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Abstract

This thesis explores principal leadership in Australian schools offering International Baccalaureate (IB) programmes. Since its introduction to Australia in 1978, the IB has grown considerably and now occupies a sizable place in the Australian education landscape. Despite this growth, the impact of the IB on Australian principal leadership has been, to this point, unexplored. This research fills this gap through a mixed methods sequential exploratory investigation employing complexity leadership theory as an investigative framework.

A maximum variation purposive sampling strategy identified seven case schools across three Australian states for Phase One. Principals in the seven case schools participated in a series of semi-structured interviews ($n^1 = 7$). Constructive grounded theory and thematic analysis techniques produced findings which are explored further through a survey questionnaire offered to the total population of 174 Australian IB principals ($n^2 = 50, RR = 28.7\%$). The two data analyses are integrated to show that Australian IB principals inhabit cultures where leadership actions continually shift between resolving conflicting expectations and overcoming confusing experiences. These expectations and experiences perpetually reconfigure, requiring responsive leadership by principals in sense-making (coherence) and structuration (congruence).

This research finds that Australian IB principals hold philosophical and pedagogical views which align with the IB, but are not necessarily derived from their experience of, or attraction to, the IB. Rather, implementing IB programmes is a pragmatic strategy to realise principals’ pre-existing educational visions, mediated through the temporally manifest culture of their school. As an exploratory study, this thesis also identifies important topics for future research.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Australian Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACARA</td>
<td>Australian Curriculum, Assessment, and Reporting Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AITSL</td>
<td>Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTES</td>
<td>New South Wales Board of Studies, Teaching, and Educational Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Complex adaptive systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaaS</td>
<td>Creativity, Activity, and Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Complexity leadership theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Career-related Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBLP</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Learner Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBO</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSEA</td>
<td>Index of Socio-Community Educational Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEETYA</td>
<td>Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPLAN</td>
<td>National Assessment Plan for Literacy and Numeracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESA</td>
<td>New South Wales Education Standards Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter One: A journey of inquiry

1.1 Introduction
In the 1960s, a group of affluent and well credentialed internationalists developed a tertiary entrance course to help a transient global populace gain access to leading international universities (Peterson, 1972). Still recoiling from the horrors of World War Two and its dislocating aftermath, they dreamed of a world infused with peace, respect, and a global generosity of heart. Through their children, the future leaders of a better global community, a reconstructed world could flourish, built on humanistic hope and understanding, mutual honouring of cultures, and where “other people, with their differences, can also be right” (IBO, 2017, p. i). So was born the International Baccalaureate Organization¹ (IB) and its Diploma Programme².

Within a decade, this vision for the world reached Australia (Bagnall, 1997), an antipodean declension whose student profile possessed limited equivalence to the original target group. The IB has grown in Australia and now provides programmes across the complete age range of formal schooling in Australia. Questions have been asked about its merits in the Australian context (Bagnall, 1997, 2005), its curriculum (Bagnall, Wilson, & Hu, 2015; Dixon, Charles, Moss, Hubber, & Pitt, 2014; Kidson, Odhiambo, & Wilson, 2019), its internationalism (Rizvi et al., 2014; Sripikash, Singh, & Qi, 2014), and even how well it meets its own mission of inclusivity (Dickson, Perry, & Ledger, 2017). Surprisingly, no inquiry exists to this point into how the presence of these programmes impacts principal

¹ Literature referred to in this thesis utilises both organisation and organization. For consistency, the Australian preferred spelling, organisation, is employed in general text, and organization is not identified as incorrect via the standard academic practice, sic. This thesis also uses the abbreviation IB throughout and reserves the abbreviation IBO specifically for the administrative functions of the organization (see 5.3.5 IBO).
² The IB denotes its curriculum as programme; this spelling is used throughout the thesis for consistency. Material cited using the spelling, “program”, is not identified as incorrect via the standard academic practice, sic.
leadership in Australian IB schools\(^3\), despite the now well-established acknowledgement of school leadership to effective schooling (Day, Gu, & Sammons, 2016; Dinham, 2016), including those offering IB programmes (Day, Townsend, Knight, & Richardson, 2016; Lee, Hallinger, & Walker, 2012a, 2012b). This research adds to this limited body of research through exploring the hitherto unexamined leadership experiences of principals in Australian IB schools.

Australian principals work within complex governance and policy architectures, and additional structures and obligations created by offering IB programmes increase that complexity. Australian education is historically and constitutionally the responsibility of individual states and territories, including school starting age, divisions between primary and secondary schooling, curriculum structures and content, certification, and matriculation requirements. State governments also hold responsibility for registration and accreditation of non-government schools. More recently, national policy initiatives have emerged which cover school funding arrangements for non-government schools (Gonski, Boston, Greiner, Scales, & Tannock, 2011; Harrington, 2011), a national curriculum, national literacy and numeracy testing, and concomitant public accountability and reporting mechanisms (OECD, 2012). These multifaceted and challenging contexts significantly impact how Australian principals enact their leadership (Eacott & Norris, 2014; Lingard & Sellar, 2013; Ragusa & Bousfield, 2015; Savage, 2016). Schools which then choose to offer IB programmes thus introduce further obligations and structural requirements which create leadership experiences distinctly different from other Australian schools.

This research explores how the presence of the IB in Australian schools impacts principal leadership. It seeks to understand this phenomenon by examining the subjective

---

\(^{3}\) Schools authorised by the IB to offer one or more programmes are authorised to use the term IB World School. This research uses the more generic term IB school.
experience and perspectives of principals. It neither considers more philosophical and sociological questions concerning the legitimacy, or otherwise, of IB programmes in Australia (Bagnall, 2005; Dickson et al., 2017; Doherty, 2009), nor does it examine challenges related to the implementation of the curriculum and pedagogy (Bagnall et al., 2015; Rizvi et al., 2014; Skrzypiec, Askell-Williams, Slee, & Rudzinski, 2014; Sripikash et al., 2014). These have been explored through other research which is reviewed as part of this thesis. Rather, the focus in this study is on how the presence of IB programmes impacts upon the leadership of Australian IB principals.

1.2 Background to the study

This research emerged in response to my direct experience, first as a curriculum leader, then as a principal, in Australian non-government schools, culminating in appointment as principal in an IB school offering three of the four IB programmes: the Primary Years Programme (PYP), the Middle Years Programme (MYP), and the Diploma Programme (DP). In total, I served 6 years as principal of a school accountable to the New South Wales Education Standards Authority (NESA), followed by a further 5½ years in a school responsible to both NESA and the IB. These contrasting experiences raised a series of questions about the extent to which the presence of the IB in the school impacted upon my role.

The genesis of this study is my diverse leadership experience. I spent five years as a director of curriculum working within two contrasting contexts. The first was a co-educational, Kindergarten – Year 12 day and boarding school of approximately 600 students in regional New South Wales with over 125 years’ history; boarders comprised 35% of the total school population, and nearly half of the secondary section (Years 7 – 12). The school

---

4 The New South Wales Education Standards Authority (NESA) is the regulatory authority for education in New South Wales. Between 1st January 2014 and 1st January 2017, it was known as the Board of Studies, Teaching and Educational Standards (BOSTES), and prior to 1st January 2014 it was known as the New South Wales Board of Studies (BOS). This study was conducted across this time period.
was in the mid-range for Australian non-government school tuition fees. I took up the position in 1999 during a time of significant curriculum change, including the first major overhaul since 1967 of the New South Wales Higher School Certificate (HSC), that state’s matriculation credential (NSW Department of Education and Training, 1997). The significant proportion of boarders in the student population influenced numerous structural elements of the school’s operation, including, but not limited to, timetabling, excursion planning, parent-teacher interactions, staffing allocations, and annual calendar fixtures. The second school was also a Kindergarten – Year 12 co-educational, day and boarding school nearly 100 years old, but had over 1200 students and was in regional Victoria. In contrast, the proportion of boarders was only 25% of the total population, and less than one-third of the secondary school population. The school was also in the mid-range for Australian non-government school tuition fees. Due to the larger size of the overall school, and the lower proportion of boarders, the tensions experienced in the first school over such matters as excursions and the staffing needs of the boarding community were different. I began to appreciate that size, type of school, and socio-economic capacity are factors which directly impact the work of school leaders. Throughout this period, responsibility for curriculum rested entirely with respective state governments, including for non-government schools. Differences between the two states were evident in curriculum structures and sequencing, assessment, and reporting processes, leading to further appreciation of how regulatory contexts impact the practice of leadership.

Between 2005-2009, I held a principal’s position in a New South Wales day school which offered only the state-based curriculum, however, it was in a lower socio-economic regional community with much less capacity than schools in which I previously worked; it was also a young school, only 14 years old, and had experienced considerable conflict under the previous principal. Parental expectations, student engagement, and staff resourcing were challenges I had not previously experienced, given the two boarding schools had greater
socio-economic capacity, stable leadership, longstanding history, and clear institutional identity. Finally, in 2010, I accepted appointment to the IB school mentioned above, a Kindergarten – Year 12 co-educational day school of 1100 students, including approximately 35 international students in Years 11 and 12. I became acutely conscious that differences between each context (state, size, type, socio-economic capacity) impact the practice of leadership. At the time of taking up the appointment, I assumed the impact of the IB was in its curriculum management, a task undertaken by a member of the senior executive staff. During 2010, the school prepared for its five-yearly evaluation visit by the IB in 2011. This process revealed my assumption to be wrong; consequently, I concluded the differences to be significant.

The IB evaluation is a process involving a self-study conducted by a school prior to the scheduled visit by IBO representatives (IBO, 2018h). The IBO undertakes its own study, and findings of both are compared. During 2011, this took place concurrent with the process of re-registration and re-accreditation as a non-government school by the then New South Wales Board of Studies’ (BOS). The IB evaluation and BOS registration processes highlighted a range of administrative and organisational requirements of the IB quite different to those of the BOS. During the BOS registration and accreditation process, the inquiry-based pedagogical model central to the IB curriculum did not always appear well understood by the BOS inspectors; this was particularly the case in the PYP which covers the Kindergarten – Year 6 curriculum (see Table 2.2). Furthermore, during the IB evaluation visit, differences were identified in assessment and reporting practices, student grouping policies, additional language learning requirements, teacher professional learning obligations and costs, administrative processes and reporting obligations, timetabling constraints, and the understanding of IB philosophy and pedagogy among parents and governors (IBO, 2011, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014d, 2014e, 2016b). In addition to meeting with the principal and
senior curriculum leaders, the IB evaluation team met with representatives of the student body, parents, and the school’s governing board of directors, a process that is still not part of current NESA inspections.

I observed these differences created particular conflict within the school which was not present in my previous non-IB school contexts. Staff who preferred one curriculum framework could appear disparaging of the other, leading to confusion among some parents and students about learning priorities within the school. Small DP and HSC subjects were, where needed, combined into a single class, yet assessment tasks were not common or comparable between the two, creating confusion and frustration for students; this was highlighted directly when I taught a combined class of DP Theatre and HSC Drama students. Parents of students in the primary years expressed concern that inquiry-based pedagogy was not focused enough on developing core literacy and numeracy skills, while in the upper secondary years, parents and students perceived that more capable teachers were appointed to teach DP courses, leaving the HSC classes staffed by lower quality teachers.

Reflecting on these differences led me to consider how the experience of leading an Australian IB school is impacted by the presence of IB programmes, in addition to the size, type and socio-economic contexts I encountered previously. These experiences raised a question of whether my experience was unique and highly contextual or reflected a more common experience for Australian IB principals across a range of contexts. Consistent with Emmel’s (2013) observation that personal background informs a researcher’s project, I began comparing anecdotal experience with colleagues in IB schools across different Australian states. While school size, type, and socio-economic capacity appeared less significant for many principals, it became clear that meeting both state-based and IB educational requirements varied considerably. For some principals, it was not difficult to meet expectations of the IB and their local educational authority, while for others there seemed
significant challenge. I became aware of variance in state education policy regarding the IB across Australia; four Australian states and territories permit the IB in government schools, including for matriculation, while four do not. Some principals expressed a desire to be rid of the strictures of local education authorities, while others expressed a view that the IB was intrusive and lacked insight into, and appreciation for, local requirements. There was also a range of views in between, indicating diversity of experience in leading Australian IB schools.

A preliminary literature review was undertaken and revealed an absence of research into principal leadership in Australian IB schools, underscoring the value of this investigation. The principal as a unit of analysis is barely discernible within literature reviewed for this thesis, creating an impression that the role appears of secondary importance to effective implementation of the IB within Australian schools. To this end, this study pursues the overarching research question: *how does the presence of IB programmes impact upon the leadership of principals in Australian schools?*

This question is addressed through three sub-questions which emerge from literature reviewed in Chapters Two and Three:

1. To what extent do principals in Australian IB schools consider their leadership is impacted by:
   i. individual school demographics;
   ii. governance structures?
2. What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about:
   i. the role of vision and direction setting;
   ii. their focus of action;
   iii. the nature of school culture?
3. What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use:
   i. to enable effective school administration;
   ii. for decision-making purposes;
   iii. to sustain themselves as leaders?
These questions are addressed using a mixed-methods (QUAL-quan) sequential exploratory methodology (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989), employing in depth qualitative interviews with a maximum variation purposive sample of Australian IB principals ($n^1 = 7$) followed by a comprehensive survey of the total population of 174 Australian IB Principals via an online questionnaire ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%). Complexity leadership theory informs the research (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018; Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007; Wheatley, 2006, 2007), acknowledging that principal leadership is enacted in complex and dynamic contexts (AITSL, 2014, 2016; MCEETYA, 2008). Phase One data are analysed using techniques drawn from constructive grounded theory and thematic analysis. Descriptive data is provided for Phase Two data, which is then tested for difference across school sectors (Mann-Whitney U), socio-educational advantage (Kruskall Wallis), and number and types of IB programmes (Kruskall Wallis). Item correlations and open-ended comments are reported.

1.3 **Significance of the research**

Despite the significant growth of the IB in Australia (Dickson et al., 2017), critical research into its presence is scarce (Kidson et al., 2019). Bagnall (1997, 2005) charted the early rise of the IB in Australia and suggested it would remain a niche within the Australian educational landscape due to its existence in socially advantaged communities, a reality evident in more recent Australian research (Dickson et al., 2017; Doherty, 2009, 2012; Doherty, Luke, Shield, & Hincksman, 2012). Other research focuses overwhelmingly on issues related to programme implementation (Bagnall et al., 2015; Cole, Ullman, Gannon, & Rooney, 2015; Dixon et al., 2014; Gough, Sharpley, Vander Pal, & Griffiths, 2014), language teaching (Lebreton, 2014), student experience (Edwards & Underwood, 2012; Gan, 2009; Paris, 2003; Skrzypiec et al., 2014), and international mindedness (Kidson, 2016; Sripikash et al., 2014). This thesis argues the presence of the IB in Australia is now significant, and likely to experience continued
growth. Such a position lends weight to a call for further research into this now considerable presence across the Australian educational landscape (Kidson et al., 2019).

No study to date was located which specifically focuses on the subjective experience of the principal in Australian IB schools, outside that related to this current research (Kidson, 2016). This thesis fills that gap. In doing so, it provides exploratory and descriptive insight into how principals perceive the IB impacts upon their leadership. It reveals an overwhelming majority of Australian IB principals possess deep commitment to the principles and practices of the IB, but these commitments are not derivative from the IB. Rather, they are pre-existing and deeply personal. Principals’ overarching priority is their school community. The IB is welcomed to the extent it supports the leadership of the principal in implementing her or his vision for the school, but where conflicts emerge, the needs of the local school community are prioritised, subordinating the IB. The presence of IB programmes exacerbates a constant need for principals to recalibrate; the willingness to do so is because the IB is effective in delivering educational experiences with which principals deeply resonate. This thesis reveals a challenge for the IBO to engage more authentically with the idiosyncratic nature of Australian schooling, and to collaborate more closely, and constructively, with principals.

The absence of prior research underscores the importance of this study. Its significance is in discovering new and critical insights to the leadership of principals in a growing, yet under-researched, segment of Australian education.

1.4 Limitations of the study

This research investigates the subjective experience of principal leadership within Australian IB schools. Both the Phase One participant interviews and the Phase Two online survey questionnaire occurred at specific times and locations as snapshots of these experiences, rather than as longitudinal processes of data collection. The study is therefore firmly located
within its own spatio-temporal context (Eacott, 2013a) which presents both as a limitation and a strength. As a limitation, the interview comments and survey responses reflect principals’ views about governors, parents, students, and staff that are perceptional and subjective, consistent with the symbolic interactionist epistemology underpinning this research (see 4.2.1 Theoretical assumptions). Views attributed by principals to governors, parents, students, and staff may not accurately reflect views held by members of each of these groups; additional research is needed to compare the views of these people against the views of the principals who participated in this investigation. Conversely, as a strength, these insights provide rich and subjective descriptions of phenomena hitherto unexamined. As such, they add to our knowledge of educational leadership generally, and shine a light on a growing, yet discrete, context of Australian educational leadership.

The limited number of participants in Phase One ($n^1 = 7$), the modest response rate of the total Phase Two population questionnaire survey ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%), and the diversity of contextual experiences available, highlight the need for further research into principal leadership within Australian IB schools. The ever changing and complex nature of principal leadership requires ongoing research to explore new and emerging challenges. Findings from any one study will always be constrained by its temporality. This exploratory study both captures the current spatio-temporal experience of Australian IB principals, as well as focuses future research through identifying questions which seem critical at this juncture. In this way, this study adds to our knowledge of this under-researched context of principal leadership, as well as serves to chart the way forward.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

This thesis is presented in eight chapters. Chapter One introduces the study and its significance, as well as the research questions.
Chapter Two describes the complex governance and policy architecture in which Australian IB schools exist. It provides an overview of the IB, its mission and philosophy, and its programmes, followed by a brief history of the IB’s growth in Australia. A demographic profile of the IB in Australia as at October 10, 2018, highlights the scale of the IB in Australia and the consequential value of this study. This profile is contrasted with a review of literature on the IB in Australia related to alignment of a transnational curriculum within national and state curriculum frameworks. Criticism related to equity and accessibility of the IB in Australia is also reviewed.

Chapter Three reviews literature on core responsibilities of principal leadership in Australian schools and in IB schools more broadly. Critical questions are raised regarding how school culture is represented in this literature, including its reification and assumed homogenous normativity. The absence of temporality in researching principal leadership is also identified. These combine to support a criticism that much of the literature assumes an open systems approach to control and stability which is incommensurate with wider organisational literature on complex adaptive systems. This flows on to exploration of complexity leadership theory as a theoretical lens for this study. The chapter concludes with linking the detailed research sub-questions to the theoretical framework.

Chapter Four details the methodology used in this study. The research is a mixed method (QUAL-quan) sequential exploratory study. It details subjective symbolic interactionist theoretical assumptions (Blumer, 1969) underpinning the study, then provides data collection and analysis methods used for the qualitative Phase One and quantitative Phase Two. Phase One analytical strategies drawn from constructive grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) and thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) are described and justified; quantitative analysis techniques applied to Phase Two data are detailed. The chapter
concludes by addressing ethical considerations and issues of credibility, trustworthiness, and resonance.

Chapter Five reports findings on analysis of Phase One semi-structured interviews \((n^1 = 7)\). The chapter concludes with a preliminary theoretical model of principal leadership in Australian IB schools. This model guides refinement of the Phase Two survey questionnaire. Chapter Six reports findings on analysis of the Phase Two survey questionnaire \((n^2 = 50, \text{RR} 28.7\%)\).

Chapter Seven presents an integrated interpretation and discussion (Greene et al., 1989) of findings from both phases. The chapter concludes with a revised theoretical model of principal leadership in Australian IB schools. Chapter Eight concludes the thesis with descriptions of leadership experiences observed in this research. The notion of principal as actor (Goffman, 1959) is employed to describe the rich experience of leadership (Charmaz, 2014) for seven principals of Australian IB schools, along with recommendations and suggestions for future research in response to the findings.

Some section titles appear in italics and include an abbreviation in brackets. These are \textit{in vivo} participant comments and the abbreviation refers to their anonymous participant identifier, described in 4.3.5 Case schools and principal participant details. This strategy is used to give voice to participants’ language and perspective wherever possible, and within the philosophical assumptions underpinning this research. It is a device for “taking the reader into a story and imparting its mood through linguistic style” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 314; see also Martin, 1992, p. 17). It should also be noted that Chapter Two utilises italics for field, a convention described in Footnote 6 (see 2.2 Contextualising the work of principals).
Chapter Two: Locating the field of Australian IB schools

2.1 Introduction

This study investigates how the presence of IB programmes impacts the leadership of Australian IB principals. To date, no research has explored the experiences of principals leading Australian IB schools. This chapter locates the study and its relationship to wider theoretical perspectives, then considers the diverse governance contexts in which Australian IB school principals work. The growth of the IB in Australia is reviewed, leading to description of its current profile, followed by a comparison of this profile to existing relevant literature on the IB in Australia. The following chapter then explores educational leadership literature relevant to this study.

Lingard and Christie (2003) apply Bourdieu’s concept of field to educational leadership, and, building on from their work, Eacott (2010, 2013b, 2015) mounts a sustained argument against educational leadership research which fails to examine the impact of spatial and temporal contexts. These are mobilised in this chapter as initial framing concepts for critically reviewing the historic, demographic, and social contexts within which Australian IB schools are located. They frame a review of the diverse governance arrangements which exist across Australian schools, as well as obligations set by the IB on those schools. Chapter Three develops further the importance to this study of spatiality, temporality, and perspectives on culture derived from Martin (1992). Chapter Three also moves the theoretical perspective of this study beyond Bourdieu’s notion of field to argue for viewing principal leadership of Australian IB schools through the lens of complexity leadership theory (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Wheatley, 2006, 2007). Bourdieu’s analytic value

---

5 Sections of this chapter (2.5; 2.6; 2.7; 2.9) are published in modified form in Kidson et al. (2019). Schools data included below are correct as at October 10, 2018, whereas data included in the published article were correct as at July 5, 2017. The results of the analysis, however, remain consistent between the article and this chapter.
is thus enhanced by insights from organisational dynamics and culture reflected in complexity leadership theories (Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2015; Morrison, 2010; R. Stacey, 2012).

This chapter then continues with an overview of the IB mission and philosophy, including key features of the four programmes currently available in Australian schools. A brief history of the IB’s growth globally and across the Asia-Pacific is provided within which the growth of the IB in Australia is contextualised. A detailed contemporary profile of the IB is developed from data published by the IB (IBO, 2018f) and the Australian Curriculum, Assessment, and Reporting Authority (ACARA, 2019). This profile provides a backdrop for review of the limited extant critical research literature on the IB in Australia.

Review of literature and relevant school data in this chapter shows the IB is now a significant feature across the Australian educational landscape, but also that limited critical research exists into its practice (Kidson et al., 2019). In relation to this current investigation, it highlights an absence of research on the role of the principal as the unit of analysis, supporting both the imperative for, and significance of, this current investigation.

### 2.2 Contextualising the work of principals

School communities are social constructs located within diverse relational, spatial, and temporal contexts which impact the leadership of the principal. Their boundaries are indistinct, and the forces which influence the leadership of the principal are numerous. Frameworks of governance relationships to local, state, and national bodies both constrain and enable schools, and principals enact their leadership through relationships with staff, students, caregivers, and their wider professional colleagues. Lingard and Christie (2003) argue the contexts and practices of school leadership can be usefully understood through the
lens of Bourdieu’s concept of field. Building on from this, Eacott (2010, 2013b, 2015) argues the practice of educational leadership must be understood within its distinct spatial and temporal contexts, rather than ahistorical, normative approaches present in much of the research literature.

Bourdieu’s concept of field is:

> a structured social space [which] contains people who dominate and people who are dominated. Constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which the various actors struggle for the transformation or preservation of the field. All the individuals in this universe bring to the competition all the (relative) power at their disposal. It is this power that defines their position in the field and, as a result, their strategies (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 40-41; cited in Lingard & Christie (2003), p. 322).

Ideas found in Bourdieu’s reflection on the literary field (Bourdieu, 1993), however, express a more succinct and arguably pertinent definition of field as it applies to the context of an Australian IB school. Bourdieu defines the literary field as “a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 162). In this construction of field, literary authors exist as dominated agents within a context of being part of the dominant class. Analogous to this, principals occupy a “dominated position in the dominant class” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 164) of educational leadership, a role which remains arguably one of the few positions of social authority. Within the field of educational leadership at the school site, principals occupy a position of significant dominating power. They exercise power across a wide range of responsibilities, including, but not limited to, the purpose and direction of the school (Blackmore, 2010; Dinham, 2005, 2008; Odhiambo, 2007), school organisational design (Kools & Stoll, 2016).

---

6 Eacott (2010) follows Bourdieu’s italicised language throughout his writings, and this convention is followed here. Lingard and Christie (2003) do not. Quotations from the respective sources reflect the use, or non-use, of italics for Bourdieu’s terms.
school culture and climate (Bryson, 2008; Deal & Peterson, 2016; Gruenert & Whitaker, 2015; Kaplan & Owings, 2013), capacity building across the school (Bain, Walker, & Chan, 2011; Duignan & Cannon, 2011), pedagogy (Mulford, Cranston, & Ehrich, 2009; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008), community relationships (Cunningham, 2014), and the integrity of the school’s governance, administration and business operations (Keddie, Gobby, & Wilkins, 2017; Newcombe & McCormick, 2001; Walkley, 2016). Yet the power of a principal is also related to other powerful agents in the wider field, positioning the principal both as dominating and dominated. These contestations are multiple and derive from “local and national educational policy fields [which] are affected and inflected by global developments and flows” (Lingard & Christie, 2003, p. 326).

The individual school site is the predominant focal context of a principal’s work (Eacott, 2013b), although many of the influences upon their work have their genesis well beyond the local. For most principals, including in this study, their site location is a singularity, a specific geographical location which numerous people attend, some daily, others sporadically. Other schools, including some in this study, are multi-campus schools whose principals exercise influence across campus locations which can be proximal to a main campus, or, like Trinity Grammar School in New South Wales, across a main campus, a preparatory school approximately six kilometres away, and an environmental field studies campus located over 170 kilometres from the main campus.

Although a school is an identifiable entity, it is not an isolated one. It has “its own properties and power relations, overlapping and interrelating with economic, power, political and other fields” (Lingard & Christie, 2003, pp. 319-320) beyond its physical limits. Similarly, principals enact their leadership “across a number of fields with different power structures, hierarchies of influence, and logics of practice” (Lingard & Christie, 2003, p.
Principals must therefore navigate complex relationships across different fields, themselves located within the still larger fields of politics and economics (Thomson, 2010).

Eacott (2013b) argues the concept of field is also relevant to each individual school because they are structures with their own logics of practice and power relationships. Commonalities may exist across different schools and their contexts, such as being an “IB World School”, but their unique contextualities and relationships need to be understood at the individual level. There is a paradox whereby an individual school exists within a larger field within which the principal experiences constraining domination, such as national literacy and numeracy testing requirements (ACARA, 2016), yet within the field of the individual school there is still a range of autonomy available to the principal. This irreconcilable tension leads Eacott (2015, p. 420) to observe that “nobody knows anymore who is the subject of the final decision, and the place of the decision is both everywhere and nowhere”. For this reason, he continues, study of the principalship can only be undertaken through consideration of the agentic relationships within and beyond the school, relationships which are “only brought into existence in a particular time and space” (Eacott, 2015, p. 421). Employing Bourdieu’s field, then, helps researchers “explicitly link leadership actions to the social space in which they occur” (Eacott, 2010, p. 268). In the context of this study, an Australian IB school can be considered its own field, with its own logics of practice and power relationships.

The concept of temporality (Eacott, 2013a, 2015) locates research and theorising about leadership both in the present and in wider performativity discourses. Commodification of time is eschewed, and reification of the future is rejected. Both contribute to a reductionist notion of leadership where “strategic planning and reporting/funding cycles become not only synchronised with the game of schooling, but become the game of school administration” (Eacott, 2013a, p. 96). School leadership is constructed around notions of change, future improvement, competition, and external performance measures. This conceptualises
leadership as co-dependent upon time as a quantitative commodity, and leadership becomes “understanding of change and its measurement over time” (Eacott, 2015, p. 422). Successful school leadership thus is reduced to “a problem solving toolkit for practitioners” (Eacott, 2013a, p. 97) whose effectiveness is evaluated by reference to yet to be realised future measures. By positioning leadership as overwhelmingly change/future oriented, it decontextualises its practice. Educational leadership scholars acknowledge context matters in school leadership (Gurr, 2014; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008), yet Eacott (2013a) maintains this literature predominantly excludes consideration of temporality. School leadership is performative in the present only, and it is this aspect of its “context that gives [leadership] behaviours or interventions meaning and significance” (Eacott, 2013a, p. 98).

Applying the concept of field to governance of Australian IB schools constructs the experience of principals as one of “political, meaning power, struggles of players within the field” (Eacott, 2013b, p. 184; see also Hilgers & Mangez, 2015). An examination of school governance contexts in the next two sections supports this construction, revealing that principals in Australian IB schools work in a complex array of governance, policy, and administrative contexts. Following these, the importance of temporality in understanding principals’ experiences is located through reviewing the growth of the IB in Australia and describing its contemporary profile.

2.3 Schooling in Australia: fields of contestation

Australian IB schools exist within an idiosyncratic set of contexts which create complexity for principals in the exercise of their role. The broad field of Australian education includes governance and policy obligations which are set at a national level, yet constitutional responsibility for education resides at the state/territory level. The recent introduction of an Australian Curriculum (AC) resulted in the development of eight distinct versions (ACARA,
2015), with each state and territory devising their own curriculum to reflect the AC while retaining contextual distinction. This exacerbates the dominating/dominated relationship between the Commonwealth and states/territories. Increased linkage by the Commonwealth of public funding to schools creates a danger whereby “state agencies risk being repositioned as mere ‘implementers’, rather than direct producers, of national policy objectives” (Savage, 2016, p. 848). Furthermore, recent policy shifts in school autonomy for government schools heighten the significance of policy settings at the local school site (Gobby, 2016; Keddie, 2016; Keddie et al., 2017). It is in such contested fields that IB school principals work, even before the presence of the IB in their schools is considered. This section provides an overview of the major educational structures across Australia and highlights that wide variation exists in school governance contexts of Australian IB schools.

Australia is a constitutional monarchy comprising six states (New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania), two mainland self-governing territories (Australian Capital Territory and Northern Territory), six off-shore territories, and Jervis Bay Territory, which is administratively part of the Australian Capital Territory, despite being nearly 200km outside of the Australian Capital Territory and wholly contained within New South Wales. Constitutionally, the Commonwealth does not provide primary and secondary schooling; this is the responsibility of the state/territory tier of government, however all Australian schools receive some amount of Commonwealth government funding (Gonski, Boston, Greiner, Scales, & Tannock, 2011). Beyond operational responsibility for government schools, state and territory governments have responsibility for registration of non-government schools, accreditation of non-government schools to prepare students for its relevant matriculation credential, and approval for students to undertake home-schooling.
Offshore territories are governed by the Commonwealth, but only Norfolk Island, Christmas Island, and the Cocos Islands provide schooling; the other islands are either uninhabited or staffed by meteorological, naval or scientific research personnel. These territories deliver a variety of state-based curricula, despite being administered by the Commonwealth: Norfolk Island provides education through the New South Wales curriculum, Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands provide education through the Western Australian curriculum (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2019), and Jervis Bay provides education through the Australian Capital Territory curriculum. None of the schools in the off-shore territories or Jervis Bay provide IB programmes.

Schools in Australia are defined by Commonwealth legislation as either government, being one “conducted by or on behalf of the government of a State or Territory” (Australian Education Act 2013 (C’th), s. 6), while schools falling outside this definition are known as non-government. Equally, schools are described as belonging to the government or non-government sector. In contrast, the IBO uses the dichotomy of state/private to describe schools (IBO, 2018f), a term also used by some Australian scholars (Bagnall, 2005; Bonnor & Caro, 2007; Dickson et al., 2017; Maire, 2015; Perry, Ledger, & Dickson, 2018; Perry, Lubienski, & Ladwig, 2016; Whitehead, 2005).

The descriptive term, non-government, is further sub-categorised into Catholic and Independent (Figure 2.1) due to differing governance structures (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004). The term Catholic identifies schools represented by various state Catholic Education Commissions (CEC), as well as a National Catholic Education Commission. Schools administered by state CECs are referred to in Australia as Catholic system or systemic schools and are currently administered under the authority of a diocesan bishop (Catholic Education Commission of NSW, 2008), while Catholic schools governed by various congregational orders are referred to as independent Catholic schools. Along with
other independent schools, these congregational schools are responsible to a board of governors, directors, or management committee (Independent Schools Council of Australia, 2018).

In 2018, there were 9,477 schools across Australia, of which 6,646 (70.1%) were in the government sector, 1,753 (18.5%) in the Catholic sector, and 1,078 (11.4%) in the independent sector (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2019). By contrast, IB programmes are predominantly implemented in school in the non-government sector (Table 2.1).

Alignment of school divisions and their relationship to structures of IB programmes is nationally inconsistent (Table 2.2). The PYP provides learning for students age 3-13 (IBO, 2014e) and the MYP for students age 11-16 (IBO, 2016b). This flexibility enables schools to structure when the crossover from PYP to MYP takes place, according to their specific contexts, however schools are required to ensure there is no break between programmes if more than one contiguous programme is offered within the school (IBO, 2014e, 2016b). This is not the case with the DP and CP. The DP is clearly articulated as a pre-university preparation programme for students aged 16-19 and does not overlap with the MYP (IBO, 2014d, 2016b); the CP similarly caters for students aged 16-19.

Having described in this section the multilayered and inconsistent contexts within which Australian IB schools are located, the following section explores ways in which these contexts impact upon principal leadership.

---

**Figure 2.1. Classification of Australian schools by sector.**

Table 2.1. Total IB programmes in Australian schools by state jurisdiction and sector.

Source: IBO (2018f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govt</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Govt</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Govt</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Non-Govt</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NSW = New South Wales; VIC = Victoria; QLD = Queensland; SA = South Australia; WA = Western Australia; TAS = Tasmania; ACT = Australian Capital Territory; NT = Northern Territory.

2.4 Beyond hints and shadows: governance as a context of principals’ work

Principals have prime responsibility for ensuring governance obligations are met, along with managing concomitant tensions between differing obligations, or, following Lingard and Christie (2003), fields. The insertion of IB programmes into this already challenging and, at times, paradoxical set of contexts creates further complexity for principals. Examination of the impact governance has on the work of principals is barely evident within the limited corpus of research on the IB in Australia. This absence is striking given that effective school governance is critical to the work of the principal (Austen, Swepson, & Marchant, 2011; Gray, Campbell-Evans, & Leggett, 2013; Hawkes, Loader, & Jackson, 2005; McCormick, Barnett, Alavi, & Newcombe, 2006; Walkley, 2016). Examining how principals lead IB schools must therefore include examination of governance in Australian schools more broadly.

Governance is defined in a wide sense as:

structures and processes that are designed to ensure accountability, transparency, responsiveness, rule of law, stability, equity and inclusiveness, empowerment, and broad-based participation...[I]t is about the culture and institutional environment in which citizens and stakeholders interact among themselves (UNESCO, 2017).
Table 2.2. *Australian schooling structures.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Senior Secondary</th>
<th>Starting age*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB Programmes</td>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>PYP/MYP**</td>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>DP/CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * Age by which students must have commenced compulsory schooling.

** Implementation of the PYP may be across Pre-primary to Year 5 or 6; MYP may be across Year 6-10 or Year 7-10.

Fundamental to these structures and processes is responsibility for strategic vision and direction, demarcating responsibilities of governors and management, approving budgets, monitoring performance of the management, and ensuring ongoing viability of the organisation (ASX Corporate Governance Council, 2014; Carver, 2006; Carver & Carver, 2006; Chait, Ryan, & Taylor, 2005; Fishel, 2008). Australian school governing councils similarly have these responsibilities. In Western Australia, for example, non-government governing councils are responsible for “development and implementation of an effective strategic direction for the school” (WA Department of Education Services, 2017, p. 47) as well as requiring “the day-to-day management of the school to be the responsibility of the principal and clearly separated from the governance role of the governing body” (WA Department of Education Services, 2017, p. 46). In New South Wales:

---

7 Terms used for school governing bodies vary and include school council, school board, governing council, board of directors, governors, and trustees. The term *governing council* is used from this point forward.
the proprietor is the legal entity that owns the school [and who] is primarily concerned with the governance of the school, including such matters as long-term financial planning, administrative policies and accountability…[while] the principal is responsible for the management, day-to-day functioning and routine operations of the school. (NESA, 2017, p. 21).

These responsibilities are equally the case for government school governing councils, subject to the overall responsibility for educational strategy and policy which rests with the respective Ministers and departments of education. Only four Australian jurisdictions (Australian Capital Territory, Queensland, South Australia, and Victoria) currently permit the IB in government schools (Table 2.1), yet all explicitly state that school governing councils are responsible for:

- implementation of the strategic priorities and monitoring of the process [and] to approve the school’s budget and monitor financial statements (ACT Government Education Directorate, 2016, p. 48);
- establishing the broad direction and vision of the school within the school's community…participating in the development and monitoring of the school strategic plan…[and] approving the annual budget and monitoring expenditure (Victoria Department of Education and Training, 2017, p. 7);
- [setting] general directions for the site [and to] monitor and report on achievements (South Australia Department for Education and Child Development, 2011);
- [monitoring] the school's strategic direction; [and] approve school plans and policies of a strategic nature, or other documents affecting strategic matters including the annual estimate of revenue and expenditure for the school; [and] monitor the implementation of the plans, policies and other documents mentioned above; and advise the school's principal about strategic matters (Queensland Department of Education, 2017).

To date, no research on the IB in Australia has explicitly considered in what ways these governance contexts impact the leadership of the principal. Some opaque reference is found
in early publications by Bagnall (1997, 2005), although it is simplistic in its analysis, as well as reflects historical and policy contexts which have changed markedly since.

Bagnall (1997) identified differences between non-government and government school decision making processes regarding curriculum implementation, differences across states regarding comparability or complementarity of the DP with the local credential, and structural challenges in supporting second language learning requirements as three significant challenges for Australian schools implementing the IB. Of the 12 IB schools offering the DP in 1991, ten were non-government schools. He suggested a non-government school principal enjoyed considerable autonomy such that “providing he or she acts with the approval of the school [governing council], changes such as the implementation of a new syllabus are relatively straight forward” (Bagnall, 1997, p. 134). By contrast, the experience of a school principal seeking to introduce the DP to a Victorian government high school was more complicated. Initial registration of Mount Waverly Secondary College was undertaken with the IB in 1993, and despite the state department supporting the move, the teachers’ union vehemently opposed it through a hostile media campaign and the principal ultimately did not proceed with implementation (Bagnall, 1994).

The conclusion about the autonomy of the non-government school principal appears overly simplistic, yet the comparison indicates a stark difference between the two contexts. The non-government school principal appears to have much more freedom to alter the operations of the school via introduction of the IB, while the government school principal is characterised, again perhaps overly simplistically, as beholden to union militancy and adverse publicity. Neither the perceived expansive autonomy of a non-government school principal, nor the imagined constrained impotence of a government school principal fairly reflect the complexity of school leadership. Consideration of the then Victorian government’s policy shift towards devolutionary decision-making across public schools (Caldwell & Hayward,
1998; Caldwell & Spinks, 1988) is similarly absent in the analysis. Bagnall’s (2005) follow-up analysis also found that financial costs of implementation could be much more extensive than principals and school governing councils initially appreciated, although no distinction is explored between the impact of this for government schools, nor are details provided about what this entails. This omission seems surprising given the growth in research related to financial governance and leadership in schools published between Bagnall’s two papers (Bush & Gamage, 2001; Caldwell & Hayward, 1998; Newcombe & McCormick, 2001; Newcombe, McCormick, & Sharpe, 1997).

Across both of Bagnall’s publications, the framing context is at the school or state level. In Bagnall (1997), this is likely due to the DP, an alternate matriculation credential, being the only IB programme then available. Later, Bagnall (2005) acknowledges the presence of the PYP and MYP, although no state differences are examined. The impact of the Commonwealth, other than its support for increasing internationalism in Australian schools (Hill, 1990), is not explored, underscoring the impression that issues for principals have their genesis in state or locally based contextual circumstances. Since Bagnall’s reviews (1997, 2005), however, the governance contexts within which principals in Australian IB schools work have altered significantly. The field is much more contested than Bagnall’s studies acknowledge. The Commonwealth now exerts considerable and direct influence on government and non-government schools alike through a series of measures, most of which have emerged since the most recent critical analysis (Bagnall, 2005). These developments are positioned as a form of cooperative federalism (Gerrard, Savage, & O’Connor, 2017; Lingard, 2000; Savage, 2016), yet critics argue that, rather than provide greater autonomy for school leaders under a framework of effective educational policy, they represent a “ministerialisation of policy making” (Lingard, Porter, Bartlett, & Knight, 1995, pp. 41-42). This manifests in “infiltration of economic and political discourses, particularly around matters of the
administration and management of school(ing)” (Eacott, 2013b, p. 176; brackets in original) and makes the work of principals more complex and chaotic, rather than less so (Gavin & McGrath-Champ, 2017; McGrath-Champ et al., 2017). Australian IB school principals now work in a comprehensive educational regulatory framework, or field, of:

- national agreed goals for education (MCEETYA, 2008);
- NAPLAN, a national assessment program consisting of literacy and numeracy testing (ACARA, 2016) linked to the Australian Curriculum (ACARA, 2015), and reported via the MySchool website (ACARA, 2019);
- national disability standards for education (Australian Government, 2015) and nationally consistent processes for collection of student disability data (Australian Government, 2018a);
- national privacy principles and data security of personal information collected by the school (Australian Government, 2018b);
- recurrent and capital school funding agreements (Gonski et al., 2011); and,

Non-government schools are now also subject to reporting and compliance obligations of the Australian Securities and Investment Commission (ASIC) or the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC), established in 2013. These obligations include explicit requirement to meet governance standards comparable to those of commercial companies and incorporated associations (AICD, 2013). Baxt (2016) advises these obligations extend to the chief executive officer, a title gaining currency in some non-government independent schools\(^8\). The ACNC (2018) thus expects principals in non-government independent schools to:

- act with reasonable care and diligence;
- act honestly in the best interests of the charity and for its purposes;

\(^8\) Independent schools using the term CEO on their school websites include Strathalbyn Christian College (WA), Sheldon College (QLD), Haileybury (VIC), Forestville Montessori School (NSW), and Central Coast Grammar School (NSW). Independent Schools Queensland use the title principal/CEO in governance training materials (see https://www.isq.qld.edu.au/our-work-with-schools/governance-and-executive-oversight) and Lutheran Education Queensland explicitly state that each “School or College shall have a principal who is a suitably qualified educator appointed as Chief Executive Officer of the School/College” (Lutheran Church of Australia Queensland District, 2015, p. 59). See also commentary on principal tenure by Blackwood (2018).
not misuse the position of responsible person;
not to misuse information obtained in performing duties;
disclose any actual or perceived conflict of interest;
ensure that the charity's financial affairs are managed responsibly;
not allow a charity to operate while insolvent.

This is comprehensively different to the perceived autonomy of Bagnall’s (1997) non-government school principal. There is no acknowledgement in his analysis that extensive and comprehensive governance fields set the framework within which principals of contemporary non-government schools work (Braddon & Hooper, 2018). This is surprising given Bagnall’s own use of Bourdieu in his earlier doctoral research (Bagnall, 1994).

Most of these developments have occurred since Bagnall’s (1997, 2005) analyses and they continue to expand their impact on the work of principals. Because governance and policy requirements continue to evolve over time, analysis of their impact must be considered temporally and spatially, rather than normatively. Eacott (2013b) recognises, however, these wider influences do not negate or render impotent the power of the principal to act within their local context. They may constrain some, but not all, aspects of the principals’ work (Dinham, 2005). Understanding the leadership of Australian IB principals within the dynamic interplay of these contexts is therefore central to this research. The presence of the IB compounds this.

### 2.5 History, mission, and programmes of the IB

The previous section located Australian schools within a complex set of governance and policy framework constraints. The insertion of IB programmes into these contexts adds additional complexity for principals. Yet the suite of IB programmes available also varies in

---

9 By way of example, since the commencement of 2018, all New South Wales teachers now require registration with NESA. Ongoing maintenance of teacher registration in the years ahead is contingent on undertaking 100 hours of accredited professional learning. The principal is the accreditation agent on behalf of NESA and is required to monitor teachers’ progress in completing appropriate professional learning.
its implementation across Australia (see 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia), creating additional contextual factors not present for principals in non-IB schools. Table 2.2 highlights the variable structures of Australian schools and their relationship to IB programmes. Before considering how the alignment of schooling structures and IB programme structures impact the work of the principal (see 2.8 Eschewing homogeneity: in search of an Australian “IB World School”?), this section provides a brief overview of the IB and its programmes. The following section provides an account of the growth of the IB in Australia and analysis of its current profile.

The IB commenced in 1968 offering a tertiary preparation diploma programme (DP). Since that time, it has established the PYP, the MYP, and the CP; as of October 10, 2018, there are now 5,239 IB World Schools (IBO, 2018d). The programmes present a continuum of learning, although they are distinct and separate programmes (Hallinger, Lee, & Walker, 2011; Hallinger, Walker, & Lee, 2010; IBO, 2017).

The DP emerged from within a group of international schools whose populations, and their educational needs, were diverse. Expatriate student mobility in the aftermath of World War Two created significant challenges for students seeking matriculation. From these challenges grew the establishment of the International Schools Association (ISA) in 1951, an association whose schools were not reflective of any particular national identity (Bagnall, 2008). Peterson (2003) notes that international schools which offered multiple matriculation credentials found their provision expensive, that such an approach divided the international school community along national lines, and thus “offended against the international spirit of the school” (p. 17). From this chiasma grew the DP which was first offered in 1968 through five schools spread across Europe, one in Tehran, and the United Nations International School in New York. Central to the DP’s development was university recognition, although it
was early acknowledged that provision should also be made for students not bound for
tertiary study (Peterson, 2003).

By 1980, the ISA had turned its attention to a program of education which would
articulate into the DP. Advocates of the idea were experienced DP educators and the
discussions were reflective of the DP philosophy (Hill, 2003). Out of these discussions
emerged the MYP, although it did not take full shape until 1994. By contrast, the
development of the PYP emerged from discussions around the lack of a coherent
international curriculum among European international schools. The European Council of
International Schools (ECIS) began discussions in 1990 toward development of a curriculum
for international primary schools. Meetings throughout 1991 and 1992 created what was
initially known as the International Schools’ Curriculum Project. ECIS and the IB supported
the development of curriculum materials and by 1997 the IB assumed responsibility for the
entire project, renaming it the Primary Years Programme (Hill, 2003). More recently, the
Career-related Programme (CP) was developed and made available for implementation from
2012. Taken together, the four programmes represent “a continuum of international education
for students aged 3 to 19” (IBO, 2017, p. 1). Only two Australian schools currently offer the
CP, therefore the remainder of this section includes detail of only the three main programmes
(PYP, MYP, DP) implemented across Australia.

Each programme pursues the IB mission:

to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to
create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding
and respect… These programmes encourage students across the world to
become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other
people, with their differences, can also be right (IBO, 2017, p. 1).

The IB describes its model of education as “broad, balanced, conceptual, and connected”
(IBO, 2017, p. 5). Connectedness is fundamental to the curriculum and pedagogical models
of the programmes. The PYP and MYP are both structured around transdisciplinary themes,
while the DP is structured across six discipline-based subject groupings, a 100-hour interdisciplinary epistemology course titled Theory of Knowledge (TOK), an Extended Essay (EE) comprising a 4,000 word self-directed study related to one of the student’s DP subjects specifically designed as a “practical preparation for undergraduate research” (IBO, 2018j), and Creativity, Activity, and Service (CAaS)\textsuperscript{10}. CAaS is “is a specific event in which the student engages with one or more of the three [Creativity, Activity, and Service] strands” (IBO, 2015a) as either a single or sustained event. Examples of a CAaS include:

Creative: A student group plans, designs and creates a mural.
Activity: Students organize and participate in a sports team including training sessions and matches against other teams.
Service: Students set up and conduct tutoring for people in need.
Service and activity: Students plan and participate in the planting and maintenance of a garden with members of the local community.
Creativity, activity and service: Students rehearse and perform a dance production for a community retirement home (IBO, 2015a).

CAaS is reported in a number of studies to be one of the most valued aspects of the DP (Cambridge & Simandiraki, 2006; Culross & Tarver, 2011; Wilkinson & Hayden, 2010), even amongst scholars who question other social and epistemological values embedded in the DP (Bunnell, 2015; Hughes, 2009; van Oord, 2007). By contrast, in some contexts, CAaS has been considered distracting to overall academic priorities of the DP (Lee et al., 2012a). All three IB programmes reflect constructivist epistemology (IBO, 2014c) and approaches to teaching are based on guided inquiry, making connections across disciplines, and collaboration (IBO, 2017).

Central to all programmes is the IB Learner Profile (IBLP), a series of ten attributes which “reflect the holistic nature of an IB education” (IBO, 2017, p. 3): IB learners are inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, principled, open-minded, caring, risk-takers, balanced, and reflective. All elements of IB programmes reinforce the primacy of the

\textsuperscript{10} The abbreviation used by the IBO for Creativity, Activity, and Service is CAS (IBO, 2015a), however this abbreviation is applied in this research to the more pertinent construct of Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS). To distinguish between the two, Creativity, Activity, and Service is abbreviated to CAaS.
IBLP, and it has therefore received some critical attention in recent years. Wells (2011, p. 177) criticises its lack of definitional clarity and confusing nomenclature between ideals, attributes, values, and dispositions. Van Oord (2013, p. 209) acknowledges the IBLP “attributes all express a positive trait and habit considered to be morally good”, but simultaneously considers them “essentially contestable” (van Oord, 2013, p. 210). A strongly Westernised morality is implicit in the IBLP, a difficulty acknowledged by longstanding former Director-General of the IBO, George Walker (2010). Rizvi et al. (2014) extend this criticism by questioning the cultural biases they argue are built into the IBLP. By articulating an “ideal learner for a globalised world [the IBLP] thus implicitly serves a specific normative purpose” (Rizvi et al., 2014, p. 15) that is questionable in ethnically diverse, pluralistic contexts. In the context of this current study, they also raise the question of how much control over implementation of the IB is left to leaders and administrators at the local school level. For example, the IB’s *Programme Standards and Practices* explicitly requires schools to implement “the attributes of the IB learner profile across the school community” (IBO, 2014c, p. 3), although no guidance as to how this is to be done is given, nor are details provided as to how this is evaluated by the IB (Wells, 2011).

These criticisms are particularly pertinent to the question of whether IB programmes can fulfil the mission to develop international mindedness (Tarc, 2009). The IB defines international mindedness as a:

multi-faceted and complex concept that captures a way of thinking, being and acting that is characterized by an openness to the world and a recognition of our deep interconnectedness to others (IBO, 2017, p. 2; see also Davy, 2011).

However, the capacity of IB curriculum content to develop international mindedness may be limited by an embedded Western epistemology (van Oord, 2007). This produces a recurring tension for the IB between providing a curriculum designed to give students access to elite universities, themselves grounded in Western epistemology, and promoting a curriculum.
whose claim to develop international understanding may itself be questionable. Although this
tension is acknowledged in some quarters of the IB (G. Walker, 2010), access to the elite
academy of the West remains a clear priority, including in Australia (Edwards & Underwood,
2012). Western universal grand narratives are contestable in a world where geopolitical
centres of power continue to shift to the East and where nationalistic fundamentalisms merge,
morph, dissolve, and re-emerge on an ongoing basis. Under such circumstances, argues Tate
(2013), the IB may be better served by acknowledging that the epistemology which underpins
the curriculum is far from self-evident, universal, and temporally transcendent. He suggests
the IB engage more with national modes of education and seek to complement them, rather
than supersede.

