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ABSTRACT

This study examines Australian university colleges and halls of residence (collegiate residences) at a time of pressure and change and proposes a leadership model for success into the future.

In 1995, a survey of members of the Association of Heads of Australian University Colleges and Halls Incorporated indicated that 39% of residences were operating at less than full capacity and since that time two residences have closed and others are contracting which indicates a significant problem exists.

Pressures on Australian universities are forcing changes which impact upon collegiate residences. Changes to government funding arrangements, increased demands for accountability and better performance, more direct competition, increasing internationalisation, proliferation of institutions providing tertiary education, a rapidly changing working, teaching and learning environment due to new information technology and methods of communication and increasing expectations of students, academic and general staff are pressures on universities. These, together with further residence specific pressures are requiring universities and collegiate residences to respond with strategies and management practices which uphold their mission and are accountable and responsive to their immediate and wider communities.

An analysis of the two relevant strands of literature on collegiate residence and leadership theory led to the adaptation of a conceptual framework which Caldwell and Spinks (1992) had developed to apply to self-managing schools. As university colleges and halls of residence are both university and privately owned and have leadership needs similar to other educational institutions including schools, the CSER model of collegiate leadership was proposed as presenting an ideal where that collegiate residence leaders would have understanding and expertise in the four domains of strategic, cultural, educational and responsive leadership.

The methodology of a questionnaire surveying heads of residences and case study visits to twelve residences and consultations with university and residence professionals with specific knowledge and expertise led to development of profiles of contemporary collegiate residence and headship together with insight into the research question how future leaders will need to operate to be successful in future. From this, a guide for use in self-evaluation within a collegiate residence was developed.

The thesis that future leaders will require expertise in the four domains is tested and the significant finding is that the greatest area of weakness is in strategic leadership and development on this domain will be the greatest need of future leaders, particularly those in residences whose survival is threatened. There will also be a need to develop entrepreneurial abilities together with specific components of responsive leadership. As surmised, the strengths of residences and their heads lay within the cultural and educational domains.

The CSER model of collegiate leadership proved to be a sound framework for the study and, together with the findings, provided an important contribution to the literature on university residence and leadership theory and practice.
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PART A

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND
CHAPTER 1

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

1.1 THE PROBLEM

During the 1990s, universities throughout the world, including those in Australia, have been undergoing revolutionary changes which are challenging their origins. This is particularly due to the rapid development of information technology, changes in expectations of universities and changes in the level of governmental financial contributions to universities. Pressures on the Australian universities also have an effect on their affiliated collegiate residences and these, together with other sector specific pressures, have meant that 39% of university collegiate residences recorded less than full occupancy in 1995.

For any residence, operating at less than full capacity is obviously a cause for concern in economic terms but also in philosophical terms as it may point to a mismatch between internal and external perceptions of what collegiate residence should offer. That this figure had fluctuated between 14% in 1989 to 40% in 1993 is indicative of a widespread problem to which a response is necessary. In some cases survival is being threatened and, as evidence, two university residential colleges at the University of New England closed at the end of 1996 and further closures are mooted. Also, at least one university is investigating privatisation of existing residences. These changes in collegiate residence are occurring at a time when a number of universities are supporting the setting up of alternative forms of accommodation, most of which would not qualify as collegiate residences, as defined in section 1.3 below.

The problem, therefore, is how university collegiate residences should respond to immediate and growing pressures in order to survive quite apart from the complementary question of how to sustain and develop further the distinctive advantages they offer to students. More specifically, the key question concerns the nature of leadership required to take collegiate residences into an uncertain future.

This study proposes a model of collegiate leadership, adapted from the writings of Caldwell and Spinks (1992), which provides an operating framework for heads and other leaders of collegiate residences. It identifies components within four domains required for
successful leadership and for the purposes of discussion is named the CSER model of collegiate leadership. The components of the four domains are outlined in Figure 3.1.

The major thrust of this study, therefore, is to demonstrate that the CSER model provides a timely, constructive and readily applied operating framework within which leaders of collegiate residences can positively meet the pressures and challenges facing their institutions.

1.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

University residential colleges and halls form a significant contribution to tertiary education in Australia and overseas. In 1995, over 25,000 residential places were offered to Australian and overseas students attending Australian universities. This present study is significant in that, whilst there have been a number of individual college histories written and collective surveys of what they provide, such as those of Beswick (1984) and McInnis and James (1995) in Australia, Brothers and Hatch (1971) in the United Kingdom and Upcraft (1991) in the United States, there did not appear to be any literature focussing directly on leadership in Australian university collegiate residences, with the exception of a dissertation by Stanisłowsky (1990) which looked specifically at the role, selection, training and supervision procedures of resident advisors/assistants (RAs).

There has been a large and developing amount of theory and practical studies on leadership in schools and other organisations and it is timely for a study relating educational leadership theory to the specific educational sector occupied by Australian university residential collegiate residences.

1.3 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The Components of Collegiate Residence

Students attending university in Australia have four major residential options. They may live (i) at home with family, (ii) in privately rented accommodation, (iii) in university provided shared flats or houses, or (iv) in purpose built residential colleges or halls which have been established either by the university itself or by a church or independent community organisation, generally as an affiliate of the university. It is this fourth category of colleges and halls of residence, collectively called 'collegiate residences',
which has provided the focus of this study.

McInnis and James (1995) examined the initial experience of on-campus undergraduates. They surveyed over four thousand first-year students at Australian universities to determine background factors which had an effect on perceptions of their university life. The general findings were that gender, secondary school type, parental background and maturity were factors which could affect perceptions. However, of interest to this study, it was also found that "students living in residential colleges were more positive about their university experiences". In addition to any previously supporting evidence, or even negative views, this provided a powerful argument which could be used to encourage universities to support a collegiate residence experience, at least for first-year students, and any consideration of the future relevance of colleges and halls of residence should take this finding into account.

From the earliest Oxford Colleges, which effectively provided the university teaching, collegiate residence has been seen to provide a value added educational provision in terms of the academic, cultural and social development of residents. The components of this provision were summarised by a joint meeting of the National Executive and local representatives of the Australian Association of Heads of University Colleges and Halls Incorporated (AAHCHI), held at Newcastle on 3rd December, 1979. The following definition statement for collegiate residence was agreed upon:

"Because colleges and halls of residence are integral parts of universities, we believe that the distinction between collegiate and non-collegiate residence must be defined in 'academic' rather than in 'accommodation' terms.

To be a collegiate a residence must include substantial provision for:

a. The academic development of residents and
b. The social and cultural development of residents.

Academic Development

How this development takes place will vary from place to place but should include:

1 Formal or informal tutorials.
2 Debate or discussion on matters of current concern.
3 Visiting speakers from the university or the community.
Association with the residence of university staff members and others of scholarly or professional distinction.

The provision of study facilities including, where possible, and desirable, a library.

Oversight of the academic progress of residents.

Social and Cultural Development

This implies a community which:

1. Provides pastoral care for all its members and especially for first year students.

2. Encourages its members to take responsibility for the various aspects of its life.

3. Creates opportunities for members to meet across faculty, national and socio-economic boundaries.

4. Fosters social, cultural and sporting activities.

5. Accepts responsibility for the adequate nutrition of its residents and provides formal and communal dining within the residence with due regularity.

We therefore affirm that a collegiate style residence is one which deliberately creates opportunities for the academic, social and cultural development of its members. We further affirm that the operation of collegiate style residence requires a significant administrative structure, headed by a Principal, Warden or Master.

The importance of this 1979 statement is that, although a number of individual residences have attempted to develop a vision or mission statement, it is the only known declaration from a collective residential body which attempts to define the component requirements for identification as a collegiate residence. Its development was in response to a concern that, to retain recurrent funding received at that time, residences needed to be able to demonstrate an educational component rather than simply the provision of accommodation. However, its greater value is as a measure of collegiality and it provides a guide to comparisons of its implementation nationally. The statement provides a starting point for comparison between residences and identifies components of culture which residences should include in their offering if they are to be seen as fulfilling the expectations of collegiate residence. It effectively defines the meaning of collegiate life in residence and contrasts that with a residential situation deemed not to be collegiate and, in development of the evaluation guide in Appendix D, these components have been taken into account.
Terminology

For the purposes of this study, the terms college, hall of residence and collegiate residence are seen as being synonymous where the above criteria are in place. Collegiate residence has been adopted as a generic term although college and hall of residence tend to be in common usage. In conversation and in the literature the tendency is to refer to colleges and halls and the name adopted by the national association of heads reinforces this point. However, there can be differences between the two and use of one generic term has simplified the need to keep referring to those differences.

Non-collegiate residence is the term applied where these components are not in existence and that may include some halls of residence, hostels and other forms of residence for university students which simply provide accommodation. It is also important to note that usage of the term college in this context should not be confused with such institutions as schools, senior colleges and universities, particularly as used in American literature as the nomenclature for smaller universities.

Three forms of ownership or sponsorship of collegiate residences needed clarification:

(i) those owned or sponsored by their university,
(ii) those with a church affiliation, and
(iii) those which were independently owned or sponsored.

Due to a range of foundations for each of these forms, it was difficult to find an alternative to the words ownership and sponsorship. Therefore, ownership has been adopted for the purpose of simplicity in analysis. In most situations the residences with independent and church foundations have been combined and identified as privately owned residences (PORs) as they may be seen as a relatively homogeneous grouping not owned by a university, even if affiliated in some form to a university. By comparison, the university owned residences (UORs) formed an homogeneous grouping in the sense that they would all be accountable to senior members of the university through line management as well as their university council or equivalent. Even so, two distinct structural models of UORs are in existence; the traditional single entity model and the more recent central administration and multiple residence model.
Establishing the meaning of these terms was important as a focus of the analysis is differences between university owned residences (UORs) and privately owned residences (PORs), that is between university and non-university ownership which may also be seen as public and private prevision, respectively.

The Past to the Present:

The Relationship between Australian Universities and Collegiate Residences

The emergence of university colleges and halls of residence in Australia has mirrored that of the universities, from the establishment of Christ College Hobart in 1846 (which preceded the establishment of the University of Tasmania) to the present day, and factors affecting universities have had an impact upon university residences. In 1995, there were 36 universities in the Unified National System (UNS). There were 139 collegiate residences (offering in excess of 25,000 residential places) which were affiliated with the Australian Association of Heads of University Colleges and Halls Incorporated (AAHCHI), the professional association representing the 113 members heads of residence. In 1996 this body changed its name to the Association of Heads of Australian Colleges and Halls Incorporated (AHAUCHI) and further references in this study generally adopt the AHAUCHI acronym.

For the first 100 years from 1846 to the end of the Second World War in 1945, 24 university colleges or halls of residence were established at the six universities then in operation; all in the capital cities. There were six at the University of Sydney, eight at the University of Melbourne, six at the University of Queensland, two at the University of Adelaide and one at each of the University of Western Australia and the University of Tasmania. Twenty were owned or sponsored by churches and four were independently sponsored; all for women residents. There were no UORs prior to World War II.

