaks down very distinctively between pastoral care and academic care. The pastoral people have got their jobs following a successful period as Heads of Departments. They deal with the whole person. There is an obvious need for communication between both sides of the structure and top management. Heads of Departments meet once a month with their own teachers. The Director of Studies represents the departments at top management. He meets the departments on a personal basis. The Heads of Departments do not meet together as a group. The Director of Studies sits by invitation at departmental meetings. Minutes of such meetings are published.

The various committees are so grouped that everyone on the staff has an area in which he can help to frame decisions. It is important that even the most junior teacher feels involved. The large group meeting is very passive. The fact that there has been so much consultation before the staff meeting is probably the reason for this passivity. They will all have had some measure of discussion before the major meeting. The staff meeting almost becomes a summary of what has been going on, and decision making then is straightforward.

The biggest problem is communication. How do we make sure that everyone gets the information? We publish many information sheets but you cannot make teachers read them. One of the major problems is to ensure that the teachers operate the system as laid down. The head's role is to know his people and where it is obvious that the various roles are not being played then the head should intervene. 90% of the staff present no problem in this respect.

The Director of Studies monitors the departments so far as this is needed. The check is perhaps with the minutes of each Department meeting. These are filed, they come to me from the Director of Studies. If we
were not getting a regular record it would show up. I would not want to monitor the pastoral side. They have such a senior role to play and we meet weekly so there's no need. The pastoral people belong to departments and they have to accept a change of role in that respect. In one sphere he is superior to Head of Department and in another he comes under the Head of Department. This is one area where personality clashes may come in.

The finer the roles are cast the better, providing the staff know and understand their roles. There was one clash of personality where the members of a department approached me to complain about the Head of Department not fulfilling his role, and then it was my position to deal with the matter. It turned out to be an emotional problem on his part, a family problem which was unknown to anyone, and it was affecting his personal relationships. The pastoral people have no second-in-command but we have one in each department. There is a danger that one will think in terms of being the natural successor for the job. This could lead to tricky problems.

When I delegate authority, and I delegate a lot, I leave the people to get on with things. I do not interfere.
School 3

The mistake that I made was to assume that, if you set up a system, the persons concerned would operate it. We had a policy document agreed by all the senior staff and you tend to assume that people can carry it out. Every Head of Department is working in relation to nine or ten other people, and you tend to believe that he can succeed in these aims in relation to these other people. In fact, some can't, some don't, and some don't want to.

One of the things I found about the role of Head of Department, after about eighteen months, was that instead of the Head of Department being a focus for management aims in relation to the teachers, he was, in fact, a focus for teacher discontent in relation to management. Even though he had been a party to the document, he was in that position. And the grumbles that teachers have, and always will have, in relation to class control, marking, and all the tedious things we've got to do as teachers (and normally you just shrug and get on with it), these were becoming major issues because departments took them up.

Some departments had tremendous tension between themselves, between the teachers within the department, between the teachers in different departments, whilst some departments did not function as departments. Some try to make the thing work but have difficulty. You don't get tension where people are not co-operating anyway. You get to the stage sometime when some intervention is essential by higher authority.

The Deputy Head was made Director of Studies with the intention of keeping a watch on Departments. This was a specific role established because the Heads of Departments were in some cases not caring, and not carrying out their functions. The Director of Studies has to
attend departmental meetings, and he does a survey on departmental policy in relation to our over-all policy.

Departmental meetings are compulsory. Each half-term has its own set of meetings. Each half-term you have a staff meeting which is the culmination of a series of meetings. We have a curriculum co-ordination development committee and a Policy Committee, and these are the two top groups for decisions. There are Year Head meetings which are mainly pastoral and all these syphon decisions to a staff meeting. Policy Committee is top brass, and there are representatives from both the pastoral and departmental sides with the head and his deputies. The departments meet monthly, as do the tutor groups within the years. All meetings are outside school time.

In the early days the departments were not seeing any carry-over of the ideals of the school into their departments, and at one famous meeting I had to lay down exactly what the Departmental Heads were getting their allowances for in the school.

Minutes are taken of departmental meetings and staff meetings. Many things require a lot of talking-out at all meetings. Decisions at the meetings are taken by consensus. Sometimes the meetings go against me. Usually what happens is that there is enough of a consensus for me to say: "Well, this is what we'll do." The decision to go for a four period day was taken by fifty absolutely in favour and eight very much against. This started in the Policy Committee as a result of a Working Paper from me, and then went on to two staff meetings. At the first we kicked it around on the understanding that at the second we would come to a decision. On the question of having the mock examination time changed, no decision was forthcoming at the Policy Meeting, and the staff were divided so I decided that there was insufficient support for change. There are no firm rules about this.
After putting a thing on the table I couldn't in all honesty go against the wishes of the staff. I think I could say that it is established practice that you need a good majority to make a change in policy. You use your discretion to determine this; you look at the weight of the departments voting. Sometimes you have to say that this is not a thing to be decided by staff vote. On one occasion staff decided that ancillary staff should drive the school bus, but this was not possible. They took this decision without a proper study of the matter. If you have a lousy job to do, you can't just decide to vote to give it to someone else. The matter was solved not by voting someone else to do it, because that was not acceptable, but the solution came out of discussion. The democratic process had solved it.

The job specifications for Heads of Years and Heads of Departments have to be carefully worked out. Above the Heads of Years we have Heads of Schools, and these are Senior Teacher status. Sometimes there is tension between these. What happens is that an enthusiastic Head of Year will take on things which he couldn't if the Head of School was more keen, and vice-versa. Sometimes a child will be sent to Head of School instead of Head of Year. A Head of Year, in this case, will either feel grateful for the helping hand, or a little annoyed at being by-passed. Obviously a complex situation; within the system there are many combinations with, for example, the Head of School or Year coming under the Head of Department, or being a teacher in a team teaching situation.

Both Heads of Year and School will interview parents. Heads of Years teach about 25 out of 40 periods and there are some objections to this from Heads of Departments who teach 32. I'm a bit hard on this because a Head of Department is supposed to be the best teacher. Nobody is both Head of Year and Head of Department. We have a fairly efficient system for letting me know what's happening when parents are seen. A report comes to me.
about each parent seen, then it goes to the form tutor
before it goes into the records. A standard form is
available with information and action taken detailed.
It's easily done, and can be done as the parent is
talking to you. This then is a two or three minute job
to be done while the parent is there or within five
minutes of the interview. We have one person who deals
entirely with records. Not a teacher's job this, but
that of an auxiliary. We have three secretaries, a
records clerk, a bursar, a matron, and technicians.