The concept of cultural difference is also criticised. Van Oord (2008) argues via social
identity theory that a lack of cultural theorising among IB educators compounds definitional
confusion, and thus pedagogical programmes. A lack of agreement on how to define culture
may mean IB educators are attributing to culture those behaviours and values which are
merely different to their own. Thus, one’s neighbour, who appears ethnically, linguistically
and socio-economically similar, may have quite dissimilar behaviours and values. These
behaviours and values are therefore not inter-cultural, but reflective of intergroup difference.
Intergroup understanding thus creates opportunity to learn and grow together, while
intercultural understanding reinforces, and infers, a difference that is deterministically
impervious to change.

The IB’s approach to international mindedness is underpinned by its commitment to
multilingualism. Students in the PYP, MYP, and DP are required to learn an additional
language (IBO, 2014d, 2014e, 2016b) because:

we believe that communicating in more than one language provides excellent
opportunities to develop intercultural understanding and respect. It helps the
students to appreciate that his or her own language, culture and worldview is just one of many (IBO, 2017, p. 2).

This stands in contrast to the requirements, and experience, of Australian non-IB schools. Although the study of additional languages other than English is available in all states and territories, it is not compulsorily required across all years. A review of language provision in Victoria (Department of Education and Training, 2016) found only 77% of government primary students and 43% of government secondary students studied an additional language, and only 17% of students undertaking the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE), that state’s matriculation credential, completed study of an additional language. In New South Wales, 100 hours of language study is compulsory for students in Years 7 and 8, but once study of languages becomes elective, only 11% of students in Years 9 and 10 opt to study a second language, and only 10% of students opt to study a second language for the Higher School Certificate (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, 2018).

This brief overview of the history and programmes of the IB noted its constructivist epistemology, inquiry-based pedagogy, commitment to international mindedness, and multilingualism. The following section charts the growth of the IB in Australia.

2.6 A growing community: The IB in Australia

The first Australian IB school was registered for DP examination in 1979 (Bagnall, 1997). Growth since that time is significant and seems likely to continue. A contemporary profile of the IB is developed in this section which shows there is great diversity across Australia as to what constitutes an IB school. Following this profile, socio-educational advantage data provided by the Australian Curriculum, Assessment, and Reporting Authority (ACARA, 2019) are critically analysed to develop a more detailed understanding of the field of Australian IB schools. This analysis shows contemporary Australian IB schools are predominantly located within socio-educationally advantaged communities.
The first Australian IB school was Narrabundah College, Canberra. It serviced a student population which included international students, a consequence of their parents’ diplomatic posting. The principal at the time formed a view the Australian Capital Territory curriculum did not meet the needs of international students and subsequently introduced the DP in 1979, although it was 1984 before they provided sufficient subjects to offer the complete diploma (Bagnall, 1997). In 1982, the headmaster of St Leonard’s College in Melbourne introduced the DP to broaden the vision of the student population and to provide for more academically able students. Growth across Australia was slow, and by 1992 only 13 schools offered the DP (Bagnall 1997). The introduction of the DP appeared understandable for schools with students seeking to pursue tertiary study outside Australia, but Bagnall (2005) criticised schools which implemented the MYP (available from 1994) and PYP (available from 1997) for abdicating responsibility to teach national “culture, beliefs and goals” (Bagnall, 2005, p. 118). He envisaged the IB would remain a small niche curriculum for financially resourced schools, however this has not been the case.

Since 1979, the IB in Australia has grown remarkably, particularly in recent years (Figure 2.2). It took 25 years to grow from one school to 53 schools, compared with 122 schools authorised in the decade following Bagnall’s review (2005), most of which are government schools offering the PYP and MYP. The PYP, MYP, DP, and CP are all now present in Australia and, as of October 10, 2018, there are 196 IB schools. Many schools offer two or three programmes within the one school, but to date no Australian school offers all four programmes. The 196 IB schools offer a total of 263 programmes. Analysis of school enrolment data drawn from the MySchool website (ACARA, 2019) indicates more than 150,000 students attend schools offering IB programmes, although caution is needed in interpreting this figure. Some combined primary and secondary schools may have a large overall enrolment, such as Penrith Anglican College in New South Wales, with 1,131
students in 2017 (ACARA, 2019), despite offering the DP to only a small senior secondary cohort as evidenced by only three graduating DP candidates (Penrith Anglican College, 2017). In contrast, St Paul’s Grammar School, also in New South Wales, had 784 students in 2017, of whom all but 67 were enrolled in an IB programme (St Paul's Grammar School, 2017, 2018). St Paul’s Grammar School enrolls all students in the PYP, the MYP, and students then select between the DP and the local matriculation credential. MySchool does not disaggregate enrolment data for combined primary and secondary schools, therefore an accurate figure of IB enrolments by programme cannot be determined using this data source. However, the total number of students enrolled in government schools offering the PYP in the Australian Capital Territory, Queensland, South Australia and Victoria can be determined, and this analysis reveals in excess of 25,000 students. Additionally, analysis of non-government stand-alone primary schools shows a further 4,374 students. Taken together, these data sufficiently highlight the importance of this study; the addition of thousands more MYP and DP students heightens that importance.
The growth patterns in Australia over the last decade, however, do not reflect those across the globe (Table 2.3). Hill’s (2006) data show the DP remained a significant feature of the worldwide IB profile a decade after the introduction of the PYP and MYP. In the intervening decade, however, this dominance reduced, yet the DP remains the majority of all worldwide IB programmes (Table 2.3). Bunnell (2015) predicted the DP would likely settle into long term dominance of the IB portfolio, especially given its scale in the US, and notwithstanding apparent declines in other countries. Changes between 2013 and 2018 (Table 2.3) lead to a hypothesis that the rapid period of expansion for the PYP and MYP may be slowing. Between 2013 and 2018, the proportional distribution of the programmes has remained relatively constant. The global profile contrasts markedly to that of the IB Asia-Pacific (IBAP) region in which Australia is located (Table 2.4). IBAP does not reflect the global pattern of DP implementation, and the growth of the PYP is a significant element of the IBAP profile compared to the global profile. Implementation of the PYP in Australia far outstrips the wider Asia-Pacific region so much so that the pattern of programme distribution in Australia, compared with the global pattern, is almost inverted. Growth of the PYP in Australia has outstripped growth in the DP and MYP, yet, as is detailed below in 2.9 Congruence between IB growth and research literature, the extant research literature on the IB in Australia remains disproportionately focused on contexts of the DP.

Having considered global and national level patterns of IB growth, a more granular analysis of programme implementation across Australia follows, using data drawn from the IB’s online database (IBO, 2018f). Analysis of overall implementation data at the state/territory level is undertaken before more detailed data by programme, state, and sector levels are examined. It should be noted the IB treats multi-campus schools, such as Trinity Grammar School in New South Wales and Xavier College in Victoria, as separate schools within its database (IBO, 2014d, 2014e, 2016b). These multi-campus distinctions are
Table 2.3. Global IB programme growth 2006-2018.

Sources: Hill (2006); IBO (2013, 2018f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>2461</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>4621</td>
<td>6671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CP programmes excluded for comparison consistency.

Table 2.4. IB programmes 2018 - World, IB Asia Pacific, Australia comparison.

Source: IBO (2018f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>World</th>
<th>Asia Pacific</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6671</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reflected in Table 2.5; for consistency, the total number of schools listed on the IBO website (IBO, 2018f) is used in this analysis.

IB programme implementation is inconsistent across states and territories, and between government and non-government sectors (Table 2.5). One implication of this is that families preferring an IB education in some states only have the option to enrol their children in non-government schools to do so (Singhal, 2017). The visit to Australia in 2017 by Director-General of the IB, Dr Siva Kumari, included meetings with the New South Wales government to influence a change of policy in that state where currently the IB is not offered in any government school (Singhal, 2017), although there are signs the government may be open to reconsideration of this policy (Smith, 2018). By contrast, the significant presence of the IB in government schools in Victoria and South Australia indicates wide variation in state education policy towards the IB. This may, for example, relate to the introduction of school autonomy policies in various states; Victoria has promoted school autonomy among
government schools for much longer (Caldwell & Hayward, 1998) than New South Wales and Western Australia (Gray et al., 2013) which recently implemented policy shifts for greater school autonomy in government schools (McGrath-Champ et al., 2017; M. Stacey, 2016).

At the school level, single programme implementation is most common, with 143 of the 196 schools offering only one. Of these, the most significant proportion are schools offering the PYP (62%). This is, in part, due to the high proportion of government primary schools in Victoria adopting the PYP. By contrast, only one of the 15 non-government Victorian schools implementing the PYP is a stand-alone primary school. Both New South Wales and Victoria have the largest share of DP programmes (25%), a situation in stark contrast to earlier data in which only two of 24 schools offering the DP in 1997 were in New South Wales (Bagnall, 1997).

Fifty-three Australian IB schools currently offer more than one programme; only four multi-programme schools are government schools, perhaps reflective of the structural divisions mentioned previously. For example, a South Australian primary school is R-Year 7, providing opportunity to implement either R-Year 5 (PYP) and Years 6-7 (MYP) or R-Year 6 (PYP) and Year 7 (MYP). The MYP is least implemented, either as a single or combined programme, raising questions as to why its take up is markedly different.

IB programmes have a greater presence in non-government schools (Table 2.6). Government schools account for nearly one third of schools across Australia offering the PYP and MYP, in stark contrast to the DP which is offered in only 21% of government schools. Furthermore, 25 of the 26 Victorian government schools have only introduced the PYP since 2006, along with all five PYP government schools in the ACT. This contrasts with South Australian government schools, where five of the seven introduced the PYP before 2006.
Table 2.5. Profile of implementation by programme configuration.
Source: IBO (2018f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; MYP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; DP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP &amp; DP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP, MYP &amp; DP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP &amp; CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. G = Government schools; NG = Non-government schools.
Data reviewed in this section show considerable diversity of what constitutes an Australian IB school. State differences are evident, as are sectoral differences. The rise of the PYP, particularly in government schools in some jurisdictions, suggests that state policy and governance differences should be explored in this study. Some schools do not have the IB across the entire range of enrolment years, such as Ballarat Grammar School in Victoria, a Preparatory – Year 12 school offering the PYP only. This raises questions about how infused IB philosophy is across the entire school, or in what ways IB philosophy and pedagogy contrast to the experience of that school’s secondary education.

The analysis above does not take into consideration significant financial disparity, and subsequent contestation, regarding Australian education (Forsey, Proctor, & Stacey, 2017; Gerrard et al., 2017; Perry et al., 2016). To provide a more comprehensive understanding of the IB in Australia, the following section therefore considers socio-educational contexts of Australian IB schools.

2.7 Access and equity

The previous section indicates there is great diversity across Australian IB schools. The concept of being an “IB World School”, the official branding by the IBO for authorised schools (IBO, 2015b), suggests an homogeneity not reflected in the profile presented in the previous section. Contextual factors of governance, school type, and number of programmes offered appear to be significant. Some variance is also evident when considered in light of socio-educational advantage data published by the Australian Government (ACARA, 2019). These data are considered in this section, which concludes with examination of costs schools incur by becoming and remaining an IB school.
ACARA developed the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) to enable comparisons between the academic performances of similar school populations, specifically on national assessments in literacy and numeracy (NAPLAN). It is “an indication of the socio-educational backgrounds of students” (ACARA, 2018a) and is calculated using data on parental occupation and education, geographical location of the school, proportion of students with a language background other than English (LBOTE), and proportion of indigenous students. It is scaled to a mean of 1000 and standard deviation of 100. Quartile distribution of student enrolment for each school is also published on MySchool, enabling comparative analysis of socio-educational advantage to be undertaken (ACARA, 2018a). Individual students whose background locates them in the 4th quartile are considered socio-educationally disadvantaged, while those located in the 1st quartile are considered socio-educationally advantaged (Dickson et al., 2017). Therefore, a school with a high proportion of its total student population in the 1st quartile is considered a highly socio-educationally advantaged community, while high proportions of the total student population in the 4th quartile represent a socio-educationally disadvantaged community.
IB schools in Australia are more present in highly socio-educationally advantaged communities, with even greater concentration of this advantage evident in non-government schools (Figure 2.3). In the non-government sector, six of eight states and territories have average 1st quartile distributions higher than 50%, with New South Wales (n = 26) at 65% and the Australian Capital Territory (n = 4) at 72%; in the Australian Capital Territory, all four schools are higher than 50%, with two over 80%. Eighteen schools have 1st quartile distributions higher than 80%, only one of whom is a government primary school in Victoria. Eleven of these schools have 4th quartile distributions of 0%, while the other seven have distributions of 1%. Seven out of eight states and territories have 4th quartile distributions lower than 10%. The exception is the Northern Territory, although there are only two schools in the sample, one of whom has over 30% of its students from remote indigenous communities.

There is a difference in ICSEA profiles between government and non-government schools. The highest ICSEA for a government school is 1180, compared to 1208 for the highest non-government school. Of the highest 20 government schools by ICSEA, 13 are primary schools offering the PYP, six offer the DP, and only one offers the MYP. By contrast, seven of the lowest ICSEA government schools offer only the MYP and three offer the DP. Only ten schools have an ICSEA under 1000, with the lowest being 928; seven of the ten are in South Australia, and one in each of New South Wales, the Northern Territory and Victoria. This analysis supports criticism that IB programmes exist within communities which already benefit from socio-educational advantage (Dickson et al., 2017; Doherty, 2009, 2012, 2013; Doherty et al., 2012), particularly in contexts where socio-educational profiling may contribute to a drift among parents seeking enrolment for their children in schools perceived to be better performing (Rowe & Lubienski, 2017).
Figure 2.3. **Total population of Australian IB schools – ICSEA by sector and state.**
Source: ACARA (2019).

One possible reason for disproportionate implementation of IB programmes within socio-educationally advantaged schools may be the costs required for candidacy, authorisation and evaluation, as well as annual recurrent fees. Ongoing costs for professional development can be substantial, especially in schools offering the DP. The PYP and MYP are both recognised by ACARA as meeting the requirements of the Australian Curriculum (ACARA, 2018b), but differences exist across jurisdictions in content and assessment processes (Bagnall et al., 2015). Similarly, the DP “meets the specifications for ‘Senior Secondary Certificate of Education’ outlined in the Australian Qualifications Framework” (Dixon et al., 2014, p. 6), but significant differences are evident in content and assessment methodologies for Mathematics, Sciences, Language and Literature, and History. In addition, the compulsory elements of TOK, and the EE create professional development needs unique to the IB. Australian IB schools already provide
professional development to support the AC, so meeting IB professional development needs adds to a school’s recurrent costs.

A school seeking to implement an IB programme first applies to be a candidate school. The costs require significant financial commitment (Table 2.7). Depending on progress, the annual candidate fee can become quite an impost as it is payable each year of candidacy. The IB suggests the period of candidacy “typically takes between two and three years” (IBO, 2018a), resulting in minimum direct costs of AUD 24,724 for a school which requires three year candidacy. Throughout the candidacy phase, further costs are incurred because:

- the head of the school participates in an IB workshop to become familiar with IB’s programmes, philosophy and authorization process (IBO, 2018c); and,
- the programme coordinator and other staff must attend specified IB-recognized professional development activities (IBO, 2018b).

These costs can be considerable, both in the candidacy phase and once authorised, with an expectation by the IB that schools fund “continuous training of their teachers” (IBO, 2018i). The standard registration fee for workshop attendance across the IBAP in 2018 is SGD 996, or, AUD 1,009; workshops scheduled for 2018 in Sydney, Melbourne, Perth, Hong Kong, Mumbai, Bangalore, and Shanghai all list this standard fee (IBO, 2018g). International Baccalaureate Schools Australasia (IBSA) is now more proactive in providing IB training in Australia, reducing the need for schools to send staff members outside Australia to access IB accredited professional learning. During 2018, IB accredited training workshops are offered in Melbourne, Sydney, Perth, Adelaide, Canberra, and Brisbane. However, not all venues provide the same training, still necessitating interstate travel for many schools. For example, a series of leadership workshops are only available in Adelaide, and at a cost of SGD 1,250/AUD 1266 (IBO, 2018g).
Table 2.7 *IB authorisation and annual fees, 2017-2018.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>AUD(^{11})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application for authorisation</td>
<td>SGD 6,100</td>
<td>AUD 6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidacy annual fees</td>
<td>SGD 6,100</td>
<td>AUD 6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee PYP</td>
<td>SGD 10,130</td>
<td>AUD 10,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee MYP</td>
<td>SGD 11,945</td>
<td>AUD 12,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual fee DP</td>
<td>SGD 13,865</td>
<td>AUD 14,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* SGD = Singapore dollars; all schools in the IB Asia-Pacific region are charged in SGD. AUD = Australian dollars.

Representatives from each school are also expected to attend annual regional conferences. During the period I served as an IB school principal, I attended annual IBAP conferences in Singapore (twice), Kuala Lumpur, and Melbourne. These conferences were also attended by the three programme coordinators and other appropriate senior staff, representing a major financial commitment in annual recurrent budgets.

Australian-based professional learning does not always provide the full range needed by IB teachers. Schools are therefore required, at times, to send staff internationally to access appropriate IB approved training, as “continuous professional development of IB teachers is a mandatory requirement” (IBO, 2018i). For example, in 2018, there are no scheduled workshops in Australia for courses in the DP Theatre course, my teaching discipline. Workshops are only available in Singapore (September 20-22, 2018) or Hong Kong (September 21-23, 2018) (IBO, 2018g). These dates also fall within published academic term dates across all Australian states and territories, either completely (Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Australia, South Australia, Tasmania, Western Australia) or partially (Queensland, Victoria). As

---

\(^{11}\) All conversions in this section by www.xe.com 5:45pm, September 2, 2018.
well as international flight travel and accommodation, the timing of either workshop requires additional costs to provide coverage of timetabled classes during a teacher’s attendance (Table 2.8).

Annual costs to schools offering multiple programmes are significant, and the IB acknowledges this commitment through provision of discounted subscription costs whereby:

if a school offers two programmes…the school is given a 10% discount on the lowest single programme fee they would otherwise pay; if the school teaches all three programmes…the discount is 10% on the combined cost of the two lowest programme fees (IBO, 2018e).

Calculations for various programme annual fees are also provided (Table 2.7), and the school in which I worked as principal, a three-programme school, thus incurs annual subscription costs for 2018 of AUD 36,419\(^{12}\). No distinction on fees is made between schools which the IB classifies as private, who can set their own income levels and thus modify their income to cover the cost, and state schools, equivalent to Australian government schools (see explanation in 2.3 Schooling in Australia: fields of contestation) whose income is centrally determined.

Taken together, these expectations place significant financial obligation on schools which can create conflict for principals, given financial management is identified as a responsibility of the principal (see 2.4 Beyond hints and shadows: governance as a context of principals’ work). Newcombe and McCormick (2001, p. 184) identify “preparing the whole school budget and allocating financial resources to individual cost centres throughout the school”, including costs for becoming and remaining an IB school, as first order responsibilities. First order responsibilities are “broad policy or strategic decisions which establish a framework” (Newcombe & McCormick, 2001, p. 183) for school operations. Costs incurred is clearly a site

\(^{12}\) Conversion by www.xe.com at 5:45pm, September 2, 2018.
Table 2.8 *Estimated costs for attending 2018 DP Theatre workshop in Singapore.*
Source: Association of Independent Schools (NSW) (2017); IBO (2018g).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost (AUD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop fee</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation (X 3 nights)(^{13})</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flights(^{14})</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual staff coverage (X 3 days @ AUD 427/day)</td>
<td>1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,727</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of contestation within the *field* of IB schools. The dominating AC requirements are placed in
tension with dominating IB requirements, and it is the principal who is charged with the
responsibility to fulfil obligations to both. For principals who would seek to jettison the AC (see
**Chapter 1: Background to the study**), costs associated with its professional development may
be considered better spent supporting the considerable costs of being an IB school. For principals
who would prefer not to have the IB, the costs associated become a straightforward justification
for a school’s withdrawal of an IB programme.

### 2.8 Eschewing homogeneity: in search of an Australian “IB World School”?

The review thus far of literature and school data reveals the work of Australian IB school
principals is situated in variable, complex, and contestable contexts. The variety of governance
arrangements, IB programme requirements, and additional financial obligations placed on IB
schools support the notion that study of leadership requires consideration of “the social space in
which they occur” (Eacott, 2010, p. 268). Disaggregation of schools under the banner of “IB
World School” is required to understand how the presence of the IB impacts principal leadership.

\(^{13}\) Accommodation costs were estimated by www.trivago.com.au on September 2, 2018.

\(^{14}\) Flight costs were estimated by www.webjet.com.au on September 2, 2018.
Even a small sample group (Table 2.9) shows significant variance in the areas of governance, programme implementation across the school, and socio-educational profile; none of the schools in this sample are participants in Phase One of this study.

The two non-government schools have very different contexts of governance. Newington College, established in 1863, was constituted in its current governance mode by the *Newington College Council Act 1922* (NSW), hereafter as “the Act”. The Act created a College Council as a legal entity in perpetuity, and the College is thus not owned by any ecclesiastic authority. However, the Act authorised the Synod of the Methodist Church of Australasia in New South Wales (i.e., the church’s governing body at that time) to appoint members of the governing council and thereby maintain a dominant governing interest. This responsibility transferred to the Uniting Church in Australia, Synod of New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory, in 1977 when the Uniting Church of Australia formed through the union of the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian churches (*Uniting Church of Australia, 2012*). The Act stipulates that one-third of the governing council will be Uniting Church clergy, that the governing council not dispose of or mortgage the College’s property without the approval of the Synod, and that:

> such directions and regulations shall not contravene the teachings and tenets of The Uniting Church in Australia, and any such regulations shall be subject to review and alteration at any meeting of the Synod of The Uniting Church in Australia in New South Wales (*Newington College Council Act 1922* (NSW) s. 12).

Determination of the College’s educational activities, including whether to implement or withdraw an IB programme, rests at the site level, provided it meets the above test. The governing council must report to Synod annually, including a statement of its financial affairs.
Table 2.9 Profiles of four “IB World Schools”.
Source: ACARA (2019); IBO (2018f).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Newington College</th>
<th>Good Shepherd Lutheran College</th>
<th>Le Fevre High School</th>
<th>Kororoit Creek Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Non-government;</td>
<td>Non-government;</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Government (Private-Public Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established by Act of Parliament</td>
<td>Lutheran Education Queensland system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td>Kindergarten – 12</td>
<td>Preparatory – 12</td>
<td>Year 8 – 12</td>
<td>Kindergarten – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>2036</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Boys only</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campuses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSEA</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ Per student</td>
<td>25,513</td>
<td>15,677</td>
<td>16,516</td>
<td>8,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous %</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBOTE %</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. LBOTE % = percentage of students with a language background other than English.*

Good Shepherd Lutheran College, established in 1986, is an entity directly owned and operated by the Lutheran Church of Australia, Queensland District. It operates under the authority of Lutheran Education Queensland (LEQ), a system of 26 Lutheran schools and 62 Early Childhood centres (Lutheran Education Queensland, 2018). Like the relationship between the Uniting Church Synod and Newington College, LEQ determines governing council appointments and has a duty to:

- ensure that the objects of the School/College are carried out in accordance with the Confession [of the Lutheran Church of Australia, and]…ensure that a Christian education is provided in accordance with the Confession and principles of the Church (Lutheran Church of Australia Queensland District, 2015, p. 56).
In addition, there is a requirement for all members of a governing council to be “active communicant members of a Congregation of the Church…[or] active members of other Christian denominations” (Lutheran Church of Australia Queensland District, 2015, p. 54). By contrast to Newington College, there is an additional layer of governance impacting the principal’s leadership. The LEQ sets “curriculum guidelines and statements of educational policy for the District in relation to Schools” (Lutheran Church of Australia Queensland District, 2015, p. 47) and develops “formulae for distribution of Government Funds” (Lutheran Church of Australia Queensland District, 2015, p. 48).

The linking of these two responsibilities has potential to create friction between principals of non-IB Lutheran schools over issues of equity. The significant cost to schools which implement IB programmes (see 2.7 Access and Equity) could become a contentious issue for one of two possible reasons; either the additional costs for IB schools are factored into systemic budget distribution, thereby reducing the proportional funding given to non-IB schools, or IB school governing councils and principals must adjust their site-based budgets to ensure they meet these additional costs. This is also the case for government school principals. How principals manage both the financial challenges and any concomitant collegial relationship pressures becomes pertinent to this study.

There is notable difference across the student demographics of all four schools, raising questions as to what commonalities exist between them beyond the “IB World School” branding. Le Fevre High School is the only school with a significant indigenous population, suggesting the Western epistemological foundations of the IB (van Oord, 2007; Wells, 2011) may present different challenges to those of Good Shepherd Lutheran School, whose ethnicity appears much more homogenous due to its low indigenous and LBOTE enrolment. The high level of LBOTE
students at Kororoit Creek Primary School stands out in this sample, indicating a more complex culture of internationalism may exist. The way in which a principal of a highly diverse, moderate income school like Kororoit Creek Primary School views “distinctions between the local, national and international” (IBO, 2017, p. 2) is likely to vary from the way a principal in a less diverse but highly affluent school like Newington College views these distinctions.

2.9 Congruence between IB growth and research literature

The preliminary literature review undertaken for this current study did not locate any research which directly explores the experience of principalship in Australian IB schools; more recent published work drawn from this current research (Kidson, 2016; Kidson et al., 2019) remain the only studies to date to do so. This absence is surprising, considering the significant growth of the IB in Australia since 1979 examined in earlier sections of this chapter. This chapter now critically examines the limited extant peer-reviewed and academic literature on the IB in Australia. This review shows an imbalance in inquiry which focuses predominantly on curriculum implementation issues, leaving the experience of principalship in IB schools unresearched. Within this literature, there is also a disproportionate representation of studies related to the DP, creating a false impression the DP is the dominant feature of the Australian IB landscape (Kidson et al., 2019). Wider school leadership literature shows the principal is critical to effective schools, including, but not limited to, responsibility for instructional leadership (Kools & Stoll, 2016; Robinson et al., 2008), school culture (Kaplan & Owings, 2013), teacher leadership (Bush & Glover, 2014), and student achievement (Day, Gu, et al., 2016), all of which are required in schools implementing IB programmes. However, no examination of the extent to which the presence of the IB impacts the principal’s responsibility for these has been undertaken.
prior to this current study. The review of literature in the following chapter reveals a comparable absence of the IB in broader educational leadership literature.

As a body of literature, critical research into the IB in Australia is modest in scale. Bagnall (1997, 2005), Doherty (2009, 2012, 2013), Doherty et al. (2012), and Dickson et al. (2017) are the only scholars to this point who question the place of the IB in Australian education on philosophical or sociological grounds. This seems problematic, given the current scale of IB (see 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia). In 2017, IB schools received annual recurrent funding of more than $600M from the Commonwealth Government and $590M from state and territory governments (ACARA, 2019; Kidson et al., 2019). A lack of critical research into an enterprise of such scale is untenable, even more so given its expected continued growth. Kidson (2016) indicates the pressures of compliance and academic performance militate against some of the more idealistic and philosophical objectives of the IB, thereby suggesting school leaders may already assume the presence of the IB is uncontested and leadership challenges are but matters of effective implementation.

Complementary to Bagnall’s work (1997, 2005) is Paris’ (2003) study of student motivation in choosing the DP over the local South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE). The research comprises a mixed methods study of students drawn from one government school and one non-government school which offered both the DP and the SACE. The concepts of globalisation and internationalisation are explored briefly in the literature review, with a conclusion that the DP supports a globalisation construct, rather than one of internationalisation, based on its elite tertiary entrance priority. There is not a clear definition given of either term by Paris and the study concludes that students select the DP for class size, teacher attitude, better tertiary prospects and academic rigour. Although globalisation and internationalisation do not
feature in the findings, Paris concludes that local values and ideas can be diminished through student engagement with the DP.

The contexts which have enabled the DP to grow in Australia have been analysed for how they position the IB within public discourse. Analysis of public domain documents from the IB and newspaper reportage (Doherty, 2009) concludes that neo-liberal and neo-conservative ideologies enable the IB to gain a foothold in communities which already evidence socially advantageous characteristics, inferring growth of the IB may be attributable more to political serendipities than widespread attraction to its liberal humanistic mission. Doherty et al. (2012) use mixed methods comprising survey questionnaires of 179 parents, 231 students, and three case studies (Doherty, 2012, 2013) to explore the social ecology around the uptake of the DP. Findings support the hypothesis that families who choose the DP already possess higher socio-economic advantage. These families pursue the DP for its cultural and intellectual capital with a goal to further enhancing their children’s educational opportunities. This produces a self-selection process by caregivers who are themselves likely to possess post-graduate qualifications, have transnational experience and value “canonical disciplinary knowledge and intercultural capital” (Doherty et al., 2012, p. 328). Consideration of this ecology must therefore inform the approach to this study, seeking to understand how principals perceive parents’ expectations of participating in an IB school.

Student perceptions about academic merit optimisation are also explored (Doherty, 2012). Students from both groups (DP and non-DP) perceive the DP has tertiary preparation benefit. Perceptions exist amongst non-DP students that DP students have better teachers, resources and academic culture within their classes, consistent with the findings of Paris (2003). Some DP students weigh the workload and reward as beneficial for achieving their tertiary
aspirations, while some are not convinced of this, given changeable conversion rates of DP grades to university entrance scores. These findings are also partially found in Coleman’s (2010) study of course selection at an Adelaide boys’ school. Tertiary aspiration, portability, class sizes, teacher quality and specific subject availability are important factors in choice, but parental expectation is not. Absent from findings in these studies, though, is any reference to developing international mindedness, which is central to the mission of the IB.

Of interest to this study, however, is a comment from a government principal regarding enrolment of students from out of area. The school in question, School A, enjoys such a positive reputation that students from outside of the school’s normal catchment area plead their case to attend the school, because the IB is available at the school. Yet the principal “expressed some frustration that the desire to enrol in the IB did not necessarily constitute” (Doherty, 2012, p. 190) sufficient reason to overturn the overarching enrolment policy of that state’s department of education. No further exploration of this tension occurs, yet it indicates that the presence of IB programmes can place principals in positions of conflict. Student interest and desire to study the IB must be balanced by adherence to government enrolment priorities, pitting policy against student opportunity.

The final analysis from the study (Doherty, 2013) examined how the three case study schools position the DP within the local ecology of their market. In School A, the initial market dominance was about to be tested by other schools introducing the DP, thereby pressuring the school’s reputation. School B targeted students in an endeavour to select only highly academically capable students, a consequence of which was to create subsidised curriculum for a select group of students. School C faced changing enrolment patterns, thus forcing the school to reconfigure its curriculum offering, including the DP. Consequently, financial constraints were
beginning to pressure the implementation of the DP. The overall finding of this study is that each school’s engagement with the DP is not without its own adverse consequences for which the IB must be held to account. In two of the three cases, the principals noted the significant financial commitment, but positioned this as a positive for all students across the school on the basis that staff skill and expertise increased, regardless of which credential they taught. This was not always seen as positive by the rest of the school community, however, with “only the small group of IBD students…seen to profit” (Doherty, 2013, p. 391) while others carried the consequences through increased staffing allocations.

The IB’s mission of inclusivity is explored by Dickson et al. (2017) who compare ICSEA and MySchool financial data to median house price data for communities in which IB schools are located. They examine the extent to which IB programmes are accessible to a wide range of socio-economic communities. Their key finding is that IB schools serve communities which are already socio-educationally advantaged, excluding lower socio-economic families from the IB. These families cannot access the IB because they either cannot afford additional fees for a non-government school or cannot afford to reside in affluent communities serviced by government schools offering the IB but which do not charge fees. They note that “principals…at IB schools believe that IB programmes improve student outcomes and experiences” (Dickson et al., 2017, p. 65), but the focus of the article is on the socio-economic accessibility of the IB broadly, rather than the view of principals about issues related to cost, access, and equity of the IB within their community.

Paris (2003), Doherty (2012, 2013), and Dickson et al. (2017) further the initial critical insights of Bagnall (1997, 2005). The accessibility of IB programmes to those who are already socio-educationally advantaged limits the actualisation of its liberal humanist vision, although
social elitism is a straightforward target to hit in a context where 80% of DP schools are non-government and, of these, over 80% have per student income over AUD 20,000 (ACARA, 2019; Kidson et al., 2019). For example, Edwards and Underwood (2012) found that DP students from higher socio-educationally advantaged backgrounds are more suited to, and likely to succeed at, tertiary study, although this is also unsurprising given the DP was established as a tertiary preparation course.

Beyond these studies, other studies have investigated practical implementation strategies related to the DP in which the perspectives of principals are largely absent. Both the DP and the local state curriculum meet the needs of students who select each course, but there can be a perception amongst students the DP is for more academically elite students (Hugman, 2009). Cultural dissonance for Chinese DP students (Gan, 2009) can result from differences in teaching methods, emphasis on critical thinking as opposed to memorisation, and closer power-distance relationships (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkow, 2010). Students who adopt a positive mind set and who perceive the DP to be of high value are better equipped to overcome these challenges.

Three studies exist on features unique to the DP: TOK and the EE. Hamer (2010) investigated the extent to which subject knowledge, thinking skills, and student motivation are predictive for achievement in TOK and the EE. The study includes 777 students, although only 470 are from Australia, the balance being from Hong Kong, United States, Italy, and New Zealand; all schools except one are private/non-government. The EE is considered more cognitively demanding than TOK, and formulating an appropriate research question and methodology, conducting the research, and finding the time to write up the EE are identified as the most challenging aspects. Hamer’s work built on earlier exploratory work of Munro (2003) in which 39 students completed assessment instruments for cognitive style, approaches to
learning and motivation. These are then compared to the EE grades of students. Students with higher self-regulation and self-management skills achieve better EE grades, although it must be noted that students from outside a national culture encounter additional language and cultural factors with which to contend.

A recent study of critical thinking skills in TOK (Cole et al., 2015) finds the course to be very effective in developing these skills. Perceived strengths of TOK are the explicit teaching of critical thinking skills and its interdisciplinary nature. Students who complete TOK also complete the wider DP program and so caution must be exercised about implementing a critical thinking program in isolation. School based factors such as timetabling, resourcing and staffing constraints also require considerable school organisational commitment to implement TOK successfully. No investigation of how principals perceive the impact of these constraints is included in these studies.

As a trans-national curriculum, the IB in Australia must locate itself within the wider national curriculum landscape (Resnik, 2012). Two studies affirm that the PYP Science curriculum (Bagnall et al., 2015) and the DP (Dixon et al., 2014) both meet the requirements of the AC. Similarly, the inquiry-based pedagogy of the PYP provides adequate preparation for successful student participation in compulsory national testing regimes (C. Campbell, Chittleborough, Jobling, Tytler, & Doig, 2013). This study of student science literacy in eight non-government and two government schools found proficiency levels of PYP students (n = 337) on the 2012 National Sample Assessment in Science Literacy (NAP-SL) generally higher than national levels. Interestingly, the performance of students in government schools included in the study are higher than those of non-government schools, although the researchers note the small sample size is a significant qualifying factor to this finding. The study also fails to include socio-
educational advantage as a covariate in its analyses and thus diminishes the impact of the privileged background of students in IB schools in Australia (Dickson et al., 2017).

A study on approaches to language teaching in the PYP (Lebreton, 2014) shows the IB’s mandatory requirement for additional language instruction can create challenges for schools. While most parents and teachers have positive attitudes towards second language acquisition, the choice of language and the culture of the school are factors affecting their responses. The Sydney-based school in the study provides Mandarin but is not located anywhere near Chinese communities, causing some parents and students to question its value. No exploration of how principals value additional language learning, or might deal with staffing these language programmes, is considered.

Only three studies located focus on the MYP. This is perhaps unsurprising, given it represents the smallest of the three main IB programmes offered in Australian schools. Whereas the literature reviewed in this section focuses almost entirely on philosophical and curriculum based challenges, Perry et al. (2018) are the only scholars to include an explicit link between these and the work of the principal. Principals represent only a small proportion of the study (N = 28; n = 6). Unfortunately, the “six school principals or deputies” (Perry et al., 2018, p. 27) are not disaggregated between the two and thus it is unclear exactly how many principals participated. Comments are attributed to three principals, and this can reasonably be assumed as the number of principal participants.

Most of the report examines philosophical, pedagogical, and curriculum matters, consistent with the wider Australian IB literature, yet it is the additional exploration of organisational elements which marks the relevance of the report to this current study. Two themes of significance are reported: meeting the obligations of multiple governing contexts, and
the costs associated with implementation. Principals report frustration in meeting the requirements of Australian curriculum authorities and the IB, with one principal describing the process as “a ridiculous waste of time” (Perry et al., 2018, p. 37). Costs of implementing and sustaining the IB are felt acutely, particularly related to costs for ongoing professional learning. The allocation of time for collaboration and professional learning is seen as one of the “hidden costs” (Perry et al., 2018, p. 36) of implementing IB programmes, a situation exacerbated for the two government school principals.

The focus of the MYP is curious in a national context where it represents less than 20% of all Australian IB programmes (see Table 2.4). It is also the curriculum framework which creates the most challenge for schools to implement. The PYP is a learning framework which enables schools to construct their content flexibly, and the DP is a discrete standalone curriculum with its own externally set examination and credentialing process. The MYP must meet both the IB and local jurisdictional requirements, thereby positioning the MYP in a more complex curriculum and organisational context. Notwithstanding this limitation, and the very small number of principals involved in the study, the report identifies sectoral difference and financial encumbrance as two challenges for Australian schools implementing the MYP. Although descriptive of these challenges, the report does not explore how principals address them.

The other two studies are student-focused and include no consideration of the role of the principal. Skrzypiec et al. (2014) find that student well-being is flourishing among MYP students across five non-government \((n = 1449)\) and three government schools \((n = 475)\) in South Australia. The attributes of the IB Learner Profile are considered effective in developing cognitive empathy, global self-concept, resilience and relationships. However, the self-report methodology and use of single time point data collection are limitations of the study, and better
insights would be gained from longitudinal data collection. Furthermore, comments from principals interviewed reinforce the philosophical values of the IB also expressed by coordinators and teachers who participated. Distinctions based on responsibilities held by the principal are not evident.

2.10 Conclusion

This chapter critically reviewed the current state of the IB in Australian schools. Following Lingard and Christie’s (2003) and Eacott’s (2010, 2013b, 2015) mobilising of Bourdieu in the study of educational leadership, the chapter located Australian IB schools within the wider field of Australian education. It provided an overview of the IB programmes currently available in Australia, before examining constraints and obligations placed by the IB on Australian schools. Finally, it critically reviewed the limited existing literature which investigates the IB in Australia, contrasting this literature to the contemporary profile of IB schools.

This review found the presence of the IB in Australia is now significant, but that there are distinct gaps in the extant literature. First, and of most significance to this study, there is an absence of explicit investigation into the experience of the principal. Given the significance of the role performed by the principal, this absence is compelling and warrants the investigation explored within this study. Yet this review also found that the work of the principal cannot be decontextualized. It must be considered in relation to the wider fields to which it is connected, as well as through the localised “black box that is the school” (Eacott, 2013b, p. 181). At a macro level, this constitutes the governance and policy architecture of Australian education. At a local site-based level, this constitutes the local governing authorities, staff, students, caregivers, and members of each school’s wider community, however they are uniquely defined for each school.
To gain insight into how principals perceive the impact of the IB in their school, it is helpful to explore their perceptions of views about the IB held by these other constituencies.

Second, this review found that research into the IB focuses disproportionately on implementation issues related to the DP. This contrasts markedly to the profile of programme implementation. The view of principals about these issues within this literature is opaque. Consequently, it is impossible to know whether the findings of the extant research align with or differ from the perceptions of principals, and, if so, on what issues and to what extent. This creates an impression the IB exists within schools beyond either the purvey or involvement of the principal. Such a conclusion characterises the work of the principal as quite contrary to that of broader educational leadership literature. A brief review of that literature, explored in the following chapter, underscores the centrality of the principal to schools, as well as identifies the leadership actions required to align actions to the school’s educational purpose. None of these issues are present in research into the IB undertaken to this point, a conclusion all the more significant given the strength of the IB’s own educational purpose and vision (Davy, 2011; IBO, 2017). Also barely discernible within this literature is the voice of the principal, the one person in the school who is organisationally and morally charged with responsibility for its effective leadership (Fullan & Quinn, 2016; Gurr, 2014; Leithwood et al., 2008).

Third, Lingard and Christie (2003) and Eacott (2010, 2013b, 2015) argue that Bourdieu’s concept of field is a helpful lens through which to view the impact of external and internal contexts of principals’ leadership. The tensions and conflicts which emerge within this field may vary across the diversity of IB school types (one, two, or three programmes). This diversity suggests the logics of practice and power relationships (Eacott, 2013b) need to be understood within both these wider and site-based contexts. This is highlighted by the diversity evident
across Australian IB schools (see 2.8 Eschewing homogeneity: in search of an Australian “IB World School”). Review of literature and the contemporary profile of the IB leads to the following sub-question for this research:

To what extent do principals in Australian IB school principals consider their leadership is impacted by:

i. governance structures;

ii. individual school demographics?

This thesis now turns to an examination of educational leadership literature, particularly in the context of principalship in Australia. Building on from the theoretical ideas introduced in this chapter, it shows how temporal contexts are largely absent from educational leadership models and research. This is particularly evident in conceptions of school culture. Having identified these deficiencies, Chapter Three then argues for moving beyond Bourdieu’s concept of field and approaching this current investigation more usefully through a theoretical framework based on complexity leadership theory.
Chapter Three: Contextualising principal leadership in Australian IB schools

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter invoked Lingard and Christie’s (2003) and Eacott’s (2010, 2013b) mobilisation of Bourdieu’s concept of field to educational leadership in Australian IB schools. In particular, the chapter highlighted that study of educational leadership must consider spatio-temporal contextuality of the individual school, while acknowledging these themselves “are not static, [but] rather complex and ambiguous” (Eacott, 2013b, p. 184). The chapter shows a very limited corpus of scholarly research on Australian IB schools, incommensurate with their now significant presence. In the context of this study, none of the literature identified includes examination of principals’ experience of leadership.

This chapter continues the notion of field established in Chapter Two to review literature on the core responsibilities of principals reflected in wider educational leadership literature. This review identifies three key criticisms in the way leadership contexts are characterised throughout the literature, consistent with the criticisms of Lingard and Christie (2003) and Eacott (2010, 2013b). The first is that Australian IB schools have not, to this point, been a context for investigation of principal leadership. The second criticism is the reification of a unified culture as something a school should normatively possess, and that developing and sustaining such a culture is, by extension, the responsibility of principals. This is inconsistent with wider sociological and organisational theoretical insights which view culture as multimodal. The third criticism is the assumption of a normative organisational structuralism which fails to acknowledge schools exist as part of complex emergent and adaptive systems (Osborn, Hunt, &
Jauch, 2002; Plowman et al., 2007; R. Stacey, 2012; R. Stacey, Griffin, & Shaw, 2000; Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Wheatley, 2007).

This current investigation seeks to redress the absence of research on Australian IB school principals, and in doing so addresses the first criticism. To guide development of the investigation, the chapter proceeds to address the second criticism through considering three perspectives for studying culture: integration, differentiation, and fragmentation (Martin, 1992). These perspectives can be mobilised to gain insights about how principals view the organisational culture in which they enact their leadership. Rather than consider organisational culture from a single, reified perspective, Martin (1992) argues that organisational culture is more comprehensively understood when seen through the three perspectives.

This leads finally to consideration of complexity leadership theory as a guiding theoretical lens for this investigation. A central claim of theorists exploring complexity leadership theories is for leaders to “position organizations and the people within them to be adaptive in the face of complex challenges” (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018, p. 89). Recent Australian research in theoretical, empirical, and policy contexts (Breakspear, 2016; Champ-McGrath, Wilson, Stacey, & Fitzgerald, 2018; Riley, 2017; Savage, 2016; M. Stacey, 2016) affirms one of the central contentions in this thesis, that contemporary school dynamics, and the leadership required within them, are complex (OECD, 2016). The addition of IB programmes into these already complex contexts warrants investigation as to the extent of their impact on those entrusted to lead such complexity, namely, principals.
3.2 Principal leadership – the same, but different

This section provides a brief overview of relevant principal leadership literature while the following section narrows the focus more closely to principal leadership in school contexts offering the IB (3.3 Principal leadership in IB schools). These reviews show a broad consensus around practices which comprise effective principal leadership. To this extent, the presence of IB programmes is not sufficient to warrant an alternate construction of principal leadership. Rather, this section highlights the need to consider more closely what is understood by leadership contexts, how principals perceive school culture, and how these may feature in subjective experiences for principals who lead Australian IB schools.

Major reviews of school leadership from the past decade consistently show principal leadership comprises a core set of responsibilities and functions (Day, Gu, et al., 2016; Day et al., 2010; Dinham, 2016; Leithwood et al., 2008; National College for School Leadership, 2007; PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC), 2007; Robinson, 2007; Robinson, Hohepa, & Lloyd, 2015; Robinson et al., 2008). These responsibilities and functions are codified in Australia through an Australian Standard for Principals (AITSL, 2014; Dinham, Anderson, Caldwell, & Weldon, 2011), hereafter referred to as the Standard. There is now widespread acceptance across contemporary Australian society that principals’ work is central to effective education (ACEL, 2015; AITSL, 2011; Dinham, 2016; Gurr, 2008, 2014; MCEETYA, 2008), which must, by definition, include schools offering IB programmes. Similarly, these reviews highlight that a school’s context is critical to understanding principal leadership (Leithwood et al., 2008; National College for School Leadership, 2007). It is widely agreed the range of core practices is small and it is the adaptive capacity of the principal in employing these practices to suit their particular context which is critical to their leadership. In this research, the inclusion of IB
programmes is an essential part of the leadership context for principals in Australian IB schools, thus driving the central research question: how does the presence of IB programmes impact upon the leadership of principals in Australian schools?

Consensus around the core work of the principal in Australia emerged during the first decade of this century, concurrent with greater educational policy centralisation (Lingard, 2000; Mulford et al., 2009; Savage, 2016). A connection between these two is seen in the expectation Australian principals are accountable for leading schools which meet the aspirations of the Melbourne Declaration (MCEETYA, 2008). The Standard acknowledges that pursuit of these aspirations locates principals’ work:

in a complex, challenging and changing environment, leading and managing the school of today, ever-conscious of the needs of tomorrow (AITSL, 2014, p. 6). The Standard is built upon “essential elements of effective leadership practices” (Ingvarson, Anderson, Gronn, & Jackson, 2006, p. 106), themselves reflecting similar international findings.

Around the same time that Ingvarson et al. (2006) reviewed principal leadership standards for their Australian context, Leithwood et al. (2008) articulated the four tasks of principals as building vision and setting direction, understanding and developing people, redesigning the organisation, and managing the teaching and learning programme. A review of school leadership in the UK (PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC), 2007) similarly identified that principals set strategic direction and ethos, promote and develop the quality of teaching and learning, and develop and manage people.

These findings resonate with findings of two earlier major Australian studies. Silins and Mulford (2004) identified Vision and Goals, Culture, Structure, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Support, and Performance Expectation as the tasks of principals in schools which foster effective organisational learning. Dinham’s (2005, pp. 159-173; see also Dinham, 2016)
original research on leadership for exceptional schooling outcomes found the following principal attributes and practices evident:

- External awareness and engagement;
- A bias toward innovation and action;
- Personal qualities and attributes such as being “‘open’, ‘honest’, ‘fair’, ‘friendly’ and ‘approachable’” (Dinham, 2005, p. 346);
- Vision, expectations, and a culture of success;
- Teacher learning, responsibility, and trust;
- Student support, common purpose, and collaboration;
- Focus on students, learning, and teaching.

Similar findings are seen in the five dimensions identified by a more recent extensive review by Robinson et al. (2015, p. 95):

- Establishing goals and expectations;
- Resourcing strategically;
- Planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum;
- Promoting and participating in teacher learning and development; and,
- Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment.

These are consistent with the substance of the widely endorsed Standard (Dinham, Collarbone, Evans, & Mackay, 2013), articulated through the five Professional Practices:

1. Leading teaching and learning;
2. Developing self and others;
3. Leading improvement, innovation and change;
4. Leading the management of the school; and
5. Engaging and working with the community (AITSL, 2014, p. 11).

There are several factors of effective principalship around which there also appears a broad international consensus. First, the varied contexts and characteristics of schools greatly impact the leadership of principals (OECD, 2016). Day et al.’s (2011) review of 60 studies identifies school size, level (primary/middle/secondary), academic climate, collective teacher
efficacy, trust, length of experience, and district and/or national policy contexts among the most significant variables. Earley et al. (2012) indicate both local and broader external contexts impact the leadership of the principal, particularly regarding implementation of changing government curriculum policies, relationships with local educational partners, and, for some principals, providing support for governors given their “relative lack of educational expertise” (Earley et al., 2012, p. 74). Considerable variance in skill and expertise is similarly evident across four cases in a Western Australian study of independent public school governance (Gray et al., 2013). Dinham (2005, 2016) notes successful principals not only have awareness of their wider contexts, but positive attitudes towards engaging with those contexts.

Second, while principals are essential to effective student learning, their effectiveness is indirect, rather than direct (Day, Gu, et al., 2016; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Mulford et al., 2007; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Effective principals are those who have been found to focus on culture and school climate (Deal & Peterson, 2016; Dinham, 2016; Gruenert & Whitaker, 2015; Kaplan & Owings, 2013) as well as on developing staff capabilities. One meta-analysis of the impacts of different types of leadership on students’ academic and non-academic outcomes (Robinson et al., 2008) found particular significance in goal setting (effect size = 0.42), oversight of the curriculum (0.42), and promoting and participating in teacher learning and development (0.82).

Third, a heroic, singular, model of leadership is unrealistic, deficient and dangerous. Contrasted with this, broad-based, multi-person configurations of leadership are shown to support both principals’ effectiveness and sustainability. Gronn (2003a, 2008, 2010) indicates the concept of distributed leadership is a welcome development in conceptualising how leadership is practiced in schools. This is due to criticism of individualistic charismatic/transformational
leadership models that have a tendency to “exaggerate the agency or ability of one person to make a difference” (Gronn, 2010, p. 416; Tourish, 2013). By contrast, holistic and distributed leadership “highlights people’s interdependence or mutual dependence” (Gronn, 2010, p. 418, emphasis in original; Harris, 2008; Pont, Nusche, & Moorman, 2008).

Fourth, schools in which collaborative cultures are found show evidence of successful student learning. Dinham’s (2005, 2016) study identifies collaboration as a significant factor in effective principal leadership, echoing Mulford and Silins’ (2003) finding that effective leadership for improved student learning is “both position-based (head teacher) and distributive (administrative team and teachers)” (Mulford & Silins, 2003, p. 183). In one study of senior school leadership teams, Barnett and McCormick (2012) conclude that belief in the design and successful use of teams by principals is likely held as a prior belief of the principal or based on successful previous experience.

These responsibilities and practices manifest across varying theoretical models. Bush and Glover (2014) reviewed nine models, including transformational leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999, 2006), instructional leadership (Dinham, 2016; Robinson et al., 2008), moral and ethical leadership (Bhindri & Duignan, 1997; Duignan, 2006; Fullan, 2003; Starratt, 2004), and distributed leadership (Gronn, 2003a, 2003b; Harris, 2008). These models provide principals with valuable ways of conceptualising school leadership, but within a wider conception of contextual contingency. Gurr (2014, p. 86) reports successful principals “employ multiple conceptions of leadership (they are not wedded to the use of narrow concepts like instructional or transformational leadership) and utilise a core set of practices focused on setting direction, developing people, leading change and improving teaching and learning”. Hallinger and Heck (2010, p. 107) conclude their study on leadership for improving schools that “leadership styles
and strategies are highly contextualised” and should consider both the initial conditions of the school’s position, as well as its capacity to respond to its situation. Gronn’s (2010, p. 422) more recent work replaces distributed leadership with configurations of leadership, which he defines as “a pattern or an arrangement of co-occurring elements”. Viewed through this perspective, leadership is enacted through an ever-changing set of networked relationships which are developed, engaged, and dissolved as the needs of the moment require. To this end, he argues researchers should examine the “creative ways in which [school] leaders accommodate contingent circumstances as these arise, rather than strait-jacketing them in normative models of leadership” (Gronn, 2010, p. 425).