In addition, there were three of the 1995 university collegiate residences which commenced in this period, but not as university residences. S H Smith House (University of New England) began as a residence for women training to be teachers at the Armidale Teachers College. Dookie College (University of Melbourne) and Gatton College (University of Queensland) began as residences for students studying at their respective agricultural colleges. S H Smith House closed at the end of 1996.
With the considerable development and amalgamation of tertiary institutions into universities since the Second World War, so was there a proliferation of university residences. In the fifty years from 1945 to 1995, 30 universities and 112 university residences (affiliated to AHAUCHI) were established. Of these residences, 76 were sponsored by universities, 14 were independently sponsored and 22 by churches. The 1960s and 1970s were the major decades of this growth, however, growth has continued with 13 residences commencing operation in the first half of the 1990s.

This post-war development represented a fundamental and complete change from virtually sole church and independent (private) provision prior to the Second World War to the reverse with solely university provision of new residences occurring since 1974. Whether this trend will continue and what the future holds will be open to question but, if new collegiate residences are to be established in future, it would appear most likely that the impetus for their development will come from universities identifying a need rather than private providers. In this context, it is important to note that another dynamic situation is unfolding as universities are showing an inclination to enter into partnership with private developers to meet the demand for accommodation in close proximity and developments in Sydney and Melbourne are indicative of this new trend. The important issue is the degree of support service and it is likely that such residences would be classified in the category of non-collegiate residence but they may have an effect on demand for existing collegiate residences.

The expectation that any future collegiate residence provision will come from university ownership will have implications for the style of future new residence, organisational structure and leadership styles as there appear to be notable differences between the sectors. Comparison between the UORs and the PORs forms the basis of much of the analysis of this study. Effectively there are these two distinct sectors even though there are differences within each sector and similarities between the sectors.

Not one style of leadership will be appropriate into the future as situational variables will require different responses. However, this study proposes the CSER model of collegiate leadership as providing a framework which can accommodate these differences. It is seen not only as valuable for comparative analysis of current theory in use but also as providing leaders with an operating framework within which they will be able to develop future directions for their residences.
The Future:

Responding to Pressures on Australian Universities and Collegiate Residences

In the move towards the next century, Australian Universities are being pressured in many directions and forced to change. These changes impact upon the leadership of the existing collegiate residences and on those wishing to establish further university collegiate residences. As noted, this study proposes a leadership framework within which a sound response may be made and, as background, the following identifies some of the pressures on universities and collegiate residences.

The Higher Education Management Review: Report of the Committee of Inquiry – December 1995 (The Hoare Report) identified a number of pressures on universities. These included increased demands for accountability and better performance; more direct competition; increasing internationalisation; proliferation of institutions providing tertiary education; a rapidly changing working, teaching and learning environment due to new information technology and methods of communication and increasing expectations of students, academic and general staff.

In addition, a change in Australia’s Federal Government in 1996 has brought changes, including overall reductions in the government funding of universities and the support of students through the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS). Australian university students pay fees but these are subsidised at a level below cost and students are able to defer payment until they have obtained employment with an income in excess of $20,000 per annum. The Australian Taxation Office – Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs booklet, *HECS: Your Questions Answered 1997*, indicates that, from 1997, the government increased the fees from $2,478 per annum for all full-time courses and structured them in three bands relating specific course fees to potential future earnings. These bands were $3,300, $4,700 and $5,500 per annum, respectively. This meant that the fees of students studying arts, commerce and medicine would be $822, $2,222 and $3,022 more per annum than they were in 1996. This translates into $2,466, $6,666 and $18,132 more, respectively, for a degree in arts, commerce and medicine. These increased costs of university education may have a considerable effect on the disposable income of students and parents and their ability to afford university courses and, of relevance to this study, enrolment and accommodation in collegiate residences.
Another change from reduced funding has been that, where the government had largely funded universities in the past, now these institutions are obliged to seek corporate financial support and enrolments from full fee-paying students from within Australia. DEETYA (1996) higher education student statistics reveal that there are more than 50,000 full fee-paying students from overseas studying in Australian universities and their contribution to the funding of university courses is considerable. With the move in 1998 to allow full-fee paying courses for Australian students, this may lead to students who had not qualified for a HECS place taking up this option and the most likely scenario would be consequent reductions in student numbers in regional universities and their residences. Added to this and likely to have a similar and compounding effect, is the late 1997 economic downturn in Asian countries. As the majority of overseas students come from Asia, this may translate into a significant decline in intakes of overseas students in Australian universities and residences.

Unknown at the time of writing is the effect that the recommendations of the West Review (1997) may have. A central recommendation from the West Committee was a change from government funding of universities for a certain number of places to a concept of attaching payment rights to each student, colloquially known as vouchers, which would pass to the university on enrolment. This would have a considerable effect on enrolment patterns and, although not translated into government policy, if implemented these changes will provide a further pressure requiring response.

Together, these pressures and changes have meant that universities are having to balance the traditional benefits of collaboration and collegiality with an environment which has become increasingly competitive. This is presenting demands on universities to develop new frameworks of leadership. Traditionally, universities have been autonomous and had the academic freedom to pursue independent inquiry and to undertake research and this has been a cherished ideal. Now each university must respond in terms of establishing leadership strategies and management practices which are faithful to its mission and accountable to its immediate stakeholders and the wider community. The competitive environment is such that already there are moves for universities which consider themselves to be elite to band together and pressure the government for higher levels of research funding. Some with the greatest attraction to students have decided to offer full fee-paying courses to Australian students, thereby increasing numbers and income further. This may be at the expense of the less prestigious and smaller regional universities. It is not inconceivable that some may close and with them their affiliated collegiate residences.
There are a number of related pressures which collegiate residences will be under and these need to be addressed for them to remain economically viable. Included amongst these are the following:

* Pressure on enrolments due to the economic downturn, reducing retention rates to year 12 at school (after all-time high levels in the early 1990s) and demographic reductions in undergraduate age members of the population.

* Competition for students from other universities and a refocussing on Tertiary and Further Education (TAFE) Colleges as a viable alternative for students seeking a more vocational orientation.

* University pressures, as identified by the Hoare Report, including tightening of funding to universities which will impact particularly on university owned residences (58% of all collegiate residences in 1995), an increasing emphasis on accountability for resources, evaluation of programme and appraisal of personnel and an increase in emphasis on postgraduate research.

* Higher costs associated with operation due to workplace reforms, building and occupational health and safety requirements together with increasing student expectations of service provision and less financial support from universities leading to increasing pressure to be self-sufficient.

* The expansion of information technology providing two distinct pressures. Firstly, expectations from residents of collegiate residences that there will be provision of access to such facilities. Secondly, changes to delivery of university teaching and research making it possible to study from overseas via the internet, will reduce the need to physically attend a university campus on a full-time basis. This clearly challenges the notion of an on-campus involvement being central to a full academic experience and, with it, a need for collegiate style accommodation.

In consequence, the leadership of each collegiate residence will have to develop approaches to ensure continued viability. One value of this study is the proposed leadership model as a framework and the evaluation guide which leaders can use to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their residence and make changes to establish a strong reputation and ultimately attract and retain residential students.
1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY

As a first step to identifying the extent of problems facing colleges and developing approaches to meet these challenges, it was necessary to obtain an understanding of current patterns of collegiate residence in Australia and leadership within this sector of education. This was achieved through a questionnaire (Appendix A) sent to all heads and case study interviews (Appendix B) and observations made in visits to twelve selected residences. Profiles of the defining characteristics of Australian collegiate residences and their heads are developed in chapter 4 and perspectives of success are identified.

The second step was to conduct an analysis identifying how heads and other leaders of collegiate residences will need to respond to the changing environment to be successful in future. Within the questionnaire and case study interviews, specific questions were directed to future needs and an analysis of responses is developed in chapter 6 and the analysis in chapter 7 relates the case study responses and observations to the domains of CSER model of collegiate leadership to test the propositions of the thesis, as outlined in section 3.2.

A final step was the development of an evaluation guide (Appendix D) for use by heads and others responsible for leadership of collegiate residences. The intention was that this checklist of questions would enable critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the culture of any collegiate residence and provide a focus to address specific issues, including how best to position and market the residence.

Underpinning these three overarching purposes was the aim of drawing together themes contained in the rich history of collegiate residence that have set the parameters for leadership styles. An historical account of themes is to be found in the review of literature on universities and colleges in chapter 2 which also contains a review of relevant leadership theory, particularly that relating to educational institutions.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the words of C. Wright Mills (1971:12):

"The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society. . . . No social study that does not come back to the problems of biography, of history, and of their intersections within a society, has completed this intellectual journey."

This argument indicates a need to understand the field within which any study is completed and, for this study, a review of the literature relating to leadership of university residential colleges and halls falls into two obvious fields:

(i) Writings and Studies of Universities and Residence: the considerable number of histories and studies tracing the development of individual universities and colleges and the interwoven relationship between the two educational institutions, and

(ii) Theories of Leadership: the theoretical domains which have been developed from study of educational and other organisations.

The following account draws together some of the background to the development in each field which had relevance for this study, particularly as it led ultimately to adaptation of the writings of Caldwell and Spinks (1992) to develop the CSER model of collegiate leadership.

2.1 WRITINGS AND STUDIES OF UNIVERSITIES AND RESIDENCE

There is a large body of individual university and college histories worldwide but, with the exception of an established field focussing on college life in the USA, the number of studies on aspects of collegiate residence is limited. This is surprising given the long history of collegiate residence which can be traced back to the origins of Oxford and Cambridge in the twelfth century.

Ironically, even allowing for differences between educational institutions and historical developments in different countries, a search of the literature on colleges shows more
research from the USA and Australia than the UK. In itself, this made it worthwhile to trace some of the development of colleges and to identify the place of the Australian university collegiate residence. This was not an easy task as there was a range of themes which have emerged, particularly in recent years, as access to university education has increased and different responses have been in evidence in terms of the forms of provision of university residence.

Some of the important themes to have emerged were:

* perceived differences in offerings between residential colleges, residential halls and other forms of university residence,

* the roles of the college head (warden, master, head, principal etc.), tutors, residential assistants and students and the interrelationship between the leaders and students, including the concept of student governance, and

* the positives and negatives of college life, particularly in relation to academic progress and social development and what makes a 'good' college.

A Brief History of University Residence

The development of colleges worldwide has been linked with the mission of their affiliated universities, the nature of that relationship and the levels of students moving away from home to attend university. In the UK, USA, Australia and elsewhere, it is possible to identify eras of development. The Oxbridge influence has permeated into the development of virtually all colleges from its earliest inception and particularly as it was redefined in the nineteenth century. Whilst this influence may have declined with mass university education requiring large numbers to live in residence and, therefore, more basic provision in halls of residence, hostels and other alternatives, it is arguable that the ideals established so long ago are equally as important today.