Where do the ordinary staff come into decision
making? If Departments hold their meetings, then ordinary
staff will be able to push their recommendations to
higher meetings. Year Tutors and School Heads can hold
their meetings to discuss more generalised matters.
The theory of the multiplicity of committees is sound,
but practice sometimes leaves much to be desired; one
can only keep on about these things. The Heads of
Departments can allow their work in, for example, the
presentation of children's work to get slack. We've
done exercises where we have collected in individuals'
work from various departments and it's clear that some
teachers are being slack. How then do you set standards?
They can vary so widely. We have a set procedure when
complaints are received about homework books for the class
to check the complaint. Initially it's a subject teacher
at fault, but the Head of Department should check even
though the Head of Year will be responsible for the
enquiry. The head then sees the Head of Department
concerned privately. If things are not working, you don't
want a meeting but a face-to-face confrontation. I'm
paid to be unpleasant!

The difficulties if the roles are specified
clearly are concerned with personalities. One can find
in a school a department which is functioning quite
independently of the provisions made in the organisation.
Often the problem is the background of the teachers in
that they have operated successfully in one teacher
departments in other schools. He might not have the
strength to impose a departmental policy. Many different
attitudes within the department make life difficult.

The deputy who has been appointed to be
Director of Studies has the right to monitor departments
in their work. In theory, before his appointment, I was
supposed to be doing it. Sometimes the book of rules
is produced and read one year and then that's the end of
it. Hence the need for continual in-service training,
day closures, and similar arrangements.

Without any doubt the pastoral people in the
school are the most important. The trend is obviously
away from the curriculum side to the pastoral side on
promotion. Our structure has grown naturally, and
with the advent of large schools invariably the Heads of
Year people came from experienced Heads of Departments.
We have now got away from the academic types, ex-grammar
school, going to departments and secondary modern, non-
degree types, doing the pastoral side.

There's no real tension here between Heads of
Schools and Heads of Departments as the former are clearly
superior in status. There is tension between the Heads
of Years and Departmental Heads. A senior Head of
Department who chooses to stay in the Department has
chosen a different route to promotion, perhaps to the
Inspectorate or College of Education. One of the long
term problems is that we train new heads through this
system; the better the system, the better the structure
in the school, the more will leave for promotion. The
book of rules which we have has been said to be fatal
to the school in that candidates for headship are usually
asked questions and damn good answers, which have been
worked out over the years, answers to the real problems
in the big schools, are in the book. The main training
is done on the job. Some in-service training is done
within the school along the line of evaluating standards
and marking systems necessary between the various departments.

One of the head's most important tasks is to see his teachers. I keep a record of interviews with my staff. There's always conflict, first between individuals, who can't get on with each other. Conflict exists between roles in relation to the different aspects of a school's and a child's development, different people being responsible for different aspects. There's conflict over resources. The autocratic head can set out to resolve these conflicts by himself. He can take the whole burden of it. Various departments want to use scarce resources. You can take the decision and suffer the tension from those disappointed. If they have to compete with each other, well then the conflict's spread around. You allow this. Whether the Head of Year can use the child's scarce resource of time rather than the Head of Department is a source of tension. If everything goes quiet when the head goes into the staff room it is clear that the man has built around himself, focused on himself, the whole tension of the place.

The basic conflict is to do with personalities. The structure spreads the areas of conflict. There's conflict between pastoral and departmental staff as I've indicated, and this can be resolved if the system is given the chance to operate. If people are driving they'll create conflict. You need a high proportion of drive in the school. More pressure is needed from some Heads of Departments to corner resources. You've got to have people who think: "This is the way it should be done." It's a bad sign surely if you've got no tension. People must then be under-achieving. Aggressive, brash, thrusting types are needed. This creates tension as opposed to the cosy, comfortable types. Personal relationships are not an end. You've got to get things done. If people won't do the work they should get out of the system.
This is a problem when it comes to Christian names. You create a relationship but you've to be strong enough to tell such a one what's wrong in a tough interview. You need people's co-operation all the time. You're walking a tightrope. The head has to have the vision of what he wants. The Head of School, the Head of Year, the Head of Department, none of them has this. But leadership must come from others too, right down to the lowest in rank.
Structure has developed over the two years since I've been here. It continues to develop. One senior member of staff has been unable to play a full part through sickness and is now being replaced upon retirement. The most important area in the structure is the form tutor base. The form tutor must be involved as much as possible in what must be the caring community of the school.

The school is organised horizontally, and the form tutors have groups which are basically form groups. The third and fourth years (our first two years) come under a Head of Lower School. This was the way we started. Heads of Years had to come because of the size of present schools.

We are still in the process of writing job specifications. At one time we felt that we shouldn't have a Head of Year system because we wished to get the form tutor responsible. We felt that form tutors would tend to pass anything to the Head of Year. Form tutors have a definite role specification but some tutors make no real attempt to follow it, and the cause is probably personality or overwork.

Senior management attends Heads of Departments' meetings. Senior management means myself, the Deputy Head, Senior Mistress, Director of Studies, and Heads of Lower and Upper Schools. I often bring in the chaplain, and sometimes the Careers Officer.

I feel that pastoral and curricular people are subject to a certain amount of tension between them. This is sometimes expressed in staff room discussions by remarks like: "I am the one expected to administer, and leave them to get on with their teaching. I should take the decisions and leave them to get on with their teaching." The clash is generally over the ways we take to achieve
the pretty general philosophy we have with regard to the task. We know what we are trying to do. We are trying to put it down on paper. I can see the new pastoral people in charge of years coming from people other than Heads of Departments.

