

Some Characteristics of Successful Christian Schooling in Australia

Jim Twelves

Published: Journal of Education & Christian Belief - Volume 5:1/Spring 2001 pp.61-74

Abstract

This is a report on three case studies of successful Australian Christian Schools conducted primarily by in-depth interviewing of key leaders. The schools were selected on the recommendation of an expert panel. The study sought to describe leadership and management characteristics of these schools. Characteristics include: collaborative leadership; school boards adopting the Carver Governance Model; two schools used to have strained relations between the board and staff; enrolment policies (two closed, one open); the significant impact of committed, quality teachers on student performance; transforming the lives of students; the implementation of their dynamic vision.

Introduction

What are some of the characteristics of successful Australian Christian schools? This article reports on an in-depth study of the leadership and management practices of three case studies. These three organisations are self-managing, non-government schools and independent of government administration. However, they are accountable to the government for the use of their per-capita recurrent grants that provide a high proportion of their running costs.

Australian Protestant Christian schools are mainly autonomous organisations that are usually affiliated to one of a number of national or state based umbrella associations that provide an array of services ranging from curriculum expertise to legal advice. Despite the wide variety of style of operations, they can be regarded as a distinct group as they are united by a number of common themes, such as their relatively low fees and the pre-eminence of 'Christ as the foundation' (1). They fall into one of five sub-groups (2):

1. Schools using Accelerated Christian Education (ACE) (3),
2. Schools associated with Christian Parent Controlled Schools (CPCS),
3. Schools associated with Christian Community Schools Ltd (CCSL),
4. Christian Community Colleges and
5. Other Christian Schools.

These Christian schools first began to appear in Australia in the 1960's as a response to a variety of stimuli (4). Robert Long identified a number of factors that in his opinion stimulated the development of the Australian Christian schooling movement (5):

1. *The Karmel Report 1973, that made possible state funding,*
2. *Continued anxiety over Communism and Teacher Strikes, particularly in Victoria,*
3. *Moves towards Comprehensive schools, co-education and open-plan schools,*
4. *Increased moral permissiveness in society, fashion, arts and media,*
5. *Changes in government schooling - open space classrooms, indirect teaching,*
6. *The drive to outlaw corporal punishment,*
7. *The declining strength of the church to halt the changes in society and*
8. *The move in some states to discontinue Religious Instruction in state schools.*

At one level, these factors can be seen to be the criteria by which the Christian schools can be judged to be successful, because those parent communities and church organisations who founded the schools, are largely the ones who judge their success or otherwise, by the enrolment of their children.

The study described in this article does not attempt to define success. Rather it simply aimed to hold up three positive case studies for review and to identify a number of characteristics of success that could be applied to existing or new Christian schools seeking to develop their educational outcomes.

Selection of the Three Case Studies

An expert panel of six professional executives representing the main Christian schooling organisations in Australia were asked to nominate a number of schools that in their opinion, exhibited 'excellent qualities in terms of their educational outcomes' (6). The organisations represented were:

1. Australian Association of Christian Schools, O'Connor, ACT.,
2. Christian Community Schools Ltd., Wentworthville, NSW.,
3. Christian Parent Controlled Christian Schools Ltd., Blacktown, NSW. and
4. Christian Schools Association of Queensland, Spring Hill, Queensland.

The most frequently nominated schools were invited to participate and the first three that accepted became the three schools that were studied.

Interview Questions

Eleven leaders were interviewed, and each was asked six standard questions, however, the interviews all developed other issues, exploring the interviewee's interests and experience. The standard questions were designed to discover the style of the leadership and the management practices of the leaders. They also probed the nature of the relationships within the communities and the perceived reasons for the schools' success.

The Three Case Study Sites

Pseudonyms have been used for the schools and the leaders who were interviewed. All the schools are about twenty years old, comprise both primary and secondary departments and have total enrolments of between 600 and 800 students each.