Hallinger’s (2011) review is notable for its highlighting of temporality as a context for understanding and researching leadership. He specifically notes that tools available to principals to lead their school, such as those examined in the previous paragraphs, are not all equally effective all the time. He advises principals “to read your context correctly and adapt your leadership” (Hallinger, 2011, p. 137) to its unique needs. He draws attention to Day et al. (2010) who identify the importance of phases of leadership. Day et al. (2010) show that although principals do draw on the core range of skills, the needs of the school and its developmental phase affect how principals deploy these skills. Their three-year study of schools in which improvement in student learning outcomes occurs while maintaining the same headteacher reports that priorities in the early phase of a principal’s appointment tend to focus on setting direction and expectations, as well as developing system structures and accountabilities. These more transformational forms of leadership (Day, Gu, et al., 2016) give way over time to more distributive and instructional forms of leadership as a consequence of perceived “confidence and stability [achieved] in the foundational and developmental phases (Day, Gu, et al., 2016, p. 243).
Hallinger (2011, p. 138) concludes that we “require both quantitative and qualitative studies that describe successful leadership practices across different school levels, at different points in the “school improvement journey” and across different cultures”, highlighting that distinctions of context necessarily impact how principals might enact their role. This is in contradistinction to Gurr’s (2014, p. 86) conclusion that “context and culture can influence leadership practice, but not as much as some might think”.

Finally, as the task of leading a school continues to be increasingly complex, issues of principal well-being and strategies for leadership sustainability have emerged (Deloitte Consulting Pty Ltd, 2017; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Mulford, 2008; Victoria Department of Education and Training, 2004). Riley’s (2017) longitudinal study of principal health and well-being reports that job demands of principalship and job resources available are imbalanced. Over a period of 6 years and 5,247 respondents (Riley, 2017, p. 13), more than one quarter of participants report working in excess of 60 hours per week, and a further half report working in excess of 50 hours per week. These hours reflect recent findings on principal workload in New South Wales government schools (n = 732). Participants report a range of 40-94 hours, with $M = 60$ and $Mdn = 60$ (McGrath-Champ, Wilson, Stacey, & Fitzgerald, 2018, p. 34). This pattern is consistent with findings from Victorian government schools that are well over a decade old (Victoria Department of Education and Training, 2004), and Riley (2017, p. 13) notes that “average working hours have remained stable over the 6 years of the survey” consistent with these other reports.

Although stability of hours worked appears consistent across time, changing circumstances create new challenges for principals and raise concern for how principals effectively manage themselves as leaders. The impact of mental health issues for staff and
students, ubiquity of technology, and increased accountability and compliance measures have increased in recent reports. Highest rates of stress remain the quantity of work and lack of time to focus on teaching and learning (Deloitte Consulting Pty Ltd, 2017; Riley, 2017). Of relevance to this current investigation are increases between 2011 and 2016 of both rise in Expectations of the employer \((M = 6.44, SD = 2.44, n = 2049 \ [2011]; M = 6.92, SD = 2.58, n = 2785 \ [2016])\) and Government initiatives \((M = 5.98, SD = 2.51 \ [2011]; M = 6.52, SD = 2.52 \ [2016])\) (Riley, 2017, p. 67; scale is 0-10).

Riley (2017, p. 12) finds that “the problems and the solutions are very similar in all sectors so the differences between the sectors are more superficial than substantive”, a view reflected in similar reports targeting sectoral populations and contexts (Australian Lutheran Institute for Theology and Ethics, 2013; Australian Secondary Principals’ Association, Australian Heads of Independent Schools Association, & Catholic Secondary Principals Australia, 2008; Kidson, 2008). This suggests principals in Australian IB schools are unlikely to have significantly different experiences of leadership, but lack of any previous research into this context warrants exploration of these ideas within this current study. For this reason, it is included as part of Research Question 3.

The review of literature and relevant data in Chapter Two identified governance as a key context for exploration in this research. The review of principal leadership literature in this section leads to subsequent identification of research questions 2 and 3:

2. **What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about:**
   i. the role of vision and direction setting;
   ii. their focus of action;
   iii. the nature of school culture?

3. **What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use:**
   i. to enable effective school administration;
ii. for decision-making purposes;
iii. to sustain themselves as leaders?

The context of Australian IB schools is absent from the leadership literature reviewed above, reinforcing the value of this current research. The following section complements this through an overview of leadership literature in other IB contexts.

3.3 Principal leadership in IB schools

The previous section highlights a requirement for research into principalship to consider context, enabling its enactment to be more fully understood. In this regard, the absence of research on principal leadership in Australian IB schools to date is striking. As was highlighted in 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia, the initial niche position of the IB in Australia no longer exists. The IB is present across all Australian states and territories, and its growth over the last decade broadened its reach particularly into government primary schools. The trajectory of growth is steep (see Figure 2.2) and shows few signs of abating. Research on the IB in Australia is incommensurate with this rapid growth (Kidson et al., 2019), and this section reveals a complete absence of research into principalship in Australian IB schools within the limited literature on leadership in IB schools internationally (Bryant, Walker, & Lee, 2018; Gardner-McTaggart, 2018a), highlighting the need for this current study.

Principal leadership in IB schools is one context of leadership only within the more broad category of international schools (Blandford & Shaw, 2001; Caffyn, 2010; Hayden, Thompson, & Walker, 2002; Keller, 2015; MacDonald, 2009; Roberts & Mancuso, 2014). Research in leadership within international schools is located in schools catering for predominantly expatriate communities (Cambridge & Thompson, 2004; Dolby & Rahman, 2008) whose leadership challenges differ significantly from those found in Australian IB schools. It is perhaps for these
reasons that no research on principal leadership in Australian IB schools has been undertaken. Some of the leadership challenges for principals in international schools identified by Blandford and Shaw (2001) are less prevalent in Australian schools, such as higher rates of student and staff recruitment and turnover, managing cultural challenges of often highly transient populations, and problematic political relationships derived from school ownership (James & Sheppard, 2014). Other challenges resonate with Australian IB principal leadership, such as compliance with national laws, parental expectations regarding examinations and certification, and managing programme continuity. These issues, while similar in description, are quite different in practice for Australian IB principals. The pressure exerted on principals in international schools by governance contexts can result in higher than average turnover in principals (Benson, 2011; Lee et al., 2012b), a position not reflected in Australian school contexts in which greater longevity and stability of principalship is evident (Blackwood, 2018; Deloitte Consulting Pty Ltd, 2017; McKenzie, Weldon, Rowley, Murphy, & McMillan, 2014).

Certification and tertiary aspirations are certainly important for a number of parents in Australian IB schools (Doherty, 2012), but broader discourse in Australian education emphasises holistic and broad aspirations for students beyond certification and academic profiling (Gonski et al., 2018; MCEETYA, 2008; Ragusa & Bousfield, 2015).

Glimpses of challenges for principals in IB schools are seen in Calnin, Waterson, Richards, and Fisher’s (2018) articulation of a framework for leadership development in international schools and Gardner-McTaggart’s (2018a, p. 6) exploration of the “whether IB international schools’ directors operationalise the IBLP in their work”. Like much of the wider literature on international schools (Cambridge & Thompson, 2004; Dolby & Rahman, 2008), Calnin et al.’s (2018) critical review of leadership development focuses on broadly defined
contexts which cater “for students from many different national, cultural and linguistic backgrounds with teachers and leaders from different parts of the world” (Calnin et al., 2018, p. 101). They explore seven prescriptive intelligences which define a model of “leadership capabilities within intercultural and trans-national settings” (Calnin et al., 2018, p. 104), contexts which do not describe Australian IB schools. To this end, while the framework includes many of the same concepts articulated in 3.2 Principal leadership – the same, but different, such as “developing and operationalising strategy…innovation, effecting change and creative problem solving…[and] enabling effective teaching and learning” (Calnin et al., 2018, p. 105), the contexts in which they are applied vary significantly from that of Australia and therefore provide limited insight to principalship in Australian IB schools. They explicitly acknowledge that national school leadership contexts, like those articulated in the Standard (AITSL, 2014), impact the configuration of leadership. Such contexts, they argue, assume a “degree of homogeneity within their teaching cohort and school community” (Calnin et al., 2018) markedly different from the contexts in which their critique of the IB leadership development framework applies. Gardner-McTaggart’s (2018b) exploration of the efficacy of the IBLP to leadership shows a disconnect between the rhetoric of the IBLP and its practical usefulness for school leaders. Across a sample of 11 school directors, equivalent in responsibility to school principals in the Australian context, he found little evidence that the IBLP has any operational impact for school leaders, raising a question as to the extent to which the philosophy of the IB is deeply embedded in the personal leadership philosophy of school leaders.

Principal leadership surfaces as a related, rather than direct, research focus in two studies which include some examination of leadership in IB schools. Halicioğlu (2008) identifies a number of challenges for implementing the DP in national schools in Turkey. Schools face
difficulty with adequate teacher training, second language provision, developing international mindedness, and timetable constraints. Doherty (2012, 2013) argues these are similar challenges to those faced in Australian schools, and to some extent this is the case. Her conclusion is that the IB “does not sit in local educational markets as a benign, neutral addition” (Doherty, 2013, p. 382). The study differs from this current study, however, in that the units of analysis are teaching staff and DP coordinators, not principals. Perceptions about these challenges consider practical implementation strategies, rather than questions about mission, strategy, resourcing, and the managing of conflicts which derive therefrom. Similarly, Visser’s (2010) study of implementing the MYP in Dutch schools identifies leadership as an important factor in successful implementation, but focuses mostly on effective structure and leadership support for the role of the MYP coordinator. Regarding principal leadership, “strong, inspiring leadership seems to be beneficial” (Visser, 2010, p. 149), but no details or descriptions are given as to what behaviours are exemplary of such leadership. These two studies reflect a similar opacity regarding principal leadership that is evident in the critique of Bagnall’s (1997, 2005) lack of consideration of governance (see 2.4 Beyond hints and shadows: governance as a context of principals’ work). Principals have important leadership functions in resourcing, structuring, and sense-making, but their contribution to these within these two studies is not foregrounded.

The most extensive programme of research to explore issues related to leadership practices in IB schools is a series of studies by Hallinger et al. (2010), Hallinger et al. (2011), Hallinger and Lee (2012), Lee et al. (2012b), A. Walker, Bryant, and Lee (2014), A. Walker and Hallinger (2015), and Bryant et al. (2018). The contexts of research include single programme and multi-programme schools across a range of Asia-Pacific cultures, although not in Australia.
The collective findings are consistent with wider leadership research and reflect a number of the leadership challenges identified by Blandford and Shaw (2001).

Of relevance to this research is the role principals play in coherence building and strategic resourcing (A. Walker et al., 2014), and the distinction between “IB-focused and IB-plus schools” (Bryant et al., 2018). A consistent theme across this research is that the language leaders use is powerful in sense-making. How integrated the IB is to a school community appears in large measure predicated on active and continual use of IB specific language by school leaders, particularly the language of the IBLP. Linked to this is the structuring and deployment of resourcing, particularly staffing, to embed IB pedagogy consistently across the school. This is a particular challenge in multi-programme contexts (Hallinger et al., 2011). Bryant et al. (2018, p. 27) note a distinction between leaders for whom the IB is the core “driver of all school programs and activities” and those for whom the IB is one element among a range of tools leaders use to drive the school’s mission and performance. Their conclusion is that both can be effective and underscore the critical, and central, role a school’s mission plays in principal leadership. The emphasis of “contextually sensitive strategies” (Bryant et al., 2018, p. 29) resonates with wider educational leadership literature. Notwithstanding these findings, Lee, Walker, and Bryant (2018) conclude that the responsibilities of IB principals may not differ significantly from those of principals in non-IB schools (Robinson et al., 2008). They suggest that challenges for principals in IB schools “share certain similarities with non-IB schools in terms of leadership practices and their effects” (Lee et al., 2018, p. 578). This very issue is at the core of this present research and recommends the need to explore the central research question: to what extent does the presence of IB programmes impact principal leadership in Australian IB schools?
Coherence and sense-making responsibilities appear, however, to be greater challenges for principals of IB schools (A. Walker & Lee, 2018). The inclusive, expansive, and broad vision of the IB appears for some principals to be disconnected to the realities of daily leadership in their school. “Gaps between the demands of IB programs and the practical realities of implementing IB programs” (A. Walker & Lee, 2018, p. 474) can be attributed to differing resourcing, philosophical, pedagogical, and cultural approaches. Consequently, a major responsibility is that school leadership, particularly across multiple programme IB schools such as those in A. Walker and Lee’s (2018, p. 480) study, “deliberately facilitates coherence and consistency across the programs. This becomes increasingly challenging when the scope of IB programmes does not cover the entirety of the student population (A. Walker et al., 2014).

This brief review shows that critical literature on IB principal leadership is limited, and non-existent in the context of Australia. This current research seeks to bring into the foreground what has been sensed in this literature, but not yet scrutinised – the perspective of principals on how the IB impacts upon their leadership in Australian school contexts. In doing so, it fills the gap in two bodies of literature, that of Australian educational leadership and that of IB educational leadership. It does so through examining principal leadership in their combined contexts.

3.4 Three perspectives on culture

The two previous sections illustrate that principal leadership is enacted within specific contexts, including a school’s governance, history, socio-educational capacity, and, of relevance to this study, the number and range of IB programmes offered. Yet these contextual elements are also located within the wider construct of school culture. Comprehensive understanding of Australian
IB principal leadership must therefore consider what principals believe about school culture as well as how these beliefs are operationalised.

The importance of culture to effective organisational leadership is well understood (Alvesson, 2011; Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2016; Cameron & Quinn, 2006; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Schein & Schein, 2016; Smircich, 1983), including in school contexts (Deal & Peterson, 2016; Dinham, 2016; Gruenert & Whitaker, 2015; Hoy, 1990). School leaders shape and are shaped by their school’s culture, and one of their responsibilities is to develop and enhance school culture. However, culture is predominantly presented across the literature as a unified and reified construct:

Every school has a culture (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 47);
Transforming the culture – changing the way we do things around here – is the main point (Fullan, 2001, p. 44);
Culture is reflected in the behaviour, attitudes, and beliefs of individuals and groups (Reeves, 2009, p. 37);
School cultures are the shared orientations, values, norms, and practices that hold an educational unit together, give it a distinctive identity, and vigorously resist change from the outside (Kaplan & Owings, 2013, p. 2);
A second key aspect involves shaping the culture to foster deeper relationships, trust, and engagement (Fullan & Quinn, 2016, p. 55).

None of these definitions are contestable, but they are presented as if a school only possesses one, unified culture, and should have that as its ideal. In contrast, Martin (1992) argues viewing culture from one perspective only fails to acknowledge that reality consists of “subjectively construed conceptual judgements” (Martin, 1992, p. 12). She contends that researchers inquiring into organisational culture make subjective assumptions about the nature of culture. They then tend to interpret aspects of culture which reflect those underlying subjective beliefs. Her work is a useful heuristic for exploring principals’ beliefs about culture. This research is not a study of
organisational culture in Australian IB schools per se, but an inquiry into what assumptions about the nature of organisational culture are present among principals. What these assumptions are will then impact how they enact their leadership, particularly during periods of organisational change, a question given added significance due to the scale of recent growth in the IB (see 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia).

An integration perspective is characterised by organisation wide consensus, consistency, and exclusion of ambiguity (Martin, 1992, p. 45). Consensus is broad agreement across the organisation about its core ideals and purpose, where “people at all levels of the organizational hierarchy are said to agree about potentially divisive issues” (Martin, 1992, p. 46). This manifests in consistency of action, language, and symbolism across the organisation, and, by extension, diminution of inconsistencies in the same. A prime function of leadership from an integration perspective is clarity of purpose and addressing ambiguity. Sense-making is “necessary…in order to control behavior (sic) which disrupts harmony and predictability” (Martin, 1992, p. 51).

The differentiation perspective is characterised by inconsistency, subcultural consensus, and the locating of ambiguity outside of and in between subcultural groupings. Differentiation configures the larger organisation as a conglomeration of subcultures. The nature of the relationships between the subcultural groupings can highlight power asymmetry, and thus raise the likelihood of conflict. This tends to be based on differences of action and symbolism which are multiple, as “there are far more ways to be dissimilar than to be similar” (Martin, 1992, p. 85). Consequently, power is a central feature of cultural life; subcultures are hierarchically connected to one another, and “everyone is always either in power – enabling, prohibiting – or subordinated” (Martin, 1992, p. 85).
In contrast to the integration and differentiation perspectives in which some overarching cultural identity exists, a *fragmentation* perspective highlights and embraces ambiguity and uncertainty, views relationships across the organisation as complex and multi-configured, and tolerates multiple and, at times, contradictory interpretations that “do not coalesce into a stable consensus” (Martin, 1992, p. 130). Such organisations are characterised by notions of *différance* (Derrida, 1973), a concept which signifies multiple and complex perspectives which are not necessarily binary opposites. Perceptions and judgements can only be understood within their spatio-temporal location and context, thus subcultures are “issue-specific coalitions that may or may not have a similar configuration in the future” (Martin, 1992, p. 138).

Principals of Australian IB schools will, like researchers of organisational culture, have beliefs about how cultures work. These three perspectives therefore serve as helpful tools to discern and analyse their views.

### 3.5 From field to leadership for complexity

The application of Bourdieu’s concept of *field* was mobilised in Chapter Two as a useful device for framing complex dominating/dominated relationships characteristic of contemporary Australian education, including IB schools. Analyses by Lingard and Christie (2003) and Eacott (2010, 2013a, 2013b) argue the study of school leadership should be understood within spatio-temporal contexts. Eacott (2013a) extends these critiques to argue scholarly inquiry is, at times, guilty of reifying descriptions of leadership without connecting these descriptions to specific spatio-temporal contexts. To some extent, this criticism can be sustained in light of literature reviewed in **3.2 Principal leadership – the same, but different**, although insights from Hallinger (2011) and Day, Townsend, et al. (2016) do not reflect this view and thus impose some
limit on Eacott’s (2013a) critique. The thrust of his critique, that the absence of spatio-temporal contextuality results in research focused on “directly observable features of practice rather than the underlying generative principles” (Eacott, 2013a, p. 98), warrants heeding in a study which seeks to position its own spatio-temporal perspective within a longer spectrum of history. 

Complexity leadership theory (CLT) takes a similar stance in that it problematises both the present and the future as uncertain because “in nonlinear models there is more than one cause for an effect and more than one effect for one cause” (R. Stacey, 2012, p. 11). This transcends Eacott’s (2015, p. 420) observation that “nobody knows anymore who is the subject of the final decision, and the place of the decision is both everywhere and nowhere”, positioning principals in Australian IB schools simultaneously as those who lead and those who are led. Leaders, from a CLT perspective, reside in a conflicted space where the past, present, and future coalesce to create an understanding of an organisation’s current identity and create possibilities for what it might become (Wheatley, 2007). The critical review of Australian IB school contexts throughout Chapter Two reflect leadership dynamics consistent with those evident in complex adaptive systems (CAS), thus a CLT perspective is a useful theoretical lens (Morrison, 2010; Wheatley, 2006) through which to view the leadership experience of Australian IB principals. CLT is not a unified theoretical position (Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2015; Morrison, 2010), and the perspective developed in this study is derived from perspectives articulated by Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), Uhl-Bien and Arena (2018), and Wheatley (2006, 2007).

Fundamental to a CLT perspective is the notion of CAS. CAS operate on very different principles to general open systems (Bertalanffy, 1950), and their “fluctuations, disorder, and change” (Wheatley, 2006, p. 13) call for reconsideration of how to lead within such dynamics. Organisations are conceptualised as “living systems, possessing the same capacity to adapt and
grow that is common to all life” (Wheatley, 2006, p. 15) whose genesis lies in the science of
d Chaotic natural systems (Dooley, 1997; Gleick, 1988; Maturana & Varela, 1987; Prigogine &
Nicolis, 1971; Prigogine & Stengers, 1984). In CAS, order is emergent and unknown in advance,
system change is unpredictable and irreversible, and change takes place in unexpected and non-
linear ways, becoming more complex. CAS create contexts for leadership in “an unpredictable
world [where] we would do better to look at plans and measures as processes that enable a group
to discover shared interests, to clarify its intent and strengthen its connections to new people and
new information” (Wheatley, 2007, p. 82; emphasis added).

Uhl-Bien et al. (2007, p. 299) go beyond a dominating/dominated binary and define CAS
as “neural-like networks of interacting, interdependent agents who are bonded in a cooperative
dynamic by common goal, outlook, need”. They build on Prigogine and Stengers’ (1984)
paradox between evolution and the second law of thermodynamics. Whereas accepted biological
theory indicates complex organisms evolve from simple organisms, the concept of entropy found
in thermodynamics describes the world “as evolving from order to disorder” (Prigogine &
Stengers, 1984, p. xxix). Dissipative structures and far-from-equilibrium states, far from being
problematic and distressing, are seen to hold promise for future possibilities. Rather than a
source of distress or inertia, “those studying chaotic dynamics discovered that the disorderly
behaviour of simple systems acted as a creative process” (Gleick, 1988, p. 43; emphasis in
original).

In a CAS, individual agents interact with other agents in what Marion and Uhl-Bien
(2001) signify as aggregates, or systems. When two or more aggregates interact, this becomes a
meta-aggregate; interactions between meta-aggregates form meta-meta-aggregates. According to
this perspective, microdynamics of aggregates and meta-aggregates can influence the
macrodynamics of meta-meta-aggregates through bottom-up change. The dynamics within a CAS may be unpredictable in their behaviour and can lead to change in non-linear ways and in unexpected places within the system (R. Stacey, 2012), resulting in a CAS being “far-from-equilibrium” (Dooley, 1997, p. 77). These changes build up tensions amongst members as the system exhibits far-from-equilibrium behaviours. In this uncertainty, interacting social networks may find novel and creative solutions to problems or more effective structures, previously unknown or experienced. Rather than requiring direction from outside itself, the CAS, and its aggregates, generate this through autopoiesis (Maturana & Varela, 1987), self-creation.

A far-from-equilibrium state may be the result of external forces or internal forces. Cilliers (2001) argues that boundaries of systems are not what separates one system from another but what “constitutes that which is bounded” (Cilliers, 2001, p. 141; italics in original). He uses the analogy of an eardrum, a system which permits sound waves to come into the system but which also separates matter that is outside the body from that which is inside. Different aggregates within a CAS may not be conceptually contiguous, and different parts of the system may be in spatially disparate locations and interact with other parts of the system in diverse ways. This exemplifies the situation for Australian IB schools who have responsibilities not only to their local governing council and state/territory jurisdiction, but also to the Australian Commonwealth and to the IBO, whose closest administrative centre to Australia is Singapore.

Cilliers’ (2001) argument suggests parts of multiple systems may interact with each of the other parts simultaneously. Considered in this way, there is more uncertainty and contestation around what is “in” and what is “out” of any particular system.

Uhl-Bien et al. (2007) propose a model of CLT that subsumes bureaucratic forms of leadership. Cilliers (2001, p. 143) identifies the necessity of hierarchy and structure within a
CAS as a counter to criticism that “complex systems do not have central control systems”. In a
CAS, hierarchy may be far less defined than in traditional models, as well as much more flexible
and adaptable. They are also across the macro, meso, and micro (Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2015) levels
of a CAS and reflect a character consistent with fractal scalability (Cilliers, 2001). This produces
autocatalysis, a process whereby interacting agents produce change within the system without it
being initiated by formal bureaucratic leadership (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001). Conflict which
arises through interactions may eventually produce correlation, an acceptance of one agent’s or
aggregate’s understanding with those of other agents or aggregates within the system. This
correlation will often be achieved far from the direct influence of top-level leadership.

Effective leadership within a CAS thus requires three particular functions: administrative,
adaptive and enabling leadership (Marion & Gonzales, 2013; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007).
Administrative leadership identifies the recognised formal bureaucratic functions required within
organisations. It is responsible for vision, structuring, and resourcing the organisation. From a
CLT perspective, however, these functions have a preference towards learning and creativity
rather than command and control.

Adaptive leadership is a process, rather than any particular formalised leadership
position. It exists in interactions among network members that produce creative change
outcomes within the CAS. It emerges within contexts of asymmetrical interactions. Asymmetry
of authority results in top-down, position-based leadership, whereas asymmetry of preference
enables agents to present differing perspectives, knowledge, skills and technologies. New
knowledge, ideas and adaptations emerge from the clash of these differences and greater insights
can be gained when agents look “beyond original assumptions to something not bounded by
those assumptions” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 307). Importantly, the leadership event is not the responsibility of any one person but is a product of the interactions between agents.

*Enabling leadership* manages the ever-changing shifts between administrative and adaptive functions (Snowden & Boone, 2007), creating and fostering the conditions under which creative and dissipative structures can emerge (Plowman et al., 2007). As Marion and Uhl-Bien (2001, p. 403) argue, “leaders need to understand the patterns of complexity and learn to manipulate the *situations of complexity* more than its results”.

Complexity theory is not without its critics, of whom Morrison (2010) is notable in his focus on school leadership. He argues there is an epistemological paradox around its rejection of linearity, predictability and “totalizing, standardized, positivist behaviour” (Morrison, 2010, p. 379), while at the same time advocating the necessity of its own conceptual constructs. His major critique is that its origins are from the “cool world of the physical sciences” (Morrison, 2010, p. 386). This establishes it as ethically and humanistically neutral, a problematic situation for school leadership which is unequivocally a moral pursuit. This is a difficult criticism to understand. It infers an objectivist ethical stance which seems at odds with the past forty years of sociobiology (Wilson, 1975) and one for which Morrison provides no further justification.

Morrison’s (2010) critique seems, in part, based on a failure to acknowledge the limits theorists have themselves identified with complexity theory; many have considered complexity leadership as a complement to other leadership approaches (Cilliers, 2001; Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Osborn et al., 2002; Snowden & Boone, 2007; Tourish, 2013). It is seen as a framework for understanding (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007), a lens through which to understand the dynamics of leadership for the present and for the future (Wheatley, 2007). The very nature of CAS prohibits CLT from being predictive or prescriptive (Cilliers, 2001). There is
a consistent view, however, that traditional top-down leadership is no longer sufficient, and that leadership is present across the breadth of complex organisations. No top-level leader can know all that goes on within an organisation or understand all the forces acting upon it, thus leadership exists in many forms across the organisation (Dooley, 1997), a view consistent with distributed school leadership literature. As Wheatley (2007, p. 75) forcefully argues, “it is time to wake up to the fact that we live in an interconnected world, embedded in a fabric of relationships that requires us to pay attention to the dynamics of systems, not to isolated individuals or events”.

It is Wheatley’s insight which, paradoxically, gives pause for reflection. The lack of temporalising, lamented by Eacott (2013a), is echoed *a fortiori* by Wheatley (2007, p. 35):

> The self the organization references includes its vision, mission, and values. But there is more. An organization’s identity includes current interpretations of its history, present decisions and activities, and its sense of its future. Identity is both what we want to believe is true and what our actions show to be true about ourselves.

A dynamic, unpredictable and uncertain future is what characterises schools when viewed through the lens of CLT. But there is a balance to be struck. Stability and order has its value and place, but runs the risk of atrophy. Conversely, if a CAS spends too much time in “chaos, it has no memory” (Wheatley, 2007, p. 36).

From this review, a theoretical framework has been developed to guide this research (Figure 3.1). It incorporates a model of complexity leadership theory developed by Uhl-Bien and Arena (2018), Uhl-Bien et al. (2007), and Wheatley (2006, 2007). CLT is a valuable theoretical position through which to view this research for three reasons. First, the literature reviewed across Chapters Two and Three identifies a diversity of complex governance and social contexts within which principals of IB schools exercise leadership. CLT argues that the context of an
organisation is a significant factor impacting a leader’s beliefs and processes (Osborn et al., 2002; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007), which in turn guide their actions. Second, the double-ended arrows reflect interrelationships which (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 307) describe as:

- networks of interaction
- complex patterns of conflicting constraints
- patterns of tension
- interdependent relationships
- rules of action
- direct and indirect feedback loops
- and rapidly changing environmental demands.
These networks, relationships, loops, and environmental demands are reflective of complex contexts in which principals of Australian IB schools work (Morrison, 2010; Wheatley, 2007). Third, CLT’s emphasis on adaptability, learning, and creativity (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007) are of relevance to school leaders as they navigate complex governance and social environments.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter highlights gaps in educational leadership regarding principals in IB schools. In complementary fashion, the absence of research on principals in IB schools is evident. This chapter shows that despite the now extensive literature on principal leadership (AITSL, 2014; Bush & Glover, 2014; Day, Gu, et al., 2016; Dinham, 2016; Hallinger, 2011; Ingvarson et al., 2006; Leithwood et al., 2008; Robinson et al., 2015; Robinson et al., 2008; Wang & Bowers, 2016), little empirical investigation into the role exists within the specific context of Australian IB schools (Bryant et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2012b). Beyond the published work derived from this current research (Kidson, 2016; Kidson et al., 2019), no research on the experiences and perspectives of Australian principals has been located which examines how the presence of IB programmes impacts their leadership.
Chapter Four: A mixed-methods, sequential exploratory process

4.1 Introduction

The review of literature in Chapters Two and Three identified gaps in two significant areas. First, literature on the implementation of the IB in Australia has not examined the experience of principal leadership within Australian schooling contexts. Second, literature on school leadership in Australia has not examined how the presence of IB programmes impacts upon principals. This research, then, seeks to fill gaps in both literatures by undertaking an exploratory inquiry into the experience of principals in leading Australian schools offering IB programmes. Given the absence of prior research, this project is the first to locate and describe the leadership of Australian IB principals. A parsimonious way to address this question is to ask a representative sample group of principals directly. Then, using findings from this inquiry, survey the broader total population of principals in Australian IB schools to compare and contrast the perspectives of the total population with the sample group.

This research therefore employs a mixed methods (QUAL-quan) sequential exploratory case study research design. Phase One comprises semi-structured interviews ($n^1 = 7$) and Phase Two comprises an online questionnaire survey of the total population of 174 Australian IB principals ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%). This chapter details the methodology and research design. It outlines methodological assumptions underpinning the research, then describes the research design and its appropriateness for this investigation. It details sampling, data collection, and analytical methods used in each phase. Ethical considerations are described, and the chapter concludes with examination of credibility, validity, resonance (Charmaz, 2014; Yin, 2014), and researcher bias. Taken together, analysis of the qualitative and quantitative data sets represents a
comprehensive exploration of previously unresearched phenomena, that is, the leadership experiences of principals in Australian IB schools. In this way, the research makes a significant contribution both to scholarship on Australian educational leadership and on the presence of the IB within the Australian educational landscape.

4.2 Research design

Visual representation (Figure 4.1) is useful for succinctly representing key elements of this study. The representation is based on the model of Bulling, Hoffman, Klein, Olsen, and Walles (2006, cited in Creswell and Plano Clark, 2011). Theoretical assumptions of the study are then described, followed by a description of mixed methods research and explanation for the choice of methods and strategies. Finally, details of data collection and analysis for each phase are presented.

4.2.1 Theoretical assumptions

The exploratory nature of the central research question (see 1.2 Background to the study) reflects an overarching constructivist ontology and subjectivist epistemology (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). Constructivist ontology assumes there are multiple intersubjective realities (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) which the subjective agent creates through social settings and relationships. The complexity leadership theory lens through which this study is viewed assumes these.

In this research, the experience of principalship is socially developed and subjectively constructed by the principal within the context of their particular school. The initial mobilising of Bourdieu’s notion of field (Bourdieu, 1993; Eacott, 2013b; Lingard & Christie, 2003) in Chapter
### Study Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Phase</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase One qualitative data collection</td>
<td>Seven semi-structured interviews with principals</td>
<td>Interview schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase One qualitative data analysis</td>
<td>Line-by-line coding (Charmaz, 2014)</td>
<td>Beta version of survey instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic analysis (Braun and Clark, 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta version of survey instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two Quantitative instrument pilot testing</td>
<td>Sampling strategy</td>
<td>Sample recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two quantitative data collection</td>
<td>Survey administered</td>
<td>Survey completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Two quantitative data analysis</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics Non-parametric tests of variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of data analyses</td>
<td>Iterative analyses (Bazeley, 2012)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. *Study design.*

Two locates principal leadership within spatio-temporally subjective spaces. This subjectivity is central to principal perceptions and is therefore consistent with a constructivist ontology. Such particularity is also reflective of the subjectivist epistemology of this study. Chapter Three advances theoretically the concept of *field* to that of complex adaptive systems (CAS) and complexity leadership theory (CLT) (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Wheatley, 2006, 2007). CLT similarly assumes that understanding the organisation and its needs is inherently subjective. In a CAS, the totality of the organisation cannot be known, and the subject creates their understanding within a subjective spatio-temporal moment. As the CAS adapts, so too does subjective understanding. Other agents within the CAS similarly act based on their
subjectively constructed reality, and thus the CAS changes and is changed by multiple subjective social interrelationships (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Wheatley, 2007).

This research is underpinned by a symbolic interactionist approach to interpretation, a theoretical perspective through which actions and language can be interpreted for meaning (Blumer, 1969; Charmaz, 2014). Human actors construct their concepts of self, their understanding of social contexts and their meaning, and their relationship between self and collective society (Goffman, 1959). They also interpret these through shared language (Charmaz, 2014); in the context of this study, subjects use language and concepts that are shared with and familiar to me as an experienced former principal in an Australian IB school. As an interpretive strategy, symbolic interactionism views current reality as incomplete, temporary, malleable, changeable, and open to multiple interpretations (Goffman, 1959). This perspective is helpful for exploratory research involving extensive contextual variation. While this current research claims to present credible and valid findings, future research may reveal contrasts or contradictions to the findings of these temporally located and conceptually subjective findings.

This is because there is not one definitive experience what constitutes the experience of being an Australian IB principal, therefore there must be many constructed understandings, or “multiple realities” (Lincoln et al., 2011, p. 13). This is evident in the demographic profile described in Chapter Two. Principals’ personal leadership is also influenced by their personal histories, cultures and values, shaping the way principals interpret their actions (Best & Kahn, 1999). The experience of leadership for one IB principal, and the perceptions they describe within this research, is thus truthful for them (Goffman, 1959), but not necessarily normative or prescriptive of what it means to be an Australian IB principal.
The second phase of the research design is an online survey questionnaire, a data collection method usually reflective of quantitative research approaches. Such methods are generally considered characteristic of a realist ontology and objectivist epistemology which seem antithetical to interpretive research (Blumer, 1969). Quantitative paradigms typically gather facts related to causation and “empirical regularities” (Robson & McCartan, 2016, p. 21), an approach considered incommensurate with exploratory research. Positivist approaches can devalue sociopolitical factors and be considered incompatible with constructivist ontological perspectives. Post-positivist approaches, by contrast, acknowledge that knowledge is imperfect, and subject to the impact of researcher limitation (Lincoln et al., 2011). As such, truth claims can only be partial, leaving open the possibility that further investigation is needed to modify, augment, or even abandon claims in the light of newer evidence. Alvesson (1996, p. 468) argues that quantitative data are “constructions made by the researcher” that reflect priorities and lines of inquiry of interest to them. As such, they ought not be considered objective per se, but should be treated interpretively through “self-critical consideration of one’s own assumptions and consistent consideration of alternative interpretative lines” (Alvesson, 1996, p. 468). This perspective is useful when analysing quantitative data within an exploratory study and has been adopted here.

Blumer (1969) argues that exploratory research by its very nature embraces any methods which can give insight into the phenomena being explored. He distinguishes two modes of inquiry which characterise a symbolic interactionist approach: exploration and inspection. Exploration is defined as “a flexible procedure in which the scholar shifts from one line of inquiry” (Blumer, 1969, p. 40) to others. One possible purpose in adopting such an approach is to “develop ideas of what are significant lines of relation” (Blumer, 1969, p. 40) between the
phenomena being explored. Inspection is a process whereby key elements of the researched phenomena are further subjected to “intensive focused examination” (Blumer, 1969, p. 43). He uses the metaphor of picking up and observing a physical object, turning it over, examining it from different angles, of asking different questions about the object, and then “returning to its scrutiny from the standpoint of such questions” (Blumer, 1969).

Given the absence of prior research into the experience of Australian IB principals, the Phase One semi-structured interviews comprise an initial exploration of ideas. To develop more comprehensive insights, and consistent with the symbolic interactionist approach advocated by Blumer (1969), this research then inspects these insights across the wider total population of Australian IB principals ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%). This is achieved through a Phase Two survey questionnaire developed from analysis of Phase One findings. Taken together, they represent a subjective interpretive description of principal leadership in Australian IB schools. Notwithstanding the limitations of this study (see 1.4 Limitations of the study), the responses from other IB principals detailed in 4.8 Validity, credibility, and resonance suggest the findings of this study do provide valuable insights to the subjective experiences of principals in Australian IB schools.

### 4.2.2 Mixed methods research designs

Mixed methods research designs have been extensively theorised by scholars over the past 30 years (Bazeley, 2012; Caracelli & Greene, 1993; Greene et al., 1989; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007; Stentz, Plano Clark, & Matkin, 2013; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2010, 2011; Teddlie & Yu, 2007), although some scholars prefer the terminology of multi-strategy on the basis that “they involve not only
combining methods in some way but also [are] using more than one research strategy” (Robson & McCartan, 2016, p. 174; see also Bryman, 2004). More recently, the truncated term *mixed research* has found a vocal advocate in Johnson (2017).

A distinction can be discerned between research which uses two different methods to collect data within the same research paradigm (either qualitative or quantitative) and the use of two (or more) research strategies drawn from different paradigms. For example, Robson and McCartan (2016, p. 174) consider projects “typically combining two or more methods of collecting qualitative data” to be uncontroversial, compared to juxtaposing qualitative and quantitative strategies within the one project such as this current investigation. This current research can thus be considered an example of a multi-strategy design, incorporating a qualitative data collection strategy (semi-structured interview) and a quantitative data collection strategy (survey questionnaire), however the terminology of mixed methods is used for consistency and its more broad presence within the literature.

An agreed definition of mixed methods research remains elusive (Johnson et al., 2007), although the following characteristics are common across a wide range of definitions:

- qualitative and quantitative methods are used within the same research project;
- the research design clearly specifies the sequencing and priority given to the qualitative and quantitative elements of data collection and analysis;
- an explicit account is given of the manner in which the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the research relate to each other; and,
- it exhibits pragmatic theoretical foundations (based on Robson & McCartan, 2016, p. 177).

A fifth feature evident across a number of scholars is a conviction that use of multiple strategies provides better insight to research problems than using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Robson & McCartan,
2016). While different paradigms have their own strengths, some scholars maintain mixed methods benefit from the strengths of both methods in ways that may even provide superior research results (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Yin, 2014). For example, Teddlie and Tashakkori (2011, p. 286) use the term *methodological eclecticism* to emphasise the selection of whatever strategies and techniques have utility to “more thoroughly investigate a phenomenon of interest”. They designate a researcher in this tradition as a “connoisseur of methods who knowledgeably (and often intuitively) selects the best techniques available” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2011, p. 286; italics in original). Recent theorising by Johnson (2017, p. 161) on dialectical pluralism highlights the value of research which values multiple perspectives. Researchers should, he argues:

> carefully listen to, consider, and continually dialogue with qualitative and quantitative perspectives/epistemologies/values/methods and learn from the natural tensions between these while developing a workable solution for each mixed research study.

There is therefore no privileged model of mixed methods research; each project must be designed to be fit for purpose (Johnson et al., 2007). Research strategies arise from consideration of the research question and the suitability of the strategies to provide adequate data for analysis. Development of a research design, its sampling, data collection, and analytic strategies are therefore contingent on the research question and its rationale. The following sections outline how these conditions are met.
4.2.2.1 Rationale for using mixed methods

A frequently cited typology of mixed methods research is that of Greene et al. (1989). They reviewed a range of theoretical works and located 57 empirical studies which identify purposes researchers might have for using a mixed methods approach. They specify five purposes:

*Triangulation* – to increase validity of findings through counteracting inherent biases of heterogenous methods;

*Complementarity* – to increase validity and interpretability by counteracting methodological biases or limitations;

*Development* – to increase validity through using the strengths of different methods;

*Initiation* – to increase the breadth and depth of results by using the strength of different analytical techniques;

*Expansion* – to increase the scope of the inquiry through selection of multiple techniques (based on Greene et al., 1989, p. 259).

This research best reflects a development rationale. The findings from Phase One represent perceptions about principal leadership in Australian IB schools from a limited number of principals obtained via semi-structured interview (qualitative). The administration of the Phase Two survey questionnaire to the total population of Australian IB principals (quantitative) compares findings from the small Phase One group with the total population and thus permits more comprehensive insights into the phenomena of principal leadership in Australian IB schools. It also reflects Eacott’s (2008, p. 274) conclusion that “mixed methods…be applied in the search for greater understanding”, particularly in the area of strategic principal leadership.

Similarly, a recent large scale study by Day, Gu, et al. (2016, p. 227) utilised mixed methods to increase “the possibilities of identifying various patterns of association and possible causal connections between variation”. Exploring variation across school sector and type of programmes offered is enhanced in this study through use of a mixed methods design.
4.2.2.2 Collecting data

Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) identify four elements a researcher must address when designing a mixed methods investigation:

- **Interaction** – the extent to which the two components are independent of one another or are kept separate from one another (see also Greene et al., 1989);
- **Priority** – the emphasis on the respective method in addressing the research question;
- **Timing** – whether the data from differing methods is collected concurrently or sequentially;
- **Mixing** – when and how the two (or more) data sets are integrated.

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p. 22) combine **Priority** and **Timing** into a matrix (Figure 4.2) reflecting how these decisions influence the overall project design. These also reflect findings on development projects reported in the conceptual framework of Greene et al. (1989, p. 267). Their recommendation for development projects is sequential timing of the different methods. One method is implemented first, and the results used to select the sample, develop the instrument, or inform the analysis for the subsequent method. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) describe this as an exploratory sequential approach in which quantitative data is used supplementary to qualitative data for the purposes of advancing the findings from the qualitative analysis (see also Biesta, 2012).

This is also reflected in a review of leadership studies by Stentz et al. (2013). They undertook an investigation into mixed methods research across the period 1990-2012 in *Leadership Quarterly*, a leading journal for management and leadership research (2017 JCR Impact Factor 3.307) and found “no existing review of mixed methods in the field of leadership studies” (Stentz et al., 2013, p. 1174) had been undertaken. This contrasts with notable growth of
mixed methods in other social sciences during this period (see Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011, Ch.2). Their search located only 15 mixed methods studies, of which nine used sequential data collection timing strategies. Such a high proportion of sequential collection timing supports a strategy where “insights emerging from one component [lead] to the implementation of another component” as “the results of one method [are used] to shape the implementation of the other” (Stentz et al., 2013, p. 1180).

This research design follows the recommendations of Greene et al. (1989), the exploratory sequential description of Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), and is consistent with the analysis conducted by Stentz et al. (2013). It is sequential in the timing of its data collection, using results from Phase One data analysis to develop and refine the Phase Two questionnaire. However, it differs from Greene et al. (1989) regarding sample selection. The sample selection for Phase Two is the total population of 174 Australian IB principals ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%), a decision derived from the initial research question, rather than analysis of Phase One data.

---

**Time Order**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm Status</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>Sequential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>QUAL + QUAN</td>
<td>QUAL → QUAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUAN → QUAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Decision Status</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>Sequential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal Status</td>
<td>QUAL + quan</td>
<td>qual → QUAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Status</td>
<td>QUAN + qual</td>
<td>QUAL → quan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis Decision Status</th>
<th>Concurrent</th>
<th>Sequential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal Status</td>
<td>QUAL + quan</td>
<td>qual → QUAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Status</td>
<td>QUAN + qual</td>
<td>QUAL → quan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2. *Mixed methods design matrix.*
Based on Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p. 22)
4.2.2.3 Analysing and interpreting data

Mixed methods research design must give consideration as to how and at what stage there is integration of data analysis and interpretation. Greene et al. (1989, p. 270) found four approaches in their review:

- No integration – analysis and interpretation remain separate;
- Integration during interpretation only – analysis occurs separately, but some integration is attempted during the interpretation phase;
- Integration occurs during both analysis and interpretation;
- Analyses not reported.

They found nearly half their sample studies (44%) made no attempt to integrate analysis and interpretation of the data, 32% attempted integration during the interpretation phase, and less than 10% attempted integration during both analysis and interpretation. Within the small sample group of development studies \( n = 7 \), there is equal distribution of analysis category according to research purpose. Two studies report no integration, two report integration at the implementation phase, one reports integration during both analysis and interpretation, and two do not report any analysis. In this present study, findings from Phase Two analysis are compared and contrasted to findings from Phase One, reflecting the second category indicated by Greene et al. (1989), that analysis is conducted separately but integration attempted at the interpretation phase.

Bazeley (2012) provides more detailed strategies for integrating analysis in mixed methods research. The strategy most suited to this study is “using one form of data to inform the design or analysis of another” (Bazeley, 2012, p. 819). In this study, qualitative data analysis is used to inform both the final design of the Phase Two online survey questionnaire and the quantitative analysis is compared and contrasted to the qualitative analysis during the interpretation phase.
4.3 Phase One – semi-structured interviews

4.3.1 Strategy

Phase One comprises case studies of principal leadership in seven Australian IB schools through semi-structured interviews with each school’s principal. The schools represent a range of Australian IB school contexts, identified through a maximum variation purposeful sampling process. Six of the participant interviews were held in the office of the principal within their school; one was held in an educational services office in a location mutually convenient to the participant and researcher (Appendix A). Informed consent was given in the form of signed consent forms (Appendix B). Interviews were digitally recorded on two separate devices, transcribed by me, and transcripts returned to participants for member checking, editing (if necessary), and approval. Transcripts were analysed using techniques drawn from constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) and thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

4.3.2 Sampling

Phase One of this study comprises seven Australian IB schools identified using maximum variation purposeful sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002; Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Maximum variation purposeful sampling is a useful strategy both to identify variations within groups as well as to identify commonalities. This sampling method identifies variation of certain characteristics across Australian IB schools and is “aimed at producing contrasting cases” (Teddlie & Yu, 2007, p. 81). The characteristics selected here are based on my expert judgement as to what is of interest and significance to the research question (Robson & McCartan, 2016), given 11½ years’ direct experience as a principal, including 5½ years in a three-programme IB
school. Maximum variation purposeful sampling explores the significance of the variation to the case being studied, rather than commonality (Patton, 2002). The strategy provides insights to the significance of the variation across cases (Flyvbjerg, 2011). Given the exploratory nature of this investigation, maximum variation purposeful sampling is a useful strategy to cover the range of variation present in Australian IB schools.

4.3.3 Sampling strata

There are three relevant “School Contexts” strata represented in the theoretical framework developed to guide this research (see Figure 3.1):

1. socio-economic educational advantage (ICSEA);
2. number of IB programmes offered (1, 2, or 3);
3. governance (by state and sector).

From the demographic profile presented in Chapter Two (Table 2.5), the following can be observed:

1. 34% are government schools, while 66% are non-government schools;
2. 76% are single programme schools, 17% two programme schools, and 6% three programme schools;
3. Wide variation exists within single and two programme school profiles. 46% of all schools are single programme PYP schools, 10% are MYP schools, and 17% are DP schools. The most popular combination for two programme schools is the PYP and DP (n = 18; 9% of total schools), followed by PYP and MYP (n = 15; 8% of total schools). Only five schools offer the combination of the MYP and DP;
4. ICSEA scores vary widely (936 – 1208), however, the distribution has a moderate negative skew of -0.71, kurtosis of 0.22, and Pearson’s coefficient of -0.82 (Figure 4.3; bin width = 20). Together, these indicate a greater concentration of schools with higher ICSEA values (Doherty, 2012). This concentration is also reflected in the sample population of Phase One participants (see 4.3.4 Sample size).
The analysis above provides a matrix of multiple cases to study which represent similarities or differences (Robson & McCartan, 2016) in the experience of principalship. The sample population includes co-educational and single-sex schools, but this has not been included as a stratum for the purposes of sampling.

Although this research explores the experience of principal leadership in Australian IB schools, the sampling strategy chosen is based on variation of the school context. Chapters Two and Three identified the importance to leadership of school context; in particular, 2.8 Eschewing homogeneity: in search of an Australian “IB World School” highlights significant variation in Australian IB schools, underscoring a requirement to select case sites which reflect this variation in an endeavour to answer the central research question. Fidler, Jones, McBurnie, Makori, and Boparai (2006) and Fidler and Jones (2005) found that principals deemed to be successful in one school context (i.e., small, rural, outer metropolitan) do not necessarily succeed when transferred into differing contexts (i.e., large, urban, inner metropolitan). Given the central research question in this study explores how the presence of IB programmes impacts the experience of principal leadership, selecting cases based on the variation of school context, rather than variation of principal experience, is considered more appropriate.

Cases are always bounded (Harrison, Birks, Franklin, & Mills, 2017; Yin, 2014). This can refer to geography as well as spatio-temporality. In the context of this research, boundedness refers both to temporality and governance. Regarding temporality, this research collected Phase One data during the early part of 2016, and for Phase Two, during September 2017. The perceptions of participants are acknowledged to be those held by participants at those particular times. Simultaneously, each participant was subject to governing authorities and processes pertinent at the time of both interview and questionnaire survey. The concept of boundedness
acknowledges that these constraints may change, but are relevant constructs for the purposes of this current study.

4.3.4 Sample size

There is no agreed sample size for qualitative interview research designs (Charmaz, 2014; Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006; Mason, 2010; Teddlie & Yu, 2007; Yin, 2014). The central consideration for the qualitative researcher is to ensure sufficient subjects are selected so that quality data is collected to address the research question, and that the selection strategy is appropriate for identifying a relevant sample population. Sample size is not a question of being large or small, but of being too large or too small because “inadequate sample sizes can undermine the credibility of research findings” (Sandelowski, 1995, p. 179).

A range of literature supports the contention smaller sample sizes do not diminish the credibility of research findings. Collins’ (2010) summary of sampling size recommendations highlights case studies ranging between 3-5, with phenomenological studies ranging between 6-10, while Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) note that case studies are typically between 4-10. Collins (2010) reviewed six empirical studies which use interviews as a data collection strategy and where sample sizes ranged from 6-9 to 8-12. The average of minimum reported numbers across the six studies is 6.3, and the average of maximum reported numbers is 10.8. In their analysis of sampling size based on the rate of code development in interviews, Guest et al. (2006) found that 73% of their codes were identified within the first six interviews. This had increased to 92% by the conclusion of twelve interviews, leading them to hypothesise that analysis of interviews in smaller sample sizes can generate sufficient data to approach theoretical saturation.
Yin (2014) argues the language of sampling does not apply to case studies, based on the distinction between analytical and statistical generalisation. Where statistical generalisation relies on the adequacy of sampling to draw generalised conclusions from the broader population, analytic generalisation seeks to develop higher conceptual and theoretical insights which may have reach beyond the specific project. Rather, he advocates that selection of cases be considered for the extent to which they can “shed empirical light” (Yin, 2014, p. 40) on the research topic. Analytic generalisation thus rests not on the quantity of sample cases selected, but on having sufficient relevant data and on the quality of its analytic credibility and integrity. Homogeneity, or the extent to which the sample population has similarity, also supports use of smaller sampling sizes. Guest et al. (2006, p. 75) argue that homogenous sample sizes using a schedule with “a
certain degree of structure within interviews” will likely reach a position of theoretical saturation with lower sample sizes.