We have a structure of decision-making in this school. A monthly cycle of meetings takes place. We start with the school council meeting. This takes place on Monday afternoons after school. A representative from each form meets to make recommendations but there is no decision-making. The following week there is a meeting of Heads of Upper and Lower schools with their tutors, and they can discuss anything that comes from the school council. Heads of Years, with their tutors, meet in the lunch hour. This means that some teachers have no meetings except for the Staff Meeting. The next week there is a Heads of Departments' meeting, and their work is essentially curricular. Each Head of Department is very much his own boss. I would not interfere. Some departments are very small but that person is probably the only specialist. I feel that we are gradually moving in the direction of more integrated studies, and as time goes on I think that the resistance at present in the staff will erode. I was not going to tell a Head of Department to get on with it when he was not pleased with the idea.

I chair the Heads of Departments' meeting because I'm particularly interested in curriculum development. The Director of Studies goes round consulting departments. I have a top order management meeting every Wednesday; it's a trouble-shooting meeting, a meeting of information to all about what's going on. I feel that I get to know this way about what's going on in the staff. It's a consultative situation for feedback from various meetings.

The pastoral and curricular roles are organised separately but the roles are blurred by the fact that pastoral heads teach and teachers are tutors. There is conflict in various areas between the two sides: general philosophy, job specifications, time. Specific job
specifications are developing but these are not provided yet for Heads of Departments, but I think they are quite clear about their jobs. They have complete autonomy within their departments, the way they develop their syllabuses, utilise their resources, and so on. The job specifications have tended to be for the pastoral side.

Curricular Heads have proceeded to Heads of Years but in future I can see some senior Heads of Departments preferring to stay out of the pastoral side and some younger ones wanting to get in. Some subjects lend themselves more to this kind of promotion. Physical Education and Music, yes, Science perhaps no, though my scientist might. Training should be on the job.

Heads of Departments have seconds-in-command in the bigger departments but we have no real deputies on the pastoral side.

I don't know everything that happens but I'm interested. I do not find the head's task easier when large sectors of decision making are shared. I suppose the easiest thing would be to have an autocratic situation where everyone accepted the head's decisions and implemented them without question. I certainly find the debating and consultation, plus occasional problems of implementation very wearing.

Staff meetings are every four weeks and the dates are published at the beginning of the year; an agenda is published beforehand and full minutes kept. The large staff meeting has its difficulties, particularly where some staff are inhibited by the large body of people; the regular meetings have helped to encourage a more honest and fruitful debate. I give leadership by raising particular issues at a staff meeting or by setting up Working Parties to discuss particular topics, and occasionally by producing a paper for discussion. We do not normally vote but a consensus is usually achieved.

I feel it is necessary to have fairly clear guidelines for the different roles but I prefer some blurring of the edges and a reliance upon colleagues seeing
the need for co-operation. It does occasionally lead
to a bit of treading on toes, but better this than some
people falling through the net. The Director of Studies
and I decide on space, time, and technology allocation.
We had a Working Party to look into the whole use of room
resources in the school and its findings were put to the
staff and accepted. I certainly would not interfere
with a Head of Department or Head of Year in relation to
his area of responsibility as defined unless I learned
that he was implementing a change which ran counter to
total school policy. This latter is unlikely I think
but, for instance, I would consider it a Head of Department'
responsibility to decide on Mode 1 or Mode 111 CSE but not
his decision to decide that no one would do any external
examinations in his subject.
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I find it very difficult to decide about the allocation of time in the curriculum. The deputy has no teaching time. I have no teaching time but the senior master is anxious to teach and has 20 periods. The Heads of Years have on average 10 out of 40 periods free for pastoral work, and my experience in this and other schools is that this is barely adequate, but I find myself in the ambivalent position of having to take some of my best teachers out of the classroom to give them pastoral time. I'm considering at the moment appointing non-paid seconds-in-command, who perhaps aren't such strong teachers, but who are good pastoral people, who could perhaps chip away at some of the work on behalf of Heads of Years and so allowing them a bit more time in the classroom in direct contact with kiddies. I think that a lot of pastoral work happens in the classroom.

Heads of Departments are on a varying scale, with regard to being free from teaching; it depends upon the number of staff they have. Heads of major departments tend to get about 7 free, the average member of staff gets 5, and I try to work all probationers on 10 free.

The Head of Year's time is specifically for Head of Year pastoral duties. I find it difficult to justify the amount of free time they might have had in the past. I think the probationer teacher is more looked after nowadays in the general pastoral structure in the school. The Heads of Departments have less responsibility in that area than in the past. Their pastoral role in respect of probationers has been nibbled away. The Director of Studies has only 22 teaching periods, and the School Counsellor only 20 periods, and both of these in giving guidance do work that the Head of Department might have done in the past.

There is undoubtedly tension. I don't know it in depth and one should speak to the people concerned.
When I came to the school there was little structure
and the Heads of Departments were the important people.
I wanted a structure which I could rely upon, and which
would release me from the day-to-day problems. I
disbanded the House System (I had the support of the
majority of staff) and I have organised, with the full
approval of the staff, a Year System so there are four
Year Heads and they have a tremendous autonomy within
their year groups.

I feel undoubtedly that there are Heads of
Departments who have felt challenged by this, and feel
that they need the time rather than the Heads of Years,
or as well as the Heads of Years, let's put it that way.
It's not always easy to justify to them why you do
things in a particular way, though in practice I find
that the people who are most unhappy about the time issue
are the ones who spend most time in the staff room.
There are undoubtedly tensions but the main tension is
that within the Heads of Years themselves, who are not very
clear of their roles, who expect me to tell them what
their jobs are, and I don't know, so how can I tell
them?

They have had no explicit job specifications from
me, in the sense that I have said that these are your
jobs, but I meet them frequently on a personal basis.
Every day I speak to all of them, even if it's only for
five minutes, and I meet them in a structured way about
twice each half-term. We discuss problems that they
are experiencing and we try to talk ourselves into what
we think the situation should be. If something comes
up I will go to the Head of Year and say: "Do you think
this is something you ought to do?" and it's up to him
to say: "Yes" or "No". It is part of my policy that
they have to practise the decision-making to become good
at it. The only way to get experience is by experiencing.
In some areas I have seen incredible growth in people who
have been put in these positions.