Bethlehem Christian College is run by an association of Christian parents, and is affiliated with Christian Parent Controlled Schools Limited. The chairman of the College Board, David Maxwell, has been in office for nearly ten years, as has the principal, Beryl Yates and her deputy Barry Henderson. The general manager of the school, Henry Rothwell, is a relatively new member of the leadership team.

Nazareth Christian College is a church sponsored school governed by a council appointed by the directors of the church. Larry Swallow has held the chairmanship for nearly twenty years while his son, Robert, has been the general manager of the church for about three years. The principal, Stephen Pullman, is one of the longest serving members of staff and the deputy (secondary), Miss Jane Roys, has been on the leadership team nearly ten years.

Jerusalem Christian School is a Christian Parent Controlled School. The chairman, Fred Johnson, has been in office for nearly five years, while the principal, Peter Duncan, has led the school for nearly ten years. Jonathan Charles, deputy (secondary), has served the school for more than ten years.

Some Characteristics of the Three Successful Christian Schools

This section considers a number of the more significant issues that have emerged from the interviews. These issues will be discussed in the light of some of the academic literature. The discussion includes a number of notable direct quotations from the interviewees in the hope that the reader will be able to gain a deeper understanding of these successful Christian schools.

1. Collaborative Leadership

The leaders discussed their style of leadership at length but generally they did not see this as a direct reason for success. Nevertheless, as it is such a crucial attribute of school life, it is bound to influence the way things are done, and therefore to influence success indirectly. The schools were in fact being led and managed very effectively despite the questions and apparent tensions raised by some of the leaders.

There was tension between the 'collaborative' style of leadership that many wished they could model more effectively and the 'bureaucratic' style that they wished did not come quite so naturally to the fore. Henry Rothwell, the general

manager of Bethlehem Christian College, spoke succinctly about the tension he felt in his leadership. In response to a question about the initiative expected of his staff, he replied:

I have said to them, if you see there is an issue or a problem or an issue coming up, let me know - tell me what your solution is to the problem and how you would implement it, and obviously they have ownership and responsibility for that decision making. So in many cases I do stretch a lot of the staff a lot of the time. I try not to be directive, I am not an autocratic manager or leader, I do expect participation and their response. As I have said before, if some decisions have to be made they have to be made.

Henry Rothwell demonstrated that he wanted to be inclusive and collaborative, however he believed that he was in his position of leadership to make the hard decisions. At the opposite extreme, was Stephen Pullman, principal of Nazareth Christian College who described how his leadership style had changed with the growth of the school:

My style changed from me making the decisions to me working with the other key players in the school. Call that what you want to, I would call it a team approach, I am not out there making the decisions without any consultation or reference to any one else but when we have to make a decision, putting it on the table, in some ways that takes a little longer because...(we are) trying to arrive at some sort of consensus. That is the approach.

The attributes that were used to signify a collaborative style included team building, good delegation, open leadership, being a good listener, being a pastor and 'managing by walking around' (MBWA). Acting against these trends were the bureaucratic attributes such as an ability to make the hard decisions, assertive leadership, belief in the hierarchy and an implied dictatorial style. However, most of the interviewees talked convincingly of their awareness of the characteristics of collaborative leadership and of their belief that their organisation was moving in the collaborative direction if it had not already arrived.

The interviewees recognised a second 'tension' in their leadership, between 'task oriented' and 'people oriented' leadership. The overall result was that 'task orientation' dominated, but each case study recognised the importance of the 'people' perspective as well. Perhaps Jane Roys, the deputy principal from Nazareth Christian College, gave the clearest testimony to this dichotomy. In response to a question on this theme, she responded:

I vacillate actually...There are some days when I am totally task oriented, yes I think that's my style of leadership, but the next week I have forgotten the tasks and it's the people. Perhaps this is one of my problems; I can't decide which I am!

No one appeared to advocate the bureaucratic style that has been discredited by Argyris (7) or belittled by Warren Bennis (8) and Bear and Slaughter (9). Rather this study concurs with the feelings of Theodore Sizer in the Forward to Barth's work on 'Improving Schools from Within', where he observes that improving schools are characterised by collegial and collaborative leadership styles (10). The leadership in the three case studies were aware of current 'best practice' and were at pains to incorporate them increasingly. Therefore, collaborative leadership with an emphasis on teamwork and a balance between 'task orientation' and 'people orientation', has been clearly exemplified by these three successful Christian schools.