The United Kingdom

Two periods of development of Oxbridge were crucial to the shaping of residential colleges. It is thought that Oxford University came into existence in 1167 and Cambridge University shortly after. This was around the same period as other 'universities' began in
Salerno, Paris, Bologna and Montpellier and coincided with the decline of monasteries and cathedral schools. Brothers and Hatch (1971:29) identified features of this early period as follows:

"At Oxford the University originally consisted of a body of masters, without any buildings held in common. Students were both men and boys, aged fifteen and sixteen, even younger. They looked after themselves and by the early thirteenth century they were living locally as tenants or lodgers....Originally the colleges (a term which at this time meant a collection of men) were for poor scholars, mainly graduates, who were dependent on patronage for support. The halls originated as a kind of boarding house under the direction of a master or bachelor who was directly responsible to the university for running the premises."

Ali was not smooth sailing and Broderick (1886:29) contrasted these halls with the colleges at the beginning of the fourteenth century:

"...there was no effective system of discipline, while college discipline, still in its infancy, was confined within the precincts of Merton, University and Balliol....The common herd of students, inmates of halls and inns and lodging-houses, were still crowded together in miserable sleeping-rooms and lecture-rooms, without domestic care or comfort....There were no libraries or museums, and the few books possessed by the University were stored in a vault under St Mary's Church....Under such conditions, and in such society, it was utterly impossible that education or learning could flourish...and yet it is certain that a restless and even feverish activity of speculation prevailed within an inner circle of philosophical spirits, to which there are few parallels in the history of thought."

The colleges of Oxford had first emerged in the thirteenth century and there was considerable growth in the fourteenth century but halls and hostels were the norm. The collegiate system did not develop fully until the nineteenth century when a religious revival brought changes to English schools and the same effect was felt at Oxford and Cambridge. There had been a concern about the exclusiveness of the colleges largely due to high costs and, in 1850, a Royal Commission was called.

Two of the greatest influences on nineteenth century tertiary education were Cardinal Newman and Pattison. Both were supporters of the residential university and the colleges fitted their educational philosophies. The major contribution of Newman in The Idea of a University (1852) was to promote the concept of a university as a community of scholars living together to obtain a liberal education. Brothers and Hatch (1971:26) quoted from Newman:
"...if I had to choose between a so-called university, which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, and gave its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects and a university which had no professors or examinations at all, but merely brought a number of young men together for three or four years and then sent them away as the University of Oxford is said to have done some sixty years since, if I were asked which of these two methods was the better discipline of the intellect....

...if I must determine which of the two courses was the more successful in training, moulding, enlarging the mind, which sent out men the more fitted for their secular duties, which produced better public men, men of the world, men whose names would descend to posterity, I have no hesitation in giving preference to that university which did nothing over that which exacted of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun."

Like Newman witnessing to the benefits to be gained from students living together and sharing, Pattison saw significant advantage in the interaction between the teacher (don) and the student and the colleges brought together these two in the tutorial system where the tutor's duties were both as a guardian and as a teacher. Moore (1968:6) put this as follows:

"...owing to a number of able and devoted teachers a medieval legacy of the tutor-guardian came to new life in the course of the nineteenth century and thus little by little acquired the tradition and authority which accounts for the way in which we who are tutors today carry out our duties."

As Oxford and Cambridge could not cater for all university education needs, a large number of universities emerged in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Oxbridge influence continued to be important. For example, the Anglican University of Durham adopted the collegiate structure and, until the end of the Second World War, all students actually lived in a college. Conversely, the founders of other universities, whilst aware of the advantages, were concerned about high cost and access being denied on the basis of wealth, religion or class. The residential college assumed a significantly lower incidence and halls of residence and hostels emerged, some under university control. In the UK the tendency is to live away from home (approximately eighty per cent compared with less than ten per cent in Australia) and, by and large, these residences were planned as part of the development of new universities.

After the Second World War, a sequence of reports, Murray (1948), Niblett (1957) and Robbins (1963), all stressed the value of residence (and some of the problems) and the need to allow for residential provision in the post-war expansion. Whilst the emphasis
was not on emulating the Oxbridge model, the educational and other benefits of students living together were recognised. Later universities had not approached the Oxbridge stage where the colleges were the university and to become a member of the university was through college membership. However, the values of collective residential experience were to be available, wherever possible, and the aim was to be seen to be providing more than cheap accommodation. That is, the benefits of living in a residential community were recognised as being important even when academic and social support were at a minimum.

The United States

When reviewing the history of residence in the USA, one is confronted by a terminology problem. College is a term often used interchangeably with university and there are liberal arts colleges and community colleges to cloud understanding of the term further. The reader needs to be aware which connotation is being used at any time.

The development of residence in the USA has been diverse, as identified by Stanisłowsky (1990:5):

"With the settlement of the United States of America (USA) by English immigrants, many English traditions were modified and applied. While some smaller American colleges followed the goals of some British university residences as noted in the previous paragraph, many of the larger institutions, and sorority and fraternity houses have used their residences as a living place separate from academic interests."

Stanisłowsky quoted Scherer in espousing further the benefits of residential living:

"...in larger institutions, residence has often been used by students as insulation against the shock of meeting a large and heterogeneous student body. It was a way of protecting the student from the rigorous and intellectual commitments of academic life. Thus the club or fraternity house, or even the carefully regulated dormitory, could be a place where the student might gain his composure, his balance and security by finding people like himself who shared his values and supported his beliefs."

In general, however, residence has been seen as important for the dual roles of academic and social support and this has applied consistently in the residential setting across the USA. Martin (1994:20) elaborated as follows:
"In contrast to the British Universities where residence administration is largely conducted by well-meaning, part-time, amateurs, the newcomer cannot but be struck by the sheer professionalism of the staff backing the North American College residence. Despite the variety in styles of College, there is a remarkable similarity in the provision of residential services, with the notable exception of Yale, Harvard, Goddard and the Canadian Universities.

It was difficult to trace the historical development of residence in the United States. However, it is clear that the pattern of growth of American Colleges closely resembles that of Australia. Very few Colleges were established in the 17th and 18th centuries, the first being Harvard, 1636 and Yale 1701. About the time of the Declaration of Independence, State Universities began to appear, the first being Pennsylvania 1740 (founded as an Independent University), Georgia 1785, North Carolina 1789, Vermont 1791, Tennessee 1794, South Carolina 1801, Michigan 1817, Virginia 1819, Indiana 1820, Alabama 1831, Massachusetts 1863, Maine 1865, New Hampshire 1866 and Connecticut 1881.

It came by way of a surprise to learn that the provision of residence was not of great significance in the early days of Harvard and Yale."

Martin's reference to professionalism may be attributable to the fact that in the USA there is a student housing profession which has its own organisation in the Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I). It is ACUHO-I conferences and journals have provided much of the recent literature on colleges.

Martin's surprise with Harvard, Yale, Cornell and the University of Michigan was that, when there was so much in common elsewhere, these universities had adopted the Oxbridge model, but only from the 1930s. In his 1983 overview of the first fifty years of residential colleges at Yale, Bergin (1983:12) said:

"The story of how the colleges came to be is a fascinating one, and through it all run two dominant strands. The first is the excitement generated by planning a new venture with such ancient roots, that is, the stimulation provided by adapting to American education and an American institution already over two hundred years old, a system inspired by the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. To adapt the English residential features, esprit and sense of individuality without the traditions of administrative and academic autonomy tested the Yale planners wherein the American gift for adaptation and innovation was best fitted to respond.

The second strand grows from the first. That was how to provide for precisely what was lacking in the new creation – academic focus."

All students were assigned to a college and Bergin (1983) carefully pointed out the separate roles of Fellows (Tutors), Masters and students. He saw as crucial to college success the interactive role of the Fellows with the students, even if their primary focus would be teaching and research.
Bergin (1983:15) envisaged students as:

"...not the passive recipients of a 'system'. They are the source of energy that animates the college as much as their individual education and collective life are the goals to which the colleges, and the College, tend."

"The Master is the person upon whom the success of the whole enterprise most delicately, persistently and endurably depends. The Master is the point of reconciliation for all the academic energies, personal values and administrative wisdom that has made and makes the college system successful."

Bergin (1983:45) saw the college system at Yale as being successful. He summed it up:

"It is clear that from the beginning the residential colleges were successful in their primary aim: to offer a way of life socially richer and more rewarding to the undergraduates than had been possible under the old regime....For faculty members elected to the Fellowships the experience of College life was as healthy and as inspirational as it was for students."

It is notable that Yale and Harvard had reverted to the Oxbridge model at a time when the expansion of university education across the USA did not allow this form elsewhere. However, the joint aims of academic and social support and development are considered to be important in the collective residential offering and the development of a housing profession and a career path for those in the profession is a recognition of this.

Zeller (1995:16) identified a new wave of universities adopting the college system to provide enhancement of community life and improved student services. He cited the growing awareness of a need for ethical formation during the university years, a goal of cultivating citizenship, a need to revive a sense of community, including the benefits of being part of an intellectual community of peers, tutors, deans and masters. He concluded:

"Ethics, community, citizenship, instruction, cocurricular programming, and peer learning: these interrelated aims are ancient...they are by no means dependent on residence. But along the way, residence has been seen...as a means of enhancing them. The ideals and experience of that rich history can help to guide our own vision today, as American universities make new excursions down the Collegiate Way."
Australia

In Australia, the most recent work on the university and college experience is the Centre for the Study of Higher Education – University of Melbourne study conducted by McInnis and James in 1995. This followed in the style of student surveys conducted in Australia by Beswick (1984), in the UK by Brothers and Hatch (1971) and in the USA by Upcraft (1991).

A paper by James and McInnis (1995:1), "The Residential Arrangements of First Year Students: Student Accommodation and Adjustment to University", highlighted a number of issues related to the collegiate experience:

"In this paper we discuss the effects of students' residential arrangements by analysing the responses of three groups of students: students living in on-campus residential colleges; students who moved to other forms of accommodation when they commenced higher education; and students living with their families. The results indicate that students living with their families are less likely to be well integrated and less likely to be positive about their initial experiences, while students living on-campus more rapidly develop a sense of student identity and are more satisfied overall.

A number of factors were advanced to account for their finding of greater satisfaction among college residents. These included less reliance on obtaining part-time work as a source of income, less time commuting and having tutors and other students readily available for assistance. Conversely they noted homesickness, alcohol and sexuality as being distractions.