Mind you, also in some Heads of Departments I have
found those who have had considerable responsibilities put upon them have grown tremendously in the past year and a half. The Heads of Years have been shattered time and time again by my refusal to make them do things my way. People still want me to tell them what to do. I totally refuse to do it. I have excellent deputies and the other staff often confide in them the uncertainties I have created for them. They'll say: "What does he want us to do?" Now I take pride in the fact that my deputies now tell them: "Well, he wants you to work things out for yourselves."

On the resources side, I have allocated money to pastoral development. I've spent on facilities, like curtains, chairs, desks; by force of circumstances, only one Head of Year has her own room whilst the others share a very adequate room with telephone and filing cabinets.

The distribution of teachers gives zero tension I feel here.

Communications are a major problem. However democratic you are, a lot of younger teachers seldom talk to you. Some older teachers are like this, too. I work in my room with an open door but even so there are staff who stand at the open door and knock it before they come in. You can't change the system. The single greatest help to the staff has been the weekly Monday morning quickie Staff Meeting. It lasts from 10.30 to 11. Those on duty hear from the others. I give them all my news which includes any visitors and my daily plans for the week. I tell them of staffing, cuts, anything I'm in on. Then if anyone has anything to say it's said.

I believe in the Working Party and I find that a tremendous amount of tension is absorbed in this way. As early as possible, I usually get out of any Working Party established.

I now refuse to attend Year Meetings. The Heads of Years now meet with Heads of Departments monthly; they didn't used to do so. I used in the beginning to meet regularly only with Heads of Years to the great
resentment of Heads of Departments. Now that's changed. Getting them together has been a great help. The top inner caucus of senior administrative people includes Heads of Years but not Heads of Departments at present, but I think the representatives of Heads of Departments will have to be invited in the future. I believe the present situation is resented by Heads of Departments. They must feel that I put more weight on the pastoral side.

I decided early to write frequently to the parents. A lot of comment came back from them, much of it critical. One said: "You ought to have put a place at the bottom, a reply slip, so that we could send back our comments." I thought about this and decided to do it. I then got not fifteen complaints but seventy or eighty. Management is making decisions you can live with but, having decided to do this, all that I'm getting out of it is anxiety for myself. Actually I had given the parents an area to level their criticism and having made their little complaints they'll feel a lot better and a lot of tension will be out of the situation.

If you apply this by analogy, I think there's a lot of tension in schools, particularly on the personality level. Very often people who have a gripe, or who feel they have to get at someone because of roles, perhaps don't find it as easy to get at someone like the head as the head might like to think it is. I can say to everyone: "If you have a worry come and see me" but in fact many feel they might place their careers in jeopardy. The role imposes a threat rather than the person. I find generally that my senior staff rarely openly make a criticism. Few are really prepared to come out openly with what is wrong with something or some person. They take it very badly if at senior level they are criticised. When criticised at a low level of importance, they assume they are being criticised about everything. I say I don't like yellow and they assume I don't like the whole spectrum.

People in authority have to be careful of abusing that authority. I usually recommend someone else
to criticise for me as, if it comes from me, it seems to have the wrong effect. So the personality factor has a tremendous amount to do with tension, especially in the old situation which we are growing out of. But people have to grow into this new situation. When very critical remarks occur at a staff meeting I'm usually cast in the role of the one who has to balance the thing up. I find it's me who has to put the person down, as it were, and I don't relish that task, and then I find afterwards that if I haven't done it that's when all sorts of gossip starts, and people begin to feel that so-and-so should have been put in his box. Presumably it's my role to do that, whereas I would like to get to the place where other people would share that with me. I don't think that we should be the hammer of the Goths! Like everything else, that is a responsibility that should be shared. Of course, people have got to be chipped off from time to time.

People always misrepresent what I say. Often when staff claim that they are representing the views of others to the head they are in fact being patronising, and in this situation I feel it is extremely difficult to be courteous in reply. I also find that whoever brings something to me that it is usually one-sided, and usually exaggerated, and if, as at times happens, I act upon it, then I will have made a mistake. I try to look for balance. If I find that one member of staff has been particularly unpleasant to another one, I will try to get an unbiased picture of what has happened to help me with my dealings with that member of staff for the future.

I have a belief in a circular system of management, a going-out of authority and a coming-in, with parents and children actually on the circle. The circle goes in to a management group and I am on the edge of that group. I'm not at the centre of it, but on the circumference.

My only developmental role appointed is my counsellor; all the rest has been feeding the beast.
I have not got strict role specifications for my staff. I believe that even if I had, then discontinuities would inevitably occur. I feel the strength of open meetings is that these gaps quickly come to the surface and people come to realise their responsibilities. I have had trouble with the relationships between the counsellor and the Heads of Years about who has the right to send people home. When this trouble arises I expect them to sit down and work out between them what is the best system, what will work. I would prefer to work in this way rather than write out a list of rights and duties and give them out. Trust is the most important part of all our relationships, and if you can establish that, there will be an end to a lot of conflict.

I believe in some conflict. I think it's a good thing. I believe it can be creative. In the counselling situation it can be very useful. What I find which amuses me is that when you sit down with a group of people in a school to discuss a problem about the school there comes a stage when everyone is highly critical. Then everyone is very frightened about what he's criticised and then everyone starts to bolster up the system again. Those stages seem to go on in education. Perhaps the head's role, when everyone is bolstering himself up is to say: "Wait a minute" and then, when everyone is very depressed, to say: "Well, it could be worse, couldn't it?"
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The pastoral structure appears to have come into its own in recent years, and most large schools have Heads of Years or Houses. We have Heads of Years and Heads of Schools, with a Lower and Upper School division. The different tiers are criticised sometimes, and it is true that I found this structure when I came and perhaps it does make for some conflict that needn't be there.

There is often conflict between the Head of Year and Head of School, and personalities play an important part. The Heads of Years generally would prefer to act directly under me and they tend to by-pass the Head of School on occasion.

I suppose the biggest problem between Heads of Years and Heads of Schools and Departments would be that of communications. We're always trying to improve on this. We have many meetings within the groupings in the school and between them.

The pastoral staff meet me regularly, and this has been a source of tension with the departments who may feel that they are being left out of things. Yet they are autonomous in the way they organise their subjects. They decide on the examinations and the way they teach their subjects. They have departmental meetings; generally the large departments are very regular and formal, and minutes are kept. The Head of Department has wide areas of decision-making in making use of his resources of teachers, rooms, money, and so on. We have some excellent Heads of Departments who make a most valuable contribution to the school. I am always interested in new developments on the curricular side and do what I can to encourage these. Changes in the curricular work of the school may come from teachers within the departments or from outside, as we have plenty of opportunities for staff to give their opinions and views.
and Working Parties are frequently set up.