The final sample size of seven for this current study falls within these ranges and meets these criteria, although a size of eight was initially sought. Eight schools were identified using the maximum variation purposeful sampling strategy. Principals of these schools were approached via email during September 2015 seeking their willingness to participate, contingent on ethics approval (Appendix C). The schools were spread across New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory. Two principals declined to participate from the outset, thus another two schools were identified with the same contextual characteristics. Principals of these schools were approached to replace those who declined. Four principals agreed to participate and gave email notification of their approval. One participant withdrew for health reasons, while another failed to respond to repeated requests to confirm willingness to participate in the study. Two further schools were identified using the maximum variation sampling strategy and principals of those schools approached as replacements. One principal who indicated agreement to participate was subsequently forced to withdraw due to their state department of education declining to give ethical approval complementary to that provided by the University of Sydney’s Human Research Ethics Committee (see 4.7 Ethical considerations).

Another state department of education declined to approve the ethics application. This process took in excess of three months, during which time the other seven interviews were conducted. In consultation with the research supervisory team, consideration was given to proceeding with analysis of the seven interviews already concluded. Time constraints, and the view that limited new insights would likely emerge from further interviews, resulted in the
decision not to proceed with seeking an eighth participant. This was confirmed during initial
coding where only 12 unique codes (from a total of 330 initial codes) were generated in coding
the last interview transcript, and 23 from the second last. In total, these 35 codes represent
10.6%, thus 89.4% of codes were developed through initial coding of the first five participant
transcripts, consistent with the experience of Guest et al. (2006).

Table 4.1 matches the maximum variation sampling strategy identified in the theoretical
framework to participant schools, using pseudonyms; detailed descriptions of the schools and
their pseudonyms are given in 4.3.5 Case schools and principal participant details. Only three
Australian schools currently offer the CP (Table 2.5) and they are not included in this sample
group due to their small proportion as a sub-population within the entire population of Australian
IB schools. A comparison between the Phase One sample and the total Australian IB population
by strata is also provided (Table 4.1).

4.3.5 Case schools and principal participant details

The final sample population is located across New South Wales, South Australia, and Victoria.
Case details do not indicate in which state each school is located as this may enable identification
of participants, contrary to the requirement for de-identification required by the University of
Sydney’s Human Research Ethics Committee approval (Appendix D). Fictitious school names
are used throughout this research (Table 4.2). When identifying the school, its full title is used;
initials are used when referring only to the principal of that school. School pseudonyms (in
alphabetical order) reference key global centres of the IB, with the exception of St Donat’s
School which is named after the location of Atlantic College, a school which was instrumental in
establishing the IB (Peterson, 1972, 2003).
Table 4.1 Phase One total population to sample population comparison.
Source: ACARA (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Sample %</th>
<th>Var</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single programme</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two programmes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three programmes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bethesda School (BS)** is a large\(^{15}\), coeducational government secondary high school and is located in a metropolitan city; 34% of students have a language background other than English and there are no students enrolled who identify as indigenous\(^{16}\). The principal has no teaching or educational leadership experience outside of Australia.

**Cardiff School (CS)** is a large, boys’ only non-government primary and secondary combined school and is located in a metropolitan city; 18% of students have a language background other than English and 1% identify as indigenous. The principal worked previously at an IB school but not in the role of principal. The principal previously lead a school internationally, but it does not offer IB programmes.

**Geneva School (GS)** is a large, multi-campus girls’ non-government primary and secondary combined school and is located in a metropolitan city; 17% of students have a language background other than English and there are no students enrolled who identify as indigenous. It has one primary campus that is girls’ only and one campus that is coeducational.

\(^{15}\) School size definitions come from *Australian Education Act 2013* (Cth) s.43.

\(^{16}\) Language Background other than English (LBOTE) and percentage of indigenous student data for each school are sourced from ACARA (2019), accessed October 10, 2018.
Table 4.2 Profile of Phase One Pseudonym Cases.
Source: ACARA (2019); IBO (2018f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G/NG</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>C/G/B</th>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>ICSEA</th>
<th>1Q</th>
<th>4Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda School</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff School</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>R-12</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva School</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>C/G</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland School</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>R-7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore School</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Donat's School</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague School</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg 1150 66.9 1.9
Max 1189 81 3
Med 1152 68 2
Min 1101 48 1

Note.

G/NG: Governance context of school - government (G) or non-government (NG).

Years: Years of schooling offered.

C/G/B: School enrolment profile by co-educational, girls only or boys only. Note. Geneva School is predominantly a girls’ school, but provides coeducation in one of its primary schools.

ICSEA: School’s ICSEA (ACARA, 2018a).

1Q: Percentage of students in the top (1st) quartile of Socio-Educational Advantage (ACARA, 2019).

4Q: Percentage of students in the bottom (4th) quartile of Socio-Educational Advantage (ACARA, 2019).

The principal worked previously at an IB school as an executive staff member, but was not principal of that school. The principal has no teaching or educational leadership experience outside of Australia.

17 These data are from 2015; ACARA (2019) does not provide data for 2016 and 2017.
Table 4.3 *Phase One participant demographic profile.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Pseudonym</th>
<th>Years as principal</th>
<th>First IB school as principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Current School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Avg | 15.0 |      | 5.9 |                  |                  |
| Max | 35   |      | 14  |                  |                  |
| Med | 14   |      | 4   |                  |                  |
| Min | 2    |      | 2   |                  |                  |

*Note.* Pseudonym initials which represent principals refer to case schools.

**Maryland School** (MS) is a large, coeducational government primary school and is located on the fringe of a metropolitan city; 4% of students have a language background other than English and 2% identify as indigenous. The principal has no teaching or educational leadership experience outside of Australia.

**Singapore School** (SS) is a large, multi-campus coeducational non-government primary and secondary combined school and is located in a metropolitan city; 21% of students have a language background other than English and there are no students enrolled who identify as indigenous. The principal previously worked outside Australia as an educational consultant to international schools across the Asia-Pacific region, but has no teaching experience outside Australia.
St Donat’s School (SDS) is a large, coeducational non-government primary and secondary combined school and is located in a major regional city; 4% of students have a language background other than English and 2% identify as indigenous. The principal has no teaching or educational leadership experience outside of Australia.

The Hague School (THS) is a large, girls’ non-government primary and secondary combined school and is located in a metropolitan city; 2% of students have a language background other than English and there are no students enrolled who identify as indigenous. The principal held a senior leadership role in a school outside of Australia, but the school did not offer IB programmes.

Some principals in this research lead schools whose name includes the term college, so the generic term school is used throughout this thesis, consistent with the ethical requirements of de-identification. Where participant in vivo comments refer to their school using the term college, this has been replaced with school.

Two participants concluded their employment following participation in Phase One of the research, and one school altered the number of IB programmes it offered; this analysis uses interview transcripts approved by participants prior to these changes. Two of the principals were able to be contacted and expressed their wish for their data to remain in the research as it reflected their experience at the time of interview; the third had subsequently retired and was unable to be contacted, although completed a signed consent form as part of the interview process and provided email approval of the edited transcript. As this research utilises a maximim variation purposive sampling method, the schools and participants included in Phase One are representative of the total population of IB schools across Australia, notwithstanding these subsequent changes.
4.3.6 Data collection and checking

The schedule for Phase One semi-structured interviews is included as Appendix E. Interviews were conducted according to the following protocol:

- Arrive at designated location ahead of time and complete school-based identification processes;
- Informal welcome and thanks;
- Explanation of the research, request and receive signed consent form;
- Notify participant of the commencement of audio recording;
- Proceed with interview schedule;
- Conclude interview with notification the audio recording is switched off;
- Informal thanks for participating in the interview;
- Remind participant that verbatim transcript will be forwarded for editing and approval.

All participants acknowledged receipt and acceptance of the Participant Information Sheet and provided signed Participant Consent Forms (Appendix F). The Participant Consent Form includes consent to have the interview audio recorded.

Interviews were digitally recorded on two devices to prevent loss of data through equipment failure. The first device was the laptop provided by the University of Sydney using pre-loaded voice recording software. The second device was my iPhone using the Voice Record app. Interviews varied in length between 28 minutes and 1 hour, 9 minutes (Table 4.4).

Recordings were transcribed verbatim by me into Microsoft Word format.

All interview transcripts were returned to participants for checking and editing. Five participants returned their transcript unedited; two made edits. All transcripts were approved by participants via email correspondence. Approved transcripts were loaded into NVivo for analysis. NVivo formatted transcripts were checked for completeness against the initial Microsoft Word versions.
Table 4.4. *Phase One participant interview lengths.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>word count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1:09</td>
<td>8,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0:38</td>
<td>4,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>0:48</td>
<td>6,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>9,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>0:28</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>0:39</td>
<td>4,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THS</td>
<td>1:05</td>
<td>8,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4:33</td>
<td>43,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0:50</td>
<td>6,218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Data analysis

Phase One data were analysed using techniques drawn from constructive grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) and thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012; Robson & McCartan, 2016). Constructive grounded theory coding techniques are useful heuristic devices (Charmaz, 2014) which support inductive analytic strategies, particularly for initial coding. Thematic analysis is a useful approach for an exploratory project as it seeks to give detailed contextual description and interpretation of studied phenomena. Thematic analysis can approach data deductively by using a theoretical framework that has been developed from a preceding literature review, but Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 83) also note an inductive, or “data driven”, approach is acceptable when undertaking thematic analysis.

Analysis followed the process described by Braun and Clarke (2006) and refined by Robson and McCartan (2016). This involves familiarisation of the data, generating initial codes,
identifying and refining themes. A focused theoretical framework (Charmaz, 2014) was constructed to guide refinement of the draft online survey questionnaire (see 4.4 Phase Two – online questionnaire survey).

4.3.7.1 Familiarisation with the data
This involves extensive immersion, or “play” (Yin, 2014, p. 135), with the data. Transcription was undertaken by me as an immersive strategy (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and imported to NVivo. Transcripts were initially read as a complete data set (Corbin & Strauss, 2015) and initial notes made (Appendix G). Separate memos (Yin 2014) were written for each individual transcript, recording initial ideas. An example (THS) is included as Appendix H.

4.3.7.2 Initial coding
Initial coding can be suggested by experiences and knowledge of key concepts drawn from a researcher’s personal prior experience. This acknowledges a researcher’s subjective perspective (Charmaz, 2014) and Yin’s (2014) observation that experienced practitioners often bring to their analysis extensive “prior, expert knowledge” (Yin, 2014, p. 168; emphasis in original). J. L. Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, and Pedersen (2013) also assert that extensive background knowledge of the subject is critical to effective coding. While my experience as a principal of an IB school is clearly beneficial to the coding process, as noted by Charmaz (2014), Yin (2014), and J. L. Campbell et al. (2013), it was felt these prior experiences could also bias development of initial coding, rather than allow initial codes to emerge which reflect participants’ subjective experiences. It was decided therefore to use constructivist grounded theory techniques of line-by-
line coding using gerunds and constant comparison (Charmaz, 2014, pp. 124-133) to reduce the impact of potential bias.

The use of gerunds and constant comparative methods is grounded in a researcher’s subjective perspective and experience and is thus consistent with the symbolic interactionist approach outlined in 4.2.1 **Theoretical assumptions**. As Saldaña (2013, p. 4; italics added. See also Corbin & Strauss, 2015) identifies, “a code is a researcher-generated construct that symbolizes and thus attributes interpreted meaning to each datum for later purposes of pattern detection, categorization, theory building, and other analytical processes”. By contrast, however, Charmaz (2014, p. 132) cautions that prior knowledge and concepts can lead a researcher to “prejudge what is happening” and thus miss important ideas which better reflect participants’ subjective experiences or language. To minimise this possibility, the discipline of line-by-line coding using gerunds acts as a device to constrain over-generalising or premature interpretation. The use of gerunds focuses analysis on actions and topics from the perspective of the participant, not the prior assumptions of the researcher. Line-by-line coding also helps a researcher remain focused on the perspective of the participant as coding progresses through the transcript. This becomes particularly helpful when accompanied by constant comparison as new transcripts are analysed.

Transcripts of interviews with two non-government school principals and two government school principals were analysed to create the majority of initial codes (Guest et al., 2006). Constant comparison was used during coding of the remaining transcripts. Analytic memos (Charmaz, 2014; Saldaña, 2013) were written throughout this process (Appendix I).

Initial codes were then subjected to analysis and a second cycle coding process (Saldaña, 2013), also in NVivo. Initial codes were analysed to identify those which suggested more
theoretical and conceptual “reach, direction and clarity” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 141) based on the theoretical framework (Figure 3.1). Codes were then merged into focused codes or discarded on the basis of their limited relevance. The data set was then recoded accordingly.

4.3.7.3 Intercoder agreement

Reliability of qualitative research is generally considered to be based, in part, on a process of intercoder agreement (Guest et al., 2012), although approaches to intercoder checking vary. This is particularly important for projects where coding is undertaken predominantly by one coder, such as this current project. J. L. Campbell et al. (2013) distinguish between inter-coder reliability, where two or more coders use the same code for selections of text, and inter-coder agreement, where two or more coders discuss discrepancies and are able to reconcile these differences. Guest et al. (2012) identify three processes for judging intercoder agreement.

Subjective assessment is a process where two (or more) coders compare their coding and, where differences exist, discuss these and recode in light of the outcome of the discussion. The second approach quantifies how many times there is agreement or disagreement and divides this by the total number of coding comparisons, producing a percentage result. The third is calculation of a Kappa coefficient which calculates the likelihood of intercoder agreement being the product of chance. They also note that a Kappa coefficient is less appropriate for small sample projects, of which this qualifies as one (see 4.3.4 Sample size).

By contrast, Bazeley and Jackson (2013, p. 93) question the value of this process for individual research projects on the basis that solo investigators have their own goals and perspectives on a research project that may not be shared by others outside the project. Rather, they argue it is important that solo researchers keep track of how their analysis is developing,
about how decisions on coding and analysis are reached, and how the analytical case is gradually built. In these circumstances, they suggest having experienced coders review samples and discuss their views about the analysis undertaken. Robson and McCartan (2016) caution against having too much confidence in one’s own judgement alone and argue there is merit for another experienced coder to review sample text and coding in order to advance a discussion on the merits of the coding.

This project used the review and discussion process advocated by Bazeley and Jackson (2013) and supported by Robson and McCartan (2016). After initial coding was completed, I reviewed and discussed the coding with the supervisory team, one of whom is senior lecturer in research methodology. However, it was also felt valuable to have two other doctoral research students who were unfamiliar with the study review a transcript and codes used in its analysis. One was at the same university, but not in the field of educational leadership, and the other was from another local university and undertaking research in educational leadership; neither have any direct experience of IB schools. Conceptual briefing of central tenets of complexity leadership theory were provided to the two doctoral research students, given their lack of scholarly experience in the field. All four reviewers agreed the coding developed showed “adequacy and conceptual strength [in the] initial codes” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 140).

4.3.7.4 Identifying and refining themes

Codes were grouped into identifiable themes using the following processes:

- Word frequency count (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013);
- Metaphors and analogies (Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015);
- Cross-case comparisons (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013);
- Manifest and latent theme comparisons (Boyatzis, 1998);
Negative case analysis (Guest et al., 2012). Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to this process as the pulling together of “a lot of material into more meaningful and parsimonious units of analysis” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 19). Their creation assists the researcher in generating a thematic map showing themes, sub-themes, and relationships between them. Braun and Clarke (2006) note this process relies extensively on researcher judgement as to what counts as a meaningful theme, reinforcing the significance of theoretical sensitivity (Charmaz, 2014). It is not necessarily based on the number of instances that the theme appears, but on “whether it captures something important in relation to the overall research question” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82).

Themes were then reviewed in an iterative manner for their integrity and validity. This process involved review of the entire data set, review of early coding themes, review of the project journal, and writing of analytic memos as themes were revised, discarded, or relationships between themes reconfigured. Central to this review process were two considerations by the researcher in discussion with the supervisory team:

1. What processual dynamics are evident in participant comments, and to what extent might these reflect CAS dynamics; and,

2. To what extent do emerging themes, and the relationships between them, reflect or contrast with conceptual elements of CLT?

A project log, analysis workbook, and summary memos (Corbin & Strauss, 2015) document this process.

4.3.7.5 Focused thematic framework

A focused thematic framework (Charmaz, 2014) was developed initially on the basis of the thematic analysis outlined above. An iterative series of theoretical models were developed,
evaluated, and modified in consultation with the supervisory team. Once the model was conceptually stable, it was discussed with another doctoral research student not working in the field of educational leadership. Three experienced principals were given opportunity to examine and respond to the model. The first is an experienced principal (11 years) but is only in their second year in an IB school; their school is an established three programme (PYP, MYP, DP) school which also employs a number of staff accredited by the IB to run staff training workshops and school authorisation/evaluation visits on behalf of the IB. This colleague was approached due to having recent non-IB school experience and limited IB experience. The second is also an experienced principal (28 years) currently in his seventh year in a one programme (DP) school. Prior to moving to his current school, he spent 13 years in a three-programme (PYP, MYP, DP). The third is a less experienced principal (3 years) and has never worked in an IB school. All three principals and the doctoral research student were asked:

- are the ideas and their interconnections clear?
- are there any concepts, or links between them, which do not resonate?
- are there key ideas which seem to be missing?

This was to gauge how clearly the model communicated core thematic ideas and their relationships to an audience unfamiliar with the field of research. There was broad agreement among all four concerning the model’s coherence and conceptual value.

### 4.4 Phase Two – online survey questionnaire

Phase Two comprises a web-based self-completion survey questionnaire of the total population of 174 Australian IB principals ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%). Questionnaires are useful research strategies for the collection of survey data from a larger sample group. They operate most effectively when utilising standardised questions, although an exploratory study can benefit from
both closed and open items (Robson & McCartan, 2016). This questionnaire predominantly uses closed items, but includes some open items.

### 4.4.1 Sampling

Principals of every Australian IB school were invited by phone and email to participate in the questionnaire which was available via a secure website between September 5, 2017, and September 20, 2017. Robson and McCartan (2016) note that even where the possibility of surveying a total population exists, as is the case with this research, low response rates can reduce the representativeness of findings. Strategies for optimising responses should be implemented. Nulty’s (2008) review of literature found a consistently lower response rate amongst studies with online collection methods (33%) compared to paper surveys (56%). His suggested strategies to improve response rates include pre-contact, use of regular reminder notifications and follow-up phone contact. Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2014) also recommend personal connection as a useful strategy for increasing response rates. These strategies were implemented in this research design.

A review of the IB schools website was taken on July 5, 2017. On that day, the IB listed 181 schools in Australia (IBO, 2018f); after adjustment for multi-campus schools (see 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia), the total population of Australian IB schools was 174. I already held email addresses for Phase One participants as well as for six additional principals with whom I maintain regular professional contact and who were aware of the overall research. These thirteen schools did not receive a phone call invitation as principals in these schools were already aware an email invitation would be sent to them in due course. All other Australian IB schools were phoned between August 30, 2017 and September 5, 2017. The delay
in timing between the capture of school information (July 5, 2017) and the phone calls made was
due to modification of the project’s ethics approval and subsequent modification of the REDCap
survey instrument (see 4.4.2 Survey Instrument). Initial phone calls were made to explain the
research and obtain an address for an email invitation to be sent to the principal.

4.4.2 Survey instrument

The survey comprises questions on school profile, IB programme authorisation, governance, IB
support, time spent on various leadership duties, decision making, teaching and learning,
additional language learning, teacher understanding of the IB, parent understanding of the IB,
student understanding of the IB, and personal health and well-being. Open ended questions for
all sections of the survey were included in the form “is there anything further about [SUBJECT]
you would like to add?” except the school profile and IB programme authorisation sections.
Participants were provided with a Participant Information Sheet to download from the first page,
along with a requirement to give informed consent via a checkbox.

An initial version of the questionnaire was developed using items from the 2013
Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) Principals’ Questionnaire (OECD, 2014),
combined with items from the 2013 Staff in Australia’s Schools (SiAS) Questionnaire
(McKenzie et al., 2014). As an exploratory investigation, it was felt these two instruments were
valid to use for construction of a questionnaire of principals for the following reasons:

1. The TALIS questionnaire has undergone extensive international development by the
   OECD;
2. It is informed by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)
   instrument, which has itself been extensively used and reviewed (Hallinger, 2008,
   2011). While it should be noted that Hallinger is both the developer of PIMRS as well
   as the one undertaking the review, the journal in which the review appeared uses a
blind-referred peer review editorial policy, lending weight to his conclusion that the instrument has validity and reliability;

3. Items chosen from the 2013 TALIS questionnaire seek responses from principals which reflect the Elements and Factors shown in the theoretical framework (Figure 3.1) developed to guide this research.

Items from the 2013 SiAS survey have been chosen for the following reasons:

1. The 2013 survey used items developed initially for the 2007 SiAS survey (McKenzie, Kos, Walker, & Hong, 2008). The 2007 SiAS survey developed questionnaire items whose language would be meaningful across all Australian educational sectors and states; the population of schools covered in this research is also across sectors and states;

2. The initial 2007 SiAS questionnaire was designed consistent with the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ *A Dictionary of Standards for Education and Training Statistics* (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2004);

3. The 2013 survey was amended to reflect the development of the AITSL Standard (AITSL, 2014) which had been finalised between administration of the 2010 and 2013 surveys;

4. The items chosen from the 2013 SiAS questionnaire seek responses from principals which reflect the Elements and Factors shown in the theoretical framework (Figure 3.1) developed to guide this research.

This first version of the survey questionnaire was approved as part of the University of Sydney’s ethics approval process. However, following analysis of Phase One data, it was felt there was need to modify the survey to include themes that emerged during analysis which were more relevant to the central research question, reflecting the observation of Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004, p. 20) that “sometimes a design may emerge during a study in new ways, depending on the conditions and information that is obtained”. Important themes specifically related to the IB were not represented in the first version of the survey and a modified instrument with new items was therefore developed.
These new items matched themes identified in Phase One and were reviewed by the supervisory team. Three experienced non-IB principals were engaged to pre-test the questionnaire for question meaning, ambiguity, procedural clarity, and timing length (Robson & McCartan, 2016). Feedback was included in the final draft which was subjected to a modification of the initial ethics approval process. The revised survey questionnaire was approved on July 21, 2017 (Appendix J).

**4.4.3 Data collection**

The instrument detailed above was translated into an online platform using the University of Sydney’s REDCap software. Initial invitation emails were sent to the sample frame of 137 principals at 11:19am on September 5, 2017. In order to minimise low non-response rates (Dillman et al., 2014), three follow up emails were sent at 9:30am on September 8, 2017, 9:30am on September 15, 2017, and 12:03pm on September 18, 2017. Relevant schools were identified in REDCap through the *Manage survey participants* facility which records whether a participant has completed, partially completed, or not commenced the questionnaire. All schools showing “Incomplete”, “Incomplete (no data saved)”, or “Partial survey response” received follow up email invitations. The survey closed at 5:00pm on September 20, 2017. At that time, all data was downloaded and saved to both the project laptop and copied to the University of Sydney’s Research Data Store (see **4.6 Data storage and security**).

Participation in the questionnaire was voluntary. Participants completed a checkbox to indicate acknowledgement and receipt of the Participant Information Sheet; this process also served as provision of consent.
4.4.4 Sample bias and non-response bias

Obtaining an adequate response rate (RR) is foundational to the credibility of any findings which emerge from analysis (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). Nulty (2008) acknowledges that high rates (>70%) have greater generalisability but acknowledges they also incur higher cost and have greater impracticalities. By contrast, a lower RR brings generalisability into question and requires the researcher to analyse comparative results between respondents and non-respondents. This can lead to sample error and sample bias. Baruch’s (1999) meta-analysis of mailed-out and returned questionnaires found a mean of 55.6% ($SD = 19.7$) among general population surveys, although this declines to 36.1% when the target population works at a chief executive level, such as principals. Cook, Heath, & Thompson’s (2000) meta-analysis of early generation web-based surveys returned a mean of 39.6% ($SD = 19.6$), while Nulty (2008) found an even lower rate of 33%.

Calculation of a RR must also indicate what constitutes a usable response. Baruch (1999) considers questionnaires with missing data as unusable. Baruch and Holtom (2008, p. 1142) argue for removal of responses with missing data when calculating RR and contend the RR should “utilize the number of usable questionnaires as the numerator in calculating RR”. By contrast, Response Rate 2 and Cooperation Rate 2 categories specified by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Internet Surveys of Specifically Named Persons (American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2016a) provide for inclusion of partially completed responses. This is considered a useful strategy to capture as much data as possible and has been employed in this study, given its exploratory nature.

The AAPOR method of calculation assumes “that the target population is synonymous with the sampling frame and thus is defined as those persons on the list with Internet access and
a working e-mail address” (American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2016a, p. 43). I contacted each school to obtain the principal’s email address, thereby ensuring the sampling frame matched the email distribution list used to disseminate the embedded link to the questionnaire. This process addresses the assumption that the person completing the online questionnaire is “the named respondent…at the sampled e-mail address and/or otherwise still eligible for inclusion” (American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2016a, p. 43).

4.4.5 Analysis

Data was tested first for normality using mean, standard deviation, skew, kurtosis, and Q-Q plots based on ICSEA. These showed non-normal distribution of the whole population and normal distribution for the Phase Two sample.

Summary tables were generated for responses to Likert items on governance, the IB office, decision making processes, curriculum related issues, language, and personal well-being. Sectoral comparisons were made by running Mann-Whitney tests for each item. Kruskall Wallis tests were run using the strata of ICSEA quartiles, the number of IB programmes offered (1, 2, or 3), and the types of programmes offered (PYP; MYP; DP; PYP and MYP; PYP and DP; PYP, MYP, and DP). Correlation tests were conducted between items in each section of the questionnaire, as well as between relevant individual items from across sections of the questionnaire. Further Crosstabs analyses were conducted on a number of items and are reported in context throughout Chapter Six.

Open ended comments are reported.
4.6 Data storage and security

A Research Data Management Plan was established prior to collection of data, consistent with University of Sydney policy (University of Sydney, 2013) and procedures (University of Sydney, 2014). Phase One interview audio recording files, transcripts, and NVivo analysis files were located during the research period on a password protected laptop provided by the university. Signed consent forms were kept in a secure file in a locked office. Phase Two original data was stored on the university’s REDCap servers until the expiry of the survey collection period. On completion of Phase Two data collection, the full dataset was exported from REDCap and stored on the university-provided laptop, followed by an immediate data backup to the Research Data Store on September 20, 2017.

4.7 Ethical considerations

Bryman and Bell (2015) articulate ten principles to guide ethical research. This research has been conducted consistent with both these principles and those of the National Health and Medical Research Council, the Australian Research Council, and Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (2015). At all points, this research was guided by Bryman and Bell’s (2015) overriding concerns for participant safety and dignity. Phase One participants were reminded they could withdraw either during or following the interviews, and they were given opportunity to review, edit, and approve the interview transcription. Other relevant principles, with which this study complied, are that:

- **Full consent should be obtained from the participants prior to the study:** All Phase One participants were provided with an advance copy of the ethical approval notification. All participants completed a signed consent form that was handed to the researcher prior to
the commencement of the interview. Participants were also advised they could stop or withdraw from the interview at any point; none did. Phase Two participants selected a checkbox on the first page of the online questionnaire indicating they had accessed the Participation Information Sheet (downloaded via the first webpage of the questionnaire) and given informed consent to participate; they were also given opportunity at that point not to give consent and which then terminated the survey.;

- *The protection of the privacy of research participants has to be ensured:* data security was assured (see 4.6 *Data Storage and Security*);

- *Adequate level of confidentiality of the research data should be ensured:* Phase One participants were assured of confidentiality, and transcripts have been de-identified. The Phase Two survey utilises anonymous data collection processes;

- *Anonymity of individuals and organisations participating in the research has to be ensured:* all Phase One transcripts were provided to participants and have been de-identified. Phase Two respondents are not identified;

- *Any deception or exaggeration about the aims and objectives of the research must be avoided:* full disclosure of the project aims and objectives was made to participants in both phases;

- *Affiliations in any forms, sources of funding, as well as any possible conflicts of interests have to be declared:* no affiliations or sources of funding are relevant. No known conflicts of interest are evident;

- *Any type of communication in relation to the research should be done with honesty and transparency:* this study has been conducted with the support of professional colleagues and the IBO. The purposes, processes, and outcomes were presented openly and honestly
to all participants and collegial contributors. None expressed concern or asked not to be involved;

- Any type of misleading information, as well as representation of primary data findings in a biased way must be avoided: Phase One analysis engaged multiple raters for coding, while comprehensive data for Phase Two data is presented throughout Chapter Six to accompany textual commentary.

In addition to the advice of Bryman and Bell (2015), the research was approved by the University of Sydney’s Human Research Ethics Committee (2015/859) on November 16, 2015, and a modification to the questionnaire was approved on July 21, 2017. Additional ethical approval from the state department of education for the two government school participants was obtained on February 29, 2016 (CS/16/00068-1.1).

The researcher has close professional relationships with a number of IB principals. These individuals were not chosen as interview subjects. Details of participants are not identified within this thesis or any related publications.

4.8 Validity, credibility, and resonance

Robson and McCartan (2016, pp. 168-173) identify threats to the validity, and thus trustworthiness, of research designs. Strategies employed in this research to mitigate these threats are:

1. Description: all Phase One interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed, and approved in writing by participants. Two participants edited their transcripts, and these edited transcripts were used for analysis;
2. Interpretation: this research used line-by-line gerund coding (Charmaz, 2014) to minimise “imposing a framework…on what is happening” (Robson & McCartan, 2016, p. 170). Additionally, processes of intercoder agreement were employed.
They also specify strategies to address bias and rigour, five of which are applied to this research:

1. **Triangulation**: this research utilises “more than one method of data collection” (Robson & McCartan, 2016, p. 171), addressing concerns of both data triangulation and methodological triangulation;

2. **Peer debriefing and support**: key design and interpretive processes were continually checked with the research supervisory team throughout the study. Additionally, testing of the preliminary theoretical model and of the Phase Two survey questionnaire were checked with a range of experienced principals and researchers;

3. **Member checking**: transcripts were returned to Phase One participants for editing/approval. The integrated discussion (Chapter Seven) was provided to one of the participants and two principals with experience as IB principals but who did not participate in the Phase Two survey questionnaire. The inclusion of non-participants was to gauge the extent to which the findings resonate with their experience;

4. **Audit trail**: interpretive memos and draft thematic concept maps were retained throughout the research. A project log was also kept;

5. **Reliability in flexible designs**: the Phase Two survey questionnaire comprises items from two widely validated instruments (see **4.4.2 Survey instrument**).

More generally, Phase One applied maximum variation purposive sampling to select participants. The analysis of the sample shows high levels of similarity to the wider population of Australian IB principals (Table 4.2). Validity of this study is further supported by the similarity between the Phase One and Phase Two populations and the high degree of similarity in ICSEA distribution between the Phase Two sample population and total population of Australian IB schools (Table 6.3).

This research engaged the total population of Australian IB principals. Morse (2010) highlights one challenge in using QUAL → quan designs is to ensure the quan sample is significantly different to that of the QUAL sample. In this project, only two participants from
Phase One participated in Phase Two, thus 96% (48/50) of Phase Two respondents did not participate in Phase One.

Charmaz (2014, p. 338) poses the following resonating question: “does your grounded theory make sense to your participants or people who share their circumstances?” By including the perspectives of principals with long experience and short experience, the analysis resonates with both, indicating the findings of this inquiry meet Charmaz’ (2014) test for resonance.

4.9 Researcher bias

The stimulus for this investigation is my personal experience as principal of a three-programme Australian IB school for 5½ years. Prior to this, I completed six years as a principal within non-IB schools, details of which are described in Chapter One. The contrast of these experiences led to development of the central research question. Because the history and identity of “researcher as subject” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, pp. 51-52) cannot be separated from the research process, self-reflexive experiences and understandings influence interpretation of participant perceptions (Robson & McCartan, 2016).

This is due to extensive personal and subjective experience. During the period I served as principal of an Australian IB school, I attended professional development courses in IB school administration, in teaching the DP Theatre course (my teaching discipline), through regular communications from the IBO and programme coordinators within the school, through meetings with other local IB principals, through a whole school evaluation visit (in 2011), and through participation in regional IB conferences at which I gave seminar presentations (Kidson, 2013, 2014). This experiential understanding of the role of principal in an Australian IB school provides subjective insight (Blumer, 1969) into the impact of the IB on principal leadership prior
to the development of the research question, methodology, collection, and analysis of data. Consideration in the research design has been given to including data collection and analysis strategies which heighten theoretical sensitivity (Charmaz, 2014) to this prior knowledge and experience, thereby helping ameliorate the impact of researcher bias.
Chapter Five: Phase One findings

5.1 Introduction

This research is a mixed methods sequential exploratory investigation which applies techniques
drawn from constructivist grounded theory and thematic analysis. It aims “for interpretive
understanding of historically situated data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 236) in order to capture a rich,
 thick description of principals’ experiences leading Australian IB schools and which addresses
the following research questions:

1. To what extent do principals in Australian IB schools consider their leadership is
   impacted by:
   i. individual school demographics;
   ii. governance structures?

2. What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about:
   i. the role of vision and direction setting;
   ii. their focus of action;
   iii. the nature of school culture?

3. What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use:
   i. to enable effective school administration;
   ii. for decision-making purposes;
   iii. to sustain themselves as leaders?

Because this research investigates principals’ experiences, it is acknowledged that views
expressed about governors, parents, students and staff are perceptional and subjective, consistent
with the symbolic interactionist epistemology evident in this research. Views attributed to each
of these groups by participants may not be views actually held by each of these stakeholder
groups.

---

18 Sections of this chapter (5.3; 5.7.1) are published in abbreviated form in Kidson (2016).
This chapter reports findings of Phase One interviews and concludes with development of a preliminary theoretical model (Charmaz, 2014). The model is further inspected (Blumer, 1969) in Phase Two using analysis of data collected from a survey questionnaire of the total population of Australian IB principals. Findings of that investigation are detailed in Chapter Six.

The analytical methods outlined in Chapter 4 (see 4.3.7 Data analysis) commenced with line by line coding using gerunds. This identified 330 process codes, which were then grouped into 21 focused codes. Constant comparison techniques reduced the list to 18 focused codes. Initial coding and revision of codes were recorded in the project journal, and reflective memos documented development of emerging themes. A series of “candidate themes, and sub-themes” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 90) were developed and iteratively refined. This resulted in identification of two major themes, expectation and experience (Figure 5.1). The leadership of Australian IB principals is theorised in this preliminary model as a reflexive leading for coherence (purpose and sense-making) and congruence (structuration), situated in and influenced by the school’s culture.

*Expectation* refers to how the presence of the IB influences demands of governors, parents, and students, emphasising the principal’s role in resolving and managing sources of conflict. *Experience* refers to the work of meeting IB and local curriculum obligations, as well as managing structural dualities across the school created by the presence of the IB. This emphasises the principal’s role in ameliorating sources of confusion. Insights are provided on how principals perceive the work of the IB office, and strategies they employ for self-care and well-being.
Some section titles appear in italics and include an abbreviation in brackets. These are *in vivo* participant comments and the abbreviation refers to their anonymous participant identifier (see 1.5 Structure of the thesis).

### 5.2 Case schools and principal participant details redux

Fictitious school names are used throughout this research, as described previously in Table 4.1 (see 4.3.5 Case schools and principal participant details). When identifying the school, its full title is used; initials are used when referring only to the principal. School pseudonyms reference key global centres of the IB, although St Donat’s School is named after the location of Atlantic College, a school which was instrumental in the establishment of the IB (Peterson, 1972, 2003). The school names (and initials of the principals) used in this research are:

- Bethesda School (BS),
- Cardiff School (CS),
- Geneva School (GS),
- Maryland School (MS),
- St Donat’s School (SDS),
- Singapore School (SS),
- and The Hague School (THS).

Some principals in this research lead schools whose real name includes the term *college*, but the generic term *school* is used throughout this thesis, further supporting ethical requirements of de-identification. Where participant *in vivo* comments refer to their school using the term *college*, this has been replaced with *school*. Similarly, the term used to identify the governing body for each school has been modified to *governing council* for consistency, rather than school board, board of directors, or trustees. My presence as interviewer is identified in transcript excerpts included in this thesis by the abbreviation, *Int.*
5.3 Governance

Review of literature in Chapter Two identified that school governors have a major responsibility for the mission and vision of a school, while literature reviewed in Chapter Three highlighted the principal’s role to implement that mission and vision effectively. Similarly, review of literature showed that governors have a concomitant role in holding the principal to account for discharging their duties. Literature shows that effective schools display common understanding between the governing council and principal regarding a school’s mission, purpose and function. For Australian schools to be authorised to offer IB programmes, governing councils and principals must also ensure the school’s “mission and philosophy align with the IB” (IBO, 2014c, p. 3). This requires administrative and financial support “for the implementation and ongoing development of the programme(s)” (IBO, 2014c, p. 3). The presence of IB programmes is therefore an additional contextual factor which impacts the leadership of principals in Australian IB schools related to school governance.

Analysis of interviews identified five major sub-themes related to school governance, each with a set of further nested sub-themes:

5.3.1 Governors’ understanding
   5.3.1.1 History and programme offering
   5.3.1.2 Sources of understanding
      5.3.1.2.1 The principal and staff
      5.3.1.2.2 Governors as parents

5.3.2 School performance
   5.3.2.1 Academic performance
   5.3.2.2 Compliance and certification
   5.3.2.3 It’s looking outside your local area (GS)

5.3.3 Finance

5.3.4 Government governance relationships
5.3.4.1 State and territory governance
5.3.4.2 Commonwealth governance
5.3.4.3 Constraints and restraints we experience in [the] public sector (BS)

5.3.5 IBO

5.3.5.1 The ideals are great…but the execution… (THS)
5.3.5.2 Areas that I think the IB have gotten into (CS)

5.3.1 Governors’ understanding

There is significant variance among the principals as to their perception of how well governors understand the IB. Some principals perceive their governors have very good and comprehensive understanding, others express their governors are positive toward the IB but describe their understanding in generic educational terms, while one perceives governors have little meaningful understanding.

Three principals (BS, SDS, MS) indicate their governors have detailed and well articulated understanding about the IB’s inquiry pedagogy and international mindedness, including use of language directly from, or consistent with, IB documentation:

they’re really clear about all the facets of an IB World School, beginning particularly with the values and the purpose, in terms of world peace and how we all contribute to that, and we are very passionate about the mantra, “others with their differences can also be right”, because one of our school values is harmony and international mindedness (BS);

if you asked many of them, they would have a deep understanding of it, but they would keep coming back to the international mindedness and the notion of being a global school, and kids being able to have much stronger learning habits and routines around the cross-curricular approaches and those sorts of things (SDS);

They’d be very clear. They’d be able to…talk about the basic underlying principles of IB…They understand the inquiry nature of it (MS).

Two principals refer to more generic concepts that are not given further explanation:
they understand that an IB World School is one that offers a rigorous, well rounded curriculum with a world view. They understand that developing international mindedness is about global thinking and the skills to learn across cultures (SS);

they know it’s known for rigour. They know that it aims to have a global perspective. If pressed, they might have a vague sense that it requires more than just doing exams, but a lot of them would not go much beyond that (THS);

Academic rigour is mentioned as an important idea, although what this entails is not further detailed. As The Hague School is a DP school only, the rigour can be assumed to relate to its tertiary preparation context, indicated by additional reference to “more than just doing exams” (THS). No further clarification about rigour is given by SS; Singapore School is a two programme school offering the PYP and DP, but currently in candidacy for the MYP.

Only one principal (CS) specifically mentions that the IB is seen by governors as an alternate academic pathway, a point highlighted by repetition of the idea within the one sentence:

the key thing from our governors’ perspective is that we offer two pathways for our students, that we have a reasonably broad clientele academically and that we offer two different alternatives for them. That would be the major focus for them, rather than there being anything specifically around the international influence and the international possibilities that come out of it (CS).

A follow up question sought clarification about this emphasis, given all primary and lower secondary students at Cardiff School learn within the PYP and MYP frameworks:

Int: Given you have all students participate in the PYP and MYP, does that inform any of [the governors’] understanding of what it means to be an IB World School?

CS: I would say not.

This is surprising, as the school is the only three programme school in the sample. A more holistic integration of IB philosophy and language might reasonably be expected in a three
programme school, which is certainly the expectation of the IB (IBO, 2014c, 2017) and given the PYP and MYP are curriculum frameworks (IBO, 2009, 2014e, 2016b) into which local curriculum is integrated for all students enrolled up to the conclusion of Year 10 (MYP Year 5). The repetition of credential alternative, combined with a negative response to the clarifying question, likely indicates a particular emphasis in that school on matriculation achievement, which can be evaluated on the basis of DP results, in contrast to the ongoing learning progress of students across the PYP and MYP.

The offering of the IB for market positioning is mentioned by two principals only (THS, GS). Governors of The Hague School are perceived to understand the IB is a “differentiator for us” (THS), but no explanation is given as to how that marketing differential is of particular benefit or is enacted. GS indicates the governors “saw [the IB] as a differentiator for our schools, from a marketing point of view” when it was first introduced to the school. GS perceives there is some understanding amongst governors that the IB is a “really thorough, holistic way of teaching young children” (GS), but overwhelmingly the perception is that “there is very little understanding at a governance level. Very little” (GS).

The findings above indicate wide variation in how principals perceive governors understand the IB and why their particular school offers its programmes. This prompted further analysis to to identify possible reasons for this variance. The sampling strata used for selection of Phase One participants was applied to analyse if variance of understanding might be related to the length of time a school has offered IB programmes, related to which programmes are offered, or a combination of both.
5.3.1.1 History and programme offering

This analysis investigates whether any relationships exist between governors’ understanding of the IB, the number and type of programmes offered, and length of authorisation; where a school offers two or three programmes (Table 5.1), the year of authorisation is for the earliest programme offered. No particular pattern is evident across these data. Longevity as an IB school does not appear sufficient, of itself, to ensure governors have a good understanding of IB philosophy, aims and pedagogy, neither does brevity appear an impediment. For example, the most expansive and articulate expression is attributed to governors of Bethesda School. The language used by the principal to describe governors’ understanding utilises language directly from the IB: “others with their differences can also be right” (BS), which appears in the IB Mission Statement (IBO, 2014c). Given that Bethesda School has one of the longest histories of offering the IB in Australia, this might suggest a good understanding of the IB among governors is related to that long history, yet this is not comparably evident with perceptions of governors from Singapore School and Cardiff School, two schools also with over 20 years’ history offering IB programmes. Governors from these schools are perceived to have only a general understanding. By contrast, governors from St Donat’s School are perceived as having a good understanding, despite St Donat’s School having the shortest experience of Phase One participants. The reference to “international mindedness and the notion of being a global school” (SDS) explicitly reflects the language of the IB Learner Profile, an essential component of IB pedagogy across all three programmes (IBO, 2014c).

There is also no pattern apparent regarding governors’ understanding and which programmes are offered. Those governors who have a good understanding come from a single programme PYP combined primary/secondary school (St Donat’s School), a two programme
Table 5.1. *Governors' understanding by programmes and length of authorisation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Authorised</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Prim/Sec/Comb</th>
<th>PYP</th>
<th>MYP</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>Govs Und</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda School</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore School</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff School</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague School</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland School</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Prim</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva School</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Donat’s School</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* G = government; NG = Non-government. Prim = Primary only. Sec = secondary only. Comb = combined primary and secondary. Govs Und = Governors’ understanding of the IB. + Governors have a good understanding of the IB, articulated coherently. = Governors have a general understanding of the IB, articulated generically. - Governors have a limited understanding of the IB, poorly articulated.

PYP and MYP primary school (Maryland School), and a single programme DP secondary school (Bethesda School). Conversely, governors with a general understanding are found in a single programme school (The Hague School), a two programme school (Singapore School), and a three programme school (Cardiff School). The two single programme PYP schools have completely different profiles: Geneva School has a history of eight years, but poor governors’ understanding, while St Donat’s School has good understanding yet only one year’s experience.

Some commonality appears related to a general level of understanding amongst governors of three schools with experience in excess of 15 years: Singapore School (1991 – 27 years), Cardiff School (1995 – 23 years), and The Hague School (2000 – 18 years). It is possible that schools with significant IB history have governors who assume they possess a better understanding than in reality might be the case. Further, there may be a complacency about how well their understanding is developed, compared with other examples of what might be optimal. By contrast, governors of Bethesda School (1989 – 29 years) appear to have the most clearly
referenced and articulated understanding of any school in this sample group, suggesting that factors other than longevity alone are needed to ensure governors develop and retain good understanding of IB philosophy, aims and pedagogy.

5.3.1.2 Sources of understanding

The variance identified in the previous section begs the question as to what sources principals perceive governors access to develop their understanding of the IB, and to what extent this might impact the leadership of the principal. Two sources of information are identified: the principal, assisted by school staff, and governors as parents.

5.3.1.2.1 The principal and staff

There is a clear relationship between how well governors appear to understand the IB and the role the principal plays in leading that process. Three principals who indicate good understanding among their governors (Table 5.1) indicate use of direct presentation, ongoing reference to the IB in general meeting agenda items, general discussion with governors, and personal coaching as strategies to enhance governors’ understanding:

We spend quite a lot of time talking with them about being a World School…[and] talking about the clustered IB Learner Profile characteristics and how we use them as part of our pastoral care programme (BS);
My own representation and reports to them at council meetings…the constant reinforcement about the general principles, the Learner Profile, and all those sorts of things (SDS);
Because of the work that has happened over the lead-up years, and the way that material is presented in the newsletter, presented at governing council meetings and the parent meetings we have (MS).
This reference to “lead-up years” (MS) suggests use of these strategies has been continuous at Maryland School since the IB commenced in 2004.

These three principals engage governors through other staff, characteristic of “bottom-up behaviours” (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001, p. 392) evident in CAS. SDS identifies “representations from the Head of Junior School and the PYP Coordinator at governing council meetings” (SDS) as crucial to the building of governors’ understanding. At the time of interview, St Donat’s School was a candidate school for the MYP and therefore governors were “now getting briefings about the MYP” (SDS) from teaching staff. Bethesda School and Maryland School, both government schools, have very active and engaged governing councils who attend numerous school functions and presentations by staff. Both MS and BS indicate this continuous exposure to community events which articulate and reinforce the IB are important complements to more formal meeting processes.

One principal (SS) gives no specific reference to the relationship between the principal and the governors. Governors of Singapore School are perceived to have an adequate understanding (Table 5.1) and enjoy long history with offering IB programmes, but when pressed about whether further development is needed to improve their understanding, SS did not identify this as a priority, suggesting a level of comfort with the current situation:

Int: Do you think there are any areas in which they could improve their understanding?
SS: No specific area, just more of the same.

Reasons for this comfort are not provided, but the school’s reputation and quality academic outcomes (see 5.3.2.1 Academic profile) suggest the governors may hold a belief their level of understanding of the IB is adequate.
The sole principal who perceived their governors to have a poor understanding believes that improving direct engagement is necessary in order to rectify this, as well as to diminish unhelpful views being formulated through the duality of governors being parents of students (see

5.3.1.2.2 Governors as parents):

I think we need to talk more to them about it; that’s a specific question about governing councils, and we get them to see the view not through their daughters or sons (GS).

GS also identifies a lack of thorough engagement with IB values and pedagogy at the time of initial implementation as a possible contributor to this current lack of understanding. This has become clear to GS as the school was, at the time of interview, engaged with the regular IB evaluation process, with GS indicating “I will have to talk [the chair of the governing council] through Making the PYP Happen”.

5.3.1.2.2 Governors as parents

Four of the five non-government school principals refer to governors who are current or past parents of the school. Three principals complain that some governors understand the school mediated through the eyes of their children and this does not always reflect a comprehensive view, particularly for the purposes of making strategic governing decisions:

Some members of our governing council…are, or have been, parents of the school who would have a particular view from their specific experience, and I’d have to say, reflecting on one or two remarks I’ve had, not always entirely positive (CS); Others are past parents whose children have done the IB, so they have a parents’ understanding (THS).

Both CS and THS presented very confidently in interview about the support they enjoy from their governing council. The presence of parents or past parents on their governing council does
not appear to present great concern, but represents more a potential for this to become an issue if the school’s overall performance were to deteriorate:

> I need their support, I don’t necessarily need their understanding. If that support were to get wobbly, or if there were to be competing issues where they started to feel that there was a tension and should we offer it, I would have to work on their understanding (THS).

Here, THS tacitly acknowledges the uncontrollability of governors within a CAS, a context which has the potential to create leadership difficulty and uncertainty. SDS acknowledges a similar duality of perspective, but is confident that presentations made to the governing council by the principal and other staff mitigate any misperception. Rather, the experience of being a parent and witnessing the impact of IB learning reinforces its value. SS did not make any reference to parents as governors.

The experience for one principal (GS), however, highlights the possibility of significant tension when the duality converges. Governors of the Geneva School appear to have a view that academic performance is not adequate and attribute the implementation and practice of the IB to that decline (see 5.3.2.1 Academic profile). GS, on the other hand, feels the data considered by the governors to draw that conclusion is drawn from their experience as parents, not governors:

> As a lot of governing councils do, they see the world through the eyes of their [children]. They see it through “our NAPLAN results are good, but they should be better”. So they judge it from external measures and they want rigour in the external measures such as NAPLAN and they’re putting the two and two together and saying “that’s the causation” (GS).

By contrast, the two government school principals do not identify any particular distinction between the dual roles of governor and parent. This may be, in part, due to an obligation to have parents on governing councils in government schools (Department for Education and Child Development, 2018), but more likely it reflects the personal philosophy and leadership
approaches enacted by MS and BS. They are both positive and catalyse parent engagement on an ongoing basis, which likely has flow on effects to how parents perform as members of the governing council:

We’ve spent a lot of time talking about the commitment to world peace, talking about the clustered IB Learner Profile characteristics and how we use them as part of our pastoral care programme…In 2010…every family, was engaged in a really inclusive process to identify a set of values which were more than the kind of generic, motherhood statements for schools, at least for public schools (BS); When you see the feedback from the IB, the parents and governing council are our strongest advocates. When we have presentations like exhibition, we could sell tickets and make a profit, because everyone comes (MS).

5.3.2 School performance

The above section examined a range of sources governors use to build their understanding of the school. This section highlights the purposes to which that knowledge is applied, namely, the educational mission of the school. The theme of school performance as a governance matter is present across all transcripts. Analysis reveals three interrelated contexts: academic profile, compliance and certification, and internationalism.

5.3.2.1 Academic profile

Principals report governors view academic achievement as a first order issue, which is perhaps to be expected from a sample population whose ICSEA range is 1101-1189 ($M = 1150$). An NVivo query using the search term “academic” and groupings set to “including synonyms” returned 19 instances. Where academic achievement is high, or it is reported governors believe it is high, responses identify related concepts of compliance, certification, and internationalism. Six of the
seven participants refer to high academic expectations across the school that are generally met, although CS expresses some concern about the MYP, and BS states that poor academic achievement in the MYP was one reason for its withdrawal from the school. This also relates to issues of duality (see 5.4.1 An awkward dual economy (THS)).

All participants express strong qualifying views that formal academic achievement is “just one part (be it very important) of a true, holistic education” (SS), that “we have a reasonably broad clientele academically” (CS), and that “the learning attributes that are being developed are much stronger and more effective for kids’ learning [than just academic achievement]” (SDS). Given the range of views held by governors reported in the previous sections, it is possible these statements reflect personal views of principals rather than the perceived views which might be held by governors.