Stanislowksy (1990:6) felt that the Australian colleges fell between the British and American styles. She referred to Roulston (1989:1) who had identified three themes for the nature of Australian residence in the future:

"(1) participants felt very strongly that the traditional values of collegiality, community and pastoral care must be preserved, whatever the nature of residences in the future - not only that, but also the ideals of academic excellence, and the provision of quality facilities and services at an affordable price;

(2) increasing flexibility and diversity of residential settings developing alongside traditional colleges - there will also be a greater cultural diversity in student populations; and
(3) [there] is a feeling amongst Heads that there will be a challenge to cater for an increasing demand for more careers orientation and personal development programs, as well as a program to train residents to assume administrative-managerial responsibilities."

From these themes, there would appear to be general agreement on the objectives which were largely drawn together in the AAHCI 1979 definition of collegiate residence. However, Martin identified considerable differences between colleges and halls in Australia which he felt were largely due to the period of their respective development. He believed this to be similar to the trend in the UK and the USA where historical timing has had an important influence on the type of residence to emerge.

Andrews (1994:3) identified two main periods of development in Australia; the 1850s and post Murray report (1957). He identified the first period of development as commencing in 1850 with the founding of the University of Sydney (1850) and St Paul's College (1854). This coincided with the time when Newman and Pattison were writing and the period of nineteenth century Oxbridge development. A considerable difference from the Oxbridge model was that the colleges in Sydney and Melbourne were separate from their universities largely because the universities were intentionally secular which prevented replication of the Oxbridge college-university model:

"...there was concern among community leaders for the welfare of the students deprived of spiritual guidance, and generous land grants were made to the Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and the Methodists for the building of colleges in which the students would receive 'systematic religious instruction and domestic supervision'."

The pattern of separation was the same for the University of Sydney and the University of Melbourne. There was no faculty of theology within the universities and the individual denominations built colleges which took on the function of theological teaching in addition to providing residence for students attending their respective university. Martin (1994:4) elaborated:

"The older Universities in Australia sought, in part, to capture the Oxbridge traditions of quality of thought and intellectual life...the residential Colleges sustained the Oxbridge traditions in many ways, particularly in their excellent teaching and quality of life. However, the evolving pattern of University as also the changing pattern of community, inexorably moulded the Australian model of 'College'. One of the major differences between the English Colleges and their Australian counterparts, was the extent to which the Australian Colleges were
Church Foundations, with a particular emphasis upon the provision of Theological Education which had been excluded from the Universities."

Andrews (1994:4) put the second major period of development of collegiate residences as commencing with the Federal Government's adoption of the Murray Report (1957):

"Over the next 20 years, fifty new residences for university students were opened, some colleges, and some the new Halls of Residence. In the same period, many of the nation's universities were established."

Martin (1994:4) indicated that college had come to be applied to residence owned, sponsored and/or governed by a body or group independent but affiliated to a university whereas hall of residence applied to a residence owned, sponsored and/or governed by its university and he also highlighted the post-Murray period:

"Australian Halls of Residence had their origins, first in the Armidale Hostels, later to evolve into Colleges, within the University of New England in 1958. Further Halls were opened, in the University of New South Wales 1959, University of Newcastle, Monash University from 1962, James Cook University from 1961, Latrobe University from 1967 and Flinders University, 1971.

The New England Halls, from the beginning, were called Colleges, no doubt to emphasise their identity with the Colleges of the University of Sydney, of which the University of New England was an offshoot. It is the author's belief, however, that the stamp of a collegiate style in Australia was firmly implanted in the early stages of University growth and that subsequent secular Colleges and Halls have drawn their shape from the model provided by the early Australian Colleges, rather than from the secular residential Halls of the Redbrick Universities of Britain of the 19th Century."

Andrews identified recent changes which have occurred largely to increase access to higher education. In particular, the HECS scheme, allowing deferred payment of fees, gave greater access to tertiary study at a time when government expenditure to education had fallen as a proportion of Gross Domestic Product. Andrews also drew on a paper by Professor Richard Sweet to identify a further significant trend towards an increase in continuing and postgraduate enrolments within a general increase in university enrolments. Andrews (1994:6) outlined the consequences for colleges:

"While student numbers have increased, the fact that most of the increase is from continuing students means that few are likely to view college as a residential option – unless the colleges make additional efforts to attract students undertaking further courses."
In addition, with high youth unemployment and application for university entrance outstripping supply of places, the Federal Government attempted to emphasise the desirability of vocational training, particularly through the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) sector. Andrews believed that there would be a growing problem for colleges being able to attract students at a time when education may be tending to a more vocational orientation. Andrews (1994:8) called on colleges to refocus on Newman's ideas of the university and to rise to the challenge ahead:

"I believe that the colleges have an increasingly important role to play as our tertiary education system moves further and further away from the provision of an all-round liberal education and towards the provision of training for the various professions, which are subject also to increasing specialisation."

Andrews (1994:11) concluded:

"If we do not have conviction in our task, then I suspect we are merely defending elaborate buildings. If we do, we can look forward confidently in the knowledge that the university colleges will be looked upon as homes of learning and commitment; where youthful curiosity is fostered alongside moral restraint; and where the wealth of knowledge is matched by wisdom and its power by purpose. Let us reward grace and beauty as we do achievements on the sporting field; and let us make our colleges bastions not only for democracy and diversity but also personal distinction."

Andrews rightly drew attention to the pressures on universities and collegiate residences and these together with changes which are being made in response are developed later in chapter 6. Clearly, the incidence of residences which are not filling their available places provides evidence of a need to respond to these pressures and forces of change and such is the thrust of the latter part of this thesis.

**Other Literature on Colleges**

There is a growing body of literature relating to various aspects of university and college life. This has relevance in that it deals with the effectiveness of different approaches to leadership, including student government, the positives and negatives of living in residence, the differences between different forms of residence and what makes a successful, effective or 'good' college.
Leadership in Colleges

As identified by Bergin (1983), there are effectively three levels of leadership in colleges:

* Warden, (Master, Principal, Head, etc.),
* Fellows, (Tutors, Resident Assistants/Resident Advisors, etc.), and
* Students.

The Warden

Warden is a traditional title for the position of head of residence and an interesting aspect of the study, outlined in section 4.2, was to identify the range of titles attached to the position in Australia. Brothers and Hatch (1971:125) provided an outline of the role, functions, recruitment and remuneration of wardens together with an outline of goals of residence, from the wardens' perspective. They supported Bergin's comments on the importance of the Master:

"The 1957 Niblett Report describes the warden of the university hall as the 'lynchpin of the whole residential system. The character of the hall is largely determined by what he is and does....He should be at once a scholar with an understanding of academic life....His pastoral care should be unobtrusive, but must be at hand to help when needed and notice difficulties before they become disasters....It is the warden's responsibility to create a climate in which study is natural....It is his function to show his students how to make good use of the university, drawing their attention to activities and developments, and sharing with them his own interest in its wide-ranging life."

Brothers and Hatch indicated that there may be a difference between the UK and the USA by suggesting that higher value is placed on personal qualities than on a specific range of expertise. They saw the functions as threefold: administrative, social control and socialising and stressed that college effectiveness can depend on recruiting the right kind of person. However, whilst there is general agreement on the importance of the role and what it entails, there did not seem to be anything in the existing literature on what is meant by the right kind of person.

This may well depend on the different expectations within and between each college. In early Oxbridge terms, it may have been largely pastoral and, given the ecclesiastical nature of the colleges, appointments appear to have reflected this. In other places the emphasis has been on the academic scholar. The title of Master has the connotation of academic
One of the purposes of this study was to identify whether there are particular backgrounds and traits which are held to be important for the incumbent of this position and aspects of this question are addressed in chapters 4, 6 and 7.

In addition to having a warden, some colleges have another position which may be called Dean or Vice-Master. Traditionally, a warden was seen as a person in charge of young people with a largely protective role, whereas a dean could have a combination of disciplinary, pastoral, advisory and academic functions. In the American context, Bergia (1983:14) explained:

"The 'college deans', appointed by and representative of the Dean of Yale College, assist in the administration of the college and in the furtherance of the colleges' activities. The deans, indispensable to every facet of college life, bring their own intellectual and academic backgrounds to the educational life of the college."

The Fellows

Traditionally, Fellows were scholars who lived in the colleges and with whom the students had the opportunity to interact. More recently, they have become known as tutors. According to Brothers and Hatch (1971:135), tutors were usually selected by the warden for the general role of being guide, philosopher and friend to students and the following is an example of what one warden sought when appointing a tutor:

"I'm looking for a young woman who has a very healthy full existence, both academically and socially....What I don't want is the kind of woman who is using hall as a means of solving her own problems, domestic and emotional....We need people who are really interested in students and in their fellow human beings in general....I'm not necessarily looking for disciplinarians....I do like people with personalities."

Brothers and Hatch indicated that, as a generalisation, the UK tutors are given little, if any, training in counselling and guidance as to their function. In the USA, professional development is more the norm and selection methods are more clearly defined. Stanislowsky adopted the terminology of the USA, resident assistant or resident advisor (RA) and her dissertation was devoted to the topic: "Selection, Training and Supervision of Resident Assistants in University Residential Colleges." She identified that there has been some questioning of the relative effectiveness of undergraduate and postgraduate resident assistants in the literature.
It would be a worthwhile study to identify the career patterns for this second level of college leadership existing in Australian colleges. There are considerable differences and in some colleges all tutors are postgraduates whereas in others, some or all are undergraduates, and deliberately so. Daintree (1989:2) identified a concern he had with postgraduate tutors which led him to develop a system in which he employed five senior tutors and a team of undergraduate tutors. Stanislowsky (1990:98), in her study of four colleges, found that:

"Colleges do rely on RAs to facilitate the educational environment. At some colleges RAs were seen clearly as 'law enforcers' rather than facilitators of academic and personal/social development. Nearly all RAs accepted that there was a strong expectation of pastoral care...the 'counselling' role of the RA was evident in both the case studies and the research literature...the enforcement of rules and regulations, the maintenance of a safe, orderly and relatively quiet environment, and the provision of personal help and assistance to students were the three most prominent responsibilities of the RA role in the Australian colleges."

Stanislowsky was able to identify one general responsibility which the literature, particularly from the USA, included for the resident assistant which was not in evidence in the Australian colleges she studied. That is, that resident assistants in these Australian colleges were not seen as "facilitators and planners of social, recreational and educational programs."

A further strand of literature to emerge, again from the USA, has questioned the effectiveness of the resident assistant. Wetzel (1991:7) cited a number of studies beginning in the late 1960s. He identified the two characteristics of relationship skills and self-concept as being central to resident advisor effectiveness. In a study, carried out with two hundred and ten RAs on eight Californian State University campuses, his conclusions were that:

"no significant differences were found between effective and ineffective RAs in terms of gender, age, class standing, and point grade average when using the Relationship Self Inventory."