2. Governance Model for Boards

The style of operation of the schools' boards has seen a marked shift in the last ten years. Early on, the boards, literally 'managed' the schools. This has now changed and each of them has now developed a clear 'governance model' adapted from the Carver Governance Model for Boards of Non-Profit Organisations (11) or a close relative of this model. David Maxwell, the chairman of Bethlehem Christian College clearly described the changes in this regard:

We have changed at Bethlehem over the years, we have moved to a partial CEO model, where we have given a lot more responsibility to the principal for the day to day activities. It's partial, because we wanted to retain involvement in a couple of areas that pure CEO models would have, but broadly the board is concerned with vision, direction setting, strategic planning, monitoring the performance of the college, the performance of the principal, getting involved in other things but broadly the big picture things...not the day to day things that come along. The day to day things are clearly in the hands of the management team and the principal.

As David Maxwell explained, the board changes included the redefining of the role of the principal. All three schools now refer to their principal as either a 'modified', 'partial' or 'virtual' Chief Executive Officer, the single figure through whom they work in the life of their schools. While it is quite evident that this process is not complete, all three schools have embraced the changes enthusiastically, suggesting that this style of board governance is also a characteristic of success.

It seems to me that as the new governance models have been increasingly embraced, the school boards have progressively released more and more authority to the school principal, who in turn have begun to involve a growing number in the leadership of their communities. Whether or not this trend will effectively champion the collaborative leadership style over the bureaucratic style, only time will tell, but it certainly appears at the school level, as though the collaborative style is on the increase.

3. Board Relationships

In 1995, Laffin (12) observed that in many Australian Christian schools there was 'tension and conflict between boards and principals to the extent that sometimes they were seriously dysfunctional.' This was certainly not the case in Nazareth; here the strength of the board - principal relationship was seen as one of the keys for the school's success. However, both Bethlehem and Jerusalem admitted that the board - staff relationships were in need of improvement.

The staff in these last two schools both requested of their boards that their working conditions be covered by a Certified Agreement – an Australian government initiative designed to provide tighter regulation of pay and conditions for employees. This matter was raised in the mid-1990's in Jerusalem and resulted in a 'major division' between the staff and the board. Jonathan Charles, the deputy (secondary) at Jerusalem, described the relations in that period as 'pretty nasty.' These frayed relations occurred because the board could not agree to their staff's request, as the union would have had to be involved in the negotiations. The board was left wondering 'what was in this for the school?' They felt that their flexibility would be eroded by the increased restrictions of a Certified Agreement. The fallout from this in Jerusalem saw nearly half the secondary staff leave and a new board elected.

Despite the strained relations of the past, the boards at both Bethlehem and Jerusalem were now at pains to improve relations between themselves and their staff. Recently, the Bethlehem board, have instigated a bi-annual staff/board forum for 'staff to raise any issue they are concerned with.' Other board initiatives have included a 'focus group, social meetings several times a year and, the most recent initiative, that each of the board members should be provided with a photo album of all staff members with a brief resume on each one.

Fred Johnson, from Jerusalem Christian School, explained what he felt about the Certified Agreement issue and the potential for union involvement in their Christian school:

...we (the board) are not opposed to a work place agreement or some other agreement that we could sit down and talk with the staff over issues of concern. But the staff are adamant that if it was going to be anything, it was going to be a Certified Agreement. Now the issue is still open in terms of, the staff want it and the board don't... Whilst the staff respect the current board, and whilst there can be a trust with the current board, their argument is; what happens when the current board goes? That is where they want protection...I find it hard to work with unions in a Christian school environment, when we are so philosophically opposed...as Christians we should be able to resolve issues...I think that there would be around 50% of staff or just over (in the union)...I don't know for a fact what it is and it does not really interest me, that is an individual's choice.