I would say that there is a good deal of consultation going on all the time, and I cannot think of any important decision being made about the way the school is run which has not been preceded by consultation and discussion between all those who may be affected. The staff meets regularly and everything to do with the school may be discussed.

I would not think there was any great conflict between the pastoral and curricular sides. There is some resentment that the pastoral people seem to be so important in day-to-day activities. The year structure is a good training for heads of the future, and the way forward for the Head of Department is not so straightforward as it was in the past.

I don't attend the Heads of Departments' meetings but this does not mean that I do not meet individual Heads of Departments frequently. This is something that is happening often as I make a habit of inviting them to speak to me about their work, and I go into the departments to make enquiries and to show my interest. We need strong departments and they rank on equal terms with the pastoral people as far as pay is concerned.

The Heads of Years are more seen in public to be acting for me at various Assemblies and so on, and seeing the parents. It's not often a Head of Department sees a parent in ordinary school time, though he does see them at Year evenings and Open Evenings.
I believe that my staff would consider that the introduction of pastoral people was a good thing. Of course, my Heads of Departments would have some reservations and they have a very important role to play. I would suggest that the role they play in this school is more important than it may be in other schools because of the gravity, if you like, of the job they find themselves in. The Head of Department is a very important cog in the wheel. He is responsible for the growth, the teaching of his subject to the whole population of the school. He has to make the decisions about the way his subject is organised and taught. He has the staff in his department to do that. He knows their strengths and weaknesses; therefore he has to put those members of staff to the groups that he has to cover. In other words the Head of Department allocates his teachers.

I believe that is one of our functions as heads: to encourage members of staff within the organisation to give that kind of responsibility because these members of staff are going to be the future heads of schools. For job satisfaction alone, I think you have to give that person his head, if you like.

The pastoral staff have duties equally as important. Their brief is to care for the youngsters who come within their groups. We then have two complete systems working in the school, and I would agree with you wholeheartedly, how to make them gel together so that you're not worried about the difficulties is the problem.

I have seen in this school that the pastoral side has been in conflict with the departmental heads because they feel that it is difficult to decide just whose job it is at different times to do a particular thing. We have tried to solve this by careful job specifications and procedures. We have feed-back systems of all kinds.
I'm sure that conflicts go on in school. We have differences of opinion but no great conflict. We try through the clearance system to smooth things out. I think communication is terribly important. When you lack communication that's when your problems start. I believe the communication area to be the area which causes the biggest problems in the school. Not so much whether the Head of Department sees eye-to-eye with those on the pastoral side; by discussion we solve these problems. Conflict comes through lack of communication or the right kind of communication.

I find delegation difficult. I think this is only natural. There are many meetings going on all the time in the various groups. The criticism has been made that there are too many.

I don't think the Heads of Departments resent the time given to Heads of Years. Much of the Heads of Years' work has to be done immediately and is of a short term nature. The Heads of Departments have pressure periods too when they plan for their subjects and organise for requisition periods. There is a danger of Heads of Departments and others saying: "This is not my problem. Pass it to the pastoral side because they are paid to do that" and this is bound to introduce tension into relationships. It's resentment, I suppose, at the way in which the pastoral system appears to have grown so quickly, and the Heads of Departments sometimes feel that this growth has been at their expense. They used to be the most important people in the school and now they have to share power with others. The Head of Year takes little from the departments in the way of money, but other resources like room space and teacher time are very important in the life of the school. There is always the feeling that too much emphasis may be given to social welfare services. There is a tendency for this kind of priority to exist and something of a divorce appearing between the two sides.

I would like to emphasise the importance of the
curricular side of the school, but the Head of Year always appears to be the more powerful figure because of the kind of work that he has to be involved with every day. The Head of Year is very much the front man dealing with the organisation of the pupils on a day-to-day basis, and the pupils come to see him as being important. He has to see the parents and to seek out children who are behavioural problems and pupils are often impressed by the disciplinary aspect. Many of the Heads of Years have been successful on the departmental side, whereas many Heads of Departments would not seek to work on the pastoral side, and perhaps would not be suitable anyway.

The main groups in the school meet regularly. The Heads of Departments meet monthly as do the Heads of Years. I have a weekly meeting with my deputies and the senior master which could be called top management. The departments and years meet regularly, some more than others. The full staff meets about twice termly but much of the work has already been done in the system of meetings within the various groups in the school. There is a good deal of consultation but communication remains a problem.
There is conflict between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments. I notice that one of the Heads of Departments is complaining only today about the way some of the pupils appear to be getting away with missing some of their work because they have to leave class for the Head of Year who is making some investigation. I do not think that there is a lot involved in conflict such as this. I think the personalities involved are responsible for the complaint ever to have been made. I think there is a perfectly reasonable explanation, and I will make this clear when I next meet the Heads of Departments.

The Heads of Departments meet under their own chairman but I always attend the meetings so that questions raised can be answered directly. The Heads of Years meet weekly but the Heads of Departments meet about three times a term. I attend the Heads of Years' meetings too, and I suppose that since they are more frequent some of the Heads of Departments may feel that the Heads of Years have an advantage. There are many meetings within the departments and also within the years. The top management group contains a mixture of both sides, academic or departmental and pastoral. The whole staff meets a couple of times a term and I chair that meeting. Policy decisions are more likely to come from the top management group rather than from any other.

I believe in talking out the various problems that are continually arising in administration and teaching. I believe that if all the staff see that all teachers are valued as persons, then a lot of the sting goes out of the various conflict situations that may arise as a result of the reaction between roles.

I try to enable the Head of Department to receive some opportunity to gain experience on the pastoral side, though some Heads of Departments show no interest and decline the invitation to take on some pastoral
responsibility. I feel that the Heads of Years have the edge these days, as far as promotion is concerned, and it is on this ground that I try to encourage Heads of Departments to gain some pastoral experience. There has been movement to and from the pastoral side as against the departmental structure, and I do not think the division between the two is all that pronounced, but I could be wrong on that. My staff may say differently.