However, a positive finding had emerged:

"RAs who were identified as effective had positive feelings of their self-worth, their adequacy as a person, their understanding of themselves, and their ability to measure their honesty in presenting their feelings."
This equates well with the UK warden's expectations, quoted above. Even allowing for valuing the differences which individuals bring to the role, the qualities expected of this level of college leadership may be universal. Obviously, there is a rich field of study to be researched further on this position and other levels of college leadership, including student involvement in leadership.

The Students

As indicated above, Bergin (1983:15) saw residential students not as "recipients of the system" but as "the source of energy that animates the college." There has been a developing field of literature on advantages to be gained from living on campus and, from that, Schuh (1986:16) identified two strands of student leadership as student government and involvement as a peer helper. The latter overlaps with the appointment of RAs which is perceived as a formal leadership position for which continuing students generally apply, but other unremunerated positions exist, such as orientation leaders and peer advisors or mentors.

Elected student government positions are common in many colleges and provide opportunities for student involvement, development and leadership. Rasche and Stoner (1988:65) referred to a 1980 work by Bowling entitled "Student Governance and Leadership" in which she developed three components to the organisational dimensions of residence hall governance:

"(a) a well articulated purpose which defines functions, (b) officers elected by the residents, and (c) a delineation of roles of the student officers as well as the student and professional staff."

It was felt that involvement in leadership enhanced the educational experience and development of students and greater acceptance of responsibility for influencing the quality of life in residence halls.

At a number of Australian university collegiate residences, student 'representative government' has a significant place. As an example, in the Queen's College (University of Melbourne) Handbook (1995:7), the Sugden Principle identified "the first Master's expectation that students at Queen's will be largely self-regulating and willing to accept responsibility for the well-being of the College." This document identified the responsibilities of the Master, the roles and expectations of the elected student President
and General Committee and their relationship with the Master. The elected students accept a disciplinary responsibility, including the fining of residents who commit misdemeanours. Members of the Senior Common Room (tutors) do not have disciplinary powers but report concerns to the elected General Committee members, the Vice-Master or Master. This provides a different approach from other residences where discipline falls into the province of tutors or resident assistants. In addition, as occurs in most other residences, three students were elected by their peers to serve on the College Council.

A 'Good' College

A number of checklists of characteristics of what makes a 'good' college are emerging. As indicated in chapter 1, in 1979 the members of AAHCHI developed a definition of collegiate residence which differentiated it from a non-collegiate residence. They believed that the distinction must be defined in academic rather than accommodation terms. In particular, they identified a list of minimum provisions for the academic, social and cultural development of residents for a residence to be considered a collegiate residence.

Andrews (1994:9) provided a further list of four components or characteristics of a collegiate environment:

"First there are a series of activities related to the learning object of the university. The most obvious example in college is the provision of tutorials, both formal and informal...The presence of a tutor, a person with whom a student can consult...In this context, the role of senior students cannot be underestimated...."

Secondly, there is the college library, both as a place of study and as a collection of resources...in a technological age, computer links with vast banks of stored information are increasingly important....

Thirdly, the colleges offer the opportunity to create a unity of knowledge. Visiting speakers, faculty nights, guest lectures, resident academics and so on contribute to this objective....

Finally, there are cultural pursuits which cross faculty boundaries: debates, plays, musical performances, choirs and so forth. In this context, I believe that the colleges and halls are not merely residences attached to the universities: the colleges and halls are the universities."

Andrews (1994:11) went on to question the extent to which colleges were adopting the components identified in the 1979 definition:
"How many have ever sat down to draft a mission statement or flesh out the definition for their own institution? What are the rituals of your college, for example, and do they promote or hinder social and cultural development? Fine rhetoric is important. It is the vehicle of ideas. But it also requires an action plan if it is to be of practical use."

Boyer (1987:287) headed a study in the USA which visited thirty private and public campuses and surveyed academic deans, faculty members, undergraduates, high school students and parents. From this he provided a further list under the heading: 'A Guide to a Good College':

"There is no single model of 'the good college'. Missions and circumstances vary greatly from one campus to another. But there are, we believe, characteristics widely enough shared to support the suggestions made in the body of our report."

While there may be differences between the definition of college as it applies in the USA and Australian milieu, the following selection of those characteristics he attributed to the making of 'the good college' appear to be universal:

"Cooperation with schools...willingness to smooth the transition between school and higher education....

A clear and vital mission....

A year round program of academic advising and personal counseling, structured to serve all undergraduates....

A common learning curriculum that will express the claims of community....

A climate that encourages independent, self-directed study....

Good teaching encouraged through student evaluation....

Well-supported campus-wide activities – lectures, symposia, debates, concerts, and the like – that encourages community, sustain college traditions, and stimulate both social and intellectual interaction....

All parts of college life are measured by high standards, and that educated people are guided in their behaviour by civility and decency....

The total campus, not just the classroom, is viewed as a place of learning....

...affirms that service to others is a central part of education....

...governance is to be measured not by the formality of the structure but by the integrity of the participants, by the willingness of individuals to work together in support of shared objectives.....
...designs creative ways to both extend and encourage diversity on campus....

...has prepared students to see beyond the boundaries of their own narrow interests and discover connections which are global.

Boyer concluded idealistically:

"Colleges, we have said, should help students become independent, self-reliant human beings, yet also they should give priority to community....The aim of the undergraduate experience is not only to prepare the young for productive careers, but also to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose: not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to humane ends; not merely to study government, but to help shape a citizenry that can promote the public good."

It would seem that the ideals of the earliest Oxbridge colleges remain. It has been a primary theme throughout that colleges provide students with the possibility of intellectual stimulation and academic excellence. However, there has also been an expectation that a pastoral dimension will exist and that experiences will be provided aimed at enhancing individual development and a community awareness. Given that these ideals seem timeless and the McInnis and James (1995) research supported the value of collegiate residence, the future for colleges and halls of residence should be assured but some real challenges are emerging in responding to financial pressures, higher expectations and responding to the information technology revolution.

The Future

"Ours is the age of the information technology revolution....Now, we must come to grapple with the reality that computers that are accessed every day in the office, at school and at home, are not just sophisticated word processors, but provide a different means of accessing knowledge and communicating with others around the world. The implications, not only for telecommunications, but also for globalization, collaborative research and the specialisation of knowledge, are profound."

[Gilbert (1996:1)]

One theme in this study is how changes in universities will impact on collegiate residences and how they will need to respond to remain viable. Gilbert (1996:1) proceeded:

"Given the fascination with the new technology, it is not surprising that some, including higher education policy makers, have started talking about 'virtual universities', and begun to question the viability of the traditional model of universities as campus-based communities."
There has been a growth in distance education. Examples of this include the Open University in the UK and courses provided by Deakin University in Australia, and McWilliam (1995:1) identified the commencement of the "de-peopled university campus", at the University of Maine (USA) where a "video campus without teachers or buildings" was created and students "would no longer need to attend lectures, but could tune in to their chosen subjects on TV screens, either from home or other campuses, and then 'interact' with a teacher hundreds of kilometres away...teaching and learning may become cheaper, faster and more accessible."

McWilliam (1995:1) concluded:

"...its effects are important for two reasons. First, it shows the press of technology to revolutionise pedagogical events. Second, while academics quite rightly see the threat to their professional work in such developments, there is no mention of cogent pedagogical arguments against this change."

Universities will change with technological development and residences will need to respond. The extent of response required will depend on the extent of the changes. Gilbert (1996:1) provided a ray of hope:

"With respect, I believe that it is entirely premature to conclude that the social nature of humankind is in imminent danger of disappearing into cyberspace....What is 'virtual' is not - in essential respects - 'real'. The real world of human activities, including intellectual activities, has always been adept at making use of new, more efficient ways of accessing and using information. Ours remains a world in which real people communicate best - at once most profoundly and most satisfyingly - at a personal level."

Gilbert (1996:3) indicated that both university and college derive from words that denoted a body of persons with common interests and concluded, much as Newman had a century and a half before, that a university is a learning community, and:

"Colleges and residential halls, an important sub-set of the university community and communities in their own right, have the potential to demonstrate par excellence, the importance of communal learning environment."

One of the main purposes of this study was to identify the perceptions of those involved in universities and Australian colleges and halls of residence on what changes lie ahead and how collegiate residences will need to respond. Relating what makes a 'good' college
to educational leadership theory provided a focus for approaching this question. In the following section, a conceptual framework for collegiate leadership is adopted from which the evaluation guide in Appendix D was developed to provide a practical approach to identifying future needs.

2.2 THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

"Outstanding leadership has invariably emerged as a key characteristic of outstanding schools. There can no longer be doubt that those seeking quality in education must ensure its presence and that the development of potential leaders must be given high priority." [Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991:99)]

Theories relating to leadership in education have developed from the larger body of organisational theory but have largely concentrated on leadership in schools. Despite this, it is argued that this body of research and writing is applicable to institutions or organisations involved in the tertiary education sector, including collegiate residences.

As defined in chapter 1, collegiate residences are educational institutions which, in addition to providing residential accommodation for many university students, also provide an educational programme aimed at enhancing the academic, social and cultural development of residents. As with schools, structures and provisions are diverse but a need for leadership to create and sustain values, structures and provisions is common. That is, the form and needs of leadership are similar in both and the following review of literature supports the contention that an adaptation of the theory of Caldwell and Spinks (1992), although developed for application in self-managing schools, is appropriate for research into leadership of university collegiate residence in Australia. Caldwell and Spinks provided a synthesis which drew together many earlier leadership theories. In essence, they provided a broad framework which can be crafted to apply to the specific needs of any educational institution and that proved to be a sound starting point for the investigation of collegiate residences.

For this study, it is important that an understanding of the general field of leadership theories leads to the specific field of theories applying to educational organisations and ultimately to collegiate residences. Despite all the research and theoretical proposals, no agreed theory of leadership appropriate to all settings has been developed. Some of the problems and issues surrounding the development of leadership theories are discussed in this chapter. Nevertheless, particular theories may be seen to be more relevant in particular
environments and justification for adoption of a specific theory of leadership is feasible given appropriate parameters and qualifications. This chapter provides a progression through aspects of the development of leadership theory, particularly as it relates to educational organisations, and supports the appropriateness of the Caldwell and Spinks conceptual framework for the present study.

The Development of Ideas about Leadership

"...the search for the definitive solution to the leadership problem has proved to be another endless quest for the Holy Grail in organizational theory."

[Handy (1985:93)]

During the 1980s and 1990s, there has been a considerable increase in writings specifically on leadership of educational organisations from a comparatively limited base pre-1980. Largely this has been in response to a professional intent to enhance the effectiveness of schools in providing improved outcomes for students and appropriate leadership practice which has been seen as central to the achievement of excellence.

There have been a number of recent reviews tracing the development of leadership theory. Handy (1985), Owens (1991), Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991) and Telford (1994) have provided historical overviews of this dynamic field of enquiry. Below is a brief overview of the evolution of ideas about leadership which shows that, over time, leadership theory has become less generalised and more contextual, particularly as the structure and culture of organisations have developed dynamically in response to a need to adapt in order to remain viable. It would appear that change has become the only certainty and leadership theory and practice has had to respond accordingly. Therefore, no one theory has achieved universal acceptance simply because there are so many variables. However, there are strands which have come to the fore and remain.