In contrast, at Nazareth, where no strained relations were detected, the model of governance operated by their college council was called the 'big bowl' principle:

The way we operate here is that, we work on the 'big bowl' principle...we don't want the council to hamstring the staff and the CEO in particular...the council has set down parameters for the CEO, to define how far he can operate and the terms of operation, then we allow him freedom to work within that area.

At Nazareth, as so many of the key leaders have been involved for so long, good inter-personal relationships seem to have given rise quite naturally to healthy relationships throughout the organisation. This has helped generate stability as seen particularly in the chairman and the principal's long service together.

Despite Nazareth's success, on balance, relationships would have to be seen, as the weakest attribute of the schools in this study, with the conflicts of the mid-1990's still fresh in the minds of the staff at Bethlehem and Jerusalem. However, they have all recognised that it is vital to build strong, lasting relationships if their schools are going to continue to succeed in the future.

4. Enrolment Policies

So far in this discussion of the characteristics of successful Australian Christian schools, all the schools in this study have been pulling in the same direction. However, in their enrolment policies, they could not have been more divergent. Jerusalem's 'open' enrolment policy was clearly advocated by their deputy principal, Jonathan Charles:

I feel that if we have got a place that is there, that we should use it. I will give you an example - when the present Year 11's were in Year 7 we had enough coming through plus Christian applicants for two and a half classes, what do we do? We could send that group of Christian kids away or we could make it economic? We took the choice to make it economic, so we said we would have three classes, we will set 23 in each class to be pretty economic as long as it was around there, it would certainly have to be over 20 in each class to make it economic. So we made that decision and I think that the Christian/Non Christian context got to 60:40 for that year, so it was quite down on what the board wanted, but that gave us the impetus to do it again and again...There is confidence within the school to do the triple streaming, that we don't have to scrimp and save because we have a reasonable healthy budget, we can hire the teachers that we need and we can move forwards, and then gradually we can get acceptance and therefore the Christian's will be attracted.

In essence, he justified their 'open' policy on the grounds that it provided them with the much-needed flexibility to make the stages of growth more economic as well as satisfying the desire of Christian families who would otherwise have been denied a place. This approach concurs with my academic literature review on enrolment policies in Christian schools, the majority reporting 'open' policies (13).

In stark contrast, Nazareth Christian College's policy was very firmly 'closed' to non-Christian families. They justify this position on the grounds that it is so crucial to them for the maintenance of the ethos they need to generate successful outcomes for their students. Stephen Pullman, the principal, offered his justification:

I see it as a problem when you start (your school) one way and you change midstream, and that is normally going from a 'closed' to an 'open', 'because you want enrolment'. No one will ever admit to that mind you, no one. Everybody knows that is why it is done, but no one will admit to it, that is quite incredible...If you start as a sort of mission/outreach school, then you will do things differently. With only Christian families, we are strong in unity, prayer, Bible reading, and conduct...So how do we maintain the ethos when we grow? I think it's the enrolments, keeping the same criteria, not dropping the standard in that area, not changing it mid-stream, I think that is very important.

Therefore it would seem that neither an 'open' nor a 'closed' policy leads to the greatest success, but rather that sticking to an agreed policy that works best for the school, is the key to success. Nazareth believes that their policy best feeds their family atmosphere whereas Jerusalem's 'open' policy enables them to offer Christian education to far more families.

5. Commitment and Quality of the Teaching Staff

Once the students have arrived in a school, the most important impact on their lives is the teachers who work with them. All eleven interviewees from all three schools cited the quality of the teaching staff as the prime cause of their success. Beryl Yates, principal of Bethlehem Christian College talked of the quality and commitment of the staff who were so willing to 'go the second mile.' Fred Johnson, chairman of Jerusalem Christian School talked of their teachers as being so willing to go 'beyond the call of duty' and Barry Henderson, deputy principal from Bethlehem, was unequivocal about this commitment, saying that the main reason for their success was:

...very dedicated teachers without a doubt. Teachers who are committed to their task, who love their teaching, who love the Lord, who feel that it is important that they share their faith in the hustle and bustle of daily life, who often give testimony to their faith, in the way that God has worked at appropriate moments and times.