In stark contrast to the other six participants, GS reports that governors at Geneva School perceive there is under-achievement and, as a consequence, attribute this to the IB. This focus dominates the interview, contrasted with other participants. An NVivo text search query for “NAPLAN” and groupings set to “exact matches” across all transcripts returned 17 instances, of which 13 appear in GS’ transcript. The other instances are from SDS (2), THS (1), and MS (1).

These findings suggest this measure of school performance is of minor significance to these principals, and, by extension, to their governors and wider school community:

I could be misreading our parents, they don’t get excited about NAPLAN, either. This is my 11th year in the school and I haven’t had one parent write to me about MySchool or the NAPLAN results (SDS).

THS refers to NAPLAN in the context of its misalignment to the Australian Curriculum (AC), while MS refers to NAPLAN in the context of quality assurance processes for the government department, noting that bureaucrats “expect me to know [students’] NAPLAN results” (MS).
For BS and MS, the two government school principals, their strong academic profiles are what provides the level of ongoing support needed from their state department of education (see 5.3.4.3 Constraints and restraints we experience in [the] public sector (BS)). Despite being different school types (one primary, one secondary), both use similar language to signify the importance of high academic achievement for their community, and, by extension, for the government. Both view continued high academic achievement as essential to diminishing critical voices in the department whose “experience of IB was that it was elitist” (MS), or for whom “the IB is somewhat inconvenient” (BS).

5.3.2.2 Compliance and certification

All participants acknowledge that governors expect the school to meet compliance and certification requirements. High level confidence is expressed about the “great pains [we go] to make sure our framework for PYP or MYP, fits the requirements of ACARA” (SS), about “mapping out our matrix to make sure we’ve got all the bases covered” (CS), and “meeting the [state compliance] requirements within the IB framework” (SDS). The lengths to which these schools go in meeting these competing obligations is consistent with a CAS perspective which assumes multiple and conflicting influences on an organisation, and the organisation’s responsiveness to those influences. Schools offering the PYP find compliance to both frameworks easier than those offering the MYP, while schools offering the DP find this the most straightforward process, given its standalone nature.

Two principals in DP schools (CS, THS) perceive their governing councils would frame delivery of the IB in terms of credentialling. In both cases, their governors are considered to have only a general understanding of IB philosophy (Table 5.1), which appears consistent with their
framing of the IB as a certificate rather than a pedagogical framework or internationally minded outlook. Governors of The Hague School “might have a vague sense that [the DP] requires more than just doing exams, but a lot of them would not go much beyond that” (THS). Governors of Cardiff School are perceived to frame the IB entirely around “offering two different pathways for different students”, despite being a three-programme school (see also 5.3.1 Governors’ understanding).

SS indicates IB programmes are effective at “breaking out of the parochial, local view of education” (SS), but this is never referenced to credentialling. Instead, SS uses language such as “global understanding”, “well-rounded curriculum”, “pedagogy of inquiry”, and “the best practices in the world”. This also resonates with Bethesda School, a DP school, which explicitly “moved very strongly from [the DP] being something that enables people to carry accreditation to something that is about a mindset” (BS).

5.3.2.3 It's looking outside your local area (GS)

It might reasonably be expected internationalism would be a priority for governing councils of schools that have chosen to implement, and recurrently fund, IB programmes. Yet three distinct perspectives are evident. Singapore School, Bethesda School, and St Donat’s School all report their governors perceive development of internationalism as a priority. For The Hague School and Cardiff School, it is a second order priority, while it is not mentioned at all by MS and GS.

Singapore School has included international perspectives as part of its “very strategic focus on internationalism, on globalisation” (SS) for nearly three decades, while Bethesda School currently has “students from 81 different countries of birth” (BS). Both principals report their governors highly value developing international and global outlooks, although “strictly
speaking…international mindedness is not a value” (BS). These views, in part, reflect the long experience both schools have in implementing IB programmes, yet the same language is also a feature of St Donat’s School governors whose governance discussions about the IB “keep coming back to the international mindedness and the notion of being a global school” (SDS).

For governors of The Hague School, they appear to have some notion that the DP “aims to have a global perspective” (THS), but this is neither detailed nor seen as a matter of critical importance. Indeed, THS is adamant “there are other things about the school that I need them to understand” (THS), although a longer term goal is for them “to have a more sound and robust understanding than they do now” (THS). At Cardiff School, governors are perceived to see the IB as little more than an alternate credential, one selection only from the suite of offerings available in the school, “rather than there being anything specifically around the international influence and the international possibilities that come out of it” (CS).

This diversity of response well may reflect that no specific question was included in the interview schedule (see Appendix E – Phase One Interview Schedule). It may perhaps also reflect the personal priorities of some principals, rather than a broad-based commitment across a wider range of Australian IB principals.

5.3.3 Finance

The costs associated with IB candidacy, ongoing authorisation, and professional learning are significant (see 2.7 Access and equity), thus it is reasonable to consider that governing councils’ interest in these costs impacts the work of the principal. Surprisingly, it is not reported to have much impact. The extensive costs are acknowledged, but governing councils appear to accept
them willingly, with no principal indicating any IB programme is under review by their
governing council due to cost.

The possibility for finance to become a more significant issue, and grow in its impact on
the principal’s work, is expressed by SS, CS, and THS, all within the context of offering the DP.
Singapore School was in the candidacy period for the MYP at the time of interview and, as part
of the monitoring of implementation, undertook data collection on patterns of which Year 10
students choose the DP or the alternate state matriculation credential. At the time of interview,
no concerns were apparent, but:

we’ll get to a point where if it flips to 70% DP and 30% [state credential] we have
to come to the hard decision about what is viable, what is the minimum viable
percentage for [the state credential] just as we did in the early days of [the DP]
(SS).

The same view appears obliquely at Cardiff School. The school must be vigilant in “ensuring
that we’ve got a reasonable balance there” (CS) between the DP and the local credential.
Similarly, despite THS commenting twice about the DP being costly, “I don’t have sceptics on
the board saying “is this a good thing?” It seems to be fully accepted as a given that it is a good
thing” (THS). Having acknowledged that, a change to the school’s academic performance could
lead to a revision of the commitment. If the governing council of The Hague School “started to
feel that there was a tension and should we offer it, I would have to work on their understanding”
(THS). All three perspectives explicitly acknowledge that any decision to continue, or modify,
the school’s offerings rests not exclusively with the school’s leadership (governors and
principal), but is in response to the adaptive priorities of each school’s wider community.

Neither of the two schools involved in a decision to withdraw from the MYP indicate
finance as a critical factor in the decision. Bethesda School withdrew from the MYP shortly after
BS commenced at the school, but the decision to do so was based on curriculum priorities and staff professional focus. Staff were not fully engaged with creating positive learning for students and “really felt their energies were dissipated by trying to juggle [the local curriculum]…and then the IB MYP” (BS). Similarly, at the time of interview, Cardiff School was closely examining the merits of continuing with the MYP, but reasons for its review relate to the efficacy of its transdisciplinarity approach, a pedagogical philosophy, not its cost. The review questions:

how well prepared our students are [by the MYP] simply in taking on the intellectual levels associated with the DP, but also to some extent [the state matriculation credential], when you’ve done this more integrated approach (CS).

Subsequent to the collection of Phase One data, Cardiff School withdrew from the MYP (see 5.3.5.2 Areas that I think the IB have gotten into (CS) for further detail).

Some particular pressures exist for the two government school principals due to their sectoral circumstance. These are detailed in 5.3.4.3 Constraints and restraints we experience in [the] public sector (BS).

5.3.4 Government governance relationships

The preceding sections explored perceptions about the impact of site-based governance issues for principals. Consistent with the theoretical framework of complexity leadership study, the context of school governance extends beyond the local site and includes the wider field (Eacott, 2013b; Lingard & Christie, 2003) of state/territory governments, the Australian Commonwealth government, and the IBO administration.
5.3.4.1 State and territory governance

There are differences evident regarding perceptions of how state governments\(^\text{19}\) impact the leadership of Australian IB principals. This is linked to the perceived ease, or otherwise, of blending curriculum requirements of state versions of the AC with IB frameworks. This differs across the three programmes. For some principals in PYP schools, there is frustration in the staff resources required to map the two curricula due to the PYP being a pedagogical framework, rather than prescriptive content:

there’s a great deal of onus on the school to demonstrate, or show, how the state based curriculums [sic] can be used, or dovetail, or sync, with the IB programmes (SDS);

when we do our plans, our unit planning, we also have ACARA on the same [online curriculum management platform], so when we do our planning, it cross-references ACARA as we go, so we know we’re ticking the boxes for ACARA. In actual fact, we are ticking more boxes than they’ve got (MS).

There is some evidence, however, these requirements are inconsistent across jurisdictions. GS, who has worked as a principal in two different jurisdictions, perceives Geneva School has “more latitude in [this state]” (GS). In their previous school, they perceived “it would be harder in [that state] to really marry them. I think [that state’s government] want to look at curriculum mapping more” (GS) than is the case in the jurisdiction where Geneva School is located. It is not clear if this is a singular perception, or if this may be a wider experience, as GS is the only participant in this phase of the research with experience across two states/territories. Notwithstanding, it highlights the variability across jurisdictions, and the consequent challenge for principals in managing competing governance requirements.

\(^{19}\) No participant in Phase One is in a territory jurisdiction, hence the language in this section refers only to state(s).
Two participants are expressly critical of state obligations. These are perceived to diminish staff focus and energy with outcomes of limited benefit to the school. SDS is currently introducing a second IB programme to St Donat’s School, and this perhaps reflects the perspective of one who is a persuasive advocate for the IB. Nonetheless, there is significant frustration evident because “[teachers] would rather work within the IB framework and be free of the state-based doctrines … my understanding about the MYP is that it’s worse” (SDS). A similar view is held by THS who is concerned by:

The manpower we have to invest in the credentials, the regulations, the compliance and all of those things…[it’s] one of the reasons I’m absolutely not interested in introducing the MYP (THS).

Both SDS and THS are in schools located in the same state, and this perhaps reflects a parochial approach to curriculum compliance by that state’s government. While THS is “very careful about not creating a sense of one being preferred” (THS), the DP (the only IB programme offered at The Hague School) is seen as more expansive, coherent, and purposeful. The DP is “more rigorous, more robust…[and] actually has a philosophy” (THS), in contradistinction to THS’ perception of the local state credential. This leads to an admission that while “none of that is incompatible with the [state matriculation credential]…the IB actively incorporates [these] in every aspect of its curriculum” (THS).

Particular criticism is directed at state education in the final comment offered by SDS. At the conclusion of each interview, participants were given opportunity to provide “any other comments or reflections” (Int). SDS was the only participant who gave an extended response and it highlights an intense dissatisfaction with state education governance issues. It is included in abbreviated form, yet still presented here in detail to capture the full range of frustration:
I would like, somehow, for the state based curriculums (*sic*) to be freed up to enable the International Baccalaureate to be the dominant curriculum, if a school chooses that. I’d like the Minister for Education…to step out of the picture, that if a school wants to be an “IB World School”, then that is an international authority, it’s a credible and competent curriculum…the school ought to be able to do that by their choice…There already is an accreditation and registration, more rigorous than the [state regulator], so if a school wants to take that path, step out of it, Minister, and let them go, that’s what I would say. Back off (SDS).

### 5.3.4.2 Commonwealth governance

Review of literature in Chapter Two showed over the last three decades there has been a centralisation of education policy and regulation in Australia away from the states and territories towards the Commonwealth. The impact of these policy and regulation shifts is not reported as significant by participants, with the exception of aligning the state version of the AC to the PYP and MYP reported in the previous section:

In terms of the Commonwealth, we don’t have a sense of it being a difficult juggling act at all, because we think we can deliver on everything that’s needed to be delivered on. In terms of our state, it can sometimes be a bit tricky (BS); I’ve not seen, neither in my previous experience or here, that that’s impacted in any way (GS);

At the national level I don’t think there’s any great impact, from an IB perspective (SDS);

I haven’t noticed that it has (SS).

Only THS was explicit about negative impact by the Commonwealth, and this relates to the misalignment of the AC, NAPLAN, and associated compliance that is seen as distracting and time consuming. The Hague School does not offer any IB curriculum covered by NAPLAN (Years 3, 6, 7, and 9), thus the criticism is perhaps an extension of THS being “absolutely not
interested in introducing the MYP” (THS). The following extended quote is included as it is not only the most strident example across all participants, but also because the strength of THS’ feeling is best reflected as a result of extended contextualisation:

the burden of compliance…the unbelievably poor process of curriculum design and curriculum regulation. ACARA’s ridiculous in the way that they have turned these things out…it’s a real camel, you know these things that come out. The fact that NAPLAN doesn’t align with the Australian Curriculum is a travesty and we should be ashamed of ourselves. So I think we’re in an environment where…government regulation of curriculum only serves to pull us down…I think it’s a waste of our time and it’s detrimental to the kids. So to have to go through all of that compliance, for both of those levels of government, and then do another one for the IB? This is not making me smile (THS).

The practical constraints of external system impositions are here clearly articulated, reflective of the challenges of managing competing priorities within a CAS.

5.3.4.3 **Constraints and restraints we experience in [the] public sector (BS)**

Two principals in this study are in government schools; BS is principal of a secondary school and MS is principal of a primary school. Neither report previous experience of the IB, nor that the IB was a factor in them seeking appointment to their current school. Both are very experienced principals with previous appointments as principals.

Both report that government bureaucratic personnel do not understand or appreciate the presence of the IB, but are willing to accommodate it provided academic achievement and budgetary prudence are maintained. BS indicates the school’s very strong public academic profile is “a kind of interesting embarrassment that nobody wants to talk about” (BS), while MS indicates the school’s educational director “accepts and understands that IB has credibility, [and] accepts that our data is not in any way, shape, or form impacted by being IB” (MS). Department
officials are perceived to view the IB as “elitist” (MS), and “a tolerated awkwardness” (BS) due to both schools “ticking more boxes than they’ve got” (MS). When BS commenced as principal, the MYP was implemented at the school, but government requirements “to report against certain curriculum frameworks which didn’t sit easily with the kind of MYP reporting system” (BS) contributed to the decision to withdraw from the MYP. Similarly, MS expresses a concern that the focus on reporting and accountability measures “from a system’s perspective…will be the biggest drawback to IB moving forward in the years ahead, the push by the system to be data accountable to get the dollars from the government” (MS). These wider system constraints reflect a challenge for government school principals in managing conflicting priorities and purposes.

This is in contrast to the positive engagement they experience at the site level, creating a tension between the two contexts. Both communities are reported to be supportive of the IB and its value to the school. Both principals acknowledge the work of their predecessors and other senior staff in the school to embed the philosophy over a period of many years. Ongoing maintenance of this embeddedness is not taken for granted, but is, rather, actively cultivated through ongoing and regular use of IB language in communications, presentations, and formal events. At Maryland School, “the parents and governing council are our strongest advocates” (MS), while at Bethesda School:

every family, every student, every staff member [is] really prepared to commit to…the values and the purpose, in terms of world peace and how we all contribute to that, and we are very passionate about the mantra, “others with their differences can also be right” (BS).

While the preceding paragraphs indicate some similarities between the two, there is difference between how they relate with other local government schools and with other local IB
schools. Maryland School is in a local cluster of government schools which includes two other IB schools, while Bethesda School has no other local IB schools other than those in the non-government sector. For MS, this provides opportunity for staff across the schools to collaborate on professional learning, curriculum development and assessment, and resource sharing. One school close to Maryland School is much larger and has, on occasions, subsidised some of the IB costs to assist MS:

[When they’re] running a programme…her staff are doing an assessment programme, our staff are invited to go free of charge. She picks up the bills for us on stuff like that. And then, one year we were tight on money, she paid half of my MYP [fee] (MS).

By contrast, BS has no such opportunity for resource sharing and must manage the considerable costs associated with implementing the IB:

It is prohibitively expensive and our organisation, in the beginning, gave some money towards getting [it] underway, and it’s a pittance, and it doesn’t cover what the IB costs are now…two decades on, it doesn’t come anywhere near it (BS).

One strategy employed to manage these costs effectively is to open up DP classes for students from non-government schools in what is described as “hybrid collaboration” (BS). The DP coordinator at Bethesda School also cooperates with DP coordinators from other IB schools for professional learning and collegial support, but there is a distinction between their very different resource capacities:

There’s always a sense of such a difference between what the IB schools can do in the private sector compared with the constraints and restraints that we experience (BS).
The resource sharing and collaborative practices in place for Bethesda School are more recent developments and are based on positive personal relationships BS developed directly with principals in non-government IB schools. Initially, relating to other non-government IB schools:

Was tricksy, too, in that we were the only public school in amongst a group of very high fee paying…very prestigious, some of them, single-sex schools, and we were like a pork chop in the synagogue. We were not kind of popular or welcome, and it was awkward (BS).

Over time, however, key personnel at these other IB schools changed, most notably the principals. This provided opportunity for BS to establish more constructive collegial relationships, leading to establishment of the current resource sharing possibilities.

5.3.5 IBO

The term, IBO, refers in this thesis to the governance and administrative functions of the IB, in contrast to curriculum material. The relationship of the IBO to Australian IB school principals appears problematic, and its impact for some is considerable. While all principals highly value the philosophy and practice of the IB, and remain personally committed to it (see 5.6.1 Personal belief in the IB), relating to organisational elements of the IB ranges from curious bemusement through to distinct frustration. For five of the participants, their autonomy as principal of a non-government school is highly prized, and tensions exist for three of them which surface when the IBO is perceived to direct the school-based decision-making authority of the principal. Despite the autonomy issues being different for government school principals, the decision to withdraw one of the government schools from the MYP was, in part, precipitated by a perceived unhelpful stridency by the IBO.
5.3.5.1 *The ideals are great…but the execution…* (THS)

The IBO is positively acknowledged by some participants for “the stuff they do, and the level of professionalism they have is amazing” (MS). The IBO facilitates “connection through the IB and the networks that have been created” (SDS), and these have been helpful in implementing the PYP at St Donat’s School. The IBO is also perceived to be effective at supporting ongoing teacher professional learning and networking opportunities for schools, particularly across the wider Asia-Pacific region in which Australia is located.

Despite this, three participants (CS, GS, THS) use the word “zealot” to describe the behaviour of the IBO as they experience it. Engaging with the IBO for professional learning is likened to “if you were landing from outer space, you would think you’re at a cult” (MS). Although these strong ideas are expressed by participants with a sense of lightness and good natured exaggeration, their presence across four of the interviews positions them, ironically, as potential “matters to be addressed” (IBO, 2014d, p. 3; 2014e, p. 3; 2016b, p. 3) by the IBO, given how this phrase is often impressed upon schools by the IBO itself.

5.3.5.2 *Areas that I think the IB have gotten into* (CS)

Communication with principals, efficiency of administration processes and structures, and intrusiveness into school decision making emerge as areas of concern. Both CS and THS express particular frustration at the lack of communication by the IBO. Both are relatively new into their role as principal of an IB school (“Eighteen months” (CS); “Seven terms” (THS)) and indicate lack of communication by the IBO impedes their knowledge of how to lead and manage the IB within their school. This frustration results in an unflattering characterisation of the IBO as “this monolith out there that just doesn’t listen and doesn’t respond” (THS). This is particularly the
case regarding practical matters such as “feeling that we have a voice when we say “in our jurisdiction, the date of release of [DP] results is really important in these ways”” (THS).

The use of online forms of communication to schools by the IBO is not seen as effective. Both CS and THS express particular frustration with the IBO’s “damn website” (THS) for principals, compounded by a lack of clarity about who to contact for information about principals’ professional learning and conferences. This leaves some principals “struggling to find the right pathway” (CS) through the IBO’s administrative processes and personnel. Even when “I’ve asked this of people who know the whole thing better than I do…I get mixed messages” (CS), a view THS believes is consistent with “a number of heads [who] feel that the quality of the administration” (THS) is inadequate.

The strongest criticism is the perceived intrusiveness by the IBO experienced by two participants, BS and CS. Bethesda School school received a “directive from the IBO…that said, “you can’t run the MYP as a niche programme”” (BS) at a time when the school was already reviewing the efficacy of the programme for meeting student learning needs. The school pushed back on this directive on the basis “there was just no way that we could have, you know, a thousand kids involved in the MYP…because the subject choices didn’t match what lots of kids wanted to do” (BS). The decision to withdraw from the MYP was, at the time, considered on the basis of poor student achievement, incompatibility with the school’s academic priorities, and dissipation of teachers’ energies mapping the two curricula. The timing of the directive confirmed their decision “to abandon the MYP at that stage, and to focus on the Diploma” (BS).

For CS, perceived intrusion, and the strength of response, is explicitly “in terms of [the IBO] saying what you must and must not do within your school” (CS). First, a PYP evaluation criticised Cardiff School for providing “a sort of composite class at senior primary level for
gifted students” (CS). Then, the mandated requirements for delivery of additional language learning was seen as inflexible by the IBO, requiring Cardiff School to “sort of fabricate courses that will in some way meet those requirements” (CS). Consequently, CS developed a view shortly after commencing at Cardiff School that the rationale for decisions was “too often people saying “why do we do this? Oh, because the IB says we have to”” (CS). CS has very firm views about the responsibility of the site-based principal and expresses clearly that it “concerns me about how far does the IB go, as an organisation, in determining what a school should look like, how it should be structured, as opposed to being a curriculum focused organisation” (CS). For Cardiff School, it is at the school level that “decisions based on ultimately what is best for our students” (CS) should reside. The practice of always referring “back to what it says in the IB textbook” (CS) is not, in the view of CS, “responsible educational decision making” (CS). CS is firmly committed to facing this challenge directly with the IBO in way that highlights self-organisation priorities, stating:

we may well just have to argue our case and say, “look, we’re not going to go down that path because that doesn’t suit us for these reasons, that is not best for us for these reasons, but this is why we would do what we do” (CS).

Cardiff School withdrew from the MYP at the conclusion of 2016.

5.4 Resources and structures

Literature reviewed in Chapters Two and Three shows a major part of the principal’s work is responsibility for resourcing and structuring the school. The analysis of governance in the previous section also highlighted the significance of this role. Four major themes for resources and structures are identified:

5.4.1 An awkward dual economy (THS)
5.4.2 *Big, big picture people* (SDS)

5.4.3 *Presenting the conceptual framework* (THS)

5.4.4 Decision making

### 5.4.1 *An awkward dual economy* (THS)

Reference is made to aspects of financial duality in findings on governance (see 5.3.3 Finance). This section focuses on how principals lead and manage structural and staffing dualities inherent in implementing IB programmes, however, it is acknowledged that governance and management engagement in these issues is symbiotic. Governors have responsibility to ensure the overall financial sustainability and prudence of the school, while limits imposed on the principal by budgetary constraints directly influence staffing capacity, and therefore organisational structure. Where participant comments refer to structural or staffing levels, this infers a perspective on finance, given their interdependence.

The phrase “dual economy” is used by THS on four occasions and reflects a predominant perception among participants that implementing the IB imposes additional requirements for schools, both financial and structural, which are not always easily managed. Other principals speak of a “resource juggling act” (BS), of the pressure there is on “the dollars [for] staff….future staff changes” (MS), and the need to “query, at times, the amount of travel for workshops and everything else we have to send people off to do” (CS). A tension arises because “the training is horrendously expensive…[and] I just don’t think it's worth it, but we have to do it to be credentialed” (THS). The principal who is arguably most overtly committed to the IB, SDS (see 8.3 *Leadership actors and characters*), is unfazed by the costs associated with “taking people overseas, or bringing presenters in for whole days” (SDS). St Donat’s School is
progressing towards being a three-programme school, so they “sent some people overseas…visited [two other experienced IB schools], they saw what other teachers were doing” (SDS), reduced teaching loads in key leadership areas, and are “changing the curriculum structures so that when we turn the [MYP] green light on, we’re ready to go” (SDS). These comments reflect the most explicit structural, staffing, and financial commitment of any of the seven participants.

Two participants, SS and GS, make no specific mention of the theme. This seems likely due to the two schools having very high ICSEA (Geneva School = 1172, Singapore School = 1158), plus a combination of site-based factors, shifting its focus into the background. Singapore School has a very strong academic profile, very large student population base, and long history with the IB, thus it is possible the ongoing financial costs associated with the IB are well embedded, resourced, and consequently uncontested. Geneva School, on the other hand, is scrutinising the value of the IB to its academic profile, a topic which dominates the interview. The question for the governing council of Geneva School is more whether the IB inquiry pedagogy is responsible for the declining results in literacy and numeracy. At no point in the interview is this positioned by GS as a financial issue for the governing council, but one of academic reputation.

5.4.2  **Big, big picture people (SDS)**

The presence of the IB impacts staffing in four key ways: costs associated with professional learning, provision of additional language learning, time release for teacher collaboration, and, in the case of DP schools, staff teaching across both the DP and their local matriculation credential. Six participants identify these as challenges, yet overwhelmingly state the IB is of great benefit
to students and thus the challenges are worth meeting. SS does not mention finance as a challenge and the concept of the IB creating a “dual economy” (THS) does not appear to apply.

The high quality of IB professional learning is widely acknowledged by participants, particularly the benefits of learning with colleagues across the globe. The ongoing shift by the IB to provide a greater range of professional learning in Australia is reported as a positive development, but accessing this is still a source of inequity, and, consequently, is a particular impact for some participants. For example, the view that staff at Cardiff School embrace “their necessary participation in the workshops and the programmes and conferences” (CS) is in part offset by the admission that “we host the…I’m not sure what it’s called, it’s not a conference…the workshop programme, anyway, we host that here in [this state]” (CS). It is easier to perceive staff “as being fully committed” (CS) to the IB’s professional learning expectations in a circumstance where proximity of the opportunity is so immediate.

By contrast, the impost is felt most keenly by the two government school principals and highlights an apparent sectoral resourcing difference. MS reports that professional learning costs are managed through cooperation with another local government IB school. The other school hosts professional learning and covers the costs, allowing “our staff…to go free of charge” (MS) (see 5.3.4.3 Constraints and restraints we experience in [the] public sector (BS)). MS also reports the staff have “a really strong culture of PD” (MS) so much so that for a recent visit to an interstate IB school “I flew the entire staff…last year to look at their programmes, took the SSOs, everyone. I paid airfares, I paid transport to and from, they picked up their own accommodation and their own living expenses” (MS). This particular frustration is compounded by a lack of understanding about the IB requirements by departmental bureaucrats. MS relates a situation where a new staff member is appointed to the school from within the bureaucracy, who
“is a qualified teacher, and they’re now on your staff permanently…[but] hasn’t been in the classroom for 26 years” (MS). The costs associated with training this teacher sufficiently to meet the professional expectations of Maryland School and the PYP are “a horrendous cost to us, as we’ve got to send them off for PYP training” (MS; see Table 2.8 for an example of such costs).

BS expresses similar frustration that even when IB training is delivered in Australia, it can be a financial impost:

> We work on finding the money to keep sending our teachers to conferences and since the IB has agreed to run more conferences in Australia, usually they’re in [two other states], so it’s still a cost for us (MS).

There is also limited capacity for MS to raise additional funds at the school level as “just paying the IB admin fees is a huge stretch [for our parents], so, you kind of work on trying to manage all that” (BS). The constant shifting between enabling and administrative responsibilities inherent in CLT are arguably more pointed, in such circumstances.

The requirement to fund additional language learning is absent from the comments of all participants. This is quite an unexpected finding, given the extent to which this can impose financial obligations on schools. It may be that inclusion of the language requirement is already a feature of the pedagogical philosophy in participant schools, such as at The Hague School, where “for us the language requirements aren’t typically very difficult to meet and it’s a real strength for us” (THS). Nonetheless, the absence of commentary about the costs of additional language provision is quite striking.

Time is given for collaboration in all schools and is a significant factor in the way principals perceive its value to a vibrant professional culture in their schools. An NVivo word frequency text search for “collaboration” with grouping set to “with stemmed words” returned 41 instances. Importantly, no participant indicates collaboration is utilised because it is an
expectation of the IB, but because “teacher collaboration is key to [learning] success” (SS). For some, this has necessitated catalysing staff to shift their staff mindset about collaboration. “Smaller groups who have been given time to collaborate” (SDS) are preferred over larger whole school or section/stage meetings, requiring some principals to work actively in shifting mindsets. At Maryland School, the principal and deputy principal (who is the PYP coordinator) “actually…contrived who was in the groups” (MS), including senior staff, as a strategy to ensure collaborative planning time is used effectively. For THS, the shift is much greater because “a lot of people have worked in silos, not because they can’t work with each other, but because it never occurred to them to do anything else and no-one ever put them in a room and made them talk” (THS). The shift brings previously isolated colleagues together to “collaborate in terms of their teaching practice, learning from each other what they’re doing, how they’re thinking, and so on” (THS), although THS reports this is in its infancy and still meets with some resistance.

There is widespread provision of time built in to the “structure of the school day” (SS) to “meet as teams” (MS), and staff teaching loads are reviewed “to make sure that there is time for collaboration” (SDS). Bethesda School has “a late start on Wednesday morning for our students, and in that hour on Wednesday mornings” (BS) staff meet for collaborative learning and curriculum development. St Donat’s School is philosophically and practically committed to a position where “our primary school staff have the same teaching load as our secondary teachers” (SDS), a sign to staff of the high value SDS places on time for professional collaboration. Despite this variety of generous time provisions in evidence across all Phase One schools, GS, SDS, and THS report pockets of resistance among staff; all three use the phrase “buy-in” to express that some elements of their staff are yet to commit to these practices.
All three DP schools ensure teaching staff teach in both the DP and their local matriculation credential. This is partly so “we do not end up with a culture where there is a sense there is a preferred option or the school is pushing one way or the other” (THS). This is a challenge in The Hague School where traditionally some departments have teaching staff assigned to teach in one of the credentials only, a position THS is actively working to overturn. There is some resistance to this change because some “teachers are not necessarily hungry to take on the extra work and the discomfort” (THS) of expanding their teaching repertoire. Part of the rationale is that replacing niche credentialled teachers presents a strategic pressure which requires “a delicate process of having to push” (THS) some staff in that direction.

The case of St Donat’s School is worth further detailed case description, given it is the only school within the sample which recently introduced the IB and which is currently expanding its offering through the introduction of the MYP. Although Singapore School is currently in the process of authorisation for the MYP, its long history with the IB’s “shared philosophy and practice” (SS) generated “great impetus for both PYP and MYP [that] was led from the grass roots” [SS] of the teaching staff, in contrast to the experience of St Donat’s School. The example also offers valuable insight into one contemporary implementation of the IB, given the magnitude of recent programme growth (see 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia).

The decision to introduce the IB at St Donat’s School arose from the conviction of SDS that the local curriculum was inadequate to educate “children these days [who] live in a global world” (SDS). After researching a number of alternatives, SDS pursued the IB on the basis it is “based around problem solving, inquiry based learning, based around service…[and] not shackled by content heavy syllabuses” (SDS). SDS led by example and was one of the first staff members to undertake IB specific training and attend regional conferences. From there, SDS
identified other staff members “who I thought were big, big picture people; they’re broad-minded” (SDS). SDS disseminated material to them, followed by invitations to attend IB training workshops and conferences. This generated a “static of noise around what the IB looks like” (SDS) which grew in volume. It took “four or five years” (SDS) to build sufficient broad-based support and philosophical commitment before SDS judged it apposite to apply for authorisation. Once commenced, the process of embedding IB philosophy and pedagogy quickly evidenced self-organising CAS properties and “became infectious…because of the network that was out there who were so tuned in to bringing new schools into the club, or into the family or whatever you want to call it” (SDS).

SDS reports the school provided generously for staff release to prepare for implementation, and reduced face-to-face teaching time in the primary section of the school for teacher collaboration. Presentations about the IB by key staff to the governing council helped consolidate support, which was further reinforced through ongoing reporting by SDS. This “constant reinforcement about the general principles, the Learner Profile, and all those sorts of things” (SDS) is seen as essential to maintaining the commitment of the governing council who provide the financial capacity to implement the IB successfully. This is strategically critical to the current phase of MYP implementation and the planned future DP implementation.

Yet from these positive beginnings, there is still work to be done. As part of due diligence prior to introducing the MYP, the school administered an extensive community satisfaction survey utilising a paid professional school consultancy. One item explicitly asked if staff felt there is merit in adopting the MYP. Primary staff responses were overwhelmingly positive as “100% of the people who responded from the Junior School said “this is a great programme and the kids will benefit”” (SDS). This was not the case among secondary teachers, indicating to
SDS that some “secondary school teachers [are] yet to be convinced. Most of them, yes, but a number, the jury is out” (SDS). SDS employed a strategy to develop and support critical champions, “key people” (SDS) as advocates for the IB. Inclusion of the Languages department in this process is highlighted, given the compulsory nature of additional language learning required in the MYP beyond mandated state requirements.

The case of St Donat’s School appears positive, to this point. SDS has used personal modelling, articulation of a clear vision, patience, consensus building, and practical financial support to establish the PYP successfully. In person, SDS is dynamic in personality, engaging, and gregarious. It may be this success flows from a combination of personal enthusiasm, an extensive knowledge of the values of the St Donat’s School community, and an invitational approach to staff which is followed up with practical support and clear expectation. The long gestation period of research and implementation appears also to have helped the community adapt to the changes. It remains to be seen if this perceived success is replicated with implementation of the MYP and the DP.

5.4.3 Presenting the conceptual framework (THS)

Responses to the impact of the curriculum vary according to which programme(s) are offered. The PYP is most straightforward, more challenge exists with the MYP, and the standalone nature of the DP creates structural dualities that some participants find challenging. There is no evidence of difference for multi-programme schools; the responses expressed in the previous sentence apply for each programme offered, regardless of the presence of other programmes.

For PYP schools, the impact appears minimal beyond that already reported regarding time taken to align the PYP and local curriculum (see 5.3.4.1 State and territory governance).
All four principals offering the PYP report implementation exceeds requirements of their state and the AC, but it comes at the cost of staff time and stress. There is confidence the two curriculum frameworks co-exist well, despite teachers “constantly mapping the two curricula to see that they are meeting [state reporting obligations]” (SDS) rather than “spending their effort and being very positive and enthusiastic about the IB” (SDS). There is concern for GS about how well Geneva School is “integrating our literacy and numeracy as much as you should into the programme” (GS) (see 5.3.2.1 Academic profile). GS does not believe this is an issue of the PYP per se, as “I know there are schools who do very well in NAPLAN and do well in the PYP” (GS).

The MYP has more “intricacies and challenges” (CS). Only two schools within the sample offer the MYP, although insights about its impact are also evident in the transcript of BS who withdrew Bethesda School from the MYP. As a primary school, Maryland School has limited exposure to the MYP as it delivers only two years of the five year programme range (IBO, 2016b). For both BS and CS, the priorities of the MYP, including its additional language requirements and relationship to local regulatory frameworks, are inconsistent with their local priorities. In both cases, the schools withdrew from the MYP (see 5.3.5.2 Areas that I think the IB have gotten into (CS)).

For DP schools, aligning structural requirements alongside those of the local matriculation credential is challenging. Along with the six DP subjects, “you’ve got to kind of manage your Extended Essay on top of that, and your Theory of Knowledge kind of floating in amongst there” (BS). This necessitates “two additional lines” (BS) in a timetable that “is less flexible” (THS) due to a “philosophy that every student needs to do this full range” (THS) of subjects; this, states BS, “is a complexity” (BS) not required by the state credential. State
curriculum structures also permit a greater level of specialisation, which is not permitted by the IB’s “generalist qualification” (THS).

5.4.4 Decision making

All participants, except GS, describe their executive staff as variations of “a very high functioning leadership executive” (SS). A high priority is “the appointment of the right leadership team” (SS) and the willingness to do “a bit of fine tuning” (CS) where needed. The least experienced participant, THS, is quick to draw attention to inheritance of an exceptionally well functioning senior executive:

> I take no credit for this, I’ve only done seven terms; the quality…is entirely down to my predecessors (THS).

Creating decision making structures which deliver results is mentioned by five participants; only SS and GS do not use this type of language. Collaboration in relation to decision making is clearly valued and evident. BS and MS speak extensively regarding the culture of shared leadership and decision making, and MS draws attention to the inclusion of the administration manager as “an equal member of Leadership” (MS).

Programme coordinators do not report directly to the principal in six of the seven Phase One schools; the exception is Maryland School, a stand alone primary school whose curriculum coordination is the responsibility of the deputy principal who:

> leads curriculum. We run in three sections…so they meet as teams, but then curriculum wise, they plan as year levels…[the deputy principal] oversees that…within our [leadership] group, [the deputy principal] has the leadership role in that (MS).

For all other schools, IB curriculum coordination is positioned as subordinate to overall curriculum leadership. Programme coordinators are responsible for “the implementation and the
operation of the programme” (SS), “a basic operational requirement…and continual school improvement agenda” (BS), and “to ensure that we as a school are following the rules and regulations of the IBO” (GS).

Lack of integration into overall curriculum structures is mentioned by THS and GS as a challenge. For THS, this is a consequence of the DP being seen as a separate entity in the school, hence the decision to bring it more closely under the responsibility of the school’s overall curriculum leadership. For GS, the challenge is compounded by having two campuses. Both campuses have PYP coordinators who report to the Head of Campus, who in turn reports to the principal; the PYP coordinators at both campuses also report to the “Director of Curriculum who [meets] quite regularly with the two Heads of School plus the PYP coordinators” (GS). This is reported not to be an effective relationship. There is little enthusiasm for the PYP in the secondary school, and GS seeks “to involve more of the senior school staff in key areas so that they start to understand the PYP more” (GS) in order to redress this. The presence of two distinct professional cultures across the campuses, characterised as “a healthy competition between the two campuses” (GS), does not help the situation. While the two PYP coordinators “do the right things by the PYP programme…there’s different flavours” (GS) so much so that “on a day-to-day basis, I think they run quite separate shows” (GS). This frustration is reflected mostly in the desire for PYP coordinators “to see themselves as leaders, making decisions, taking responsibility, being accountable, not only to the IBO, but to the school” (GS).

5.5 Parents and students

Analysis of interviews identified three major themes related to parents and students: priorities and value or, “awareness about other cultures…is just right for kids” (SDS), language learning,
and certification. While there are some distinctions noted between perceived priorities for parents and students, the majority of participants consistently report high levels of similarity of response across both groups:

[parents] see this as a school of, and for, the world…[and students are] open to a much more expanded world now, and they can see the world as the place of work (SS);

[parents are] really happy with the IB being offered, really happy with the kind of international mindedness it continues to develop…it’s seen much more as a standard option for [any student] who’s prepared to work hard and for whom the values that are on offer in the IB and the challenges fit for them (BS);

I think [parents] would just see [the IB] as a part of who we are, it’s not a major thing. Most of them would be more interested, frankly, in other aspects of the school and other things that we’re promoting… For most of the kids, they just go to school, they go to school and they do what they’re told (laughs) (CS);

Once [parents] get some presentations and understandings about it, they see it like teachers do. In fact, parents go “wow, that’s pretty exciting”. Then they see the quality of work…The students going through seem to be inspired by the material they engage with. They see it as real rich learning experiences, they see themselves engaging with material that otherwise they wouldn’t have got (SDS).

There is also significant contrast between the expansive and extended responses participants provided to questions about governance, the IBO, and staff compared with responses to questions about parents and students. For example, in a transcript of nearly 9,000 words, THS speaks less than 500 words regarding parents, and even fewer for students. GS includes fewer than 400 words out of nearly 7,000, and CS includes fewer than 300 words from just over 5,000 words. This raises a question as to how much of the principal’s time is spent engaging with parents and students, and supports the inclusion of questions related to time expenditure in the
Phase Two survey questionnaire. With so little data to analyse, findings drawn from it must be considered a limitation to this study.

Notwithstanding the general positive way in which principals perceive parents’ understanding, there is concern amongst the parent body of Geneva School regarding a lack of conviction about the PYP and its development of core literacy and numeracy. GS identifies “a ground swell of parents who are questioning the value of the PYP” (GS), representing a potentially unhelpful self-organisation. To address these concerns, GS invests significant time and effort in communicating with parents about the merits of the PYP, providing “workshops on “Making the PYP Happen” for parents” (GS) and “through written communication” (GS). Yet more work remains to be done, as “we need to communicate [about the value of the PYP] in more subtle ways which really resonate with the parents” (GS). This parental concern adds to the pressure from the governing council, many of whom are parents (see 5.3.1.2.2 Governors as parents), that criticises recent NAPLAN results that are “low compared to our competitors who teach the PYP” (GS). This relentless focus on public measures like NAPLAN fuels tension for GS between the need for accountability and to have governors and parents “understand the holistic nature and the learning that comes to (sic) it” (GS).

5.5.1 Awareness about other cultures…is just right for kids (SDS)

Developing broad perspectives on students’ own culture and other cultures well beyond their local context is identified by all participants as a particular strength of IB programmes. This is the case across the entire programme continuum and is one of the very few areas on which there is complete agreement among participants. Developing appreciation of other cultures, creating opportunities for students “to think outside the square” (MS) of their own part of the world,
cultivating “openness and engagement with people and ideas across cultures” (SS), and having to “learn to work in teams” (SDS) are perceived to create strong philosophical and sociological interconnection for IB students:

it’s absolutely critical that you can learn and live with people across cultures, that your language ability enables you to communicate, that you can problem solve across vast differences (SS).

Yet the power of the IB is also seen in how it can change perceptions of students’ immediate community. For schools with the highest ICSEA, The Hague School (1189) and Geneva School (1172), “awareness of other cultures” (SDS) includes problematising their own highly affluent and socio-educationally advantaged communities. To this end, the IB serves an important role in broadening student views of the world well beyond what is seen, at times, as “too much of a bubble” (THS). For THS and GS, broadening student visions of the world is less about developing international perspectives, given “we have a very mobile, globally mobile [family] population” (THS). Rather, both principals actively question the social insularity assumed by their schools’ socio-educational advantage. Development of global mindedness is reframed as “looking outside your own world” (GS). The utility of the IB is thus valued for its ability to help students “look outside, so that social justice initiatives, or that perspective, is challenged” (GS). THS sees that the IB helps address the question of whether students “will…be diminished as people if during this period [at the school] they are not exposed to a diversity of ideas, people, cultures, concepts, relationships?” (THS). However, as The Hague School offers the DP to only “about a third” (THS) of their senior secondary students, direct exposure of the students at The Hague School to the IB is limited. Notwithstanding this, the critical social and cultural education is driven widely across the school by THS’ personal philosophy of education
rather than the school offering the IB. THS’ vision is consistent with that of the IB, but not derivative from it. It is a case of “milking the IB for its richness of what we already have” (THS).

5.5.2 Language learning

The learning of an additional language required by IB programmes is valued for expanding student vision and connection. For some schools, such as The Hague School, provision of additional language learning is already central to its educational philosophy and far exceeds requirements set by the IBO, therefore “the language requirements aren’t typically very difficult to meet” (THS). At St Donat’s School, engaging the Language Faculty was central to the implementation strategy SDS pursued for the PYP and continues to use in the lead up to implementing the MYP. Currently, the school requires “all [students to] do a language to Year 10” (SDS). MS admits strategies to support learning language, like short-term exchange student and teacher visits, can “sometimes…look…contrived” (MS), but they are one part only of an overall approach to “work hard at the global stuff” (MS).

There is tension evident in some schools where IB compliance requirements create more difficulty than principals judge worthwhile in their particular context. Bethesda School has a highly diverse student population drawn from over 80 different nationalities. During the time the school offered the MYP, compliance with the IB additional language learning requirement seemed redundant in a context where students “had two or three languages under their belt at home already and that was enough, and they really just wanted to concentrate on their English” (BS). In such circumstances, it seemed reasonable that students “didn’t want to particularly pursue a school language” (BS) as part of their MYP studies.
Tension is also evident at Cardiff School for students from regional areas who commence boarding at the school in Year 10 with a view to proceeding to DP study. The DP curriculum provides a pathway for students who commence it with no prior knowledge of an additional language, offering beginner language courses denominated as *Ab Initio* (IBO, 2014a, p. 6) or, *from the beginning*. However, similar to the IBO directive issued to Bethesda School that “you can’t run the MYP as a niche programme” (BS), Cardiff School faces the challenge of making their language programme meet both the IB compliance requirement and be educationally responsive to students who “have to do a language when they haven’t done a language for years and they have no background in it” (BS). Their local self-organising solution is to “sort of fabricate courses that will in some way meet those requirements” (CS). This suggests, however, the solution is compliance driven, rather than philosophically and pedagogically coherent.

5.5.3 Certification

For schools offering the DP, significant effort is expended to ensure it is not positioned for parents and students as an elitist or superior educational programme compared with the local matriculation credential. The three principals in DP schools actively work against the notion that offering the DP is simply about credentialling. All three emphatically reject “an unhelpful distinction” (CS) that the DP “is an elite credential for elite students” (THS). By broadening enrolment patterns in the DP, Bethesda School corrected the perception that “if you were really, really smart you did IB, if you were not so smart you did [the local matriculation credential]” (BS). Both Bethesda School and The Hague School pursue similar strategies and both have more than doubled their DP enrolment. More importantly, the priority “moved very strongly from it
being something that enables people to carry accreditation to something that is about a mindset” (BS).

Part of this strategy includes structuring the DP subordinate to a broader curriculum leadership portfolio which “has an investment in both [credential programmes] working” (THS), rather than permit it to be a standalone entity. Despite intense pressure from some staff, THS resists “carving out the IB as a separate curriculum” (THS) as doing so is “heading towards the sort of division and sort of lack of cohesion” (THS) that runs counter to the philosophy of The Hague School and THS personally. A similar strategy is pursued at Cardiff School with the explicit intention to mitigate “promoting it as an elite qualification which is a) only for the very top students, and b) requiring a level of commitment which means they will have to forsake everything else to do it” (CS).

5.6 Perceptions about school culture

All participants are deeply committed to the cultural values and experiences of their particular schools, of which the presence of the IB can be considered a secondary, not primary, element. Only one participant (GS) indicated the presence of the IB was a factor in their decision to seek the role of principal at the school; for all others, the IB was a lower order consideration. Nonetheless, all indicate deep personal commitment to the IB and support its continuance within the school, albeit in a role subordinate to overarching site based needs.

5.6.1 Personal belief in the IB

All principals declare strong personal resonance with IB philosophy and pedagogy, consistent with the IB’s expectation (IBO, 2014a):
[The IB] resonates with the values which are my central core, which actually
gives me the fire in the belly to do all the sorts of things that you need to do (BS);
Personally, I have had a number of experiences in my life where I have lived and
studied and worked, both as a child and as an adult, overseas and so starting from
a very personal standpoint…I see it as part of my obligation to create an
environment where, as far as possible, we are widening the lens for the students at
our school in the same way, whether or not they personally have experience of
doing it overseas (THS);
The vision and the mission of the IB fits with my own personal philosophy (SS);
I have a very strong belief that in an increasingly globalised world we need to be
looking beyond our own gates, and that looking beyond your own gates does not
just mean looking locally, but looking internationally as well. And anything that
we can do to prepare our students for an increasingly globalised world is terribly
important (CS).

Previous experience in schools offering IB programmes does not appear an important
factor in principals’ affinity with the IB. Only one principal (SS) had any significant background
with the IB prior to coming to their current school, comprising extensive prior employment at
Singapore School as head of one of its campuses and employment within the IBO. CS worked in
an IB school a number of years prior to Cardiff School, but notes the IB in that school “was very
small scale and was not a major feature of the school at the time” (CS). GS has previous
experience in an IB school, a DP school, but is not favourable towards that programme on the
basis that it “puts a huge strain on a school” (GS) financially and structurally; GS was not
principal of that school. In their previous school, GS explored the PYP to such an extent that
“[the governing council] appointed my successor to be someone who had more experience in IB
than I did” (GS) to continue the process of implementation. This process was one contributing
factor only in the development of their attraction to a PYP school:
I have to say it’s probably one of the reasons that I chose to come, because the PYP…[is] a great basis for young children to continue their fascination with learning, to be able to look at real life problems (GS).

At the same time, GS indicates there is no likelihood of introducing either the MYP or the DP at Geneva School as there are serious questions already being asked by the governing council about the value of the PYP, due to perceived underperformance in compulsory public testing:

I know there are schools who do very well in NAPLAN and do well in the PYP, they enjoy the PYP and the students get a lot from it. I think the two are compatible. The governing council believes they’re not (GS).

The presence of the IB within the school is not, therefore, in itself reported as a sufficient attractor for principals in coming to their current school. Other school context factors such as academic quality, cultural affinity, or broader educational opportunity are stronger than the presence of the IB:

What attracted me to this school, and I was enormously happy in the school I was in, I didn’t want to go and they didn’t want me to go, and had it been any other school, I wouldn’t have gone, but I believed that this school had such enormous potential that was untapped (BS);

Int: When you came [to this school], was it particularly because of the IB?
SS: Not especially. [The school] has a great history and track record in educational innovation. I was attracted to this and the potential to leverage change for the benefit of education more widely.

Joining an IB school thus opened up broader possibilities for some principals with no prior IB experience:

The attraction for me was that this was really big, big thinking stuff, with like-minded people from all around the world, cutting across backgrounds and barriers, that’s what appealed to me (SDS);

The fact this school had…lots of other opportunities, and that it was so rich in terms of its cultural diversity. It was just perfect (BS).
Despite declaring strong identification with the IB mission and philosophy, a clear definition of international mindedness is not given by any participant. Participants use general language about “internationalism” (SS), “globalised” (CS) and “global perspective” (MS). Most identify the benefit of some form of international mindedness within the IB’s pedagogical framework, and this is valued by those principals for helping broaden the educational experience for students and staff:

We’re expanding the opportunities for teachers and families to access the best practices in the world, and to be sharing with a huge collegiate of teachers in classrooms with different cultural views (SS);
I see it as part of my obligation to create an environment … where [students] are exposed to different ideas, thoughts, relationships, cultures and so on (THS);
It’s looking outside your local area and understanding other peoples’ points of view (GS).

These comments show the IB may reasonably be considered of secondary importance to the personal educational philosophy of the principals in this study. It holds utility for them as a support to implementing their wider school vision.

5.6.2 Prioritising integration, permitting differentiation, diminishing fragmentation

Chapter Three introduced Martin’s (1992) three perspectives on organisational culture: integration, differentiation, and fragmentation. These perspectives are mobilised in this study as heuristics to gain insight to principals’ beliefs about organisational culture. This research is not an investigation of culture in participants’ schools per se, but an investigation into their beliefs about that culture. The previous section shows how the IB is subordinate to principals’ overarching educational philosophy, thus the cultural perspectives evident in this section reflect a desire for an experience of culture, not its particular substance. Participant transcripts reflect all
three perspectives, but they are not all afforded equal status. There is a clear preference among participants for viewing culture as integrated, while acknowledging the pragmatics of differentiation. Fragmentation exists for most participants in some form, but it is not encouraged, and participants who do identify it do so in ways which seek to diminish it.

An integration perspective pervades most participant transcripts. Homogeneity of mindset is presented as the goal for governing councils. Four participants speak of their governing councils as a unified entity using such language as “our governing council” (BS, CS, MS, THS). CS identifies closely with their governing council through repeated use of “we”. When discussing governors’ understanding of the IB, CS acknowledges “this is a pathway we’ve taken, this is a commitment that we’ve made” (CS), despite the decision to introduce IB programmes being taken over 20 years before CS joined the school. This is a strong identification with the governing council which contrasts to GS who consistently uses “they” and “them”, the only participant in Phase One who uses such language.