What is Leadership?

In such a dynamic field of enquiry, contexts differ and, as a result, many hundreds of definitions of leadership have emerged. Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991:100) and Telford (1994:9) have identified the following definitions of leadership (leader) which tend to highlight the size and breadth of the field even though individual definitions may reveal a narrow perspective:
Dubin (1968):
"the exercise of authority and the making of decisions"

Fiedler (1967):
"the individual in the group given the task of directing and co-ordinating task-relevant group activities"

Stogdill (1950):
"the process of influencing the activities of an organised group towards goal setting and goal accomplishment"

Lipham (1964):
"the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organisation's goals and objectives"

Pondy (1978):
"ability to make activity meaningful...not to change behaviour but to give others a sense of understanding of what they are doing"

Greenfield (1986):
"a willful act where one person attempts to construct a social world for others..."

Sergiovanni (1987):
"the process of persuasion by which a leader or leadership group (such as the state) induces followers to act in a manner that enhances the leader's purposes or shared purposes"

Burns (1978):
"is exercised when persons with certain purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage and satisfy the motives of the followers"

More recent definitions have moved away from the leader having top-down authority, with all wisdom being seen to reside in the leader (none with subordinates) to the leader being in a position to transform the institution by bringing others (followers) to accept a role in the development of a shared vision of which all will have ownership and for which the leader will be the driving force. Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991:123) concluded:

"Leadership is concerned with gaining commitment to a set of values, statements of 'what ought to be', which then become the heart of the culture of the school."

Despite the variations in definition, Owen (1991:132) identified two common themes in the literature:

"(1) Leadership is a function of groups, not individuals...leadership occurs only in a process of two or more people interacting...."
(2) Leadership involves intentionally exercising influence on the behaviour of other people.

Thus, any concept of leadership deals with exercising influence on others through social interaction."

Theories of Leadership

The development of theories of leadership has tended to fall into those identifying traits of leaders, styles or behaviours adopted by leaders and those which are contingent on the different situations within which leaders are operating.

Trait Theories

Early studies attempted to identify traits of successful leaders and even the term Great Man Theory was coined when equating such traits with success. The idea was that some individuals had particular characteristics which made for good leadership. At one extreme, these characteristics were seen as being innate and in the genes with the corollary that there was a limit to how much could be learned. More globally, Handy (1985:94) attempted to draw together some of the traits which have been suggested as having a positive correlation with success. He listed intelligence, initiative, self-assurance, the helicopter factor (ability to rise above the particulars of a situation and perceive it in its relation to the overall environment), good health, above or below average height, coming from upper socio-economic levels in society, enthusiasm, sociability, integrity, courage, imagination, decisiveness, determination, energy, faith and even virility as traits which have been linked by one source or another with success in leadership.

Problems with reliance on this approach emerged. There were difficulties in definition and too many exceptions were identified as good leaders, whilst too many with the so-called desired traits failed to deliver. Also, there was a developing field of thought that effective leadership was possible when leaders read the situation and responded appropriately. Clearly, there were more dimensions to the equation. Weaknesses in an approach solely reliant on leadership traits led to the development of leadership style or behaviour theories.

Even allowing for the exceptions and different situations requiring different responses, Stogdill (1974) and Covey (1990) suggested that there may be some traits or habits which successful leaders tend to possess. Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991:103) developed a further list to include: a sense of responsibility, a concern for task completion, energy,
persistence, risk-taking, originality, self-confidence, capacity to handle stress, capacity to influence, and the capacity to coordinate the efforts of others in the achievement of purpose.

Whilst there may be some value in looking at traits, there are other subtleties and the development of leadership theory has progressed beyond a one-dimensional understanding. The realisation that leadership behaviour and situational variables were also part of the equation led to development of further strands of thought.

**Leadership Style or Behaviour**

There have been a number of attempts to relate leadership style to success, generally in terms of the effectiveness in getting employees to work harder. These have attempted to identify style on a continuum from the autocratic to the democratic. Handy (1985:97) attempted to remove the emotive connotations associate with these extremes and summarised that:

"there is evidence that 'supportive' styles of leadership:
Are related to subordinate satisfaction
Are related to lower turnover and grievance rates
Results in less inter-group conflict
Are often the preferred styles of subordinates"

It could be seen that a real contribution of this strand of theory was the notion that leadership styles and behaviours can be learned and modified. However, those identifying the impact of situational variables would assert that, like leadership traits, leadership style does not provide the whole picture even though supportive leadership may be seen as potentially conducive to achieving higher productivity. The realisation that situational factors are involved led to the development of the so-called contingency theories which have attempted to take account of the task at hand and the dynamics of the work group, including the position of the leader.

**Contingency Theories of Leadership**

Leadership theories which may be grouped under the term contingency theories do not propose that there is one approach for all situations but that concern for accomplishing the task and concern for relationships between people in an organisation are both required for
success. What they have in common is the thought that effective leadership is thought to be dependent on the particular context. What is seen to be effective leadership in one environment may not succeed in another.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) identified a development from telling (high task – low relationship) through selling (high task – high relationship) and participating (low task – high relationship) to delegating (low task – low relationship). Blake and Mouton (1984) developed the Managerial Grid moving from improvised management (low concern for people – low concern for production) to team management where both dimensions were maximised. They identified country club management and task management where the emphasis was totally on one or other dimension and middle of the road management where both were balanced but below maximum on either dimension. Fiedler (1977) looked at situations which were favourable and unfavourable to the leader in terms of (i) like, dislike and level of trust, (ii) clear and ambiguous tasks and (iii) the power of the leader (in terms of reward and punishment with organisational backing). Fiedler saw management style and behaviour needing to be differentiated from one another with style being seen as innate and behaviour as being a response deemed to be appropriate. According to Handy (1985:101), Fiedler found that:

"When the task is clearly defined and the leader is strong and well respected he is expected to get on with the job and to be fairly directive. When the task is ambiguous and he is in a weak position, vis-à-vis the group, his best strategy is still to be directive or structuring...on the other hand an ambiguous task confronted by a respected leader calls for a more supportive approach."

This line of reasoning leads to the conclusion that the search for successful leadership characteristics may be pointless and will prove nothing in isolation. It would seem clear that successful leadership is a dynamic mix dependent on personal characteristics, qualities and styles matched to the nuances of the individual context within which leaders operate.

It would further appear that there are more than the three dimensions of the leader's traits and style, the subordinate's expectations and the nature of the task to be considered. Clearly, it has emerged that leadership is multi-dimensional with numerous interacting variables. In response to this realisation, Handy (1985:108) identified six key aspects of the environment as extensions of the above which need to be considered:
* The position power of the leader in the total organization
* The relationship of the leader to the group
* The organisational norms
* The structure and technology of the organization
* The variety of tasks
* The variety of subordinates

**Transactional and Transformational Leadership**

An enduring idea in the development of leadership theory has been that which Caldwell and Spinks (1992) and others have embraced in the form of transformational leadership as a framework for proposing the form of leadership required to bring about excellence in schools.

In 1978, James McGregor Burns first proposed a difference between transactional and transformational leadership. In this he recognised a change from the concept of leader and subordinate to leader and follower. Effectively this replaced the bureaucratic expectation that the leader was the fount of all wisdom, and subordinates worked for the leader completing assigned tasks, to a position where the leader's role was to engage the followers so that all were united to achieve mutually developed higher level goals with the expectation that the process will be more fulfilling for both leader and followers.

Transactional leadership focuses on satisfying the needs of leaders and followers by the leader giving to the followers something which they want (usually in some form of extrinsic reward) in exchange for something the leaders want (usually completion of a set task). Transformational leadership, on the other hand, involves satisfying the higher psychological needs for esteem, autonomy and self-actualisation of followers so that their full involvement is secured. In essence, transactional leadership is seen as being appropriate when stability is desired and transformational leadership is seen as appropriate when change is required.

Sergiovanni (1990:25) also drew on the distinction between transactional and transformational leadership. He identified transactional leadership as a kind of bartering to provide the value of continual performance based on striking a bargain and
transformational leadership as a process of building, bonding and banking with commitment and performance enhanced (value-added) by the higher needs of all parties being met. In this scenario, everyone supports a shared vision of a new direction for the organisation.

It is largely on this platform of ideas that leadership theory in the 1990s, particularly that relating to educational organisations, has been built. However, some difficulties with the development of leadership theory and criticisms of prevailing conceptions of leadership have also emerged and should be noted.

The Problems and Issues in the Field

A number of problems and issues have been raised in recent times. Some have even questioned the whole field and the plethora of emerging terms and definitions may have muddied rather than purified the water. There are the seeds of an anti-leadership theory revolution with Sergiovanni questioning the value of the field at all and feeling that it may be antithetical to professionalism.

Leadership – one more term?

The following list illustrates some of the leadership terms and their proponents in the field of leadership: Transactional and Transformational (Burns), Collaborative (Leithwood), Technical, Human, Educational, Symbolic, Cultural, Value-Added (Sergiovanni), Strategic, Responsive (Caldwell and Spinks), Instrumental, Peer-Assisted (Fullan), Interactive (Rosener), Instructional (Murphy), Servant (Greenleaf), Principle-Centred (Covey), Super Leadership, Self-Leadership (Manz and Sims), Reflective (Evans), Reflexive (Sungafla), Educative (Duignan and Macpherson), Charismatic, Socialized, Personalized, Political, Organizational, Internal, Environmental, Moral and Entrepreneurial.

As can be seen, anyone studying the field of leadership theory is beset with nomenclature difficulties and the growing number of terms given to various perceptions of leadership. It is open to question whether the mass of such terms and definitions helps or hinders the practice of leadership. Each may have an individual justification and place in the literature but it is open to question whether this tendency to create distinctions is leading to a coherent body of knowledge.
Leadership versus Management

A further issue of definition has been a recent concern that the distinction between leadership and management has not always been clearly understood and that much theory development has really related to the latter. With strong leadership being seen as essential in an environment characterised by change, Owen (1991) and Kotter (1990) attempted to differentiate between leadership and management. Owen (1991:132) indicated that some differentiate by saying "that managers deal with 'things', while leaders deal with 'people'." Kotter (1990[a]:4) made it his mission to clarify the difference indicating that good management aims to produce order and consistency through the processes of (i) planning and budgeting, (ii) organising and staffing and (iii) controlling and problem solving. In contrast, leadership aims to produce movement through (i) establishing direction, (ii) aligning people and (iii) motivating and inspiring. They are similar in "deciding what needs to be done, creating networks of people and relationships that can accomplish an agenda, and then trying to ensure that people actually get the job done." Kotter (1990[a]:13) developed a two-dimensional correlation between the amount of change needed (due to environmental instability, rapid growth, etc.) and the complexity of the operation (due to size, technology, geographical disbursement, the number of products and services, etc.) and his contention was that:

* High change and high complexity requires considerable leadership and considerable management
* High change and low complexity requires considerable leadership and little management
* Low change and low complexity requires little leadership and little management
* Low change and high complexity requires little leadership and considerable management

When relating this to the current climate of considerable change in organisations, Kotter would say that good management is necessary but good leadership is vital. The challenge is to create a culture of leadership but, unfortunately, he contended:

"There are probably a variety of reasons why a number of firms do not appear to have the practices needed to attract, develop, retain, and motivate people with leadership potential. But the most basic reason is simply this: until recently, most organisations did not need that many people to handle their leadership challenges."
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Kotter (1990[b]:111) believed that "institutionalizing a leadership centered culture is the ultimate act of leadership" and strategies should be in place which help "create a corporate culture where people value strong leadership and strive to create it."