Therefore, by implication, the recruitment process must have been one of the most significant operations performed by these schools. Beryl Yates, principal of Bethlehem, said that without an 'obvious Christian commitment, they don't get past the door.' The principal of Nazareth, Stephen Pullman, explained that 'each applicant has to provide a written statement of their philosophy of Christian education together with a written pastoral reference from their church oversight.' Without a doubt, all three schools in this study unequivocally insisted on Christian commitment from all their teachers. The process of selection was spelt out by some of the interviewees, with great emphasis being placed on 'gut feeling' and 'totally surrounding the process is prayer.' All eleven interviewees discussed the calibre of the teachers at length, and certainly they viewed, this characteristic as the most significant criterion for their success.

6. Transformation of the Students' Lives

Arguably, one of the prime objectives of Christian education is the care and nurture and ultimately the transformation of the lives of the children. In fact, one of the common themes that many of the interviewees discussed from a wide variety of angles was the transformed lives of the students. Here they were referring to the degree to which the

school had been successful in impacting the whole life of the students in their care to the extent that they would make a positive Christian difference in their communities in adult life (14). Both Bethlehem and Nazareth felt that they had seen some success in this area and that it was their overriding chief object as a Christian school. Jerusalem also accepted the importance of this attribute, but they admitted that up to now they had not seen a great deal of success.

I asked each of the interviewees to describe the pervading ethos of their schools. The table displays the frequency of the most commonly used terms that were cited in all three schools. The numbers refer to the number of times the interviewees in a specific school referred to a particular characteristic of their school's ethos.

Frequency of use of ethos terms by interviewees

<i>Ethos</i>	<i>Bethlehem /4</i>	<i>Nazareth /4</i>	<i>Jerusalem /3</i>
Transformed lives	6	6	6
Care/nurture/family	1	8	6
Good relationships	4	5	1
Positive Comments	1	1	1

Therefore it can be seen that the transformation of the students' lives can be acknowledged to be the most widely discussed characteristic across all three case studies. These comments, were frequently associated with the interviewees perception of the 'grace of God', in the supernatural provision of resources or favour with the authorities.

These very intangible characteristics conform with the expectations from the literature. For example, the Reverend Robert Frisken (15), one of the founders of the Christian Community Schools in Australia, wrote about their schools being 'organisms, rather than organisations, extensions of the Christian home.' Similarly, Alan Peshkin's 1986 work on Bethany Baptist Academy, USA, stressed the goal of the school that the students should be 'doing and being, rather than knowing about' (16). The lack of published detailed research on specifically Christian student outcomes, hinders any meaningful judgements being reached. However, it is my observation that the three schools in this study place the transformation of the lives of their students as central to their vision and, on balance, they have been delighted with the outcomes so far.

7. Dynamic Vision

Finally, in this review of the three schools it is appropriate to consider vision and strategic planning. All three schools felt that this was very significant, with Bethlehem and Nazareth feeling that they had been very successful in this area and Jerusalem recognising that it wanted to improve on theirs.

The chair of Bethlehem, David Maxwell, certainly recognised the significance of vision for success. Describing their principal, Beryl Yates, he said:

Because she is a visionary person, she will have a leadership role in terms of the whole college. She will initiate policy and bring it to the board which is acceptable, because she is thinking ahead, she is actually miles ahead of most of us most of the time in her thinking about future directions. That has been a very good thing as it has kept our school up with the latest trends in education.

From the point of view of recognising the need for vision and strategic planning, the principal of Jerusalem, Peter Duncan was actively working on a radical restructure of the school's leadership and management and was planning a total review of the school's vision statement. Without a doubt all three schools considered their vision to be very important to their success. This shared conclusion concurs with the findings of Paul Kienel in the USA, who concluded that the most successful Christian schools were those that placed 'greatest emphasis on the articulation of dynamic vision statements' (17).