I would say that it is a matter of policy on my part not to import people to take on senior posts on the pastoral side. That side of the school's work demands so much sensitivity and understanding of what is going on, and has gone on in the school, that to bring in somebody who is completely new would be too much for my present staff. It has worked sometimes in the past and on one occasion did not work and the new recruit was so unhappy in the role that she had to move after about a year.

We have a very strongly developed pastoral side which goes back over the years and is the result of much hard work on the part of teachers, and has produced a somewhat unique relationship between staff and pupils and parents. There is considerable unity of purpose and this strong pastoral element must make for better conditions for the teaching departments. It is still true that some departments feel that too much stress is being placed upon the pastoral side, but in some cases these departments may be ones which have few problems anyway because they cater largely for the better motivated pupils. Such departments often cannot understand the severe problems felt by those staff who have to deal, sometimes all day, with the less able child who poses many problems of discipline and who has little desire to work.

I feel strongly that if personal relationships are looked after, and the climate of support for each and all is aimed at consciously in the various arrangements that are made, then the conflict that is bound to arise
whenever people are working together will be seen in perspective by all involved. Of course, a planned structure of discussion meetings, working parties, and so on, are all necessary.
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We have the historical problem in that this school was once a grammar school and when re-organisation came the Heads of Department were already in office and the need was for a pastoral structure. Those who were given these posts came in the main from the secondary modern school. Though there have been changes in the personnel of the school, there are still references made to this historical situation. The pastoral side has come to play such an important part in the life of the school, and there is some resentment felt by some of the senior Heads of Departments who feel that they have been badly treated in some way or other.

The departments get the top allowances but they can see that there is less need to consult them about wide areas of school life. Some of the departmental heads have moved over when vacancies have arisen, and I think they have been wise from the point of view of promotion prospects. The pastoral people have many of the jobs which used to be reserved for the head of the school, and when they go for interviews they can speak with greater knowledge and experience of the big school than can the Heads of Departments, who have kept themselves pretty closely involved with their own departments. It is possible to move out of this narrow position but most of the departments keep to themselves as a group, and this is understandable.

I do not underestimate the importance of good strong departments and I would do everything possible to support them as the good Head of Department is invaluable in that he can control to a large extent what goes on in the classroom. Departments meet regularly, though not all of them do this. There is a joint committee which meets once a month, and I think this has helped to bring the two sides together in the talking out of problems. I think this kind of consultation and communication to be
most important.

This is a big school and we have to work on three sites which makes for many problems. I delegate fairly extensively, and I'm happy to do this. I feel that the large departments should be fairly self-contained and be responsible for curriculum. Departments take up most of the money in the school, and the Head of Department is responsible for seeing that it is properly spent. Heads of Departments distribute their staff throughout the school, and sometimes there is tension here.

The pastoral staff have a good deal of autonomy and they have become much more responsible people because of it. They have their own rooms and facilities because they have to interview parents and people from the local education authority. They hold their own meetings with their form tutors, and pass on information about their organisation of their years. We have full staff meetings about twice each term, and there are many committees set up to discuss particular problems or ideas. I meet with my deputies daily. Some would say that we have too many meetings and that there is too much talking, but this is a necessary part in running a large school and I do not see how we could operate in any other way.
We have reached the stage here where we don’t even think about tension. One can’t pontificate about principles. All I would say is that it depends upon attitudes of mind, as does everything else. Attitudes of mind take time to change. If we believe in something long enough, and patiently enough, people’s attitudes around you change. It’s in that context, it’s things that otherwise would have been abrasive and impossible suddenly become natural and acceptable.

There are great difficulties about communicating concern between various people. A concern expressed, a communication of concern in the context of the school situation, is picked up in different ways by different people, and this is a natural and good thing. You get an idea and it doesn’t work, and then you look at what actually does come out of it and you start seeing benefits.

What we want really, instead of having a single strategy for dealing with problem children, is to have a series of strategies which can bear on the problem, and if we sit around and talk logically about what we have to do with problem children this is doomed to failure, because what we want is a diffuse pattern of strategies within the school to deal with different children and, of course, people do react differently. They adopt strategies from bases of different personalities and therefore it’s natural that their strategies are going to be different. They’re conditioned by the personalities with which they are doomed.

There are Heads of Departments who say that we should not be so concerned with the pastoral side and we should get on with our teaching, but this is a bit of a nonsense. It’s like watering a garden with a leaky watering can. It’s like saying: “The purpose of this watering can is to water the bloody garden; what do you
need to keep on trying to mend this leak for?" The point is that the two things are intimately involved. You can water the garden so much more efficiently if you take some time out in order to mend the leak; maybe you could do it twice as efficiently if you have a good leak in the thing. It's ludicrous to go on watering the garden because this is what the damn watering can is for. By stopping watering the garden for a limited period, or for part of the time, you can water it much more efficiently in the time that's left.

I think this is the thing we have to get over with regard to the business of personal concern. We're trying to get a body of knowledge over, yes, but we're trying to get a body of knowledge to people, and since people have certain characteristics, then getting the body of knowledge over must take account of the fact. Perhaps if we stop putting the body of knowledge over and mend the can or, in other words, take account of the human arrangements that we're functioning within, then in the long run we can do it more efficiently. It's how people feel about the learning situation that is very much more important than we have been led to realise throughout our careers. If people feel warm about a teacher then they tend to learn, one finds this over and over again. We know that children succeed in subjects that are often totally unrelated to their abilities and qualities and particular skills, and they leave that school thinking that their main strengths are in certain areas which is not a bit of the function of the abilities and aptitudes. It's a function of the patterns of staff they happen to have met.

In my case, the only decent teacher I came across was a Maths teacher and so Maths was my area, but in fact it should have been Science. Because we had a lousy teacher, he worked hard but the kids played him up, this was part of the school, I was drafted out to Latin and French and stuff like that, and it wasn't 'till I left school that I started learning any Science, and I only
did that because Maths was fairly closely related. So my whole school career was totally abortive really, because of this very fact that the school was not adaptable to my abilities and aptitudes. Probably it never would be totally, but it ought to have been better than this.