**Gender and Leadership**

Another issue for the theory of leadership is whether there are differences between the genders in the way they approach and exercise leadership roles. This is additional to the issue of the 'glass ceiling' and the limiting of opportunities for women to be appointed to such roles. Some writers would claim that women play the role differently due to gender and socialisation differences and that such has had an effect on leadership theory development and may even see women having an advantage in role performance.

The writings of Naisbuth and Aberdene (1990), Helgesen (1990) and Rosener (1990) are pertinent in relation to the position of women in leadership theory. Naisbuth and Aberdene (1990:217) wrote:

"To be a leader...in business today, it is no longer an advantage to have been socialized as a male.

Although we do not fully realize it as yet, men and women are on an equal playing-field in corporate America. Women may even hold a slight advantage since they need not 'unlearn' old authoritarian behaviour to run their departments or companies....

The dominant principle of organization has shifted, from management in order to control an enterprise, to leadership in order to bring out the best in people and to respond quickly to change."

Since the socialisation of women tends to be more collaborative, Helgesen (1990:249) also saw women as having a potential advantage:

"As women's leadership qualities come to play a more dominant role in the public sphere, their particular aptitude for long-term negotiating, analytical listening, and creating an ambience in which people work with zest and spirit will help reconcile the split between the ideals of being efficient and being humane. This integration of female values is already producing a more collaborative kind of leadership, and changing the very ideal of what strong leadership actually is."
Rosener (1990:120) called this leadership style of women interactive, in that:

"More specifically the women encourage participation, share power and information, enhance other people's self-worth, and get others excited about their work. All these reflect their belief that allowing employees to contribute and to feel powerful and important is a win-win situation - good for the employees and the organization."

A final word belongs to Sergiovanni. In his conversation with Brandt (1992:48), said:

"My reading of the literature on successful schools shows that while women are underrepresented in principalships, they are overrepresented in successful principalships, so there must be something to it."

The major questions in relation to apparent gender advantages are whether they are real and, even so, what opportunities are provided for women to put such into practice. If women do not reach senior positions in substantial numbers, such advantages will remain largely in the domain of theory even though it cannot be denied as an important area of leadership theory for further consideration and development.

Against Leadership Theory?

"a willful act where one person attempts to construct a social world for others..."  
[Greenfield (1986)]

It would seem that the door is open for a new line of thinking about the relationship of leadership and professional behaviour within a learning community. In the 1980s and 1990s, the thoughts of Sergiovanni have been to the fore in leadership theory. Recently, however, he has started to question the value of leadership theory. In Brandt (1992:46), he highlighted what he saw as an antithetical position between professionalism and leadership:

"We think of leadership as direct and interpersonal, and assume that we must have it. But there are many situations in which leadership is not an issue....Professionals don't need any check on them, to push them, to lead them. They are compelled from within....Much of my work in leadership over the years has been more of the problem than the solution. When I recognised that, I began to rethink traditional management theory....I began to think that what I had been saying was vacuous, that everything I had been advocating about leadership was all process, no substance."
Preceding Sergiovanni's thought change, an even more telling criticism of leadership theory was made by Greenfield (1984) who challenged any thought of educational administration being a positivist science. His emphasis would be on leaders and their values rather than leadership and, as the above quotation reveals, his contention was that no-one can claim to have better or more correct values and, therefore, no ultimate right to leadership, "constricting the world of others."

The Theory into Practice?

There has been some general questioning over leadership theory and two further specific issues should be noted. Firstly, it is appropriate to question the link between claims which are made and empirical and other evidence purporting to support such claims. Statements of theory can only be as effective as the quality of research and whether such actually supports what is claimed. They can be normative in the sense that rather than describing the world as it is, they may attempt to set out what it ought to be. There is ample evidence of lack of substantiation to make this an important qualification. Secondly, it is extremely difficult, or even impossible, to develop studies which are comprehensive and which apply universally beyond a particular environment. Therefore, it is doubtful whether there can be such a thing as a general theory of leadership.

In response to these two points, in this study care has been taken to adopt methods which are appropriately tried and accepted in obtaining the required information, as outlined in the methodology section of chapter 3. Also, as the study is limited to the sector of collegiate residences in Australia, there has been no attempt to generalise beyond the sector. However, it was seen as appropriate to adapt an existing framework for the collegiate residence sector and others may see some reverse transferability of the theory and findings from this study to other educational organisations.

Towards a Theory of Leadership for Collegiate Residence

Despite difficulties and issues relating to the field of leadership theory, for the purposes of this study, a number of conclusions about leadership can be drawn from the literature and recent studies pointed the way to adoption of the theories of Caldwell and Spinks (1992). As noted previously, their thoughts are a sound synthesis of leadership theory and they provide a conceptual framework readily applicable to collegiate residences. Similarities exist between schools and collegiate residences, in terms of a need to create and sustain
values, structures and provisions. The form and needs of leadership are similar for both and the following section shows how a brief outline of that path justifies the choice.

**Educational Leadership in the 1990s**

Caldwell and Spiaks (1992:62), although writing specifically about leadership in the self-managing school, provided six generalisations which are relevant to leadership of other educational organisations:

1. Leaders in the self-managing school have the capacity to work with others in the school community to formulate a vision for the school.

2. Leaders in a self-managing school have a coherent personal 'educational platform' which shapes their actions.

3. Vision is communicated in a way which ensures commitment among staff, students, parents and others in the community.

4. There are many facets to the leadership role: technical, human, educational, symbolic and cultural, with the higher order symbolic and cultural facets being especially important in the self-managing school.

5. Leaders in self-managing schools keep abreast of trends and issues, threats and opportunities in the school environment and in society at large, nationally and internationally: they discern the 'megatrends' and anticipate their impact on education and in the school.

6. Leadership which empowers others is central to success in a self-managing school, especially in respect to decision-making."

The first three revolved around all leaders (not merely the principal) working with others (leaders and followers) to formulate a coherent educational platform from a shared set of assumptions, beliefs, opinions and attitudes, and a vision to which all members of the organisation could be permitted. Success was dependent on this widespread commitment so that both the formal and informal leadership were working in a common direction as opposed to a situation where there was the potential for a rejection of the vision developed by the formal leadership.

In deriving the fourth generalisation, Caldwell and Spiaks drew on Sergiovanni who had added educational, symbolic and cultural leadership to the previous management orientated two-dimensional task and relationship perspectives of technical and human leadership,
respectively. They provided support for the view that educational, symbolic and cultural leadership were essential to achieving excellence and they concentrated particularly on the last two.

Symbolic leadership involved achieving the first three generalisations using words (often through metaphors indicating preferred behaviours), actions (often leadership by example) and rewards (positive reinforcement) to develop and obtain commitment to a shared vision which would obviously include an educational component. Murphy (1990) and others would see the principal best achieving educational and symbolic leadership by being an instructional leader, that is, by providing a greater lead and involvement at the educational coal-face to produce positive student educational outcomes.

Cultural leadership implied an ability to develop a robust culture (shared beliefs and values) and without which success would be limited. Although difficult to measure, Deal (1987:6) identified six cultural forms to be developed by school leaders:

* Shared values – as reflected in shorthand slogans
* Heroes – who embody values held to be important
* Rituals – shared values reinforced through repetitive activities
* Ceremonies – highlighting and celebrating shared values and heroes
* Stories – illustrating successes of shared values and heroes
* Cultural Networks – people whose activities protect the culture

In relation to the fifth generalisation, Caldwell and Spinks (1992:55) employed the term strategic leadership to identify what was required for a leader to be able to keep abreast of the changing environment in which educational organisations now exist. The capacities to be flexible and adaptable were vital in formulating long-term plans as increasingly so much was less certain than previously. Finally, Caldwell and Spinks (1992:55) believed that leadership which empowers others was a requirement for success. Four areas of empowerment were identified for providing potential benefits:

* Empowerment of other leaders (leadership density) – implies a move away from a single leader to a team of leaders.
* Empowerment in decision-making (decision saturation) – implies greater involvement and ownership.
* Empowerment through professional development and training programmes – implies greater spread of knowledge and skills.
* Empowerment acknowledging that requirements of leadership should no longer be a male domain.

A Conceptual Framework

An understanding of the above led Caldwell and Spinks to their conclusion that there were four domains which leaders should possess for effective or successful leadership (in the self-managing school). These were cultural, strategic, educational and responsive leadership.

It is these four domains of leadership in university collegiate residences which this research study has sought to explore in further detail although it should be noted that the following sequence differs from the CSER order for the reason that it provides a more logical progression for this review.

Strategic Leadership

Strategic leadership must be differentiated from tactical leadership. Sergiovanni (1984:105) contrasted strategic leadership as "the art and essence of enlisting support for broader policies and purposes and for devising longer-range plans" whereas tactical leadership "involves analyses which lead to administrative action and means of minor magnitude, which are of small scale, and which serve larger purposes". He believed that although both were necessary, as there had been an emphasis on management when leadership had been called for, so had there been a need for strategic leadership when tactical leadership was the norm. "There is more to leadership than meets the tactical eye."

Caldwell and Spinks (1992:92) indicated that:

"Strategic leadership is best defined in operational terms", that is, by listing what leaders actually do when they are engaged in strategic leadership. For the school as a whole, principals exercise strategic leadership by:

* keeping abreast of trends and issues, threats and opportunities in the school environment and in society at large, nationally and internationally; discerning 'megatrends' and anticipating their impact on education generally and on the school in particular;
sharing their knowledge with others in the school's community and encouraging other school leaders to do the same in their areas of interest;

* establishing structures and processes which enable the school to set priorities and formulate strategies which take account of likely and/or preferred futures; being a key source of expertise as these occur;

* ensuring that the attention of the school community is focused on matters of strategic importance;

* monitoring the implementation of strategies as well as emerging strategic issues in the wider environment; facilitating an ongoing process of review.