All three schools have experienced consistent growth and were all bursting at the seams on their land. All three of them were contemplating the need for additional campuses alongside the potential for purchasing adjacent land, while one of them has been contemplating establishing a university for some time. These schools will not stand still in the future.

Conclusions: Six Key Characteristics of Success in Three Australian Christian Schools

The opportunity to consider the life of these three successful Australian Christian schools has been a deeply rewarding experience for me. The interviewees' frank descriptions of their current situations, coupled with their considered descriptions of their school communities, has generated the following conclusions about the characteristics of success:

1. Collaborative Leadership Style

A marked move away from bureaucratic, hierarchical structures has been observed and is being replaced with collaborative, collegial teamwork.

2. Board Governance and CEO Model

The management of change has been effective as the boards role's have evolved from 'hands on' management towards the implementation of the Carver Model of Governance for Boards of Non-Profit Organisations, or similar, together with the clarification of the role of the principal as a modified CEO.

3. Clear Enrolment Policy Rationale

The implementation of either an 'open' or a 'closed' enrolment policy that is firmly established in the foundational philosophies of the schools.

4. Recruitment of Committed Christian Teachers

The attraction of a totally committed Christian teaching faculty whose primary focus is the sharing of their faith in God with the students in their care.

5. Focus on Transformed Lives of Students

After the staff have cared for and nurtured the children through the primary years, they begin to prepare their students in the secondary grades for the challenges of adult life, so that they will be able to make a positive difference in their communities and grow in their faith towards God.

6. Implementation of a Dynamic Vision

The communication of a progressive vision to the whole school community, building on the founders' vision, inspiring all with the confidence that their school is meeting the needs of their children and making an ongoing positive impact on the wider community.

These characteristics can all be identified to varying degrees in Bethlehem Christian College, Nazareth Christian College and Jerusalem Christian School. It is my hope that they can be adapted and applied in other settings by anyone seeking to see the Christian schooling movement flourish in the future.

Footnotes:

1. Long, Robert, *The Development of Thematic Schools in Australia* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Western Sydney, Nepean, April 1996) p. 13.
2. Jones, David, *The Development of New Christian Schools in Australia 1975-1981* (Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Melbourne, MT 758, 1983) p. 1.
3. *Accelerated Christian Education (ACE)* is an American based system of Christian schooling based on work books that are individually prescribed for each student. While some schools' entire curriculum is ACE, some others use a selection of ACE materials alongside more conventional methods. Nazareth Christian College is one such example of a school that has retained a small proportion of ACE curriculum in their primary department alongside a more conventional class based approach.
4. Brinton, Stephen, *Humanism and Christianity* (Sydney: Christian Community Schools Ltd., 1989) p. 5.
5. Long, Robert, New Christian Schools: A Thematic Tradition (Part 2), Causes of Thematic School Development, *Journal of Christian Education*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 21-34 (September 1996) pp. 21-22.