If there is an abrasive situation between Heads of Years and Heads of Departments this can only be seen as an initial situation before they have begun to understand the difficulties of the situation that they are expected to face. If you go deeply into a pastoral situation, if you have a deep pastoral element in your school, then everybody gradually becomes aware of the intractibility of the situation and gets caught up with a variety of efforts to try and take the steam out of it, and in that context they haven't got any time to be uncomfortable about each other's roles. There grows up a feeling that we're all a gang of people who are trying to do an impossible job, and the more elements that are being brought to bear on the thing the better. So in that context no one has the time to start scratching around and saying: "Who is he talking to; that kid, he's in my group or my year group;" the fact that somebody is talking to the child suddenly becomes terribly important.

Communication can mean conveying facts and messages, and the whole gamut of keeping in touch with what's going on. Now I'm not talking about that sort of communication. I'm talking about communication of concern. If we can communicate concern then other, more superficial, forms of communication will look after themselves. They may not be entirely effective, but they will be much more effective because concern comes in. People will find opportunities even when they relax to send the valuable communication out, and no structure under the sun can replace that. Yet you can't have a shared concern unless that level of trivial communication goes on. You can't write your feelings but when you talk to people
one can understand. It's a total waste of time, and it's a totally different skill to write down what you're on about. In two minutes face-to-face I can communicate an idea which would take a quarter of an hour to put on paper, and then I would feel on reading it: "This is not what I want to say." It's the same in communicating concern. You can't do that in written reports. So communication in the sense that everybody's hankering after isn't really what we want.

It's true that in some schools, Heads of Departments have sometimes felt somewhat insecure in the changing situations in the big schools in recent years, where pastoral people have appeared to have come into their own, securing time, resources, access to senior administrative posts, and the ear of the headmaster. All this has given rise to some anxiety and tension. The basis of all tension is a feeling of insecurity, so if we deal with the problem at this level, that it is a matter concerning basic security, rather than dealing with the trivia which has been caught up in the tension, if we go to the root cause of it, then I think effort shows results, and I suppose here we're talking as if there is some rational plan, or pattern, whereas the thing here is that we drift to certain set-ups, to effective situations, we don't rationalise them, we don't have any great expectations about the courses we take, but every now and again something clicks. We don't necessarily have time to look back and say: "Well, that is something we tried, consciously or subconsciously, and it's working." If something works we grab it. We reject things that don't work. So in the specific sense if one wants to rationalise it, what happens here is that we drift to a situation where a combined meeting of Heads of Year and Heads of Departments is gradually tending to be the academic board of this school: the ruling board.

This seems to work because people have their apprehensions altogether. Heads of Years have got apprehensions, Heads of Departments have got apprehensions,
and if you can create a situation in which people are free to express their apprehensions, however daft it may sound, to everybody else, then nobody bothers to take offence. We are all prepared to say daft things, and nobody is going to take you up and say: "But yesterday you said this." It's that state of mind which is the healing balm of insecurity. Right, well you use it in this situation when the Heads of Years and Heads of Departments are together. These techniques, if one can identify them as techniques, they're not designed as techniques, but they do spill over and so almost any member of staff can come along with his point of view. They're used to talking about it. They know that from time to time they will get the opportunity to talk on broad generalisations about the school.

The staff must be aware on the academic side that they can do their job better if they spend part of their time being concerned with the human variabilities of their clients. There is a basic natural tendency towards territorial imperatives, we have all got our territories, just like the robins, and what's happening is that civilisation, what it's about, is sitting back and looking at what we are, and seeing how what we are about can consciously be adjusted to a more sophisticated social arrangement. It's in this context really. First of all, we have to accept that it's not necessarily a nuisance that certain qualities of human beings still persist, but there's enough evidence to suggest that we can, by fumbling around, modify our human qualities to function in a more sophisticated way as a group.

I think the thing that's come out of the last ten years of my experience is the tremendous power that comes from group discussion and the readiness to sit down, like we are now, talk off the top of our heads and say things. If you're still insecure and defensive then you tend not to listen to what people are saying but to be critical of some of the things that they say. Now if we can move from a situation where you don't waste
time, I mean a lot of what I've said this morning is totally daft but the thing is that I know that if a group of us can go on in this way long enough, enough sense comes out of it which is so valuable that if you knew that that would have been the end product you would have gone to an awful lot of trouble to get it.

Whenever a group of people sit around and talk, ninety per cent of it is mush, but ten per cent of it represents an advance. One of the problems is you've got to do a lot of this because if you don't watch out you create tension and difference because every time a group does talk and they make an advance they have to recognise that there are other people in the staff room of whom you have certain expectations as a result of your talk and this cannot be realised because they haven't gone along with you. They've missed this particular advance.

We suffer in education from a lack of talk at the coal face. So we're deluged with written material, much better these days than it used to be, but when you get down to it the amount of actual coal face experience, despite the expertise, is virtually negligible, and it's because we're attacking it along the wrong lines. It's no good going away into a cave and sorting out ideas in your head. Ideas have got to evolve in the working situation. And this is the only way that we've got anything here, and by the way I'm often going through periods of absolute despair and misery about the situation, about the fact that, for instance, staff have reacted in a way which I would never have thought possible in different situations.

What we're about basically is caring for children and I have evidence daily of great care being exercised from all sorts of staff. If one at university tried to work out a strategy for caring, one would never hope to come up with the kind of caring that arises in so many ways. But it happens, it's infectious. It can't be rationalised. Yet even in the presence of this you still have a little fringe, say three or four children, who
can immobilise this caring machine and they can do it intuitively....they can throw a spanner in the works which makes you....... We had a girl yesterday, under tremendous stress, taken home by a parent. That girl had exploited and taken a lot of time from three members of staff in quick succession.

We have unique caring community here, and people quickly get caught up in it. Yet these dramatic things can happen and we don't know why. It's no good saying that this can all be rationalised and put on paper. We need strategies yes. But the strategies must arise out of an attitude of concern. Now it's creating that atmosphere of concern that is impossible to generalise and rationalise, except to say that if you're concerned yourself that is basic. But you can't force the pace. And you have to relate at times to someone who is unconcerned and relate in a way that he can recognise. If the teacher is up-tight then go along with him and become up-tight yourself. It's a sort of corn in the wind stunt. You may get blown over very near horizontal, but you can always come back. And that persistence in coming back enables the machine to survive and be consistent and not break down. All must get the same level of support. They don't all need to show their feelings to the same degree. The support that comes from someone who's very introspective by a little bit of openness is equivalent to another person who's less introspective and who can be more open. The support is the same.