Integration is more likely in schools where IB programmes cover the entire range of the student population, although there is no certainty this will occur. Consequently, principals use both communication and structuring strategies with the intention of developing cultural homogeneity:

I think we also need to get senior school staff who are cynical, for right or wrong reasons they’re cynical (GS);
There are absolutely passionate advocates for it, and there are people who don’t really care either way, and there are some who are dead set against it (THS).
I felt carving out the IB as a separate curriculum was heading towards the sort of division and sort of lack of cohesion which is exactly what I’m trying avoid (THS).
Participants recognise there will always be differences of perspective and expectation across their staff, but the preferred ideal is for integration. To this end, differentiation is accommodated as an acknowledged reality while the press toward integration continues. This is seen in the dual cases of those who are characterised as overly zealous for the IB and those who are not committed to the philosophy of the IB. CS runs up against staff who view decision making only through the prism of “we have to [do this] for the IB” (CS), positioning these staff within a differentiated subculture. This stands in contrast to CS’ perspective that “what should, to my mind, be the only guiding criterion which is “what is best for our students?’” (CS).

Similarly, GS expresses frustration that programme coordinators should be part of the wider school culture and “see themselves as leaders, making decisions, taking responsibility, being accountable, not only to the IBO, but to the school” (GS).

MS and SDS take direct approaches to those perceived to “hibernate. They’re doing okay, but sometimes they’re not actually taking us forward” (MS). Clear expectation is outlined about the school’s values and culture with an explicit directive regarding “that’s what we do in this school, that’s what happens with IB” (MS). The preference is clearly for voluntary engagement, but MS acknowledges different leadership modes: “in some ways we structure, in some ways we facilitate, and in other ways we direct” (MS). Similarly, SDS represents implementation of the PYP in a very positive manner, yet there is also acknowledgement some staff are not yet committed to the expansion of the IB through implementation of the MYP. The differentiation is accepted, but SDS is actively “letting people come on board when they’re ready, and then pushing others, if they need to be” (SDS). This final phrase indicates a tolerance that will, at some point, become exhausted. Overall, the expectation is these staff will be integrated into the school’s wider culture.
The decision by both BS and CS to withdraw from the MYP can be seen as an example of diminishing fragmentation. The desire to have an integrated culture is precluded by the existence of a programme supported by staff who “completely ignored what we were doing in terms of the requirements for our organisation” (BS). The presence of the MYP distracted staff and dissipated energy. The decision to withdraw enabled BS to pursue greater integration through a determined whole school “focus on what we needed to do to lift our appalling standards” (BS). Similarly, withdrawing the MYP from Cardiff School is part of CS “pushing us more down the path of, as I said, focusing on what is best for our students and what we believe will provide the best programme for them” (CS). Diminishing the fragmentation caused by the presence of the MYP at Cardiff School will, in the view of CS, likely result in having “to argue our case and say, “look, we’re not going to go down that path because that doesn’t suit us for these reasons, that is not best for us for these reasons” (CS). The clear objective is integration.

5.7 Caring for and preserving self

Five of the seven participants came to their current school with previous experience of principalship. Most report they “evolved a bit over the years” (CS) and show humility in self-assessment that they “don’t do nearly as well in it as I should” (BS). None perceive the presence of the IB makes their role “any different for an IB school” (SDS), and the challenges of the role “really have nothing to do with the IB” (THS).

Two common strategies evident for self-care and sustainability are setting clear limits on school and personal lives, and active professional and personal support networks. The most direct expression of the two comes from MS:
I don’t socialise with staff at all. School is school. If I saw people on the beach, I’d stop and say hello, but I don’t socialise with teachers at all. I have a really strong network of people outside of school (MS).

SS has “purposely engaged in a lot of other activities like being on [not-for-profit governing councils]” (SS), as do CS, SDS, and THS. These limits include pursuing physical fitness, cultural activities, and “doing something you really enjoy” (SDS) to recharge. Most report being self-disciplined with their time, diet, sleep, and physical exercise. Family support, and time away from the school with family, is reported by six of the seven participants; SS is the only participant who does not mention family.

THS is in a different position to other participants. This is their first role as principal, and THS has been in the role for only “seven terms” (THS). There is an eagerness to prove worthy of the role, and this comes across in interview as fierce determination to succeed. An admission that “I’ve found it tough; I think any new principal does” (THS) is balanced by the acknowledgement this phase is for a season only, as “I do have my eyes on a horizon” (THS) beyond the “awful lot of change going on” (THS) during the early phase of incumbency. A guardedness with staff exemplifies the need for “projecting a total control and unfazed-ness with the complexity, with the crises, and so on” (THS), because THS perceives “people draw strength from that” (THS).

5.8 Toward a theoretical model

The analysis above applied a combination of constructive grounded theoretical and thematic analysis techniques to the seven Phase One interview transcripts. This exploratory study seeks insight into the previously unresearched experience of Australian IB principals, consistent with its subjective symbolic interactionist approach. Having analysed these transcripts, this section moves the analysis beyond simply identifying separate themes to exploring what the “different
themes are, how they fit together, and the overall story they tell about the data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 92). The methods used to develop this model were detailed in 4.3.7.4 Identifying and refining themes and 4.3.7.5 Focused thematic framework.

Development of a theoretical model through constructivist grounded theory foregrounds the researcher’s perspective. This research applied line-by-line gerund coding techniques initially to limit the impact of the researcher’s perspective in order to allow participant perspectives to emerge (see 4.3.7.2 Initial coding). The process of developing meanings and connections across the wider data set is, however, inherently interpretivist in its function (Blumer, 1969). In employing constructivist grounded theory techniques, the researcher must aim to “avoid inadvertently importing taken-for-granted values and beliefs into [their] work” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 240). Constructivist grounded theory approaches must therefore “locate participants’ meanings and actions in larger social structures and discourses” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 241), consonant with the perspectives of Lingard and Christie (2003) and Eacott (2010, 2013b, 2015) in mobilising Bourdieu’s theory of field to study educational leadership.

A preliminary theoretical model (Figure 5.1) developed from this analysis was reviewed by three experienced principals, two with direct IB experience and one without any IB experience (see 4.3.7.5 Focused thematic framework); it was also reviewed by a doctoral research student not researching the field of educational leadership. All four indicate the model has descriptive power, and the two principals with direct IB experience report it resonates with their personal experience (Charmaz, 2014). This has significance for claims of validity to this research as one IB principal has extensive experience (20 years as principal in IB schools), and the other is an experienced principal (11 years) but who is only in their second year of principalship in an IB school. These comparative perspectives suggest the model is consonant
The model shows leadership of Australian IB principals through two overarching themes: expectation and experience. The theme of expectation includes major stakeholders at the school site level, that is, governors, and parents and students. As the analysis throughout this chapter reveals, governors have very clear expectations about the contribution of the IB to the success (academic profile) and sustainability (number of programmes and finances) of the school. There is evidence in participant comments these can and do vary across time (history). There are also some distinct challenges evident for the two participants in Phase One from government schools; in addition to challenges common to all participants, these differences require government school principals to manage their school in the face of contestable views about its validity held by some departmental bureaucrats. They face additional financial pressures which are met through
cooperative resource sharing with other schools. By contrast, and understandably, parent and student expectations are perceived to focus on different priorities. Both stakeholder groups see the value of the IB as one of broadening horizons, complemented by the value of it as an internationally reputable credential. There is evidence these can be, at times, in conflict with priorities established by a governing council. Perceptions gained by governors from their perspective as parents is also seen as a source of conflict which impacts the leadership of some principals. The theme of experience reflects the challenge for principals in “connecting all the bits together” (BS). The blending of curriculum requirements has implications for duality of structure in pedagogy, staff resourcing, and professional learning. Mitigating confusion brought about by these dualities appears a significant leadership responsibility for principals in Australian IB schools.

At the core of the preliminary theoretical model is the ongoing work of responding to shifting priorities. The image invoked is that of the Chinese circus art of plate spinning, where sufficient energy is supplied to maintain the gyroscopic effect needed to keep the plate near equilibrium; once momentum slows, and the plate moves into disequilibrium, further input of energy is required to return the plate to a position of stability. The two “plates”, to continue the analogy, are coherence (sense-making) and congruence (structuration). These are both enabled and constrained by the unique culture of each school. While separated into these four major components for the sake of analysis, the principal’s leadership is impacted by these components in ways which reflect the behaviour of complex adaptive systems; any one of the components can self-organise in unexpected and non-linear ways which, in turn, can alter the equilibrium of the “plates”.
5.9 Conclusion

Principals of Australian IB schools constantly shift and recalibrate the focus of their leadership as needs change, consistent with the complexity leadership theory that informs this research. This is reflected in the coherence/congruence element in the preliminary theoretical model (Figure 5.1). Commonalities are evident even within this sample group ($n^1 = 7$), such as how well governors understand the IB, managing conflicting stakeholder expectations. Yet there are also factors which create diversity of experience, such as programme options (1, 2, or 3) and configurations (e.g., PYP and DP; MYP and DP; PYP, MYP, and DP), differing state/territory governance and curriculum obligations, length of history in offering an IB programme, and school financial capacity. Principals focus their leadership on the most pressing issues from among the array reported in this chapter. The shifting and changing dynamics articulated by Phase One participants are consistent with the behaviour of complex adaptive systems, and those principals who enable complexity leadership dynamics appear more confident and secure.

Change and continuity are managed more effectively where adaptive leadership embraces change and fosters agency throughout the school community.

The model described in the previous section is now inspected (Blumer, 1969) further through the Phase Two survey questionnaire made available to the total population of 174 Australian IB principals ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%). This is to consider the extent to which perceptions of the seven Phase One participants are present across the wider total population of Australian IB school principals. A survey questionnaire instrument was developed as part of the initial proposal for this research using items from the 2013 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) Principals’ Questionnaire (OECD, 2014), combined with items from the 2013 Staff in Australia’s Schools (SiAS) Questionnaire (McKenzie et al., 2014). Following analysis of Phase
One interview transcripts, further items were developed to interrogate ideas which emerged from the findings reported in this chapter (see 4.6.2 Survey instrument for further details). The following chapter reports findings of the Phase Two survey questionnaire analysis, followed by Chapter Seven which provides an integrated discussion (Greene et al., 1989) of both qualitative and quantitative findings.
6.1 Introduction

This chapter reports findings from quantitative analysis of Phase Two survey questionnaire data. Using the findings from analysis of Phase One interview data, a web-based survey questionnaire was developed to explore further themes identified in Phase One (Appendix K). The total population of 174 Australian IB school principals ($n^2 = 50; \text{RR } 28.7\%$) was invited to participate, of whom a sample of 137 agreed to receive an invitation to complete an online questionnaire via REDCap. Further details of data collection processes are outlined in 4.4.3 Data collection. This chapter documents and describes the available data from across the total population of Australian IB school principals.

This chapter first reports response rates to the email invitation, describes the Phase Two sample, and details results of tests for normality and variance between the total population of Australian IB school principals and the Phase Two sample. Findings are analysed by sector, ICSEA, number of programmes offered, and types of programmes offered. Correlations between items in each questionnaire section are reported, as well as correlations with other relevant items from other sections. Findings of the questionnaire analysis are reported using the structure of the questionnaire:

1. School profile;
2. Programme authorisation;
3. Governance;
4. IB Office support;
5. Work type (principals’ use of time);
6. Decision making;

---

20 As at July 5, 2017.
7. Teaching and learning;
8. Additional language learning;

Analysis of quantitative data for each section is then followed by analysis of open-ended responses.

As the total population of Australian IB principals were invited to participate in this phase of the research, discussion of sample representativeness and related generalisability of findings, is an important first step. A profile of Phase Two respondents in the following two sections shows that the sample population is a good reflection of the total population of Australian IB principals. The ability of this research to capture views which reasonably represent the total population strengthens claims to validity of its findings.

6.2 Response and non-response rates

Questionnaire responses were collected between September 5, 2017, and September 20, 2017. Table 6.1 reports responses to the request for participant email addresses described in 4.4.1 Sampling. Table 6.2 reports responses to the invitation email using AAPOR codes (American Association for Public Opinion Research, 2016a, 2016b); full details are provided in Appendix L. The Response Rate 2 is 28.7% and Cooperation Rate 2 is 35.2%. These rates are applied due to inclusion of partial responses. It is felt inclusion of as much data as possible strengthens the findings, given the exploratory nature of this research. There is a significant difference between these rates and the response rates observed by Baruch (1999) and Cook et al. (2000), although the RR of 28.7% is closer to the figure of 33% reported in more recent work of Nulty (2008). These rates are also higher than those reported in a recent mixed methods study of school leadership (Day, Gu, et al., 2016, p. 230) which achieved a response rate of 24% from primary
principals \((n = 378)\) and of 32\% from secondary principals \((n = 362)\); these responses came from a sampled population of 1,550 primary school principals and from 1,140 secondary principals.

### 6.3 Phase Two Sample Profile

Comparisons between the total population of Australian IB principals and the Phase Two sample were made using the Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) profile published for each principal’s school (ACARA, 2019), proportionality across sectors and states, number and type of programmes offered, and length of authorisation. These comparisons showed similarities across some measures, but also significant variance across others. This results in a possible sampling bias whose effect is discussed in the following chapter. Open-ended responses
from respondents who introduced or withdrew an IB programme highlight academic rigour, pedagogical coherence, and the international focus as key reasons.

6.3.1 ICSEA distribution

The total population of Australian IB principals and the Phase Two questionnaire sample were tested for normality using distribution of ICSEA (see Appendix M for Q-Q plots for ICSEA). The total population of Australian IB schools is significantly non-normal, $D(171) = 0.090$, $p < 0.005$, while the Phase Two sample does not deviate from normal, $D(46) = 0.114$, $p = 0.167$. This is also highlighted in comparison of kurtosis (Table 6.3). This difference indicates the requirement to use non-parametric tests.

The distribution of ICSEA differs by sector across the total population of Australian IB schools, $H(1) = 6.29$, $p = 0.001$, and Phase Two sample, $H(1) = 6.38$, $p = .012$. The total population of government schools offering the IB in Australia are socio-educationally advantaged ($M = 1092$, $SD = 57.7$, $Mdn = 1103$) relative to the wider total population of Australian schools ($M = 1000$, $SD = 100$) (ACARA, 2018a), but less advantaged than the total population of non-government schools offering the IB in Australia ($M = 1121$, $SD = 55.4$, $Mdn = 1134$). This difference is also reflected in the Phase Two sample (Figure 6.1). Comparison of ICSEA interquartile ranges (IQR) shows government schools in the Phase Two sample (IQR = 1033 – 1130) have lower socio-educational advantage compared with government schools in the total population of Australian IB schools (IQR = 1054 – 1142). The concentration of Q1 and Q2 non-government schools highlights the greater socio-educational advantage in this sector.
Table 6.3. **Total and sample population descriptive statistics for ICSEA.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Kurt</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total IB schools</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>-.717</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>-.538</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1. *Phase Two sample ICSEA quartile distribution by sector.*

### 6.3.2 Sector and state distribution

The overall proportion of government school principals to non-government school principals in the Phase Two sample (Table 6.4) is consistent with that of the total population of all Australian
IB schools profiled in Chapter Two. Phase Two government school principals represent 37% of the sample compared with 35% for the total of Australian IB school principals, while Phase Two non-government school principals represent 63% of the sample compared with 65% for the total of Australian IB school principals. Significant difference is observed between proportions of Phase Two sub-sample respondents from NSW, VIC, and SA when compared with the total from NSW; this may be attributable to personal knowledge about the research gained from their direct relationship with me, although this assumption was not specifically tested; 1.2 Background to the study identified collegial discussions about the presence of the IB in schools as a contributing factor leading to this research. Many of these discussions were with colleagues in NSW, the state in which the IB school where I was principal is located.

Two states have sectoral representations which differ from the total population of Australian IB schools. Victoria has a greater number of government school principals than non-government school principals in the Phase Two sample (7 of 13, or 54%), compared with 29 of

### Table 6.4 Questionnaire respondents by state and sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Non-government</th>
<th>% Sample</th>
<th>% All schools</th>
<th>Var (+/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>+8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>+1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding errors.
64 (45%) in the total population of Australian IB schools. Similarly, South Australia has equal numbers of government and non-government respondents in the Phase Two sample, compared with 37% government school principals and 63% non-government school principals in the total population of Australian IB schools.

6.3.3 Number and type of IB programmes offered

The number of programmes offered in schools of Phase Two respondents differs only slightly to the distribution of the total population of Australian IB schools. Schools offering one IB programme represent 70.5% of the Phase Two sample, compared with 76.8% of the total population of Australian IB schools. This small variation is offset by an increase in schools offering two programmes, with the Phase Two sample representing 22.7% compared with 16.6% of the total of Australian IB schools. Schools offering three programmes represent 6.8% and 6.6% of the Phase Two sample and the total population of Australian IB schools respectively.

A difference is observed in the proportion of programme types between the Phase Two sample and the total population of Australian IB schools (Figure 6.2). This creates a sampling bias, given the size of the difference between PYP and DP respondents when compared with the same groups in the total population of Australian IB schools. Most notably, schools with DP only are over-represented in the sample. This is considered further in the integrated discussion chapter which follows. Table 6.4 disaggregates this data to show the state-based pattern of programme implementation for Phase Two respondents. Three significant differences are evident between this profile and the total population of Australian IB schools (Table 2.5):

The largest group in the total population of Australian IB schools is Victorian schools offering the PYP only (46 of 196 total programmes, or 23.5%). This compares with Phase Two respondents’ sample of 5 of 44 programmes (11.4%);
South Australian schools offering a single programme represent 17.3% (34 of 196 programmes) of the total population of Australian IB schools, compared with 9.1% (4 of 44 programmes) of Phase Two respondents. All four respondents are in schools offering the PYP; no principals from schools offering the MYP or DP as a single programme participated in Phase Two; Representation of the MYP across the Phase Two sample creates a sample bias. Although Table 2.4 shows the MYP accounts for 19.5% (51 of 262 programmes) across the total population of Australian IB schools, compared with the Phase Two sample group of 16.7% (10 of 60 programmes; Table 6.5), this disguises the absence of MYP representation from South Australia. Schools offering the MYP in South Australia, whether as a single programme or combined with other programmes, represent nearly half of all MYP programmes across the total population of Australian IB schools (19 of 43, or 44%); this also represents 8% of the total programmes offered across Australia. By contrast, South Australian schools offering the MYP in the Phase Two sample account for only 3 of 60 programmes (5%). This impacts consideration of reliability of the findings.
Table 6.5. Questionnaire respondents by state and type of IB programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>PYP</th>
<th>MYP</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>PYP &amp; MYP</th>
<th>PYP &amp; DP</th>
<th>PYP, MYP &amp; DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One respondent from VIC only partially completed school profile data. Totals for VIC schools differ between Tables 6.4 and 6.5.

Table 6.6. Length of programme authorisation - Phase Two respondents’ schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisation - PYP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisation - MYP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisation - DP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

particularly related to principal leadership in South Australian government schools. The MYP in South Australian government schools is the largest group of MYP schools across the total population of Australian IB schools, yet the Phase Two sample includes only two respondents from South Australian government schools, both of whom are in schools implementing both the multi-programme configuration of PYP and MYP.

Taken together, these differences limit state and programme comparisons. At the same time, they inform areas for future research, detailed in Chapter Eight.

Phase Two respondents identified when each programme was initially authorised in their current school (Table 6.5). Significant growth of the PYP is clear, with 14 of the sample group of schools authorised in the past five years. The rates of growth across the three programmes is also
clear (Figure 6.2). It suggests the PYP will likely continue to experience growth rates much higher than both the MYP and DP. Taken together, approximately one third of IB programmes (21 of 60, 32%) in schools in the Phase Two sample were introduced within the last five years.

The above suggests there are gaps in representativeness of the Phase Two sample group. Although this must be considered a limitation, it is consistent with the complexity of the field of Australian IB schools presented in 2.6 A growing community: The IB in Australia. Given the over representation of the DP and the observed distribution differences, comparisons across states and programmes must be considered cautiously.

### 6.3.4 Reasons for introducing or withdrawing an IB programme

Principals who introduced or withdrew IB programmes from their current school were given opportunity for open-ended responses articulating reasons for doing so (see Appendix N) for responses. Respondents are identified by sector and programme(s) offered, although the state in
which the school is located is not reported to prevent identification through triangulation processes). Seventeen principals who introduced IB programmes responded, two who withdrew a programme responded, and one indicated their school recently had an authorisation visit and was awaiting the report of that process before deciding to continue or withdraw. Of the seventeen who introduced a programme, nine (53%) are in non-government schools and eight (47%) in government schools. These proportions are not consistent with the proportion of the total population of Australian IB schools, nor of this sample. It is, however, consistent with the greater growth rate in the government sector identified in 2.6 A growing community: the IB in Australia. Nearly half of programmes introduced by Phase Two respondents in government schools (8 of 18, 44%) were introduced in the last five years, while Phase Two respondents in non-government schools introduced only 13 of 42 programmes (30%). These data support the assertion there is now a faster rate of growth in government schools than in non-government schools, with the greatest proportion of that growth seen in implementation of the PYP.

A word frequency query of the verbatim responses conducted using NVivo, with the grouping setting selected to “with generalizations”, produced a Word Cloud (Figure 6.4) highlighting two dominant themes:

- perceived quality, rigour, and international focus within the IB programmes compared with the Australian curriculum or its state manifestation; and,
- the holistic, transdisciplinary, and inquiry framework provides a school with more coherence of learning and teaching practice.

The PYP is the most common programme to be implemented across the last five years. Six of eight government school principals and five of nine non-government school principals who responded to the open-ended question introduced the PYP. Academic rigour and consistency of pedagogical approach feature in reasons provided such as:
disquiet with [state] syllabuses (NG-3); academic rigour (G-7); pedagogy that delivers a rigorous curriculum (G-5); an approach to teaching and learning that challenged our students (G-6); the best whole school framework (NG-2); a consistent teaching framework for the whole school (NG-7); and, a whole school approach and framework for teaching and learning (G-8).

Six respondents highlight transdisciplinary and holistic learning, and five identify the IB’s international focus as a strong attractor.

More specifically, respondents who introduced the DP have very explicit, and forcefully expressed, academic reasons. They perceive the DP to be “much harder than the [state matriculation] system” (G-1) and is a credential which provides “students with a world class education” (G-3). Non-government principals perceive it helps “lift academic standards” (NG-5), has “academic excellence” (NG-6), and addresses the “stultifying conservatism and arrogance of
the [local matriculation credential]” (NG-6). Only one respondent commented regarding the MYP and indicates the reason they introduced it was familiarity with it from a previous school.

Four principals identify marketing and school choice, all of whom are in government schools. Of these, three introduced the DP on the pretext of giving students in “the Government Sector…the opportunity to study the DP” (G-4). The fourth, who introduced the PYP, explicitly states the reason is to provide a “point of difference for parents [and for] attracting and retaining staff” (G-7). Given this is the only explicit acknowledgement of market and staffing related matters across the seventeen respondents, this suggests the philosophy and pedagogy of the IB are much stronger reasons for implementing a programme than any market positioning rationale.

The two respondents who withdrew an IB programme have differing reasons for doing so. G-9 states finance and change of leadership, while NG-10 indicates the MYP is not perceived to be an adequate academic preparation for either the DP or their local matriculation credential. One further respondent (NG-11) indicates the outcome of an authorisation visit will guide their decision to continue or withdraw from the PYP, but neither academic nor financial reasons are stated. No clear conclusions can be drawn from these limited responses.

6.4 Governance

The first research question in this study focuses on contextual elements in which Australian IB schools operate (Figure 3.1):

1. To what extent do principals in Australian IB schools consider their leadership is impacted by:
   i. individual school demographics;
      a) Socio-economic advantage;
      b) Number of IB programmes offered (1, 2 or 3).
   ii. governance structures:
Analysis of Phase One interviews highlights variation in the impact of school governance contexts. The Commonwealth was not seen as a significant context for any of the Phase One participants and thus was not considered sufficient to warrant further exploration in Phase Two. Some Phase One principals report governors have a reasonable understanding of the IB, its philosophy, its cost, and its alignment with a school’s overall operation. Analysis of Phase One data also highlights variance about the way principals believe the IB understands the needs of Australian schooling contexts. This section reports findings from analysis of questionnaire items on governance, followed by analysis of items on the IB office.

6.4.1 Governing council membership

Significant difference exists across membership profiles of governing councils in government and non-government schools (Table 6.7). There is little agreement between the two sectors as to which of these different governance groups participate on governing councils, except Parents. Government school principals consistently report the presence of senior management (75%), administration personnel (82%), teaching staff (94%), and students (50%). By contrast, non-government principals reporting on the same categories deteriorates significantly across these four groups from senior management (50%), to administration personnel (25%), teachers (11%), and students (<1%). The one non-government school principal who indicates students are involved in the governing council completed only the section on governance.

The presence of church representatives in the non-government responses reflects the close connection many Australian non-government schools have with religious foundations.
Table 6.7. *Governing council composition.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>NG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of any state education authority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the school management team</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School administrative personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of business, church, or other private institutions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 90 of 112 (80%) non-government IB schools in this study which have historic, formal, informal, or cultural associations with various Christian, Jewish, or Islamic communities. No comments about religious associations were received in the open-ended section of the questionnaire. This was unexpected, as my personal experience within a faith-based school witnessed conflict with some governors over the IB’s mission statement that “other people, with their differences, can also be right” (IBO, 2017, p. vi).

Respondents were given opportunity to include details of other categories of school council membership. Three respondents indicated their governing council appoints designated
Table 6.8. Governance item responses – all principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governors can name most elements of the IB Learner Profile (IBLP)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry based pedagogy is discussed by governors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing international connections for staff and students is valued</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public academic results are very important to governors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB training costs are regularly discussed at governing council meetings</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors would like to know more about the IB</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors receive regular briefings about the IB from a range of staff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors think the benefits outweigh the costs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To my knowledge, the IB was introduced to differentiate the school from others</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. As detailed in 6.2 Response and non-response rates, partial responses have been included in this data due to the exploratory nature of the study. Respondent numbers \( (n) \)

vary across items and are given for all questionnaire items.

“experts in certain fields” (NG-1, PYP and DP), “community representatives” (G-1, DP), and “others with specific skill set (sic) the Board needed” (NG-2), although no details are provided regarding these skills. One bilingual school has members of both the Australian and other sponsoring national governments, and one non-government school makes governing council positions available to former parents and other independent members of the wider community.

6.4.2 Perspectives on governance

A Mann Whitney test on items for governance (Table 6.8) showed no statistically significant difference between sectors across most items, with two exceptions. These were discussion of
governors’ knowledge of the IBLP and discussion of training costs. Government school principals reported higher levels of governors’ knowledge of the IBLP (Figure 6.5), $U = 104.4$, $p = .034$. Government school principals also reported higher levels of discussion of training costs (Figure 6.6), $U = 106.0$, $p = .005$. A Kruskal Wallis test using the strata of one, two, or three programmes reported no statistically significant difference, with $p$ range .407 to .966.

A test using the strata of ISCEA quartiles showed that Q1 and Q2 school governing councils have significantly more focus on IB costs than Q3 and Q4 school governing councils, $H(3) = 14.05$, $p = .003$. A test using the strata of programme type showed that single programme PYP school governing councils are significantly more likely to discuss IB training costs than any other programme type, $H(5) = 4.82$, $p = .020$.

A correlation test was run for all statements and showed the following statistically significant moderate, positive correlations:

Governors can name most elements of the IBLP and Governors receive regular briefings about the IB from a range of staff ($\tau_b = .484$, $p = .001$); and, Governors can name most elements of the IBLP and Inquiry based pedagogy is discussed by governors ($\tau_b = .420$, $p = .004$).

It thus seems unsurprising there is a slightly weaker, but still moderate positive correlation between Governors can name most elements of the IBLP and Governors think the benefits outweigh the costs ($\tau_b = .303$, $p = .044$). This is reinforced by a moderate negative correlation between Governors think the benefits outweigh the costs and IB training costs are regularly discussed at governing council meetings ($\tau_b = -.349$, $p = .015$). Taken together, these suggest that governors who are well informed about the IB are less focused on issues related to its cost. Conversely, scrutiny of costs is more likely when governors are unclear about the value of the IB to the school.
No statistically significant correlations were detected between the items for the Phase Two sub-group of government school principals (Table 6.9). These principals report very positive response regarding the support they receive from their government department. This contrasts to criticism voiced in Phase One interviews and may reflect a cautious participant bias regarding government criticism. There is some evidence of conflict with other government
Table 6.9. Governance item responses – government school principals only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The education department manager/director supports the delivery of the IB in this school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School resources provided by the department are adequate to deliver the IB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is conflict with other local principals in my cluster/district because the school offers the IB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

school principals. Closer inspection of these responses identified that two of the three respondents are principals in Queensland schools which offer the DP. Both respondents are the same respondents who indicate Disagree regarding departmental support, perhaps indicating their negative perceptions are more contextual, rather than symptomatic of broad-based issues. However, it is also noted both respondents Agree and Strongly Agree that resources provided by the department are adequate. The responses of the other Queensland government principal are completely opposite.

The evaluation of government school departmental support, through Disagree and Strongly Disagree for resources, was analysed more closely. No pattern exists across responses. All four respondents are from single programme schools, two offering the PYP and two offering the DP. Two are from Queensland, one from Victoria, and one from South Australia. One has an ICSEA above the mean for Australian IB schools, while three are below, one significantly so (1020). None of these schools have government representatives on their governing council. None report conflict with other local principals. Three of the four report that training costs are discussed regularly, but also agree that governors believe the benefits outweigh the costs. All four indicate the IB was introduced for market differentiation purposes. Combined, these data suggest these principals are working hard to resolve conflicting pressures to deliver an education
which is valued and desired by the community, but that is costly and perceived to be inadequately resourced.

Five non-government school principals and one government school principal gave qualitative comment in response to the open-ended question on governance. Comments indicate there should be a clear distinction between governors and the management of the school, that curriculum responsibility lies with the principal, and that the relationship between governors and the principal must be robust. Governors are responsible for “monitoring the school's strategic direction...including the annual estimate of revenue and expenditure for the school...and advising the school's Principal about strategic matters” (G-1, DP). Governors are expected to provide support to the principal, which, in the view of some principals, does not extend to governors requiring “detailed knowledge of the IB, nor...making deep inquiry into educational matters which remain for management” (NG-2, DP).

Beyond the strategic role of governors, support for the principal is noted as important. Two principals state that support from their governing council is “very strong” (NG-1, MYP) because “governors have trusted the management” (NG-3, PYP and MYP). This trust is, in the view of one principal, predicated on governors’ confidence in the value of the IB to the school. This does not extend, however, to regular briefings about the IB. One principal indicates their governing council is “given updated information on the IB and the success and involvement of students” (NG-2, DP), they indicate Disagree regarding regular briefings and discussion of costs yet Agree that academic results are very important to governors. These data suggest that maintaining governors’ knowledge may be a sporadic process for this principal and is less needed while academic results remain high. Only one respondent expresses caution, identifying a
concern that the governors “are questioning the value of IB in our current context” (NG-4, PYP) based on differentiation from other local schools also using inquiry frameworks.

6.5 IBO support

The IBO is generally seen in a positive light (Table 6.10), but some principals indicate the IBO could better respond to Australian contextual conditions. Further, these data suggest while Australian principals value opportunity for collegial and professional learning provided by the IB, organisational systems which support its promotion and delivery require improvement.

These responses were consistent across the respondents. A Mann Whitney test on the IBO support showed no statistically significant differences between sectors, with \( p \) range .142 to .747. A Kruskal-Wallis test using the strata of one, two, or three programmes reported no statistically significance difference across all three strata, with \( p \) range .196 to .978. A test using the strata of ICSEA quartile reported no statistically significant difference across all four strata, with \( p \) range .087 to .812. A test using the strata of programme types reported no statistically significance difference across all six strata, with \( p \) range .196 to .806.

A correlation analysis was conducted across all items. Results showed a strong positive correlation between the rated perceptions that the IBO office staff are helpful and the experience principals enjoy with professional learning, \( \tau_b = .697, p < .001 \). A small difference was noted, however, when grouped by sector. This relationship was stronger for non-government principals, \( \tau_b = .715, p < .001 \), and not as strong for government principals, \( \tau_b = .666, p = .013 \). The perception that IBO support is helpful also shows in perceptions about the value of authorisation processes to improve teaching and learning, \( \tau_b = .493, p = .001 \), with government principals, \( \tau_b = .637, p = .018 \), more likely to value the process than non-government principals, \( \tau_b = .433 \).
Table 6.10. Views about the IB Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IB Office/admin staff are helpful &amp; supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional learning for principals is useful and easy to access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorisation/evaluation processes have improved teaching and learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB representatives understand the unique circumstances of this school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting with leadership colleagues from across the world is a strength of the IB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IB provides enough curriculum support to meet Australian curriculum requirements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\) n = 39.

\(p = .016\). The authorisation process is also positively correlated to principals’ professional learning, \(r_b = .486, p = .001\), and particularly so for government principals, \(r_b = .471, p = .005\), compared with non-government principals, \(r_b = .391, p = .029\).

Despite the above positive reports and correlations, three items have similar patterns which indicate some dissatisfaction with the IBO. Professional learning, understanding the unique circumstances of schools, and providing adequate curriculum support for the Australian curriculum all have significant levels of negative response, with each item receiving at least 35% of responses in the Disagree or Strongly Disagree categories. Given no significant differences between sectors or across programmes identified by Mann Whitney or Kruskal Wallis tests, this represents a broad-based challenge for the IBO. These findings are also reflected in the five open-ended responses, here reported verbatim and in total:

More Australian based training, and an (sic) conference (G-1, DP);
As a new leader in an IB school I had to navigate my way around. [The
curriculum] wasn't as embedded as it was believed to be through the last review. Whilst the inquiry aspect is beneficial, we lacked the fundamentals of the curriculum and the time to invest in those (G-2, PYP); The IBO has grown quickly and the quality of staff has varied (NG-1, MYP); They are chaotic (NG-2, DP); As a principal new to IB with a PYP coordinator new to this role, we have received no support from the IBO (NG-3, PYP).

6.6 Work type

Respondents provided approximate proportions of their weekly time spent in varying activities (Table 6.11). The dominance of leadership meetings is clear, as expected. A wider range of time spent is reported for each of leadership meetings, student interactions, and community/business interactions than for curriculum meetings, or interactions with parents and professional colleagues. A Mann Whitney test by sector was therefore conducted to analyse the difference. While the difference on time spent in leadership meetings does not meet the test for statistical significance, $U = 232.50, p = .058$, there is a noticeable visual difference (Figure 6.7).

Government principals report spending more time than non-government principals in student interactions, $U = 97.50, p = .032$. This difference is also evident in means for both sectors. Non-government principals spend a greater proportion of their time in leadership meetings ($M = 42.2, Mdn = 43$) than government principals ($M = 34.6, Mdn = 30$). Government school principals spend a greater proportion of their time in student interactions ($M = 21.1, Mdn = 20$) than non-government principals ($M = 14.8, Mdn = 15$). Taken together, these data suggest sectoral differences in governance and organisational management may require greater time from non-government principals, thereby reducing time available to spend on student interaction.
Table 6.11. Percentage of principals' time spent weekly on meetings and interactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M(%)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership meetings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum meetings</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student interactions</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardians/caregivers’ interactions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with the wider community, business and industry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with professional colleagues and associations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a \( n = 39 \).

Figure 6.7. Mann Whitney test - % of time spent weekly in Leadership meetings.

A Kruskal Wallis test using the strata of one, two, or three programmes did not show any statistically significant difference in relation to these meetings and interactions items across the three strata with \( p \) range .227 to .981. Statistically significant difference was evident when tested using the strata of ICSEA quartiles for Leadership meetings, \( H(5) = 12.96, p = .005 \), and for Student interactions, \( H(5) = 13.31, p = .005 \) (see Appendix O). Principals in lower socio-
economically advantaged schools spend less percentage of their time in leadership meetings ($M = 27.3$, $Mdn = 28$) compared to principals in higher socio-educationally advantaged schools ($M = 43.5$, $Mdn = 45$). Principals in lower socio-economically advantaged schools also spend more time with student interactions ($M = 24.9$, $Mdn = 23$) compared to principals in higher socio-economically advantaged schools ($M = 11.5$, $Mdn = 13$). Statistically significant difference is evident when tested using the strata of programme type for Leadership meetings, $H(5) = 11.84$, $p = .037$, and for Student interactions, $H(5) = 13.60$, $p = .018$ (see Appendix O), although no particular patterns are evident.

Unsurprisingly, given these data, there is a strong negative correlation between leadership meetings and student interactions, $\tau_b = -.723$, $p < .001$. A moderate negative correlation is also evident between both leadership meetings and parent/caregiver/guardian interactions, $\tau_b = -.316$, $p = .014$, and leadership meetings and professional and collegial interactions, $\tau_b = -.337$, $p = .009$. These relationships are consistent with the view that time spent in leadership meetings in schools has the potential to detract from time spent with students, parents/caregivers, and colleagues.

Only three responses were received to the open-ended question about work type. Two principals acknowledged estimating proportions is difficult based on a view that “time spent will change each week and be dependent upon the school calendar” (NG-1, DP), thus “figures [provided] are rough estimations” (G-1, MYP). For one respondent, additional “systemic obligations…can take up 30–40% of my time” (NG-2, PYP), highlighting the significant impact that governance obligations have on the work of principals.
6.7 Decision making processes

Research questions 2 and 3 inquire into principals’ perceptions about leadership, culture, decision-making processes they enact, and personal well-being:

2. What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about:
   i. the role of vision and direction setting;
   ii. their focus of action;
   iii. the nature of school culture?

3. What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use:
   i. to enable effective school administration;
   ii. for decision-making purposes;
   iii. to sustain themselves as leaders?

This section reports findings on administration and decision-making items related to research question 3. Consideration is given to what insights these provide about principals’ perspectives on leadership and culture; these are more fully explored in the following chapter where both qualitative and quantitative findings are discussed. The final section of this chapter reports findings on personal and well-being perspectives (Table 6.21) as part of research question 3.

There is a widespread perception amongst principals in this study that they lead inclusive and collaborative schools, as the IB requires (IBO, 2014c). A large majority of principals Agree or Strongly Agree to the range of positively framed items (Table 6.12) and Disagree with the final item to make clear they do not “make the important decisions” on their own. The only two respondents who Strongly Disagree with the statement about participatory decision making and collaborative decision-making items are the same respondents on both items, suggesting there are specific contextual issues that may be significantly different to the rest of the Phase Two sample. Neither respondent provided any further details via the open-ended question.
Table 6.12. Decision making processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school provides staff with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school provides parents, guardians, and caregivers with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school provides students with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a collaborative decision-making culture which is characterised by mutual support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make the important decisions on my own</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a n = 39.\)

This consistency of perception across the sample is significant, given how infrequently such consistency occurs throughout the questionnaire. Across the 50 Likert items, only four other items have so few Strongly Disagree or Disagree responses (order is Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree):

- Public academic results are very important to governors (Table 6.8; 0, 2, 27, 13);
- Learning another language improves students' intercultural understanding (Table 6.19; 0, 0, 18, 21);
- I enjoy working at this school (Table 6.22; 1, 0, 7, 31); and,
- I would recommend my school as a good place to work (Table 6.22; 1, 0, 5, 33).

These last two items had the same respondent who indicated Strongly Disagree for both statements, indicating some significant concerns for that respondent, but concerns which are not evidently present across the wider sample.

One response was similar for the smaller sub-group of government school principals (The education department manager/director supports the delivery of the IB in this school, Table 6.9; 0, 2, 10, 4). Two responses were relevant only to schools offering the DP:
Staff must teach in both the DP and this school's local matriculation credential, where the timetable permits (Table 6.15; 1, 1, 12, 5); and, the DP is available to any student who wishes to undertake it (Table 6.15; 0, 1, 11, 7).

There are also high levels of consistency across both sectors and across the number of programmes offered. A Mann Whitney test showed no statistically significant difference between sectors for staff participation, $U = 124.50, p = .187$, collaborative decision-making, $U = 115.50, p = .112$, or making decisions on one’s own, $U = 159.50, p = .780$. Differences are statistically significant, however, between government and non-government principals on the issue of student and parent/guardian/caregiver participation in decision making. Parents/caregivers/guardians in government schools participate more in decision making than in non-government schools, $U = 52.00, p < .001$ (Figure 6.8), as do students, $U = 84.00, p = .010$ (Figure 6.9). This is consistent with findings reported in 6.4.1 Governing council membership where students are not present as active participants in non-government school governance contexts, compared with government school contexts. Strong positive correlations are evident between parent/guardian/caregiver and student participation in government schools, $\tau_b = .675, p = .019$, as well as between staff participation and a culture of mutual support, $\tau_b = .632, p = .020$.

There was little variation in responses to these items related to programme type. A Kruskal Wallis test using the strata of one, two, or three programmes showed no statistically significant difference with $p$ range .129 to .879. A test using the strata of ICSEA quartile did not show any statistically significant differences across the four strata with $p$ range .238 to .664. A test using the strata of programme type did not show any statistically significant differences across the six strata with $p$ range .060 to .901. Although not statistically significant, principals in PYP and MYP single programme schools report higher levels of agreement that
parents/guardians/caregivers have more opportunity for involvement in decision making compared with the other four programme types represented in the Phase Two sample, $H(5) = 10.61, p = .060$.

These data suggest government IB school principals believe more strongly in cultures of inclusivity and supportive collaboration than non-government IB school principals. There is further support for this finding in the moderate negative correlation between staff participation
and the principal making important decisions alone reported by non-government school principals, τ₀ = -0.445, p = 0.017.

The open-ended question on Decision Making elicited only five responses, all from non-government school principals. Comments highlight a tension between how decisions are reached and the responsibility for those decisions, particularly in contexts where governance or market pressures exist. One respondent stated the strong view that “the buck always stops with me and I will get the blame (but not the praise!)”, leading to some hesitancy to fully embrace “a collaborative decision-making culture or not” (NG-3). Another noted that the willingness to embrace collaborative and inclusive decision making is highly contextualised, expressing the view that “the culture is consultative rather than collaborative, but it depends on the issue” (NG-4). A third respondent sees no necessary contradiction between the two on the basis that “decisions made on [my] own are always after consultation” (NG-5). Such tension and sensitivity are perhaps understandable for schools with high ICSEA (between 1149 and 1185), two of which offer the DP in high fee schools, and who all indicate their current school introduced the IB for market differentiation purposes. For one respondent, the opportunity for greater collaboration and participation flows naturally from being “a small school [so] all staff have the opportunity to join the leadership team throughout the year to be involved in planning and decision making” (NG-2).

6.8 Teaching and learning

This section reports on further structural and administrative functions which relate to decision making and collaboration. It also reports on items pertaining to parents and students which emerged from analysis of Phase One interviews. This section concludes with consideration of
perceptions about teachers’ valuing opportunity for international connections.

IB programmes are widely perceived to be engaging for students and attractive to parents, (Table 6.13), with two-thirds of principals reporting the IB is central to parents’ interest in choosing the school. This is the complete inverse for IB principals themselves (see 6.10 Personal and well-being) and may contribute to conflict of expectations. Despite the positive attraction to the IB, one-third of parents are perceived to have concern about literacy and numeracy. This may further fuel tension and conflict regarding parental expectation. The significant proportion of IB coordinators who do not report directly to the principal reveals another potential source of tension and possible conflict.

In relation to curriculum, no statistically significant differences are evident across all items based on sector or number of programmes offered, except for the item on IB coordinators’ reporting responsibility to the principal. A Mann Whitney test on IB coordinators’ reporting responsibility showed statistically significant differences between sectors, $U = 75.00, p = .004$ (Figure 6.10). Almost all IB coordinators in government IB schools report directly to the principal (12 of 13 principals Agree or Strongly Agree), while only half ($n = 13$) of the IB coordinators in non-government IB schools report directly to the principal.

Similarly, a Kruskal Wallis test on the strata of one, two, or three programmes on the same item showed no statistically significant differences across the three programmes, except for the item on IB coordinators’ reporting responsibility to the principal, $H(2) = 9.71, p = .008$. A Crosstabs analysis (Table 6.14) shows half of all non-government principals ($n = 13$) Disagree or Strongly disagree. There is also greater likelihood that single programme coordinators will report directly to the principal, regardless of sector. Of the 28 single programme schools, only six principals Disagree or Strongly Disagree with the statement.
Table 6.13. Perspectives on curriculum related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents/students choose this school because it offers IB programmes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB programmes provide more engaging learning than local curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents worry inquiry-based learning does not focus enough on literacy and numeracy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students at this school regularly refer to the IB Learner Profile (IBLP) when describing their learning experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IB Coordinator(s) reports directly to the principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are provided with time for collaborative planning within their regular timetable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers value the opportunity to connect with other teacher across the world for professional learning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 39 \).

Figure 6.10. Mann Whitney test – IB coordinators reporting to the principal by sector.

A test using the strata of ICSEA quartile reported a statistically significant difference result that principals in Q1 and Q2 schools are more likely to have their IB coordinators as direct
### Table 6.14 IB Coordinator reporting responsibility by programme and sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Non-government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; MYP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP, MYP &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reports than principals in Q3 and Q4, $H(3) = 9.99, p = .019$. A test using the strata of programme type (Figure 6.11) reported a statistically significant difference result that principals in single programme schools are more likely to have the IB coordinator report directly to them compared with principals in multi-programme schools, $H(5) = 15.73, p = .008$. Reasons for why the differences exist are not immediately clear from these data. It may be that lower ISCEA schools combine the role of IB coordinator with an existing senior reporting role, such as deputy principal, as a cost saving measure. It may be that multiple programme schools are structurally complex and the IB coordinator role is subsumed within larger curriculum coordination. It may also lend support to other evidence that the IB is subordinate to other curriculum structures.

The value of this direct reporting relationship is seen in two statistically significant correlations. A Kendall’s tau test shows a moderate positive correlation between the coordinator reporting directly to the principal and to staff and students using the IBLP to describe their learning, $\tau_b = .442, p = .002$. A weak to moderate positive correlation exists between the coordinator reporting directly to the principal and provision of time in the teaching timetable for teacher collaboration, $\tau_b = .292, p = .042$. 
A Mann Whitney test using sector was conducted on items specifically related to the DP. There were no statistically significant differences, with $p$ range .211 to .793. A Kruskal Wallis test using the strata of ICSEA quartile reported no statistically significant difference, with $p$ range .168 to .633. A Kendall’s tau test showed moderate positive correlation between principals’ belief the DP is a better preparation course for tertiary study and teachers’ preference to teach the DP, $\tau_b = .475$, $p = .027$. This is counterbalanced by similarly moderate positive correlation between principals’ belief the DP is a better preparation course for tertiary study and their commitment to ensuring the DP is available to any student, $\tau_b = .444$, $p = .044$. This highlights tensions for principals in managing competing demands between the DP and perceptions of the local state matriculation credential, as well as staff satisfaction and professional culture and climate. No other correlations were statistically significant.
Table 6.15. Diploma Programme teaching items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responsesa</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff must teach in both the DP and this school's local matriculation credential, where the timetable permits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DP is available to any student who wishes to undertake it</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some DP subjects are combined with subjects from the local curriculum when small numbers of students are enrolled in them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DP is a better preparation course than the local credential for students seeking tertiary entrance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers prefer to teach the DP rather than the state curriculum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a n = 19.

Two other statistically significant correlations are observed when a Kendall’s tau test is applied across all teaching and learning items. A strong positive correlation is observed between the perception that the DP is a better tertiary preparation course and the perception that IB programmes are more engaging than local curriculum, $\tau_b = .558, p = .009$. This is even stronger for non-government principals when the data is analysed at the sector level, $\tau_b = .711, p = .002$.

The second moderate positive correlation is between time provided for collaboration and the perception the DP is a better tertiary preparation, $\tau_b = .481, p = .026$. This is also stronger for non-government principals when the data is analysed at the sectoral level, $\tau_b = .554, p = .019$.

This suggests there is a broadly held perception among Australian IB principals that the IB is preferred ahead of the local curriculum, especially for non-government school principals.

There are no statistically significant results for any of the items related to parents, however, a Crosstabs analysis on the two parent items (parent choice, concern about literacy and numeracy) showed some differences across states and programmes. For state differences on
parents choosing the school because it offers IB programmes, all respondents to this item from the Australian Capital Territory \((n = 5)\) agreed parents choose their school because it offers the IB. Principals in Victoria \((n = 10)\) and New South Wales \((n = 9)\) mostly agree that parents choose the school because it offers the IB, but principals in South Australia \((n = 7)\) and Queensland \((n = 5)\) are evenly split on whether parents choose the school because it offers the IB. Only one principal from each of the Northern Territory, Tasmania, and Western Australia responded, limiting any meaningful finding for those jurisdictions. A Crosstabs analysis for programme type did not report any meaningful differences as results in most categories were very small, so total data by programme is reported (Table 6.16). Most principals believe the IB is a major attraction for parents, especially in schools offering the DP. Principals who *Strongly Disagree or Disagree* that parents choose the school because it offers the IB are predominantly in schools offering the PYP and MYP; only 3 of 13 are in DP schools or multi-programme schools of which the DP is one.

The Crosstabs analysis on concerns parents have regarding literacy and numeracy shows half of responding principals from the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, and Queensland *Agree or Strongly Agree*. This contrasts sharply with principals from South Australia (5 of 7) and Victoria (8 of 10) who overwhelmingly *Disagree*. Two principals from the Australian Capital Territory are the only respondents from the sample to indicate they *Strongly Disagree*. Analysis of their responses also indicates they are a non-government PYP and government MYP school who both agree that parents choose the school because it offers the IB. The Crosstabs analysis for programmes suggests strongest agreement is in schools offering the PYP. Ten respondents who *Agree or Strongly Agree* are in PYP schools or multi-programme schools of which the PYP is one. Taken together, these data suggest most principals do not
Table 6.16. *Perceptions of choosing a school for the IB by programme.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents/students choose this school because it offers IB programmes</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; MYP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; DP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP, MYP &amp; DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

believe parents are concerned about literacy and numeracy, although those who do are more likely to be in schools offering the PYP where foundations for literacy are nurtured.

Three items in the questionnaire focused on developing international connections, one within the governance section, one in the IB office section, and one in this section on teaching and learning:

*Developing international connections for staff and students is valued*  
(Governance);

*Connecting with leadership colleagues from across the world is a strength of the IB* (IB office); and,

*Teachers value the opportunity to connect with other teachers across the world for professional learning* (Teaching and Learning).

Teachers are generally perceived to value these connections (Table 6.17) with 31 of 39 respondents indicating *Agree* or *Strongly Agree*. A Mann Whitney test for all three items by sector shows no statistically significant difference, with $p$ range from .392 to .715. A Kruskal Wallis test using the strata of number of programmes shows no statistically significant difference, with $p$ range .068 to .501. A test using the strata of ICSEA quartiles shows no statistically significant difference, with $p$ range .525 to .812. A test using the strata of programme type shows no statistically significant difference, with $p$ range .196 to .730. A Kendall’s tau test
across all three items shows no statistically significant relationships, with $p$ range .071 to .546. Taken together, these data suggest that principals perceive international connection is valuable but of limited actual significance.

A Crosstabs analysis at the programme type and sector did not report any meaningful differences as results in most categories were very small, so total data by programme is reported (Table 6.17). A pattern is not obvious. Across the eight respondents who indicated they *Disagree*, seven are principals in single programme schools (PYP = 3, MYP = 1, DP = 3), which may suggest that contextual priorities at the site level are more significant. Beyond that, commonalities are not evident. Three are in government schools and five are in non-government schools. They are located across five different states and territories. They range in ICSEA from 1030 to 1185 ($M = 1111$), raising a question of whether patterns might be evident when analysed by ICSEA quartile. This analysis shows respondents are not concentrated in any ICSEA quartile (Table 6.18).