6. Twelves, James, *Leadership and Management in three exemplar non-government Australian Christian Schools* (Unpublished MEd Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne, 2000) p. 40. It is impossible objectively to define the success of Christian schooling. Just because a school has grown steadily in numbers over the years on account of the continued support of the parent body, does not necessarily imply that it is more successful than one of its competitors whose numbers have remained relatively static for a long time. In fact, a number of my interviewees commented that perhaps ten years ago, 'growth' was seen to be the main outcome of successful Christian schooling, whereas today, the school communities were looking much more for evidence of 'changed lives' that are beginning to impact their local communities for good. The selection process for the three schools in this study did not rank the schools in any way but simply identified schools that had no obvious problems.
7. Argyris, Chris (1957, 1964) was an outspoken critic of Structural Frames, or the bureaucratic style, because of its inattention to human needs and personality, cited in Bolman, Lee and Deal, Terrence, *Reframing Organisations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991) p. 57.
8. Bennis, Warren, *On Becoming a Leader* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1994) p. xiii.
9. Bear, Hedley and Slaughter, Richard, *Education for the Twenty First Century* (New York: Routledge, 1993) p. 78.
10. Sizer, Theodore (1990) in Barth, Roland, *Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals can make a difference* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990) p. xi.
11. Carver, John, *The Chairperson's Role as Servant-Leader to the Board* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997) pp. 17-18.
12. Laffin, C (1995) *I hear he is in trouble at...* Paper prepared for the Doctor of Education programme – University of Western Sydney, cited in Beavis, Allan, *Governance, Leadership and Management: An Eternal Problematic Braid, Leading and Managing, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 288-300*, 1997) p. 290.
13. Hogg, Anna, Christians and Schools, *Journal of Christian Education, Papers 67, pp. 45-56*, (July 1980) p. 48; Rose, Susan, *Keeping them Out of the Hands of Satan: Evangelical Schooling in America* (New York: Routledge, 1988) p. 37; Gilling, Bryan, (Ed.) *Godly Schools? Some Approaches to Christian Education in New Zealand, Waikato Studies in Religion No. 4*, (Hamilton, N.Z.: University of Waikato and Colcom Press, 1993) p. 68.
14. Kidson, Paul, Towards a Christian Praxis Education: Some Possibilities for Christian Schools, *Journal of Education and Christian Belief, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp.61-69* (2000), p. 68. This article proposes a Christian Praxis Education orientation, based on the Christian Religious Education of Groome and Astley as well as the Transformative Christian Education of Hobson and Welbourne. This CPE orientation provides a rationale for the process of impacting the lives of the students with the development of the lived Christian faith.
15. Frisken, Robert, Rev. (1970), cited in Kew, Rohan, *Grow up into Christ: The History and the Ethos of Christian Community Schools* (Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Melbourne, 11 27 8048, 1993) p. 76.
16. Peshkin, Alan (1986), cited in Gilling, Bryan, (Ed.) (1993) p. xi.
17. Kiene, Paul, *Common Characteristics of Christian Schools Which are Successful in their Christian Mission* (Colorado Springs: Association of Christian Schools International, 1986) p. 1.

Bibliography:

- Barth, Roland, *Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals can make a difference* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990).
- Bear, Hedley and Slaughter, Richard, *Education for the Twenty First Century* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
- Beavis, Allan, Governance, Leadership and Management: An Eternal Problematic Braid, *Leading and Managing, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 288-300*, (1997).
- Bennis, Warren, *On Becoming a Leader* (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1994).
- Brinton, Stephen, *Humanism and Christianity* (Sydney: Christian Community Schools Ltd., 1989).
- Bolman, Lee and Deal, Terrence, *Reframing Organisations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991).
- Carver, John, *The Chairperson's Role as Servant-Leader to the Board* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).
- Gilling, Bryan, (Ed.) *Godly Schools? Some Approaches to Christian Education in New Zealand, Waikato Studies in Religion No. 4*, (Hamilton, N.Z.: University of Waikato and Colcom Press, 1993).
- Hogg, Anna, Christians and Schools, *Journal of Christian Education, Papers 67, pp. 45-56*, (July 1980).
- Jones, David, *The Development of New Christian Schools in Australia 1975-1981* (Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Melbourne, MT 758, 1983).
- Kew, Rohan, *Grow up into Christ: The History and the Ethos of Christian Community Schools* (Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Melbourne, 11 27 8048, 1993).
- Kidson, Paul, Towards a Christian Praxis Education: Some Possibilities for Christian Schools, *Journal of Education and Christian Belief, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp.61-69* (2000).
- Kienel, Paul, *Common Characteristics of Christian Schools Which are Successful in their Christian Mission* (Colorado Springs: Association of Christian Schools International, 1986).
- Long, Robert, *The Development of Thematic Schools in Australia* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Western Sydney, Nepean, April 1996).
- Long, Robert, New Christian Schools: A Thematic Tradition (Part 2), Causes of Thematic School Development, *Journal of Christian Education, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 21-34* (September 1996).
- Rose, Susan, *Keeping them Out of the Hands of Satan: Evangelical Schooling in America* (New York: Routledge, 1988).
- Twelves, James, *Leadership and Management in three exemplar non-government Australian Christian Schools* (Unpublished MEd Thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne, 2000).