I hate to rationalise all this because I don't understand it. I don't know what I'm talking about. This is a deep human situation; it's basic I think in society as a whole. It's this sort of diffuse approach to the situation which has to use logical thought, sequential ideas, and so on, if I am to convince you. It's got to have some sense, but the thing to be aware of is that we cannot rationalise what we're doing. For instance, the sort of thing that is totally incomprehensible
is that there are situations, I am convinced from experience, in which just struggling in a terribly frustrated way seems to bear fruit with people. The fact that you are struggling, that one can say at a staff meeting: "Well, I don't have a clue" and somehow or other this brings human sympathy. There are no absolutes. The times that one can feel convinced and then find out that one is wrong! This is why I refuse to speak to groups of people about things they ask me to speak about. Every time I say anything I want to condition it and in the end that doesn't make any impact. The only impact I can make is by my total sincerity. The last time I spoke to a staff I found that they were so at variance with each other, they had no common concern, and that's the only thing I think people can share; I talked about the things I've talked to you about, and then someone comes up with the remark: "Yes, but you're paid to be a leader, you ought to be leading," and all I could say was: "Well, I'm sorry, but I think this is the most effective way of leading."

Leading to me is not telling people what to do, or what they ought to do. It's setting up a situation where they evolve for themselves what they ought to do, and this is important because what people evolve for themselves is more effective and has got nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness of what they do. It's far more concerned with the fact that they evolved it for themselves. After all, if they have enough chance to experience this, then why the hell should I be in a special position over them? The only thing that is special about us as heads is that we've been put in the hot seat, and we've been forced to make decisions about the best way of setting about doing things. If we can persuade a whole gamut of people to do this to some extent, then we're in a much stronger position. You can get staff at this school, when they go to outside meetings, someone will say that teachers from this school have always got a lot to contribute. They don't bother, they just talk like they talk here, whereas
in lots of schools where they have staff meetings everybody is afraid to say anything, so they've no experience. You can't think unless you talk. You can't think by sitting around and cogitating.

I don't know half of what is going on in the school. I use the exploration of what is going on to support people in what they're doing. I don't think any situation would crop up where I would beef about something that was going on. If something was happening that I did not like or think right then I would use it as an excuse for getting people together to talk about it. It would then be brought out into the open in a sideways fashion, so that we could talk about it. I wouldn't then bring up the example and say that as a result of our talk what one was doing was wrong. If the talk is effective then they'll know what is wrong, and then they will initiate the change. If the change initiated is done so because the staff think that is what I want them to do, something has gone wrong. On the other hand, once you step back and stop telling people what to do they suddenly become very conscious of what you want them to do. My staff may say: "Well, what are we going to do?" but they never say: "Well, what do you want me to do?" I wouldn't tell them.

One has to be patient at the beginning in setting up a situation where this can happen. It takes a long time to set up this strategy. If I went into a new school I don't think I could cope. You see, I have been here from the beginning. Everything that is here is a function of gradual change, and much is the result of intuitive action on my part. You don't really know where you start doing this sort of thing. You don't really rationalise it. There's a strength to this talking-out business that many have not grasped. We're all entrenched in one way or another, but one can extend one's trench.

The basic problem in creating a caring school is one of communication. The Heads of Years and Heads of Departments come together about three times a term in any
case, but if there's something special that arises then we would meet weekly. A lot of discussion is off-the-cuff and not structured. Heads of Years meet with their year teams. I don't go but sometimes they invite me. That's once a week. There's a staff forum every now and again after school. I haven't been in the habit of going, but feelings have been expressed to the effect that it would be better if I was there. This is perhaps once a month and is chaired by the Head of Maths. If something good comes up then they feel that I can say: "Let's try it" whereas if I'm not there then they have to go through all the process. I feel it is far better for them to manage themselves. I don't know if they could take a decision on policy without me being present. I don't think they would want to. This is because I don't push my wares. This is a picture of where if you relax the authoritarian role, then they need your support.

One of the things that we recognise, for instance, is that we're at the end of the line, and part of the stress of our position is that we have to make decisions without anybody to refer to. Well now in that sense I feel that I am pushing that decision-making back on to them, but they're doing it in a slightly more secure position because they have got me behind them. I don't think there is any great merit in my taking decisions. I think it's nice for them to know there is a long-stop. I think also that if you diffuse the decision-making widely then this is a necessary but not sufficient factor in stimulating concern. If people are going to have to make decisions then they're going to be concerned in a different kind of way. I think it is a horrible thing to have in a school the kind of situation where a certain body of people, say the academic side, feel that somebody ought to be organising the community so that they can function in a particular kind of way. This isn't on. You can't pass the buck to anybody. You can share the burden. People must not bring me their problems in an atmosphere of: "What are you going to do about it?" Because they're concerned they know damn well that I'm no different from
them. If they've got a difficult problem with a child then somehow we have to destroy the myth that somebody had better do something about it. We've all got to do something.

Everything is relative. At times I'm very proud of what is going on here. At other times I'm in despair. How can one assess even what's going on in your own school, let alone in others. Eventually I suspect anyone who's sure of what he's doing because I'm just inadequate. The human condition is not capable of certainty. As soon as you're relatively confident of something then life has a way of knocking you. In practice the whole damn thing is so frustrating that we have to grasp occasionally at things that seem to shed new light, even though at times we know that we are being carried away. It's necessary.

I've come to recognise that it's a good thing in a school to have people ploughing new ground somewhere. It's the excitement that goes with people trying to exploit new ideas, it's that excitement that we need. It fills a gap. I believe in having lots of nibbles at the apple.

We must avoid feeling that we can structure everything, creating roles and things; I don't believe in roles. People evolve natural roles, they're not pre-destined. These natural roles are a function of the people and the situation. There are only a small number of common factors about each role. Yet some people continue to want things to be written down, so that everything can be tidy. There is no role; there is a sort of area in which people function. There's a total overlap, in a caring school, of all roles.