Six responses were made to the open-ended question on teaching and learning, and there is little consistency of theme across the comments. Two principals in schools offering the DP expressed frustration that state bureaucratic systems do not appreciate the administrative processes of the IB regarding DP examinations and tertiary entrance requirements. One feels their school’s “IB students are disadvantaged” (G-1, DP) as a result, while the other feels it is “frustrating the [tertiary admissions processes] are wilfully ignorant of the IB…and that too many universities underestimate the quality of the IB” (NG-4, DP). A third identified the reality of managing staff tension because of offering the two curricula, commenting that while some staff prefer to teach the DP over the local curriculum, it is also the case “others have no interest in teaching IB” (NG-3, DP). Two focused on collaborative planning time for teachers, with one
Table 6.17. Perceptions of teachers’ value of international connection by programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers value the opportunity to connect with other teachers across the world for professional learning</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PYP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; MYP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP &amp; DP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYP, MYP &amp; DP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.18. Perceptions of teachers’ value of international connection by ICSEA quartile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers value the opportunity to connect with other teachers across the world for professional learning</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

highlighting the scale of their school, “up to 8 classes at a level” (G-2, PYP), makes planning for this time very challenging. The second identified local priorities over the development of international professional learning connections, choosing to prioritise “time to collaborate internally within our School” (NG-3, MYP). The final respondent highlighted tensions which run consistently through both phases of this study, that of balancing “our systemic obligations...[while remaining] very focused on achieving our school goals” (NG-1).

6.9 Additional language learning

IB schools in Australia are required to provide additional language learning in all year levels in which an IB programme is offered (IBO, 2014c). Additional language learning is generally
perceived to be beneficial and valuable (Table 6.19). The range of languages present in IB schools, grouped by sector, reflects mostly common European and Asian languages (Table 6.20). Respondents were given opportunity to include additional languages, where offered; Greek and Latin were added, reflecting pedagogical and cultural particularities of the high-fee schools in which they are offered. The highest number of additional languages reported is seven, with two schools making this provision due to language learning priorities and international specialisations. One school offers six additional languages, five schools offer five additional languages, five schools offer four additional languages, seven schools offer three additional languages, four schools offer two additional languages, and fourteen schools offer only one additional language.

Provision of multiple languages is more prevalent in non-government schools, with only 4 of 13 government schools offering more than one additional language and 5 of 26 non-government schools offering only one additional language. This is also reflected in the difference between sectors of minutes per week additional language learning provided (Table 6.21; see also Appendix P). Schools with a pedagogical commitment to offering a wide range of languages are also in the higher range for ICSEA. Commitment to offer more than the minimum required additional language requirements brings concomitant staffing obligations, both financial and structural (timetables, rooming, professional learning), but these appear to be more easily managed (Table 6.19).

A Mann Whitney test reported no statistically significant difference between sectors, with \( p \) range .384 to 1.000. Kruskal Wallis tests reported no statistically significant difference when using the strata of number of programmes, with \( p \) range .156 to .783, or when using the strata of programme type, with \( p \) range .232 to .751. One statistically significant difference was reported
Table 6.19 Additional language provision items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responsesa</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate time is allocated for additional language learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is hard to staff this school's additional language learning programme</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning another language improves students' intercultural understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students would prefer not to study another language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IB additional language learning requirement is easily managed at this school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a n = 39.

Table 6.20. Additional Languages in Phase Two schools by sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>NG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. G = Government schools, NG = Non-government schools.

when using the strata of ICSEA quartiles for the item, The IB additional language learning requirement is easily managed at this school, $H(3) = 10.23, p = .017$ (Figure 6.12). Only schools
Table 6.21. Minutes per week of additional language learning by year clusters and sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Non-government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdn</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M minutes rounded to nearest whole minute.

Figure 6.12. Box whisker plot for managing additional language learning by ICSEA quartile.

in the top quartile report having no difficulty in managing provision of additional language. All other items tested using the strata of ICSEA reported no statistically significant difference, with p range .286 to .939.

Four responses were received to the open-ended question, all from principals in non-
government schools across four different states and territories and are included here verbatim:

The largest difficulty in language learning is recruiting genuine, world-class inquiry-focused language teachers (NG-1, PYP);

It would be very valuable to have more time to promote the mother languages of our students (NG-2, PYP);

Students accept that they study an additional language but not all of them prefer to do so. The additional language places a considerable burden on those with learning needs or where it might be their third language (NG-3, PYP and MYP);

Some 'Students would prefer not to study another language’ others are happy to continue doing so (NG-4, DP).

These comments highlight complexities in delivering IB mandated requirements in cultural contexts which may already be language rich, especially students for whom an additional IB language “might be their third language” (NG-3, PYP and MYP). Given that NG-4 offers only the DP as an alternative matriculation credential, and additional language is one of the requirements of the IB but not the state credential, this comment suggests the motivation for some students selecting the DP at that school is for reasons other than international perspective.

6.10 Personal and well-being

The well-being of principals has recently attracted focus in Australia through a longitudinal study initially commenced in 2011 (Riley, 2017). This final section reports on responses to items related to research question 3 (iii) (Table 6.21).

The presence of the IB is not the prime attractor for most Phase Two sample principals (27 of 39), yet it clearly contributes to a strong sense of satisfaction. Two satisfaction items (I enjoy working at this school and I would recommend my school as a good place to work) have very high Agree and Strongly Agree response levels across the 50 Likert items in the questionnaire, second only to Learning another language improves students' intercultural
understanding reported in the previous section. The single response for \textit{Strongly Disagree} on both items is from the same respondent and suggests significant, but highly localised, circumstances.

A Mann Whitney test reported no statistically significant difference between sectors, with \(p\) range .178 to .941. Kruskal Wallis tests reported no statistically significant difference when using the strata of ICSEA quartiles, with \(p\) range .116 to .910, when using the strata of number of programmes, with \(p\) range .081 to .720, or when using the strata of programme type, with \(p\) range .110 to .907. While no significant differences are evident across these strata, there are inconsistencies with responses to the two satisfaction items reported in the previous paragraph and the remaining items in this section, suggesting a possible participant response bias. Concerns about diet, adequate sleep, and job-related stress are evident; each item received at least one third of responses in the \textit{Agree} and \textit{Strongly Agree} categories.

Correlations across items showed some statistically significant relationships. Not unsurprisingly, there is a very strong positive correlation between work enjoyment and recommendation of the school as a good place to work, \(\tau_b = .848, p < .001\). There is also a moderate negative correlation between enjoyment of work and seeking support from mentors, \(\tau_b = -.322, p = .018\), suggesting that principals who find leading their schools enjoyable may also be more self-sustaining. The community of IB leaders does not appear to be a significant source for support either, as there is no statistically significant relationship between \textit{I actively seek support from colleagues and mentors outside my school} and \textit{Connecting with leadership colleagues from across the world is a strength of the IB}, \(\tau_b = .018, p = .786\). Curiously, 23 of 39 (59\%) respondents indicate they find switching off from work difficult, yet this item has no significant correlation with any other item in this group, with \(p\) range .187 to .918. This is difficult to
Table 6.22. Personal and well-being items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item responses</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I came to this school specifically because it offered IB programmes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exercise regularly and consider myself reasonably fit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working at this school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend my school as a good place to work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rarely socialise with staff from this school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job places too much stress on my family life</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to improve my dietary habits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to switch off from work at the end of the day/week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get enough satisfying sleep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively seek support from colleagues and mentors outside my school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 39. \)

explain, given a moderate negative correlation between inadequate sleep and stress experienced by some principals, \( \tau_b = -0.450, p = 0.002, \) and a moderate negative correlation between dietary habits and exercise, \( \tau_b = -0.350, p = 0.015. \)

Four responses were received to the open-ended question, all from principals in non-government schools. One criticised the inclusion of questions regarding personal and well-being matters, asserting it was “opportunistic” and arguing the items in this section have “nothing to do with the IB programme” (NG-1, DP). The other three all indicated the management of time was a critical issue for them and comments are reported here verbatim:

Time is the issue. The position consumes as much time as one wants/is able to devote to it; (NG-2, PYP and DP);
It is an individual who creates the work/life balance they need. As leaders we are on call 24/7 but there has to be some down time and management of this is vital for wellbeing. Political pressure on education and a constant negative narrative doesn't help educators to see the great purpose and commitment they are making to the future (NG-3, PYP);
Varies from week to week given the nature of the job (NG-4, MYP).

6.11 Conclusion

This chapter reports analysis of responses to Phase Two questionnaire. Data was tested for normality and representativeness of the total population of Australian IB schools. Non-parametric tests were applied to analyse data by sector, ICSEA, number of programmes, and types of programmes. Correlations between grouped items were calculated. Open-ended responses for each section were also analysed and reported.

The next chapter discusses the findings of both the qualitative Phase One interviews and the quantitative Phase Two survey questionnaire. It integrates the two research findings during the interpretation phase (Greene et al., 1989) as outlined in 4.2 Research Design (see Figure 4.1).
Chapter Seven: An integrated discussion and revised theoretical model

7.1 Introduction

Chapters Five and Six open up the “the black box that is the [Australian IB] school” (Eacott, 2013b, p. 181) from the perspective of principals. Phase One is an initial exploration with a sample of Australian IB principals \(n^1 = 7\) who, combined, represent the diversity found in Australian IB schools: government and non-government, across three jurisdictions; single and multi-programme; primary, secondary, and combined; co-educational and single-sex; extensive history of implementation, and very recent implementation; withdrawal of IB programmes, and introduction of IB programmes. A preliminary theoretical model was developed following analysis of Phase One data (Figure 5.1), then an invitation extended to the total population of 174 Australian IB school principals \(n^2 = 50, \text{ RR 28.7\%}\) to complete a Phase Two survey questionnaire to investigate the model more broadly. The findings from Phase Two broadly reflect the theoretical model. Taken together, these provide credible and original (Charmaz, 2014) insights to the experience of principal leadership in Australian IB schools.

This chapter provides an integrated discussion (Greene et al., 1989) of the findings reported in Chapters Five and Six. It directly addresses all three research questions:

1. To what extent do principals in Australian IB schools consider their leadership is impacted by:
   i. individual school demographics;
   ii. governance structures?
2. What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about:
   i. the role of vision and direction setting;
   ii. their focus of action;
   iii. the nature of school culture?
3. What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use:
   i. to enable effective school administration;
   ii. for decision-making purposes;
   iii. to sustain themselves as leaders?

Following this discussion, two further theoretical concepts, temporality and liminality, are discussed and added to create a revised theoretical model of principalship in Australian IB schools. These concepts strengthen the explanatory power of the model and are consistent with the complexity leadership lens through which this study is viewed. A concluding reflection on principal leadership in Australian IB schools is provided in Chapter Eight, along with recommendations and suggestions for future research.

7.2 Research Question 1

To what extent do principals in Australian IB schools consider their leadership is impacted by individual school demographics?

Offering IB programmes is a costly exercise, so it is unsurprising that schools possessing moderate to high socio-educational advantage comprise the population of Australian IB schools which participated in this study (Dickson et al., 2017). The capacity of a school community to offer the IB is a self-selecting process due to costs of initial application, authorisation, professional learning, and provision of additional language learning. The impact of ongoing costs differs across sectors, creating challenges based on sectorally based resource capacities. Staffing costs vary greatly and are contingent on which programmes are offered, with greatest impact evident in the duality of offering the DP and local curriculum.

Phase One schools are located in predominantly high socio-educationally advantaged communities \((M = 1150; Mdn = 1152)\), compared with Phase Two schools \((M = 1111; Mdn = \)
The Phase Two profile closely reflects the total population of Australian IB schools ($M = 1111; Mdn = 1121$), adding credibility to these findings. Only nine schools in the total population of Australian IB schools have an ICSEA under 1000, and there is only one such school in Phase Two. Comparison of ICSEA interquartile range (IQR) for Phase Two (IQR = 1069 – 1155) and the total population of Australian IB schools (IQR = 1074 – 1157), along with these other measures, reinforce an established understanding that socio-educational advantage is high within most Australian IB schools (Dickson et al., 2017; Doherty, 2009, 2013; Doherty et al., 2012; Perry et al., 2018).

Despite this apparent advantage, extensive costs associated with implementing the IB create challenges for principals. Costs associated with providing professional learning opportunities and additional language learning requirements create fiscal tension, particularly in government schools and lower ICSEA schools. Governing councils in government schools are more likely than non-government school governing councils to discuss training costs and time provided for additional language learning. Additionally, the range of languages offered is significantly lower in government schools.

Most government school principals feel they can manage these costs, but concern is expressed in both phases that departmental bureaucrats do not appreciate the complexities for government schools in financing the IB. There is some evidence principals cost share across schools and join with other schools for professional learning. In the case of DP schools, there is evidence some schools provide classes where both the DP and local matriculation curriculum are taught by the one teacher, creating tensions and conflicts over perceived educational quality and curriculum alignment between the two.
Necessity of these costs is accepted by principals and their governing councils on the basis that the benefits, and thus value, of the IB are high. Nearly all principals in this research endorse the programmes within a broad vision for their school (Bryant et al., 2018), despite the challenges of meeting financial obligations above and beyond those of non-IB schools. No principal indicates they are considering withdrawing from a programme due to financial pressures, however it should be noted this is likely a sampling bias; it is reasonable that a principal who questions the value of the IB, and may be considering withdrawing, is unlikely to see much point responding to a survey in the midst of their busy daily schedule. Three schools invited to participate in Phase Two indicated they withdrew from the IB, but did not disclose reasons for that decision. Further analysis revealed all three are government schools, withdrew from the MYP, and have ICSEAs less than 1,000. This particular combination suggests there may come a tipping point beyond which costs associated with offering IB programmes outweigh any perceived value.

To what extent do principals in Australian IB schools consider their leadership is impacted by governance relationships?

Managing the demands of conflicting governance obligations and requirements represents a major complicating component of Australian IB principal leadership. Most of the governance focus is at the school site level, and for government school principals, additionally with departmental bureaucracy. The impact of the IB on principal leadership is evident in the requirement for principals to provide constant education to governing councils about the IB. This ensures governing councils are clear about the rationale for the IB and are committed to sustaining it as part of a school’s educational mission. Tied to this is the need to sustain academic
performance. The quality of linkage between these two is a major determinant of successful and stable principalship in Australian IB schools. The IBO, an additional governing context for Australian IB principals, is criticised for its lack of appreciation for Australian school contexts and curriculum requirements.

Principal leadership is impacted directly by the extent to which school governors understand the IB and its relationship to the overall academic profile of the school. Where successful academic achievement is perceived by governors to be high, governors tend to have a benign view of the IB and its place in the school. This enables principals to focus their leadership on other aspects of the school. Conversely, where the academic profile of the school is under scrutiny, governors take a more critical view of its value and cost. Key to managing this is principals’ education of governors through a sense-making role, configuring (Gronn, 2010) how and when governing councils are provided with information. Regular briefings to governing councils by the principal and other key staff, along with discussions using specific IB language, are found in schools where governors are perceived to have good understanding.

Related to this is the history of IB authorisation within the school. A long history with the IB can lead to its philosophy and understanding being assumed by governors, rather than understood and enacted in the contemporary context of the school. Governors in this study perceived to have good understanding of the IB are supported by the principal and other relevant staff who actively engage governors in ongoing and regular discussion of the IB. Principals’ facilitative and distributed leadership practices are clear in this context. As governing council membership changes over time, principals who strategically guide their governing council to review and reiterate the IB within the school’s mission and vision benefit from stability and support. The continuous educative function demonstrated by MS and BS exemplifies this
approach, enhancing the effectiveness of a governing council’s long-term strategic responsibility (Leggett, Campbell-Evans, & Gray, 2016). Because lack of understanding about the IB can cause conflict (see 5.3.2.1 Academic profile), careful monitoring and adjusting to this requires principals to hear concerns of governors and respond with timely and relevant information (Walkley, 2011). The case of GS shows the danger when this is not managed effectively.

Beyond their local governing council, Australian IB principals also work within the governance field of state and territory curriculum regulation. As a curriculum, the IB is overwhelmingly seen as a preferred educational philosophy compared with state/territory based versions of the Australian Curriculum (AC). Principals responsible for its introduction emphasise its comparative rigour, quality, and international perspective, a position widely evident in both phases of this research. The processes involved in implementation and ongoing authorisation are seen as beneficial to teaching and learning, but meeting compliance obligations to both state/territory regulators and the IBO creates confusion and dissipation of energy for teaching staff. Provision of time, support, and encouragement for teachers to blend requirements of both local and IB frameworks is a source of ongoing frustration for some principals. This is compounded by a perceived lack of understanding by the IBO about these alignment issues.

More than one-third of Phase Two respondents criticise a lack of curriculum support by the IBO, and direct support for the principal by the IBO varies widely. The consistency of response across sectors and programmes (see 6.5 IBO support) underscores the need for the IBO to review these matters. Goodwill toward the IBO is high, but so too is frustration that the IBO is not doing enough to understand and respond to the needs of Australian IB principals and schools. This inconsistency must be addressed if the IBO is to overcome these adverse
perceptions. The expected continued growth of the IB will compound these issues if the situation described in this research continues.

Given the strength of positive views about the IB curriculum (as opposed to the IBO administration), it seems surprising so few principals were attracted to their school specifically because it offered IB programmes. No Phase One principal was motivated to apply because the school offered the IB, although the principal of Geneva School indicated it was part of their interest. Less than one third of Phase Two respondents indicate the IB was a specific attractor to their school, and only 4 of 39 indicate they Strongly Agree the IB was specifically an attractor. It is equally clear, though, that once engaged with the philosophy and practice of the IB, dissatisfaction grows with limitations of the AC. The IB is thus positioned as a useful framework for principals to present holistic, transformative, and coherent educational visions for their schools (Perry et al., 2018).

The philosophy of the IB can best be understood in pragmatic terms as an opportunistic lens through which principals project their personal vision (see 7.3 Research Question 2). The most explicit, and forthright, expression of this is reflected by THS who argues The Hague School is “milking the IB for its richness of what we already have” (THS). This establishes a primacy of personal vision and subordinates the IB to a position of utility. The IB is positioned as a construct which aligns with a pre-existing personal educational philosophy, rather than as a source of that philosophy. Each Phase One participant articulated a personal philosophy which is consistent with the IB, but not derivative from it. The Phase Two word cloud on reasons for introducing the IB also reflects the same (see Figure 6.4).

There are four implications for governance of this subordinate positioning of the IB in the educational philosophy of principals:
1. Governors of Australian IB schools need a clear and consistent understanding of the rationale for offering the IB when appointing a principal. While the IB state this expectation of governors (IBO, 2014d, 2014e, 2016b), this research shows the reality varies considerably. As governors, they have major responsibility for the mission and vision of the school (McCormick et al., 2006; Walkley, 2016), and having clarity about the IB’s role and value to the school will assist in discerning how applicants can further its place in the school, or perhaps withdrawing it from the school. Governing councils will also benefit from seeking to draw out candidates’ understanding of the IB and consider how well this aligns with that of the governing council. Failure to address this is likely to lead to ongoing conflict between the governing council and the principal, with adverse outcomes for both;

2. What flows from these considerations is the nature and amount of support needed by new principals in developing their understanding of the IB and experience of its implementation. A principal with limited prior experience will require support likely to include international conference costs and visits to similar schools. This should be understood by the governing council in advance and provided for in its budgetary commitments; failure to do so has the potential to become a source of conflict between the governing council and the principal, as well as leave the principal lacking knowledge of the full scope of their leadership responsibility. By default, this places the principal in the hands of the coordinator for interpreting the role of the IB within the school. Depending on how this aligns with the vision of the principal, this can be both a source of structural confusion and relationship conflict (see 7.4 Research Question 3). There is a role in this challenge for the IBO as well as for governing councils. This research shows
principals spend considerable time and energy on governance related matters. Practical collegial support from other IB principals could be facilitated either by the IBO or IB Schools Australasia (IBSA). ISBA already has programme coordinator networks (IB Schools Australasia, 2018), and the addition of principal networks could make use of these already established structures;

3. The IBO must be proactive in developing and sustaining effective communication directly with principals, rather than mediated through programme coordinators. The recent visit to Australia by the Director General of the IB, Dr Siva Kumari (Singhal, 2017), suggests this may already be occurring, however, the strength of response in this research indicates more practical measures are needed, including more timely response from the IBO on matters raised by Australian IB principals. It should be noted Dr Kumari’s visit took place four months prior to the collection of Phase Two data, therefore the currency of these data adds weight to these findings;

4. The IBO can better support government school principals through more productive relationships with state/territory government policy makers and bureaucracies. There is a clear need to facilitate better understanding of the IB among policy and bureaucratic personnel. This will help principals manage what some perceive to be unhelpful and, at times, hostile conflict with their education departments. This strategy may also help redress diminishing financial support for the costs incurred offering IB programmes.

The IB in Australia will likely continue to grow, although its rate of growth may slow. A wider body of teachers is now experienced with the IB, and it remains to be seen if the IB increases over time as a predominant attractor of future principals.
7.3 Research Question 2

*What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about the role of vision and direction setting?*

Like principals in non-IB schools, principals in Australian IB schools prioritise the development, articulation, and implementation of their vision (Kools & Stoll, 2016). The personal visions of most Australian IB principals’ align with, but are not derivative from, that of the IB. To this extent, many have personal visions for their school which integrate, sustain, or enhance the IB within their broader vision for the school. Six of the seven Phase One participants implemented (SDS, SS), withdrew (BS, CS), or explicitly ruled out expanding (GS, THS) IB programmes in their current school. Clear reasons are articulated by each, and these derive from their personal vision and understanding of the values and culture of their current school. Where the IB is consistent with their personal vision, or enables its further enactment, the IB is gladly embraced. Equally, where the vision and requirements of the IB do not align with that of the principal, other needs of the school are prioritised above the ongoing inclusion of the IB. Although the IB is positioned as a dominating influence on principals (Bourdieu, 1993; Lingard & Christie, 2003), the willingness of principals to overturn this dominating relationship, through withdrawing from an IB programme, exemplifies the type of self-organising system consistent with complexity leadership theory. The needs of the school are determined from within by a community “of interacting, interdependent agents bonded in a cooperative dynamic by common goal, outlook, need” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 299; Wheatley, 2007), not from the externality of the IB.

This relationship is thus more parasitic than symbiotic. Data reported here suggest the IB thrives in Australian schools when it is a vehicle through which Australian principals can advance their personal vision. Phase Two respondents who implemented an IB programme speak
consistently of the coherence of IB programmes that meet student needs better than local alternatives, yet the needs of their site based locale (Giddens, 1984) remain the priority over that of the IB. While a principal’s vision remains congruent with a vision for the IB, the IB is sustained. Where this changes, either by diverging educational priorities or practical constraints of finance and staffing, principals are willing to excise the IB from the school. This may be in part, such as the MYP at Bethesda School and Cardiff School who both retain other IB programmes, or entirely, such as the three MYP low ICSEA schools mentioned in 7.2 Research Question 1.

The challenge of integrating a vision for the IB into their own vision is greater for principals in schools where the IB programme does not cover the total school population. For principals in PYP primary schools, the IB provides a desirable school-wide coherence. This is harder to achieve in multi-campus or combined primary and secondary schools. The continuity of inquiry pedagogy between the PYP and MYP is not as seamless in Australian IB schools as the IB would desire, consistent with other findings across the globe (Hallinger et al., 2011). Difficulty in integrating the MYP, “the problem child of the three” (CS), into Australian schools is reported by principals in both phases. The growth phase of the MYP does not match that of the PYP and this suggests the IBO would benefit from hearing the views of Australian IB principals as to possible reasons for this. The noticeable withdrawal from the MYP by five schools associated with this research is further cause for examination by the IBO (see 8.4 Recommendations). Clearly, Australian principals who embrace the IB as part of their educational vision and direction are yet to be widely convinced the MYP is similarly deserving. This may be, in part, due to a lack of sustained engagement by the IB in assisting Australian IB schools to implement the MYP effectively. The provision of “detailed curricular resources and
syllabi aligned with the national curriculum” (Perry et al., 2018, p. 2) is critical if the MYP is to take a more assured place within the suite of IB offerings in Australian schools.

The DP represents another level of complexity beyond that of either the PYP or MYP. It immediately creates dualities and consequential divisiveness (see 5.4.1 An awkward dual economy (THS)). The principal is in a political bind, forced into articulating equivalence between the DP and the local credential to avoid claims of elitism (Doherty, 2012; Doherty et al., 2012), yet operating from a vision which sees the DP as “more robust, more rigorous” (THS). The five Phase Two respondents who introduced the DP use language of “academic excellence” and “academic standards”, and appear unperturbed by the duality, suggesting pursuit of the DP for tertiary access remains prevalent. The leadership tensions reflect possible impact of contextually specific factors in Australia different to those evident in research across the wider Asia-Pacific region (Lee et al., 2012b).

What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about their focus of action?
The daily life of a principal constantly shifts focus. At times, longer term strategic issues dominate, while at others, very practical daily operational matters emerge, particularly for principals in smaller, less resourced schools, or where, like MS, “there’s nothing in a school that needs to be done that I’m not prepared to do” (MS). A constant shift of focus, and giving adequate attention to these changing needs, characterises the work of Australian IB principals. This is not significantly different to responsibilities of principals in non-IB contexts and reflects the wider consensus on what comprises the work of principals (Day, Gu, et al., 2016; Dinham, 2016; Gurr, 2014). The presence of the IB, however, creates particular tensions related to staff dualities. According to the principals in this study, these arise from administrative requirements
imposed by the IB, and inconsistent commitment to the philosophy of the IB across some schools, itself often caused by consequences of those imposed requirements. They are characteristic of the ambidexterity found in complexity leadership theory (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018). Principals both explore how best to integrate the IB into their school, while simultaneously exploiting the benefits of the IB to the school. BS describes this as identifying “the things that we needed to abandon or take on along the way” (BS) when explaining the rationale to withdraw from the MYP. In this instance, the best integration of the MYP was no integration, stemming from a sharp “focus on really high quality teaching” (BS) which necessitated, in the view of BS, withdrawal from the MYP and consequential refocusing on the local curriculum.

How embedded the philosophy of the IB is in the school’s operations determines the focus of action for Australian IB principals (Bryant et al., 2018). Evidence across both phases of the research indicates tension when the IB manifests as “little pockets of procedures and things that [don’t] match anything else” (THS). This is also the case for multi-campus and multi-programme schools if the quality of coordinators differs, such as at Geneva School; one campus IB coordinator “ruled with an iron fist” (GS), whereas at the other campus “there’s been more a “work with”, “learn to understand”’” (GS) attitude. Not only does this create tension between the two campuses, but makes the challenge of broadening the IB philosophy much harder as students progress into the secondary section of the school. New students come to the secondary school and are mixed in with those who have completed the PYP, creating further challenges for gaining pedagogical consistency. Some secondary teaching staff in these circumstances “see this truncating of Year 6, “now we’ll put them into our mould”, where I don’t know that they see the flow through” (GS) of the IB philosophy into secondary schooling.
Mitigating or resolving these tensions may be related to findings on how Australian IB principals spend their time (see 6.6 Work type). Time spent on leadership meetings ($M = 39.31$) is consistent with recent research in New South Wales government schools in which principals report spending “40% on leading the management of the school” (Deloitte Consulting Pty Ltd, 2017, p. 5). This contrasts with “leading teaching and learning” (Deloitte Consulting Pty Ltd, 2017, p. 4), which represents 30% of time for New South Wales government principals. Australian IB principals, by contrast, average only 16% of their weekly time on curriculum matters. It is important not to draw firm conclusions from this as the methodologies are very different and the data collection and analysis serve distinctly different purposes. The simple comparison does, however, suggest further need to examine usage of time by Australian IB principals. The expenditure of time on conflict resolution and administrative dualities limits what time might be available for building stronger learning cultures (Kools & Stoll, 2016).

The experiences of SDS and BS suggest these priorities shift over time. In the initial phase of exploring the IB, SDS invested significant time in building a vision, developing a coalition of interested and supportive colleagues, resourcing them with time and information, and providing extensive briefings to the governing council. This was critical in the early phase of exploration to ensure there was broad based support. Similarly, BS expended much time and effort to re-engage a community whose connection with the IB had become problematic. Linking this process to examination of academic achievement and pedagogical priorities enabled BS to bring the school together through positioning the IB within the school’s wider values and aspirations. In both instances, early investment of this energy building alignment around improving learning diminished some of the conflict. As the IB becomes more embedded at St Donat’s School, and as adoption of the Bethesda School values becomes widespread, SDS and
BS shift into what can be described as a maintenance, or minor adjustment, approach. SDS is now “talking up MYP, subliminally and otherwise in newsletters, forums and in my annual Presentation Day addresses” (SDS) to continue building support for MYP implementation, while BS is “just kind of combining all the bits together so that staff are not overwhelmed, but they can see how working on one bit delivers on all the other bits” (BS). The continual reinforcement requires less direct focus of action from the principal as other leaders within the school community become partner voices with the principal (Barnett & McCormick, 2012).

What beliefs are held by principals in Australian IB schools about the nature of school culture?

Australian IB principals work hard to develop school cultures which are described by Martin (1992) as integrated. In schools where the IB has a broad coverage of the school population, this appears more easily achieved. In schools where there is limited exposure, the challenges and conflicts are greater. Differentiation is acknowledged as a pragmatic reality. Some principals acknowledge that difference of perspective is healthy to school culture and welcome its presence (Crooke, Csikszentmihalyi, & Bikel, 2015), provided sparks of difference contribute ultimately to a coherent and integrated culture. At times, this requires principals to act against perceived zeal and passion for the IB, if this is not seen as consistent with the overarching integrated values of the community. Fragmentation is reduced initially through invitational persuasion, but ongoing instances gradually shift some principals to more coercive strategies, “pushing others, if they need to be” (SDS).

Principals in this research report initiating and leading change in moving from a non-IB framework to an IB framework. For principals undertaking introduction or withdrawal of an IB programme, the scale of change is significant and takes place over a long time period, such as the
case of St Donat’s School detailed in 5.4.2 Big, big picture people (SDS) (Wheatley, 2007). Change processes can include restructuring staff lines of reporting, altering the role of curriculum leaders to do more “generative and creative sort of strategic activity, rather than just the more mundane…compliance related matters” (CS), or any other “variety of things we’ve introduced since I arrived and we are continuing to roll out” (THS). Change can also focus on shifting pedagogical practice “from worksheets to child-centred learning, to inquiry” (MS).

For principals who introduce an IB programme, the scale of change can impact the whole school, in the case of a stand-alone primary school implementing the PYP. SDS describes such a scale as a “paradigm shift” (SDS) due to it changing not just structures and roles, but the very way the community understands the nature of learning. For some principals, embedding the IB philosophy more broadly than just as a subset of the curriculum, such as the DP in a combined primary and secondary school, requires “better integration” (THS) than “two constituencies that [are] in tension with each other” (THS). The decision to withdraw from a programme, such as that made by CS and BS, may weaken hostility and “resistance from a number of our staff to [the MYP]” (CS), but it also represents grief and loss for those “teachers [who] loved the IB MYP and completely ignored what we were doing in terms of [our state curriculum]” (BS).

7.4 Research Question 3

What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use to enable effective school administration?

Consistent with the expectation of the IB, programme managers are reported in both phases to be structurally part of the “pedagogical leadership [team] aligned with the philosophy of the programme(s)” (IBO, 2014c, p. 3). Despite this, one third of Phase Two programme coordinators
do not report directly to the principal, a position inferred by the previous quote from *Programme Standards and Practices* (IBO, 2014c). This indicates principals create structures in which the IB is absorbed into wider school educational structures, reflecting the subordination of the IB to principals’ vision discussed in 7.3 Research Question 2. Regardless of where programme coordinators are positioned structurally, principals display great levels of trust in them and other curriculum leaders. Across both phases, a range of staff are invited to present to governing councils, and coordinators are given significant responsibility for “planning meetings with the staff…[and to] lead whole staff team meetings” (GS). This structuration is proactive and reflects a strong priority among principals to create “system integration” (Giddens, 1984, p. 28) across the school, consistent with this perspective of culture (Martin, 1992).

Prudent financial leadership is a “first order” (Newcombe & McCormick, 2001, p. 183) challenge for Australian IB principals, given the additional costs associated with programme delivery (MacDonald, 2009). Government school principals in Phase One reveal creative cost shifting and resource sharing as strategies to offset the perceived inadequacy of their allocated funding; additional funds are reported not to be provided for IB schools, and one quarter of Phase Two respondents indicate resources provided by the state/territory government are inadequate. Cost is cited by GS as a prime reason why the DP would not even be considered at the Geneva School (despite its very high ICSEA of 1172), and both CS and SS reference monitoring of enrolment patterns across their secondary school programmes for the purposes of ensuring viability as well as balance. Nearly two thirds of Phase Two DP respondents indicate classes are combined with their local credential to minimise the cost of staffing rather than “fragment your classes and have a series of tiny classes” (THS). Costs of international travel for professional learning is identified as a source of conflict, and while there is acknowledgement
the IBO has improved the range of offerings for professional learning in Australia, these still incur interstate travel costs for a number of schools. This is balanced by acknowledgement that the quality and value of IB professional learning is high, producing further tension for some principals.

What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use for decision-making purposes?
Collaboration is an expectation of both pedagogical and administrative aspects of the IB. Collaboration for teachers is widely provided and prioritised by principals, including within teaching loads and timetables, however, this is provided as an indicator of their belief “that teacher collaboration is key to success” (SS), not because it is an expectation of the IBO.

Phase One principals enact collaborative and distributed forms of leadership characterised by dynamic and adaptive senior executive teams (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018), while findings from Phase Two respondents similarly indicate a preference for collective leadership approaches (Hallinger & Lee, 2012). Three of the strongest responses to Phase Two items are those which relate to participation of staff in collaborative decision making processes and inclusive approaches catalysed by the principal (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). It should be noted, however, this may represent a participant bias, given that collaboration and participative decision making are stated expectations of the IBO (IBO, 2014c, pp. 4, 9-10, 17-18, 24).

What processes do principals in Australian IB schools use to sustain themselves as leaders?
Findings of this research are consistent with literature on principal workload and well-being (Deloitte Consulting Pty Ltd, 2017; McGrath-Champ et al., 2018; Riley, 2017). Principals overwhelmingly enjoy and value the privilege of their role in an Australian IB school. The
highest number of *Strongly Agree* responses across the Phase Two questionnaire are items on enjoyment of working at their school (31 of 39 responses) and on recommending their school as a good place to work (33 of 39 responses). It is possible this represents a response bias as respondents may be concerned not to appear critical of their current school. At the same time, there is prevalence of health related concerns related to diet, sleep, and stress (Riley, 2017). Nearly 60% of Phase Two respondents (22 of 39 responses) Agreed or *Strongly Agreed* they would like to improve their dietary habits, and a similar number (23 of 39 responses) *Disagreed* or *Strongly Disagreed* they find it easy to switch off from work at the end of the day. Over 40% of Phase Two participants (17 of 39 responses) indicate they find do not get enough satisfying sleep.

Participants do not lay the responsibility for this at the feet of the IB. The inclusion of the IB in the school is not considered a contributing factor to these pressures. One respondent’s strident comment aptly reflects these findings:

*I'm not sure what this has to do with the IB programme. It seems like opportunistic questioning!* (see 6.10 Personal and well-being).

While there is disagreement about the second sentiment, given this research explores the extent to which the IB does impact the leadership of the principal, the comment reflects a view that IB programmes contribute no greater impact on personal and well-being issues for Australian principals. Despite the complexities, conflicts, and tensions identified throughout this research, principals do not attribute causality of their job stresses to the presence of the IB.

### 7.5 Curious absence – internationalism and service

Two themes seem curiously absent, given the insights developed from my own experience as principal in a three programme Australian IB school (see 1.2 Background to the study). Emmel
(2013) points out that personal experience can guide the selection of inquiry, a “paradox of detached involvement” (Griffin & Stacey, 2006, p. 9) where the researcher is located between imperfect possibilities of subjective knowledge and experience and the “purely rational thinking as is supposed by the classical, positivist scientific method” (Griffin & Stacey, 2006, p. 9). This is the case with this research. Further, the close personal relationship to, and experience with, the research topic affirms that “what we bring to the study also influences what we can see” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 27; emphasis in original). By extension, it is also what cannot be seen in data collected for this research that is as important as that which is collected. What cannot be seen is informed by knowledge accumulated from direct and subjective experience as an Australian IB principal for over five years.

The international perspective of the IB is more muted in Phase Two responses, contrasted with Phase One. Phase Two respondents identify support among governors for the international aspect of the programmes in items, but no reference to internationalism is made in responses to the open-ended question about why an IB programme was introduced. Given its significance to Phase One participants regarding how the IB aligns with their personal vision, and particularly the rationale for SDS in introducing the IB, its absence in Phase Two responses suggests the academic and socio-cultural values of the IB (Doherty, 2009) may be more powerful motivators for its introduction. This is a question worth pursuing by both the IBO and researchers. For the IBO, gaining a deeper understanding into why a community wishes to implement an IB programme can inform how best to evaluate the school through its authorisation processes. These include consideration of “whether the school’s own philosophy is similar to that of the IB” (IBO, 2016a, p. 2) and “analysis of the situation of the school with regard to IB expectations” (IBO, 2016a, p. 2). For academic researchers, this absence highlights a tension between a stated aim “to
develop internationally minded people who recognize their common humanity and shared
guardianship of the planet” (IBO, 2017, p. 2) and a stated pragmatism evident among Australian
IB principals based on perceived academic prowess and reputation.

The other significant absence is that of service to the wider community. All three
programmes represented in this research include service as a core component, and it is a central
feature of the entire suite of IB programmes. It is explicitly articulated in the IB Learner Profile
(IBLP) which states:

We have a commitment to service, and we act to make a positive difference in the
lives of others and in the world around us (IBO, 2017, p. ii).

Despite this, it is referenced by only two principals across both data sets. SDS notes that service
was an attractor in initially considering the IB, and BS specifically references the Creativity,
Activity, and Service feature of the DP on three occasions. Outside these instances, no other
mention is made in either phase of the research. Given its centrality to the overall philosophy of
the IB, this absence perhaps reflects similar findings from across the wider Asia-Pacific that
“traditional academic values of the group subjects overpower the other aspects of the DP” (Rizvi
et al., 2014, p. 38). The absence of service as a feature within the purview of Australian IB
principals stands in sharp contrast with the increased value of service-oriented educational
philosophies (Schleicher, 2018).

7.6 Leadership for complexity – revised

The integrated discussion above shows stability and resonance of the preliminary theoretical
model developed in Chapter Five (Figure 5.1). Across both phases of this research, the central
thesis is affirmed, that the presence of IB programmes requires principals to continually
recalibrate expectations and experiences. This is balanced by a widespread view that the IB is
subordinate to the overall mission and vision of the school. This finding reflects the
classification by Bryant et al. (2018, p. 27) of “IB-plus” schools. In such schools, the IB is
only one of a number of components which comprise the school, but is not the foundational or
driving force within it. Other forces push and pull principals, and it is the constancy of their
personal educational philosophy along with the school’s overriding site based needs which
dominate. Two important modifications to the model (Figure 7.1) are therefore suggested to
better represent the experience of leading an Australian IB school:

1. cultural temporality: socio-cultural needs alter and shift over time, requiring
   principals to understand and to respond to these changing needs. Williams (1980,
p. 34) posits that “fundamental contradictions and variations …[are] always in a
   state of dynamic process”, and his three modalities of culture are suggested as
   helpful adjuncts to the perspectives of Martin (1992); and,

2. liminality: processes of change which occur over time appear consistent with the
   form of rites de passage, or rites of passage (van Gennep, 1922/1960). Van
   Gennep’s (1922/1960) three phases of ritual transformation include separation,
   transition, and incorporation, stages which can be useful ways for principals to
   interpret and respond to complex adaptive contexts where coherence building and
cultural identity continuously shift and reconfigure over time.

7.6.1 Temporality

Culture is positioned centrally in the preliminary theoretical model (Figure 5.1). Principals, in
that iteration of the model, enact processes of coherence and congruence subject to their beliefs
about organisational culture. The findings of this investigation show a preference for integration,
along with an accommodation of differentiation. However, a theoretical question about the
impact of time on the school’s organisational culture is raised through further reflection on three
Phase One stories of change over time, as well as Phase Two comments on introducing or
withdrawn IB programmes. Both BS and CS withdrew from the MYP, and SDS introduced the IB to a school with no previous experience, either at the school level or for SDS personally. These actions changed the nature of the school at its essence. They altered relationships across the school, and in the case of St Donat’s School, took place over an extended period of time and included an extensive array of school community members. Martin’s (1992) multiperspective approach is useful for understanding organisational culture “more fully if it is regarded, at any point in time, from all three perspectives” (Martin, 1992, p. 174), including during processes of cultural change.

The nature of CAS is to self-organise (Dooley, 1997), and emergent states cannot be known with certainty, nor can the timescale within which they change be known in advance.

Figure 7.1. *Leading Australian IB schools – a theoretical model.*
Much of the transformative and moral purpose leadership literature assumes that transformation is inherently positive and upward in its moral purpose trajectory. On the contrary, the self-organising nature of CAS is inherently unpredictable and there can be no certainty that emergent states will necessarily lead to “critical conversations and shared perceptions of direction and innovation” (van Oord, 2013b, p. 425). Predetermined states may or may not come into existence due to other parts of the system reconfiguring. For GS, addressing the improvement of NAPLAN results has been overtaken by other unknown catalytic forces and results in the most significant of leadership changes – the principal leaves the school. Change may also be in the form of excision, as for Bethesda School and Cardiff School, a purgation which brings considerable loss for those who valued and preferred the MYP in both these schools.

While the multiperspectives of Martin (1992) have utility for understanding a school’s organisational culture at any point in time, the principal qua leader also requires insights on the shifting nature of that culture. Further multiperspectives can be gained by considering temporal modes of dominant, emergent, and residual subcultures (Williams, 1980). A dominant culture is:

>a whole body of practices and expectation, our assignments of energy, our ordinary understanding of the nature of [humanity and the] world. It is a set of meanings and values which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society (Williams, 1980, p. 38).

A dominant culture is, in part, identified through a process of selective tradition, a determining of “the way in which from a whole possible area of past and present, certain meanings and practices are chosen for emphasis, certain other meanings and practices are neglected and excluded” (Williams, 1980, p. 39). A dominant culture, however, also gives space for other practices and meanings to be tolerated because they had some meaning in the past, and thus residual
subcultures are accommodated by the dominant culture without being entirely subsumed. The meanings and practices of residual subcultures represent a risk if they do not make sense within the context of the wider dominant culture. Emergent subcultures create “new meanings and values, new practices, new significances and experiences” (Williams, 1980, p. 41) which then stand in contrast to the dominant culture and provide possibilities for its future.

At any one point in time, an organisational culture comprises all three modes. The nature of affective relationship between residual and emergent subcultures and the dominant culture can be further distinguished between “residual-incorporated and residual not incorporated, and between emergent-incorporated and emergent not incorporated” (Williams, 1980, p. 41) based on how the dominant culture perceives practices and meanings of these subcultures. A residual-incorporated subculture can include benign practices which are not inconsistent with the dominant culture but simply alternate from it, while a residual not incorporated culture will not be tolerated as it is oppositional in nature. The incorporation of emergent cultures is determined similarly by the extent to which new practices and meanings are understood by the dominant culture as alternate to it, rather than as a challenge to its dominance.

Incorporating these modes into the theoretical model can provide a more comprehensive notion of how Australian IB principals enact their leadership. Cultural configurations and identification amongst staff can shift over time, requiring principals to alter their leadership as, for example, the once emergent advocates of the MYP at Cardiff School become members of the residual subculture following its removal. For Geneva School, the emergent culture of the PYP is challenged by the dominant culture represented by the governing council and parents, even after a sustained period of implementation. The perceived decline of literacy and numeracy standards
is seen by some agents within the dominant culture as an undesirable consequence of introducing the PYP and this suggests it remains an emergent not incorporated subculture.

Including temporal modes of culture in the model acknowledges more directly that principal leadership is not only highly contextual but perpetually shifting its nature and focus. This is consistent with the overarching theoretical lens of complexity leadership. Rather than seeing structure as the core of the school, this model locates principal leadership within changing temporal “processes of human relating, because it is in the simultaneously cooperative-consensual and conflictual-competitive relating between people that everything organizational happens” (Griffin & Stacey, 2006, p. 3). The central element of culture in the model, represented by the dashed oval, reflects the dominant culture; as time progresses irreversibly (Prigogine & Nicolis, 1971), some previously dominant practices and meanings will become residual, while others will emerge, represented by the dashed lines which move away from the dominant culture. Practices and meanings can then remain not incorporated, and stay outside of the dominant culture, or they may be incorporated into the dominant culture, represented by the dotted line leading back to the dominant culture; for residual practices and meanings, these are accommodated, while for emerging practice and meanings, they are integrated into the ongoing temporality of the dominant culture.

Moments of change reflected in this model, and evident within findings of this research, can be further understood through the complementary concept of liminality.

7.6.2 Liminality

The concept of liminality was described by anthropologist Arnold van Gennep (1922/1960) in his process study of rites of passage and further developed by Turner (1969). More recently, it is
applied as a social research tool (Szakolczai, 2015; Thomassen, 2015) and consequently explored for its relevance to this study. Incorporating the concept of liminality adds a reflective process to the theoretical model, as well as highlights the essential uncertainty of change processes when seen through the lens of complexity leadership.

Liminality relates to the concept of boundaries and their thresholds. At the geographical level, one country is defined by its border on the other side of which is another country. The exterior of a house is its boundary and to enter it one must process across a threshold, most usually the door. Crossing a territorial border, or the threshold of a house, involves three phases of process, separation, transition, and incorporation. Preparing for separation across national boundaries (usually) requires presentation of a passport, beyond which is a transitional space, the liminal space, before incorporation into the new nation. Entering a house requires a ritual of seeking entrance, perhaps a door knock or ringing of the bell, a crossing of the threshold, and an acknowledgement that one’s state is now changed due to being inside the habitual space of another. According to van Gennep (1922/1960), this process is also evident across a wide and varied range of social experiences, including pregnancy and childbirth, the transition into adulthood, marriage, and death. In the processing of these rites, much more so than crossing physical boundaries such as borders or house doors, the subject is irreversibly transformed. In the example of a first successful pregnancy and childbirth, a woman is separated from her previous state of not being a mother, is then in an ambiguous liminal state that has ceased to be not a mother but is not yet a mother, and then is incorporated into society fully as a mother following the successful birth (van Gennep, 1922/1960, Ch. 4).

Turner (1969) explores notions of stability and ambiguity in preliminal, liminal, and postliminal phases which also offer valuable insights to this current study. Like van Gennep
(1922/1960), Turner’s processual anthropology looks beyond social structuralism to relational processes of power and hierarchy. In the context of this study, the processes relate to the principal as the subject of analysis. During the preliminal phase, the principal occupies a position of ambiguous power, highlighted by Lingard and Christie (2003) and Eacott (2013b), positioning the role as both dominated, by governance requirements, and dominating, through personal vision and structuration (Giddens, 1984). Contemporary descriptions of principal leadership accord the role significant power and responsibility (AITSL, 2014; Day et al., 2010; Eacott, 2015) that reflects Turner’s (1969, p. 96) “hierarchical system of politico-legal-economic positions…separating men (sic) in terms of “more” or “less””. The principal qua leader has position and authority within their community. Their actions give stability and order to the community, consistent with the coherence and congruence at the centre of the theoretical model. It is in the liminal phase, however, that these notions become destabilised.

During the liminal phase of ritual process, what was once high is brought low, and what is respected suffers ignominy. In the liminal phase, the entity (i.e., the principal) is “betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremonial” (Turner, 1969, p. 97). In Turner’s (1969) research, a Zambian chief installation rite is described in which the senior chief of the Ndembu is subjected voluntarily to ritual insult and humiliation. During the process, community members harangue and revile the presumptive chief who “during all this, has to sit silently with downcast head” (Turner, 1969, p. 101). At the end of the liminal phase, “the chief may not resent any of this or hold it against the perpetrators in times to come” (Turner, 1969, p. 102). Rather, the chief is now restored to full power, acknowledging that his power is bestowed by the community and not to be taken for granted. It is in being brought low that the restoration to a high place of power finds its full meaning. Another liminal state is
exemplified in the ritual of British Army privates who are “waited on at dinner by officers and N.C.O.’s” (Turner, 1969, p. 172) for Christmas Dinner. Once the dinner concludes, the previous hierarchy is reinstated, and neither the ongoing status of officer or private is essentially changed.

These diminished and returned states offer possibilities to principal leadership when viewed through the lens of CLT. The CLT used in this research defines enabling leadership as that which is able “to directly foster and maneuver the conditions (e.g., context) that catalyze adaptive leadership and allow for emergence” (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007, p. 309; emphasis in original). By setting aside positional power, the principal enters a liminal space whereby conditions can be created for those who are normally “low” to exercise dominance and leadership. This is distinctly different to conceptions of distributed leadership. It is an offering of power that is reciprocally honoured; those who take up power for a period do so in the knowledge that it is not a state of permanence, while those who set it aside do so in the understanding that “the high could not be high unless the low existed, and he (sic) who is high must experience what it is like to be low” (Turner, 1969, p. 97). This notion has potential to open up leadership power to a wider range of staff, yet affirms that the principal returns, transformed by the process, to their position of authority. This is what Turner (1969, p. 96) describes as communitas, a “modality of relationship” rather than a place of coresidence.

More recent explorations of liminality add further value to its inclusion in the theoretical model developed from this study, particularly in the context of complexity leadership theory. Szakolczai (2015) explores the liminal experience at moments of transition and transformation and argues that entering a liminal period is itself a place of ambiguity, as there is no certainty that the return to previous states, like those characterised in the previous paragraphs, will ensue. Rather, the instability created by the change of social order during liminal phases provides scope
for intrusion by tricksters (Szakolczai, 2015) who can overtake a sense of order and bring danger to the community. Tricksters are not committed to the good of the community, unlike presumptive chiefs who voluntarily subject themselves to the will of the people. Rather, they “are outsiders, and thus cannot trust or be trusted…and are incapable of living in a community” (Szakolczai, 2015, p. 26). In moments of critical transition, like those for the Geneva School, liminality provides an analytical tool for assessing whether the criticisms of its performance in NAPLAN represent legitimate concerns, or are “tantamount to intellectual blackmail” (Szakolczai, 2015, p. 35) by forces committed to their own “obscure, ambivalent, shadowy” (Szakolczai, 2015, p. 26) desires. Observations by GS that some governing council members “see the world through the eyes of their [children]” (GS) may exemplify the concept of the trickster; rather than consider the needs of the whole community ahead of their own, governing council members with this attitude position their personal and particular needs within what appear to be the needs of the wider community.

The concept of liminality resonates with the preliminary theoretical model and highlights two aspects of uncertainty, consistent with the non-linear nature of CLT. First, it represents opportunity for leaders to set aside positional power and embrace insights from those who are “low” within the hierarchy of the school. They may give insights to the principal about how to resolve conflicts and reduce tensions created by the presence of the IB, reflecting the “bottom-up behaviours” (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001, p. 392) characteristic of CAS. Having done so, the principal emerges from the liminal space with a transformed understanding of the community and its needs. Second, it heightens awareness that moments of instability can be overtaken by tricksters who may not necessarily have the best interests of the wider community at heart.
CLT is not necessarily a comfortable perspective through which to view school leadership. It challenges assumptions regarding power, relationships, and purpose. This research highlights a number of conflicts principals face in implementing IB programmes. Yet beyond this, it also argues that particular values and practices inherent to CLT can support Australian IB school principals in their leadership. To do so successfully requires principals to “leave the comforts and safety of home, travel to strange and unfamiliar lands, and [be] welcomed to return only after we’ve discovered answers to our quest that we’re prepared to put into practice” (Wheatley & Frieze, 2011, p. 13).

### 7.7 Conclusion

This chapter integrates and discusses findings from Phase One and Phase Two. There is broad similarity between the perspectives of participants in both phases. Key findings are that the IB is highly valued for the extent to which it can further the vision for the school. Its utility, however, is greater than its primacy. In this regard, this study shows most Australian IB principals as “leaders in the IB-plus school” (Bryant et al., 2018, p. 27) mode. Significant challenges are identified both for principals and for the IBO. For principals, these include continual sense-making, shifting focus of action, and prudent management of structural dualities. For the IBO, these include enhancing governmental relationships, and improving knowledge of and responsiveness to the needs of Australian IB school requirement and the principals who lead these schools.

This chapter also reviewed the descriptive power of the preliminary theoretical model (Figure 5.1) in light of this integrated discussion. The model is seen to have descriptive power
regarding the themes of *expectation* and *experience*, but the configuration of *culture* is further modified to include modes of temporality and processes of liminality.

The thesis concludes in the next chapter with a reflection about leading an Australian IB school in light of these findings, recommendations, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter Eight: Final reflection and recommendations

8.1 Introduction

Far from its tremulous and highly contextualised beginning, the IB in Australia is now expansive and assured. This research, however, shows such assurance may be more tenuous than the IBO desires, held at the mercy of determined and local community focused principals. Australian IB principals seek holistic and rigorous pedagogy, and the IB has utility for them in that pursuit. But the extent to which these partnerships are secure remains contestable. Evidence from this inquiry suggests the IBO would do well to engage more collaboratively with Australian principals as it responds to this challenge, reflecting the spirit of its own pedagogical culture.

While the previous chapter attended specifically to addressing the research questions, this chapter expands upon that by returning to the subjective genesis of the study, my direct experience, through a closing reflection on the findings. One particular memo from Phase One analysis is detailed using the metaphor of actor/character (Goffman, 1959). At the time of writing, prior to full analysis of Phase One data, it captured descriptive richness which, in retrospect, seems prescient. It is one impression of colleagues who generously gave of their time to open their own “black box that is [an Australian IB] school” (Eacott, 2013b, p. 181). They are not necessarily objectively true (Blumer, 1969), of course, but present perceptions about seven committed and passionate principals, each in their own spatio-temporal moment.

Recommendations are suggested for practice, along with suggestions for further academic research.
8.2 It’s not just me

The journey of this research commenced as a very personal and spatio-temporally located one. Coming to an IB school as an experienced principal, I already held beliefs about principal leadership based on six years’ experience in the role. The IB school to which I was appointed in 2010 had nearly 30 years’ of its own history, including 20 years offering IB programmes, seven of which were as a three programme school. Yet despite this extensive experience, the place of the IB in the ongoing culture and history of the school was, at the time of my appointment, still contested by some in the community. One Head of Faculty expressed to me his desire that I withdraw the school from the MYP for reasons largely consistent with CS in this study, while another asked, like SDS, if there was the possibility the school could cease providing the local matriculation credential. For my own part, the IB was not particularly a strong attractor to seek the position as principal. Yet, like many of the participants in this research, once I engaged in it through teaching and thus experienced its impact directly, I appreciated its value.

A number of my subjective experiences resonate with this research. Throughout my principalship in an IB school (2010-2015), the IB remained a valuable, but subordinate, element within the educational vision of the governing council and executive leadership team. A totalistic approach by IB programme coordinators at times created tension and conflict, some of which reflect the type of zeal evident in this research in the form of “because the IB says we have to” (CS). Dualities were legion; at one parent information evening, the curriculum leaders for the IB and the local credential not only used entirely different presentation formats, fonts, and software, but the changing of laptops between presentations symbolised the type of isolation described in this study as “two constituencies that [are] in tension with each other” (THS). A newly appointed business manager (2011) experienced significant conflict and challenge in trying to bring fiscal
discipline to curriculum, professional learning, and resourcing budget items due to the reluctance of programme coordinators to hand over the financial and administrative control they had long enjoyed.

In seeking to understand these challenges, I sought the wisdom of other IB principals, as described in 1.2 Background to the study. Given no commonality emerged from these early inquiries, I set upon the research documented in this thesis. The substantive findings match my subjective experience in the following ways:

i. the IB is highly valued as an engaging, rigorous, and expansively focused curriculum which develops understanding of and commitment to the needs of the global human community;

ii. connecting with others across the world enriches local educational experience;

iii. the IB is costly and creates structural and administrative tensions;

iv. while a valuable element of the school, it is one among many which are also highly valued (Bryant et al., 2018);

v. principals want the IBO to engage with them directly, not mediate their communication through programme coordinators. Principals are best positioned to advise the IBO about the ordering of educational and credentialling priorities for their communities, priorities which coordinators may not fully share or appreciate, particularly in multi-programme schools.

Principalship is also highly impacted by a school’s size, history, culture and climate, capabilities, and staff efficacy (Day et al., 2011). While each of these factors may be important, their impact is not proportionally equal, highlighted by the contrasting experiences of SDS and GS. For SDS, introducing the IB is an opportunity for innovation and growth, while GS battles uncertainty and fragility which flow from a moderate IB history (8 years) and where its value remains contested. These contexts require different leadership whose efficacy is contingent on how well each plays their required role. Thus, while there may be common experiences across
these findings, diversity of particular contexts tempers their overall impact and the consequent leadership required by the principal.

8.3 Leadership actors and characters

This diversity of experience is captured in the following reflection on the seven Phase One participants, drawn from an early coding memo. In the early period of Phase One analysis, one experience of freewriting, or what Charmaz (2014, p. 186) describes as “glimpses of ideas and bursts of inchoate thoughts”, resulted in an extended description of each principal’s character type. Coming back to the memo at the end of writing this thesis gives it renewed significance.

Seven distinct character types (Goffman, 1959) are evident. For most, their character is well matched to the locale (Giddens, 1984) of their school. As social actors (Şişman, 2015), principals have titular responsibility for the cultural values and experiences of their communities. Rituals, symbols, and their meaning are communicated through the priorities and affirmations of the principal, bestowing sense-making pre-eminence upon the role they play. Day et al. (2010, p. 2) describe this as the “values, virtues, dispositions, attributes and competences” of effective leadership. The seven stories of Australian IB principals below show differences borne of each actor’s unique circumstance:

I'm currently coding BS’ transcript and have been reflecting of late about the stylistic differences there are in the way that the principals speak and how this might reflect the way they see their role. For example, MS is very much about telling stories to make a point. Sometimes they are so discursive it's hard to see what the point is, or it takes a long time to come to the point. SS was so measured and exact that the transcript reads like the ultimate in reputation management; marketing and brand confidence seem the hallmarks of reflections and comments. Not a single issue appears to exist at Singapore School. Interestingly, both MS
and SS heavily redacted their transcripts; MS produced a revised transcript that minimised negative impressions about the Dept, while SS’ ended up being so devoid of rich detail that it now reads like a marketing spiel!

BS is focused on the needs of students and the values of the IB, far more than any of the other participants. I wonder if this reveals a greater commitment to truthfulness, lives, and learning than it does to curriculum, reputation and impression. BS is focused on learning, on values, on identity and community. BS seems steadfast and sure, while being open to exploring what [they] can learn from others and what others can contribute to the community. Is this the intrepid explorer? The adventurist? Greenleaf's servant leader? Hesse's Leo?

GS came across as faltering and not as assured as the others, even THS who is so new to headship. I think that is because GS is in a politically difficult space where the IB is viewed problematically. The academic focus of Geneva School is being called into question because of the declining NAPLAN results, and many in the community are linking that to the inquiry pedagogy of the PYP, although there are differences between the two campuses. Having said that, GS was the one who found the opportunity to think about the issues very helpful. GS commented several times that "this is interesting".

SDS is the confident, competent architect/engineer/builder. SDS knows what [they] want, tries out ideas in ways SDS feels sure will assist in getting to where [they] want to be, and puts plans in place. SDS is assured of [their] political position and backing, presenting the relentless march towards being a three-programme school as a fait accompli. It's just a matter of time.

Similarly, CS is very assured, as might reasonably be expected of a principal of 18 years’ standing. CS has the non-government school "all about the needs of the students" filter in place, reinforcing the protective and shepherding image of the
traditional old school principal. In fact, that might be a good metaphor: caring for the needs of the sheep who don't even know what they need or what is good for them.

THS is the least experienced of all participants, yet not lacking in confidence, vision or energy. THS is most honest about self and the challenges of leading a high expectation, highly privileged, insular community. Strong enough to make change, yet respectful of the culture and traditions established well before THS arrived.

Each actor described above appears in the conclusion to the memo as one of the following characters (in bold). Each express their character clearly, although some of them may not always be aware these are the characters they are presenting (Goffman, 1959). BS is the servant leader committed wholeheartedly to the needs of the community. CS is the shepherd, or perhaps paradoxically the benevolent dictator. MS is the quintessential story-teller, interested in the affect and impact rather than the objective detail. SDS is the adventurer/explorer, seeking to bring everyone along on the exciting and unknown journey. THS is the keen and, perhaps, overly enthusiastic and impatient mastering apprentice, keen to demonstrate their worth and affirm the wisdom of their appointment to the role. Despite numerous requests for detail and clarification, SS gave straight, direct, and innocuous responses, leading to a characterisation of the brand manager, seeking to ensure at all costs possible that the reputation of Singapore School is impervious to criticism. All seem very suited to their communities and contexts. They play their role well. Their audiences seemingly approve.

The character of GS, though, is not such an enjoyable role. GS is the naive, reflective politician, keen to combat the onslaught of interrogation into the place of the IB at Geneva School, but, in the end, was not able to do so and left the school. As an experienced principal (9
years), GS seems skilled and equipped to address the challenges, but somehow has not been successful. It raises the question as to whether GS had not “sufficiently understood the differences between their first and second schools” (Fidler et al., 2006, p. 92), or whether the governing council failed to convey to GS at the time of appointment that the legitimacy of the IB at Geneva School created “a challenging environment” (Fidler et al., 2006, p. 93). While these questions lie beyond the scope of this current investigation, the tension evident in the transcript, and GS’ hesitancy, cast GS into a role which eventually concluded by being written out of Geneva School’s ongoing story.

Therefore, while some actors play their roles with distinction and are thus able to enact effective leadership in their particular IB school context, the experience of GS underscores the need for leadership capabilities to be well matched to contextual needs. It is impossible to know if any other participant in the study would have been able to address the challenges of Geneva School satisfactorily, as it is impossible to know if GS would have been successful as principal in any of the other participant schools. The story of GS also exemplifies the unpredictability of a complex adaptive system and the inability of any one agent, even one perceived as politically powerful as a principal, to control its behaviour. GS thus entered an unforeseen personal career liminal space, no longer principal, and not yet transformed into what is yet to come.

Central to the integrated discussion in Chapter Seven is that the needs of each school context are unique. While offering IB programmes creates additional complexities, they are not the same complexities, nor are they addressed in the same manner. The metaphor of actor/character and specifically the experience of GS post interview add descriptive richness (Braun & Clarke, 2006) which highlight the diversity of leading an Australian IB school.
Overlaying this diversity, however, are some commonalities of recommendation which flow from this investigation.

8.4 Recommendations

Recommendations for practice are offered for school governing councils (Recommendations 1 and 2), for the IBO (Recommendations 3, 4, and 5), and for principals (Recommendations 6, 7, and 8). Consistent with the complexity leadership theory used in this research, each of the recommendations does not apply solely to each group, as is the nature of complex adaptive systems, but impacts others also.

1. School governing councils and principals are to articulate clearly the role of the IB within their mission and vision.

The importance of articulating a mission and vision is clear in the literature (Chait et al., 2005; Fishel, 2008), however there is variability among the governing councils represented in this study. Developing this will engage governing councils and principals more directly with the IB’s own mission. Evidence from this research shows the value of this work for principals’ leadership.

2. School governing councils receive periodic briefings on the IB from a range of staff.

Regular briefings to governing councils complement the higher order work of Recommendation 1. The governing councils considered to have the best understanding are in schools where the principal and other key staff provide ongoing and regular presentations (Austen et al., 2011; McCormick et al., 2006). The inclusion of a wider range of staff gives assurance to governors of collaborative engagement and widely distributed understanding of the IB throughout the school. Inviting senior executive staff to present to governing councils
also contributes to their professional growth and serves as useful preparation for those who aspire to principalship; this is particularly the case for those seeking principalship in an IB school.

3. The IBO communicate more directly with school principals.

The strategies in place are not perceived to be effective. The IBO would benefit from more direct communication with principals (Perry et al., 2018). Online strategies are not seen to be helpful and there is some evidence that IBO office staff are not responsive to the needs of principals. The IBO should seek feedback from principals about the effectiveness of their communication strategies. This could be in the form of a visit to Australia by senior IBO staff, similar to that of the 2017 visit by Director-General Dr Kumari (Singhal, 2017). A dialogical relationship is required in which principals are considered partner voices, not communication conduits.

4. The IBO provide more effective support for new IB principals. An induction process provided by the IBO for principals new to an IB school is required. This may be in the form of online modules or optional residential programmes. Linked to this could be the establishment of mentoring support such as that provided for programme coordinators through IB Schools Australasia (IB Schools Australasia, 2018). A six month and twelve month follow-up from the IBO would give principals opportunity to clarify concerns or indicate needs they discern following their induction and settling-in period.

5. The IBO liaise more closely with government policy makers and bureaucrats to support government school principals. Review of literature in Chapter Two indicates the IBO has liaised closely with the Australian Commonwealth government to ensure its programmes meet the requirements of the Australian Curriculum. This level of engagement is not evident
with state/territory departments of education regarding practical support for implementation (Perry et al., 2018). There is need to shift beyond regulatory compliance to establish ongoing and constructive relationships with state/territory governments. The visit of Director-General Dr Kumari (Singhal, 2017) is a signal this may be changing, but the relationship needs to extend to bureaucratic personnel as well as to policy makers. Regular briefings for, and from, education departments can complement strategies highlighted in Recommendation 3.

6. **Principals use the language of the IB more explicitly to articulate the school’s commitment to the IB.** Explicit use of IB language is evident in schools where the IB is perceived to be better understood and embedded in the learning culture. Flowing out of Recommendations 1 and 2, principals should integrate IB language into broad school discourse. The IB Learner Profile is a useful heuristic for this process (IBO, 2015b, 2017; Rizvi et al., 2014). Audit of school programmes and documentation, including those outside the scope of the formal curriculum, should be undertaken to identify areas which could benefit from greater inclusion of IB language. Reframing the discourse around the IB must be initiated and modelled by the principal (Dinham, 2016, pp. 165-169), not programme coordinators. This challenge is most acute for principals in schools where the IB does not cover the entirety of the school population.

7. **Principals should give greater attention to communicating the international core of the IB.** Internationalism is central to the IB (Hill, 2006), not least of which is inclusion in its name. However, this study reveals less emphasis than might otherwise be expected. Some principals in Phase One report using explicit language of internationalism, but its absence across the wider Phase Two survey participants suggests the need for more explicit emphasis on its value (Hill, 2014; Sripikash et al., 2014).
8. **Principals pursue collegial support opportunities with other IB principals.** Opportunity to connect with colleagues internationally through conferences is valued by participants in this study. However, many of these are not in governance and policy contexts similar to Australian schools. There is value in establishing an Australian conference, perhaps biennially, comprising principals, programme coordinators, and other relevant teachers. At the state/territory level, an annual, or biannual meeting of principals can provide opportunity for sharing of ideas, concerns, and for presenting a representative voice to the IBO. Such a forum existed in NSW during the time I was in an IB school, although it lacked clarity and purpose as a forum.

8.5 **Suggested future research**

Three lines of future research are suggested:

1. **Policy/governance.** This research identified the fastest growing context of the IB in government primary schools offering the PYP. Currently, only four state/territory jurisdictions permit the IB in government schools. Comparative studies are needed to identify policy rationale, to define challenges specific to government school contexts, and to examine how best to support ongoing growth within those jurisdictions which currently permit the IB (see Recommendation 5). Further examination of how to make the IB more accessible (Dickson et al., 2017; Perry et al., 2018) to government school communities is warranted. Extensive exploration of principal perceptions in government schools will assist this;

2. **Programme implementation.** The main finding of this research, that the IB is a pragmatic framework rather than a source from which a school’s mission is derived,
indicates further research is required on why schools choose to implement, or withdraw from, an IB programme. This should also include closer examination of socio-economic contexts which influence that decision.

The withdrawal from the MYP by BS and CS, along with three other schools noted in this study, indicates particular focus should be given to implementation issues related to the MYP. Curriculum alignment and rigour are identified as major contributors to the decision by BS and CS to withdraw, while schools contacted as part of Phase Two who indicated they withdrew are government schools with ICSEA under 1000, further supporting the need to consider socio-economic contexts; this links to both research areas 1 and 3. Further research into programme transition (PYP to MYP, MYP to DP) is needed to complement studies conducted in other national contexts (Hallinger et al., 2011).

Finally, the limited presence of internationalism and service across both phases of this research needs further inquiry and explanation. Specifically, it is worth exploring how Australian IB schools understand the notion of internationalism within the context of national education systems (Resnik, 2009) and what strategies are in place for its development;

3. **Critical case studies.** A series of case studies related to this research seem worth undertaking:

   a. *Lower ICSEA schools.* At the time of data collection for Phase Two (July 5, 2017), the total population of Australian IB schools numbered 174. Of these, only ten had an ICSEA less than 1000. A further 19 had ICSEAs between 1000 and 1050, highlighting that Australian IB schools are most present in socio-
economically advantaged communities. Given the findings of this study related to “dual economy” (THS) pressures, case studies of lower ICSEA schools are needed to examine how lower ICSEA schools manage these pressures. Related to this is whether there is a structural point beyond which these pressures become acute and it is no longer feasible to offer IB programmes in lower ICSEA Australian schools. This research might also consider ways in which the IB could adopt more flexible ways of supporting lower ICSEA schools to implement IB programmes, particularly with authorisation and professional learning costs;

b. Government schools implementing the DP. Despite attempts in this research to include a wider range of government schools, only one state department of education permitted the research to be undertaken in its schools. The experience of BS shows that offering the DP in government schools is not an easy leadership context. Further research within government schools is therefore needed to determine the extent to which the experience of BS is highly contextualised, or more typical, and on what bases, particularly given the intention to grow the IB in government schools (Smith, 2018). There seems merit for the IB to support such research, given its historical commitment to preparing students for tertiary study (Peterson, 2003);

c. Reasons for implementing an IB programme. The experience of SDS suggests it is a successful approach to implementing an IB programme. However, this current study is limited by its symbolic interactionist approach. Longitudinal studies offer opportunity to examine the process more extensively than is possible in this study. Comparative studies might also be valuable between schools implementing a
single programme and schools, like St Donat’s School and Singapore School, adding an additional programme. Schools which consider implementing an IB programme and then decide not to proceed may also offer rich research possibilities regarding reasons for their decision not to proceed with implementation;

d. *Reasons for withdrawing from IB programmes.* BS indicated the school withdrew from an IB programme under their leadership, while CS intimated this was possible during their Phase One interview; Cardiff School withdrew from the MYP between the two phases of this research. Three schools in Phase Two voluntarily indicated they withdrew from the IB in the previous 12 months and declined to participate; another indicated they were in the process of withdrawing from the IB and this was offered as a possible reason why the principal may not participate in the Phase Two survey. Follow-up case studies to explore reasons for withdrawal could provide the IBO, principals, and governors with key insights into how best to manage this process. For the IBO, such studies might reveal areas for their attention to provide better support to schools. For governing councils and principals, such studies might provide insights into which critical operational indicators they should monitor and manage, as well as highlight critical decisions to be made in continuance or discontinuance of an IB programme;

e. *Principals who have led IB schools in two different contexts (state/territory, or government & non-government).* This study reveals differences across state/territory jurisdictions. Only one Phase One participant indicated they had principal experience across two jurisdictions; no participant had experience across
sectors. Case studies of principals with these differences could provide complementary insights to these findings. This is particularly the case for principals with experience across two different state/territory jurisdictions, given there are significant differences evident between policies regarding the IB and curriculum;

f. *Cultural modality and liminality.* These two constructs offer promising insights to school organisational culture and principal leadership more broadly than just Australian IB schools. Further theoretical work and empirical research is needed to develop and test these constructs further, as well as evaluate their merit and efficacy within complex adaptive systems and complexity leadership theories.

### 8.6 Conclusion

This study shows Australian IB principals believe strongly that the IB offers rich learning opportunities for Australian students. The development of a global vision and intercultural understanding remain key elements of the IB, but these seem lesser educational priorities than academic rigour and coherent pedagogy. Integrating these into a whole-school vision, and managing the additional governance obligations and costs associated with the IB, stand as key challenges for principals in Australian IB schools. More work is needed by the IBO to assist, as it is clear Australian schools present more complex governance, policy, and curriculum contexts than other jurisdictions in the Asia-Pacific region.

These findings are tempored by some limitations of the study, including the sample size of Phase One ($n^1 = 7$) and the modest survey response from the total population of 174 Australian IB principals Phase Two ($n^2 = 50$, RR 28.7%). It was also disappointing a wider range
of possible Phase One participants were not permitted to participate by their state/territory department of education. Given the growth of the IB in Australian government schools, gaining access to government school principals remains a challenge yet to be addressed.

This study has found the perspective of complexity leadership theory to be useful as an analytic lens, yet has identified two complementary concepts, temporality and liminality. This helps limit a tendency toward theory reification as the impact of temporality is embedded into the theory itself. They also highlight perhaps the most significant limitation of this study, that of its own spatio-temporality. The perceptions of principals captured in this study are those of Phase One principals leading schools during February and March 2016, and of Phase Two principals leading schools in September 2017. Their perceptions reflect subjectively constructed perceptions of the time; as the experience of GS shows, school leadership can be a tenuous temporality, and its security reflective of its cognate, temporary.

The IB in Australia is likely to experience continued growth. The presence of IB programmes does impact the work of principals and thus creates a different experience of leadership to principals in schools without IB programmes. The willingness of participants to share their perceptions about these impacts has enabled this investigation to identify their nature and significance. Without the availability and professional generosity of the seven Phase One participants, complemented by the willingness of Phase Two participants to find time to complete the survey, these insights would still be unknown. While acknowledging this generosity, relying on subjective perceptions represents a key limitation to this study. The further research identified in the previous section will go some way to addressing this. The new knowledge discovered in this study adds to our understanding of principal leadership in
Australia, and of how principals respond to complex and adaptive leadership contexts. It is now the task to continue this exploration in other spatio-temporal contexts yet to come.
## Phase One Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2015</td>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/4/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4/2015</td>
<td>2:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/5/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/6/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/7/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/8/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/9/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/10/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/11/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/12/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/13/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/14/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/15/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/16/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/17/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/18/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/19/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/20/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/21/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/22/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/23/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/24/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/25/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/26/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/27/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/28/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/29/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/30/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/2/2015</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Principal's office</td>
<td>1/31/2015</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Interviews were mainly conducted at the principal's office and were scheduled to facilitate the principal's availability. The location of the interview was specified in Sydney, NSW.
Appendix B – Consent Form

Faculty of Education and Social Work

ABN 15 211 513 464

CHIEF INVESTIGATOR: Dr George Odhiambo
Senior Lecturer, Educational Leadership and Management

Room 919
Building A35
The University of Sydney
NSW 2006 AUSTRALIA
Telephone: +61 2 9351 6239
Facsimile: +61 2 9351 4580
Email: george.odhiambo@sydney.edu.au
Web: http://www.sydney.edu.au

Principal perspectives on leading IB schools in Australia

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ___________________________________________ [PRINT NAME], agree to take part in this research study.

In giving my consent I state that:

✓ I understand the purpose of the study, what I will be asked to do, and any risks/benefits involved.

✓ I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been able to discuss my involvement in the study with the researchers if I wished to do so.

✓ The researchers have answered any questions that I had about the study and I am happy with the answers.

✓ I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary and I do not have to take part. My decision whether to be in the study will not affect my relationship with the researchers or anyone else at the University of Sydney, my employer or the International Baccalaureate Organization now or in the future.

✓ I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.

✓ I understand that I may stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, and that unless I indicate otherwise any recordings will then be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study. I also understand that I may refuse to answer any questions I don’t wish to answer.

✓ I understand that personal information about me that is collected over the course of this project will be stored securely and will only be used for purposes that I have agreed to. I understand that information about me will only be told to others with my permission, except as required by law.
I understand that the results of this study may be published, but these publications will not contain my name or any identifiable information about me.

Being contacted about future studies

YES □ NO □

Would you like to receive feedback about the overall results of this study?

YES □ NO □

If you answered YES, please indicate your preferred form of feedback and address:

☐ Postal: __________________________________________

__________________________________________

☐ Email: _______________________________________

__________________________________________

Signature

__________________________________________

PRINT name

__________________________________________

Date
Appendix C – Email in principle request to participate

Paul Kidson

c/- Faculty of Education and Social Work
University of Sydney
Camperdown NSW 2050

14th September 2015

«Title» «First_name» «Surname»
«Role»
«School»
«Address»
«Suburb» «State» «Postcode»

Dear «Title» «Surname»,

I am currently conducting a doctoral research project with the University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr George Odhiambo, Chief Investigator. I write to seek your willingness to participate in this project as an interview subject.

The research is an exploratory study of principals’ leadership in Australian IB schools. From an analysis of 160 schools, your school profile has been identified as one of only eight schools to represent the wider group of Australian schools currently offering one or more IB programmes. A full Participant Information Sheet detailing the proposed research as well as Consent Forms will be forwarded to you once they have been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Sydney.

If you are willing to participate, the involvement comprises a one hour interview. You would also be invited at the conclusion of the interview to provide to the researcher any additional school documentation (newsletters, handbooks, policies, etc.) you feel is of value to the research.

The research is subject to ethics approval by the University of Sydney. As part of that process, your willingness to provide "in principle" agreement to be involved would assist preparation of the application. Please note, no research can be undertaken without the approval of the University of Sydney.

If you are willing to participate, please forward a return email to pkid3681@uni.sydney.edu.au

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Kidson
Appendix D – Ethics approval (2015/859)

Research Integrity
Human Research Ethics Committee

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

Dr George Odhiambo
Education and Social Work - Research; Faculty of Education & Social Work
Email: george.odhiambo@sydney.edu.au

Dear George

I am pleased to inform you that the University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has approved your project entitled “Principal leadership in Australian IB schools”.

Details of the approval are as follows:

Project No.: 2015/859
Approval Date: 16 November 2015
First Annual Report Due: 16 November 2016
Authorised Personnel: Odhiambo George; Kidson Paul; Wilson Rachel;

Documents Approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2015</td>
<td>Questionnaires/Surveys</td>
<td>Phase Two questionnaire V2 (clean version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2015</td>
<td>Other Type</td>
<td>Theoretical framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/10/2015</td>
<td>Recruitment Letter/Email</td>
<td>Follow up email recruitment text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/10/2015</td>
<td>Participant Consent Form</td>
<td>Participant Consent Form- Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/10/2015</td>
<td>Participant Info Statement</td>
<td>Participant Information Statement- Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/10/2015</td>
<td>Recruitment Letter/Email</td>
<td>Recruitment email to principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/10/2015</td>
<td>Participant Info Statement</td>
<td>Participant Information Statement- Online Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/09/2015</td>
<td>Interview Questions</td>
<td>Phase One Interview Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HREC approval is valid for four (4) years from the approval date stated in this letter and is granted pending the following conditions being met:

**Conditions of Approval**

- Continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans.
- Provision of an annual report on this research to the Human Research Ethics Committee from the approval date and at the completion of the study. Failure to submit reports will result in withdrawal of ethics approval for the project.

Research Integrity
Research Portfolio
Level 6, Jane Foss Russell
The University of Sydney
T +61 2 8627 8111
F +61 2 8627 8177
E hr.ethics@sydney.edu.au
sydney.edu.au
• All serious and unexpected adverse events should be reported to the HREC within 72 hours.
• All unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project should be reported to the HREC as soon as possible.
• Any changes to the project including changes to research personnel must be approved by the HREC before the research project can proceed.
• Note that for student research projects, a copy of this letter must be included in the candidate’s thesis.

Chief Investigator / Supervisor’s responsibilities:
1. You must retain copies of all signed Consent Forms (if applicable) and provide these to the HREC on request.
2. It is your responsibility to provide a copy of this letter to any internal/external granting agencies if requested.

Please do not hesitate to contact Research Integrity (Human Ethics) should you require further information or clarification.

Yours sincerely

Professor Judith Cashmore
Chair
Humanities Low Risk Ethics Subcommittee

This HREC is constituted and operates in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council’s (NHMRC) National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007), NHMRC and Universities Australia Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007) and the CPMP/ICH Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice.
Appendix E – Phase One Interview Schedule

1. Respondent profile questions
   a. How long have you been a principal?
   b. How long have you been at this school as the principal?
   c. What roles other than principal have you held at this school?
   d. How long has this school offered IB programmes?
   e. Have you worked in other schools in Australia which offer IB programmes?
      i. If YES, in what role?
      ii. What programme(s) did the school(s) offer?
      iii. What curriculum other than IB was offered?
      iv. Was the school a government or non-government school? (Answer for each school in which you have been employed)
   f. Have you worked in schools outside Australia which offer IB programmes?
      i. If YES, in which country/countries?
      ii. In what role(s) did you work?
      iii. What programme(s) did the school(s) offer?
      iv. What curriculum other than IB was offered?
      v. Was the school privately owned or government-run? (Answer for each school in which you have been employed)

2. School context questions
   a. In your opinion, what do your governors understand it means to be an “IB World School”? If needed, what might you do to improve this?
   b. What is your view about the relationship between the IB programme(s) offered in this school and your state based curriculum?
   c. Australian schools have obligations both to Commonwealth and state governments. In your opinion, how does being an “IB World School” impact these?

3. Principal beliefs questions
   a. How does being an “IB World School” fit into your own vision for this school?
   b. How do you articulate this vision for the community?
   c. In what ways do you consider there are benefits in offering IB programmes?
   d. What challenges do you think there are for this school in offering IB programmes?
   e. How have you as principal responded to these challenges?
   f. In your opinion, what do your staff understand it means to be an “IB World School”? Is there anything you might need to do to improve this?
   g. In your opinion, what do the parents of this school understand it means to be an “IB World School”? Is there anything you might need to do to improve this?
   h. In your opinion, what do the students of this school understand it means to be an “IB World School”? Is there anything you might need to do to improve this?

4. Processes questions
   a. What do programme coordinators do in this school?
   b. How well do you think they relate to other leadership functions across this school?
   c. How effectively does collaboration occur in this school?
   d. What are your current challenges specifically in the context of being an “IB World School”?
   e. Leading an “IB World School” is a complex task. How do you equip and sustain yourself for this task?

5. Do you have anything else you would like to add?
Appendix F – Participant Consent Form

Principals’ perspectives on leading IB schools in Australia

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ........................................................................................................... [PRINT NAME], agree to take part in this research study.

In giving my consent I state that:

✓ I understand the purpose of the study, what I will be asked to do, and any risks/benefits involved.
✓ I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been able to discuss my involvement in the study with the researchers if I wished to do so.
✓ The researchers have answered any questions that I had about the study and I am happy with the answers.
✓ I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary and I do not have to take part. My decision whether to be in the study will not affect my relationship with the researchers or anyone else at the University of Sydney, my employer or the International Baccalaureate Organization now or in the future.
✓ I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time.
✓ I understand that I may stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, and that unless I indicate otherwise any recordings will then be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study. I also understand that I may refuse to answer any questions I don’t wish to answer.
✓ I understand that personal information about me that is collected over the course of this project will be stored securely and will only be used for purposes that I have agreed to. I understand that information about me will only be told to others with my permission, except as required by law.
I understand that the results of this study may be published, but these publications will not contain my name or any identifiable information about me.

Being contacted about future studies

YES ☐ NO ☐

Would you like to receive feedback about the overall results of this study?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If you answered YES, please indicate your preferred form of feedback and address:

☐ Postal: ________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________

☐ Email: ________________________________________________

Signature

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PRINT name

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Date
Appendix G – Initial data set read through

I've finished reading the entire set of transcripts today, all in one go (punctuated by lunch and dinner, of course). These are ideas which stand out most:

- the IB has contributed positively to the sample schools, although not as positively at Geneva School; the lack of basic literacy and numeracy as assessed by NAPLAN has given the Geneva School Board cause for concern, with the PYP identified by some board members as the cause of the decline;
- international mindedness is highly valued;
- the IB is a demanding framework for teachers and requires greater commitment than the Australian Curriculum;
- the flexibility of some states' curriculum is greater than others;
- the needs of students are at the centre of principals' decision making. These override the requirements of the IB, at times bringing principals and the IBO into conflict;
- the educational benefits of IB programmes can become diminished because of the relentless focus on data (system requirements, NAPLAN, board expectations);
- personal commitment by the principal is essential; none of the participants were negative about the IB and its value to students and teachers;
- the concept of collaboration, while central to IB philosophy, is very varied in the way it is experienced across the sample schools;
- whole school commitment to the philosophy and values of the IB appears weaker in schools where programmes do not cover the whole student population;
- schools with PYP focus more on learning, those with DP more on credentialing; the MYP is still looked upon as being difficult to reconcile with a number of local contexts;
- the quality of coordinators influences the view teaching staff have about the IB and its philosophy;
- principals of DP schools actively work against positioning the DP as an elite programme;
- teachers benefit by having more emphasis on learning, rather than content;
- developing relationships with international colleagues (either students or teachers) enhances the learning experience;
- sharing learning/professional experiences with IB colleagues around the world, or Australian IB schools that also share an international perspective, is reflective of contemporary globalised society.
Appendix H – Initial read through: The Hague School

THS is an inexperienced head (less than two years) and has little direct experience of the school she leads. She thinks her governors have a reasonably useful understanding of the IB, but fairly disengaged and blithely accepting, given there appear to be no great issues at the moment. She has other change factors to address, so their limited understanding of IB is not a particular concern for her. She wants it improved, but sees no need to do so; the magnitude of importance is greater for other school issues. Their view is related to marketing and differentiation within the market.

The IB is more rigorous and better preparation for university, but THS totally rejects the elitism issue. I think there's a "cake and eat it, too" moment here. She notes that it is educationally superior:

It is more robust, more rigorous, I think with the exception of Maths; Maths is probably the only subject where I would say the [local matriculation credential] is more rigorous than the IB. It is far more coherent, it actually has a philosophy. It actually has a common framework across all of the disciplines offered. So there are aspects I like about the [local matriculation credential], that I think in some ways I prefer to the IB, and in our context, I don’t think I would be willing, certainly not at this point to go over and say “well, we’re an all IB school”, I don’t think that would be right, but if I had to pick one as being overall more rigorous and more satisfactory as preparation for university, which is all of our kids, then it would be the IB.

On the other she is saying that it is not elitist:

I’m not sure that I would buy into their philosophy that every student needs to do this full range, but equally I reject, and I publicly reject, a lot of the perception that it is an elite credential for elite students.

I wonder if this is the marketing context driving this reflection. She also talks about the languages issue being a constraint for some girls:

So, I think also we happen to have a school which is extremely strong in its languages offering, so for us the language requirements aren’t typically very difficult to meet and it’s a real strength for us. But when you think of the broader framework for most schools, the quality of language teaching, the uptake of language teaching is very low; to inject that at Diploma level into “well now you must” I think that puts a lot of kids off, and even possibly some schools.

Perhaps it is an easier fit for the IB to The Hague School because the compulsory language requirement is supported by a broader school commitment to the value of languages. Would this be the case at The Hague School if it didn't have such a strong languages culture? Why do they value languages?

Again, there is a contradiction here. On the one hand, most of the girls at The Hague School will want to progress to tertiary study, and THS thinks that the IB is the better preparation for tertiary study, but then she says it is not a major part of the overall school culture? Does this suggest that commitment to the philosophy of the IB is compromised?
She is strongly critical of the national curriculum and the bureaucratic regime that attends it:
So I think we’re in an environment where, for schools of our calibre, government regulation of curriculum only serves to pull us down.
This might reflect the fact that The Hague School is a high performing, socio-economically advantaged community. This might not reflect the attitude of principals towards the AC more broadly. Doing compliance for both the AC and the IB is unproductive:
Now I think there are other schools in the education system where it probably pulls the bottom end up, but I believe that for our cohort and our population that my staff are better, more knowledgeable about the students, more knowledgeable about their capacities, have at least as valid a vision, if not a better vision for where they want to get them to, and are really only inhibited by the Australian Curriculum. I think it’s a waste of our time and it’s detrimental to the kids. So to have to go through all of that compliance, for both of those levels of government, and then do another one for the IB? This is not making me smile, you know, so it’s costly and it’s a pain in the neck

THS speaks so highly of her staff and the fact that meeting bureaucratic standards is an affront to just how good they are. But, her emphasis is on offering the credential (IBDP, in her case) without any reference to specific benefits other than we like the credential because we think it does things for the kids. This seems underpinned again by a marketing/value proposition type of conceptualising of the IBDP.

Ironically, THS speaks with depth, resonance, feeling and experience about the value of knowing one's culture and that of others. She has a nuanced understanding that actions and behaviours in one cultural context may be fundamentally different to that of other cultures and that to understand those differences is a positive, humbling process. It is a magnanimous vision of humanity which seems inconsistent with the market driven comments from earlier in the interview.
Appendix I – Analytic memo (SDS)

SDS has long experience as a principal, 15 years. Over half that time has been at his current school. He also had two years at the school as deputy principal, so he knows the culture of the school community well, having been at the school for 10 years. The school did not have IB programmes when he came to the school, so his attraction to the school was not motivated by the presence of IB programmes. The school initially introduced the PYP, which fits more easily within the state curriculum framework. This perhaps has made the introduction of IB pedagogy more successful in the early stages.

They are early on in their IB journey. The interview took place early in only the second year of authorisation, although they had two years of candidacy before that. The school is currently a candidate school for the MYP. They are therefore a relatively inexperienced IB school. He talked about a reasonably long gestation period of exploring IB for about 5 years, so this might account for his perception there is a positive engagement with the IB, particularly by the board and the staff, although this may not be quite as harmonious, given that "We’re just letting people come on board when they’re ready, and then pushing others, if they need to be." He has used personal modelling to broaden staff understanding, including using opportunity for overseas travel as an incentive, but this reveals he also uses explication of clear professional expectations.

SDS is personally passionate about the IB. He is also dynamic in personality, engaging and gregarious. I wonder if it is going well at the moment as a result of the combination of his personal enthusiasm, his long-developed understanding of his current community, and his invitational approach to staff that is followed up with clear expectation.
Friday, 21 July 2017

Dr George Odhiambo
School of Education and Social Work Research Operations, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Email: george.odhiambo@sydney.edu.au

Dear George,

Your request to modify this project, which was submitted on 16th June 2017, has been considered.

After consideration of your response to the comments raised the project has been approved to proceed with the proposed amendments.

Details of the approval are as follows:

Project Title: Principal leadership In Australian IB schools
Project No.: 2015/859
Next Annual Report due: 16th November 2017

New Approved Documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Uploaded</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/06/2017</td>
<td>Questionnaires/Surveys</td>
<td>Phase Two Questionnaire - clean version</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please contact the Ethics Office should you require further information or clarification.

Sincerely,

Dr Jim Rooney
Chair
Modification Review Committee

The University of Sydney HRECs are constituted and operate in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council’s (NHMRC) National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007) and the NHMRC’s Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2007).
Appendix K – Phase Two survey questionnaire

Survey of Principals in Australian IB Schools

The University of Sydney's School of Education and Social Work is undertaking research into the experience of being a principal of an Australian school which offers one or more IB programmes.

You have been invited to participate in this study because you are a principal in an Australian school which offers one or more IB programmes.

This survey is for principals of schools only.

The following survey seeks your response to questions about your school’s governors, the IB and its curriculum, teaching and learning, and ways of working as a principal.

A full Participant Information Statement (PIS) is provided for you to download and read. If you decide to proceed, please indicate your acceptance of the conditions outlined in the PIS and your consent to participate by completing the first question; if you choose the “Exit” option, the survey will terminate.

The survey requires approximately 20 minutes to complete.

[Attachment: "151027 Survey Questionnaire Participant Information Sheet V1.1.pdf"]

I understand that by completing the survey, I agree that I understand the statements in the Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and consent to responses being used in the project as described above.

I would like to:

☐ Complete the survey - I acknowledge that I have read the PIS and consent to be a participant in this study. I declare I am the principal of this school.

☐ Exit without completing the study.

School Profile

This section gathers basic demographic details of your school. It is not used for identification purposes.

State/Territory
☐ Australian Capital Territory
☐ New South Wales
☐ Northern Territory
☐ Queensland
☐ South Australia
☐ Tasmania
☐ Victoria
☐ Western Australia

School Sector
☐ Government
☐ Non-government

School type (select one only)
☐ Primary
☐ Secondary
☐ Combined Primary/Secondary

Enrolment gender
☐ Co-educational
☐ Girls only
☐ Girls only (primary), co-educational (secondary)
☐ Co-educational (primary, girls only (secondary)
☐ Boys only
☐ Boys only (primary), co-educational (secondary)
☐ Co-educational (primary), boys only (secondary)
☐ Other (please specify)

Enrolment gender (other)
Programme Authorisation

Please indicate all authorised programmes currently offered in the school; do not indicate programmes for which your school is currently a candidate school. Please indicate which year the school was authorised for each programme (where relevant).

Programmes offered (select one only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PYP</th>
<th>MYP</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>CP</th>
<th>PYP and MYP</th>
<th>DP and CP</th>
<th>PYP, MYP and DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PYP Authorisation

- Not applicable
- 2016
- 2015
- 2014
- 2013
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- 2006
- 2005
- 2004
- 2003
- 2002
- 2001
- 2000
- 1999
- 1998
- 1997
- 1996
- 1995
- 1994

MYP Authorisation

- Not applicable
- 2016
- 2015
- 2014
- 2013
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- 2006
- 2005
- 2004
- 2003
- 2002
- 2001
- 2000
- 1999
- 1998
- 1997
- 1996
- 1995
- 1994

DP Authorisation

- Not applicable
- 2016
- 2015
- 2014
- 2013
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- 2006
- 2005
- 2004
- 2003
- 2002
- 2001
- 2000
- 1999
- 1998
- 1997
- 1996
- 1995
- 1994
- 1993
- 1992
- 1991
- 1990
- 1989
- 1988
- 1987
- 1986
- 1985
- 1984
- 1983
- 1982
- 1981
- 1980
- 1979
- 1978

Career-related Programme Authorisation

- Not applicable
- 2007
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017

If you are a principal who has INTRODUCED an IB programme to your CURRENT SCHOOL, please provide a brief explanation of why the programme was introduced. If not, proceed with next question.

If you are a principal who has REMOVED an IB programme from your CURRENT SCHOOL, please provide a brief explanation of the programme was removed. If not, proceed with next question.
**Governance - representatives**

This section explores who is represented on your school's governing body. Are the following current represented on your school's governing body? (Please mark one choice in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of any state education authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the school management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School administrative personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/guardians/care-givers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of business, church or other private institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance:

How strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements as applied to your current school? (Please make one choice in each row)

- School governors can name most elements of the IB Learner Profile.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- Inquiry based pedagogy is not discussed by governors of this school.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- Developing international connections for staff and students is valued by governors of this school.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- Public academic results (NAPLAN, Year 12 Matriculation) are very important to governors at this school.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- IB training costs are regularly discussed at governing council meetings.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- Governors at this school would like to know more about the IB.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- School governors regularly receive briefing about the IB from a range of staff.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- School governors think the benefits of the IB outweigh the costs.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- To my knowledge, the IB was introduced to differentiate this school from others.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- The education department manager/director for this school supports the delivery of the IB programme(s) in this school.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- School resources that are provided by the department are adequate to deliver the IB programme(s) in this school.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

- There is conflict with other local principals in my cluster/district because this school offers the IB.
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

Is there anything further about GOVERNANCE you would like to add?
IBO support

How strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements as applied to your current school? (Please make one choice in each row)

The IB office/admin staff are helpful and supportive.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Professional learning for principals is useful and easy to access.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Authorisation/evaluation processes have improved the teaching and learning at this school.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

IB representatives do not appreciate the unique circumstances of this school.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Connecting with leadership colleagues from across the world is a strength of the IB community.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The IB does not provide enough curriculum support to meet Australian curriculum requirements.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Is there anything further about the IBO you would like to add?

______________________________

Work type.

On average throughout the school year, what percentage of time in your role as a principal do you spend on the following tasks? (Rough estimates are sufficient. Please write a number in each row. Write 0 [zero] if none. Please ensure responses add up to 100%)

Leadership tasks and meetings.

______________________________

Curriculum and teaching-related tasks and meetings.

______________________________

Student interactions.

______________________________

Parents/guardians/caregivers interactions.

______________________________

Interactions with the wider community, business and industry.

______________________________

Interactions with professional colleagues and associations.

______________________________

Is there anything further about WORK TYPE you would like to add?

______________________________
Decision making

The school provides staff with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.

○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

The school provides parents, guardians, and caregivers with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.

○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

The school provides students with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.

○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

There is a collaborative decision making culture which is characterised by mutual support.

○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

I make the important decisions on my own.

○ Strongly disagree
○ Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly agree

Is there anything further about DECISION MAKING you would like to add?
Teaching and learning

How strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements as applied to your current school? (Please make one choice in each row)

Parents/students choose this school because it offers IB programmes.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

IB programmes provide more engaging learning than the local curriculum.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Parents worry inquiry based learning does not focus enough on literacy and numeracy.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Teachers and students at this school regularly refer to the IB Learner Profile when describing their learning experience.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The IB Coordinator(s) reports directly to the principal.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Teachers are provided with time for collaborative planning within their regular timetable.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Teachers value the opportunity to connect with other teachers across the world for professional learning.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Staff must teach in both the DP and this school’s local matriculation credential, where the timetable permits.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The DP is available to any student who wishes to undertake it.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Some DP subjects are combined with subjects from the local curriculum when small numbers of students are enrolled in them.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The DP is a better preparation course than the local credential for students seeking tertiary entrance.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Teachers prefer to teach the DP rather than the state curriculum.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Is there anything further about TEACHING AND LEARNING you would like to add?
Additional Language Learning

This school provides additional language learning in the following (select all applicable):

- French
- German
- Mandarin
- Indonesian
- Japanese
- Italian
- Spanish
- Korean
- Portuguese
- Vietnamese
- Arabic
- Other (please specify)

Other language

Approximate number of minutes allocated per week for additional language learning in K-2 (if applicable)

Approximate number of minutes allocated per week for additional language learning in Years 3-6 (if applicable)

Approximate number of minutes allocated per week for additional language learning in Year 7-10 (if applicable)

Approximate number of minutes allocated per week for additional language learning in Year 11-12 (if applicable)

Adequate time is allocated for additional language learning.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

It is hard to staff this school’s additional language learning programme.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Learning another language improves students’ intercultural understanding.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Students would prefer not to study another language.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

The IB additional language learning requirement is easily managed at this school.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Is there anything further about ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE LEARNING you would like to add?

______________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I came to this school specifically because it offered IB programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exercise regularly and consider myself reasonably fit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working at this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend my school as a good place to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rarely socialise with staff from this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job places too much stress on my family life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to improve my dietary habits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easy to switch off from work at the end of the day/week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not get enough satisfying sleep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively seek support from colleagues and mentors outside my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything further about PERSONAL WELL-BEING you would like to add?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Executive Summary

Would you like to receive an executive summary report of the research after it is completed?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Please provide your email address to receive an executive summary of the research. Please note, providing your email address will not enable your survey answers to be identified; survey answers remain confidential.

Survey completion

You have chosen to exit the survey without completing it.
### Appendix L – Response Rate calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAPOR Response Codes</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete (all versions)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial (all versions)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible, non-interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household-level refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known-respondent refusal (phone, IPHH, mail, web)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logged on to survey, did not complete any item (web)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read receipt confirmation, refusal (web)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break off/ Implicit refusal (phone, mail, web, mail_U)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contact (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent unavailable during field period (web)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaire, but not returned during field period (mail, web, mail_U)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, non-refusals (phone, IPHH, mail, web, mail_U)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M – Q-Q plots by ICSEA

Figure M1. Normal Q-Q plot – whole population by ICSEA.

Figure M2. Normal Q-Q plot – Phase Two respondents by ICSEA.
## Appendix N – Verbatim responses to reasons for introducing and withdrawing IB Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Introducing IB Programmes</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NG-1</td>
<td>In the absence of an Australian Curriculum, the IB programs were internationally – recognised. They complemented the international focus of the school.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>PYP, MYP, DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1</td>
<td>Different product to [state] curriculum. Whilst the IBO claims that the DP is suitable for all students, we do not believe that to be true and ours is a selective high school, students still struggle to do well in the IB, much harder than the [state matriculation] system.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-2</td>
<td>The PYP was introduced as it provided the best whole school framework (in our opinion) that supported inquiry learning, had a focus on transdisciplinary teaching, learner profile/attitudes (i.e., general capabilities) and international mindedness. The support structures within the organisation were seen as excellent and the professional learning offered was of a high quality.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2</td>
<td>The PYP provides a deep transdisciplinary framework for the curriculum and because all staff members teach the PYP, there is a consistent approach, school wide.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-3</td>
<td>Disquiet with [state] syllabuses. and wanting a truly world class program that focusses on the holistic education of the child.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-4</td>
<td>International inquiry based approach.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>PYP, DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3</td>
<td>Equity. As a state school we wanted to provide our students with a world class education at an affordable cost.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-5</td>
<td>Lift academic standards.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-6</td>
<td>Academic excellence. The balance of the programme. International portability. Quality of university preparation. An alternative to the stultifying conservatism and arrogance of the [local matriculation credential].</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4</td>
<td>I wanted students in the Government Sector to have the opportunity to study the DP</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-7</td>
<td>The programme was introduced to provide a consistent teaching framework for the whole school and also to assist in the implementation of the Australian Curriculum.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-5</td>
<td>A focus on pedagogy that delivers a rigorous curriculum with an international perspective and develops student agency/voice</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-8</td>
<td>Given previous experience with the MYP and having introduced same at my former school I had confidence that this program would benefit the students and staff at my School from an engagement perspective.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>MYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-6</td>
<td>Yes, I introduced it because we needed an approach to teaching and learning that challenged our students.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-7</td>
<td>Benefits to children – academic rigour, inquiry learning, philosophy of the IB. Benefits to local high school which runs the MYP and DP. Point of difference for parents. Attracting and retaining staff.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-9</td>
<td>We were seeking a learning framework that would support academic rigour and provide a language of learning across the school.</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>PYP, MYP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-8</td>
<td>IB PYP is a holistic program educating the whole child. It is a whole school approach and framework for teaching and learning with scaffolding of skills, concepts, etc. It provides and teaches students the skills they will need for the future – 21st century.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PYP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Withdrawing IB programmes**

| G-9    | We have removed the PYP from our site as of 2017. We had a significant change of staff and leadership and the financial implications impacted on our school.                                           | G       | PYP    |
| NG-10  | We removed MYP in 2016 because it appeared to be hindering our students' preparation for their senior assessment programs. We needed to increase focus on exam preparation. Moreover the introduction had been flawed and many staff were not supportive. | NG      | PYP, DP|
| NG-11  | Previous Principal introduced – we have just undertaken our evaluation visit. We will assess in regard to the future once our evaluation report is returned.                                  | NG      | PYP    |
Appendix O – Box whisker plots for Leadership Meetings and Student Interactions

Figure O1. Distribution of time spent weekly on Leadership meetings, by ICSEA quartile.

Figure O2. Distribution of time spent weekly on Student interactions, by ICSEA quartile.
Figure O3. *Distribution of time spent in Leadership meetings, by programme type.*

Figure O4. *Distribution of time spent in Student interactions, by programme type.*
Appendix P – Minutes per week additional language teaching

Figure P1. Box whisker plot for minutes per week language, by sector (K - Year 2).

Figure P2. Box whisker plot for minutes per week language, by sector (Years 3 - 6).
Figure P3. *Box whisker plot for minutes per week language, by sector (Years 7 - 10).*

Figure P4. *Box whisker plot for minutes per week language, by sector (Years 11 - 12).*
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