With this in mind Caldwell and Spinks (1992:93) proposed a plan for strategic leadership which included the following steps and forms a part of Figure 3.1:

* formulating a plan for strategic planning;
* reviewing the school charter to clarify mission;
* reviewing the school charter to clarify authority;
* identifying scenarios for the likely impact on the school of changes in the external environment, and the threats and opportunities associated with each;
* appraising resources, current strategies and recent outcomes to determine strengths and limitations;
* generating a list of strategic issues, in order of priority, on the basis of strengths, limitations, opportunities and threats;
* formulating strategies for action for each of the strategic issues;
* describing a vision for the school when all the strategies have been successfully implemented.

**Educational Leadership**

Educational leadership involves any process in which leaders engage to nurture a learning community through focussing on learning and teaching and positive outcomes for students. It has its groundings in the concept of instructional leadership but it is wider, encompassing activities with students, staff, parents and others in the community, to achieve excellence in terms of learning, teaching and student outcomes.
From this line of thought, Caldwell and Spinks (1992:136) developed ten extremely detailed guidelines for educational leadership. The first of these was an overarching guideline for leaders of school systems:

"to establish a policy framework within which principals and others can take up the opportunities which self-management provides. We refer, in particular, to those identified in research: a capacity to adapt curriculum to meet the educational needs of students in a particular community; the appointment of strong educational leaders as principals; a high degree of autonomy, especially in relation to the manner in which resources are allocated within the school; and staffing arrangements which will ensure placement of a cohesive team, committed to the mission of the school."

Other extensive guidelines included establishing structures for participation in decision making, development of professional development programmes, establishing collegial approaches such as coaching and mentoring, and building the strongest possible mutually supportive relationships between the principal, teachers, parents, students, and other members of the school community. The extent of each of these is developed more fully in Figure 3.1. These relationships extend into the next domain as it is to these groups that the institution and its leaders are ultimately accountable.

**Responsive Leadership**

In the 1990s greater accountability has been expected, particularly when distribution of government funds has been involved. As with sound educational leadership, responsive leaders are committed to serving the interests of students, the community and society in general. In the school context, this involves ensuring that it is achieving expectations as they have been defined, possibly in a school charter. To be a responsive leader includes a demonstrated ability in the cultural, strategic and educational domains. It is the overarching domain and, in terms of theory development, the latest to emerge. Also, it is possible that it may be the least well understood by practitioners in the field.

Caldwell and Spinks (1992:141) identified six fields of accountability of responsive leaders in schools and government and Figure 3.1 provides a practical statement of what is entailed:

* accountability of the school to the student and parent, with regular reports of student progress and achievement;
accountability of the school to parents and the local community, with reports of a general nature being furnished in relation to the achievement of expectations;

accountability of the school to the school system, with reports of varying specificity on the achievement of goals, priorities and standards, including the manner in which resources have been deployed;

accountability of the school system to the government, being consolidation of information on the achievements of the system;

accountability of state governments to national governments, as national strategies for educational reform have emerged, with reports on the extent to which school systems have attained targets or standards which have been mutually agreed or are a condition of funding;

accountability of governments and school systems to the community, especially in respect to the extent to which resources have been provided to enable schools to achieve expectations which have been set for them.

Cultural Leadership

In recent years there has been a burgeoning field of research on organisational culture and this has implications for leaders. As with terms linked to leadership, in research a number of terms associated with the term culture emerged. These include dominant culture, subculture, counterculture (Martin and Siehl), corporate culture, microculture, learning culture, high culture, popular culture (Bates), traditional, collaborative, Balkanized, and contrived culture (Leithwood and Jantzi). Furthermore, a number of definitions have emerged for the term culture:

Deal and Kennedy (1982):
"The integrated pattern of human behaviour that includes thought, speech, action, artefacts, and depends on man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations."

Schein (1985):
"The deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a basic 'taken-for-granted' fashion an organization's view of itself and its environment."

Erickson (1987):
"a system of ordinary, taken-for-granted meanings and symbols with both explicit and implicit content that is deliberately and nondeliberately, learned and shared among members of a naturally bounded social group."
From these overall definitions, Deal (1987:6) identified six cultural forms to be found in all organisations: shared values, heroes, rituals, ceremonies, stories and cultural networks. The more recent work of Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991:177) developed this further to see culture developing from two standpoints:

"From the anthropological/sociological standpoint, culture is the system of shared meanings, cognitions, symbols, and experiences which are expressed in the behaviours and practices of the members of an affiliated group (a 'tribe') and which gives them both social definition and a sense of association....

From the aesthetic/artistic/literate standpoint, the word 'culture' is used to refer to those actions and outcomes, expressions or products which are defined within the all-embracing classification of 'the fine arts', and which are deemed to have intrinsic value in and of themselves, aside from any actual or personal commercial value."

Allowing for these two standpoints, Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1991:176) developed a "Conceptual Framework for Assessing and Developing School Culture". They saw that there are three areas of intangible conceptual foundations which are present (values, philosophy and ideology) which influence what happens and should explain why. Also, there are a further three sets of tangible expressions and symbolism (conceptual/verbal, visual/material and behavioural).

Sergiovanni (1984:8) saw these two aspects as central: "Underlying the cultural perspective is the concept of community and the importance of shared means and shared values". Further, to Caldwell and Spinks (1992:68) the intangible foundations of values, philosophy and ideology answered a number of questions:

"What are the purposes of education? What is the role of the school achieving these purposes? What knowledge, skills and attitudes are worthy of being addressed in the educational program of the school? What is the relationship between a school and its community; between a school and government? To what extent should the school cater to the needs of all of its students? How should a student learn? What behaviours and relationships are desirable among different members of the school community?"

The responses to these questions were found in the tangible:

"In a verbal sense these include statements of aims and objectives, the curriculum, the language that is used in every day discourse, metaphors, organisational stories, organisational heroes and organisational structures. They are also manifested in behaviour: in rituals, ceremonies, approaches to teaching and learning, operational
procedures, rules and regulations, rewards and sanctions, psychological and social supports, and parental and community interaction patterns. Manifestations in materiel include facilities and equipment, artefacts and memorabilia, crests and mottoes, and uniforms."

From this it was possible to identify whether a culture was strong or weak, with the former being where "all in the school community share the same values and beliefs" as opposed to the latter where there was "fragmentation of values and beliefs and inconsistency in their manifestation". Here the concepts of dominant culture and three forms of subculture, outlined by Martin and Stehl (1983:53) of enhancing, orthogonal and counterculture, are important. Dominant culture is one "shared by a majority of the organization's members". An enhancing subculture "would exist in an organisational enclave in which adherence to the core values of the dominant culture would be more fervent than in the rest of the organization" and orthogonal subculture exists when the members "simultaneously accept the core values of the dominant culture and a separate, unconflicting set of values particular to themselves". A counterculture exists where some core values "present a direct challenge to the core values of a dominant culture". This last position creates "an uneasy symbiotic relationship" but "a counterculture can serve some useful functions for a dominant culture, articulating the boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate behaviour and providing a safe haven for the development of innovative ideas".

The critical issue is that leadership must be aware of the cultural position(s) of its organisation and members. Sergiovanni (1984:107) referred to building a "cultural federation of compatibility which provides enough common identity, enough common meanings, and enough of a basis for committed action for the organization to function in spirited concert". Sergiovanni (1987:124) believed that "successful leaders expect adherence to common values but provide wide discretion in implementation...successful schools are both tightly and loosely structured: they are tight on values and loose on how values are embodied in the practice of teaching, supervision and administration". He saw the key in clarity, consensus, commitment and celebration of the school's basic purposes. Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1987:3) added coherence, collectivity and cohesiveness and Sergiovanni went further to develop a 10P model of requirements for quality leadership: prerequisites, perspectives, principles, platform, politics, purposing, planning, persisting, peopling and patriotism. Sergiovanni's (1984:122) assertion was that:
"Studies of leadership give too much attention to the instrumental and behavioural aspects and not enough to the symbolic and cultural."

Caldwell and Spinks (1992:70) agreed and placed great emphasis on cultural leadership creating a culture of excellence (in a self-managing school). Adapting the Beare, Caldwell and Millikan approach they believed that the key intangible core values and beliefs, which underpin a culture of excellence, were:

* offering quality education in terms of goals for technical, aesthetic, spiritual, physical and personal development;
* effectiveness in achieving these goals;
* equity in achievement by all regardless of circumstances;
* efficiency in use of resources reducing waste duplication and unnecessary expense;
* empowerment through involvement in decision making and decision implementation.

That is, "Excellence = quality + effectiveness + equity + efficiency + empowerment". With these values and beliefs in place further development of a strong culture of excellence is dependent on a number of tangible manifestations and Caldwell and Spinks (1992:73) identified nine which were central to the self-managing school and which may be adapted for other organisations:

* a school council has been established, with powers which include the setting of goals, policies and priorities reflecting local needs and opportunities (organisational structures; parent and community interaction patterns);
* elections for school council and the occasion of the first meeting each year receive extensive publicity and are the subject of special celebrations (rituals, ceremonies);
* the aims, objectives, curriculum, policies and priorities of the school reflect the outcomes of decisions by school council and are made available in easily understood form to all with an interest in the program of the school (aims and objectives, curriculum, language);
* staff and parents are involved in professional development programs to ensure that knowledge and skill are required for successful involvement in decision making and in the instructional program of the school (psychological and social supports, teaching and learning);
stories are told and written of outstanding contributions by individual parents and teachers, with buildings and other facilities or special awards named in their honour (organisational stories, organisational heroes, artefacts and memorabilia);

a special room is set aside for meetings of school council, with appropriate displays of a functional and symbolic nature (facilities and equipment, artefacts);

the principal establishes procedures to secure the wide involvement of staff in planning and resource allocation (operational procedures);

the principal recommends a teacher for a senior appointment on the basis of outstanding leadership in fostering community involvement (rewards and sanctions); and

the metaphor of community shapes the structures and processes of the school (metaphor).

The thrust in creating a culture of excellence (for the self-managing school) has a wider relevance for leadership of any organisation or educational institution which is accountable and/or in a competitive environment, including collegiate residences. Caldwell and Spinks drew on Kotter (1990:20) who had proposed a societal marketing concept which they saw as appropriate to the current environment:

"The societal marketing concept holds that the key task of the organisation is to determine the needs, wants and interest of target markets, and to deliver the desired satisfactions more effectively and efficiently than its competitors in a manner that preserves or enhances the consumer's or the society's well-being."

Caldwell and Spinks (1992:85) asserted:

"This concept of marketing is entirely consistent with a culture of excellence in a self-managing school...An implication for leaders is a capacity to understand and articulate such a view and work accordingly with colleagues and others in the school community."

Whilst there may be some resistance to marketing in educational institutions, just as there may be to efficiency and accountability, survival may depend upon it. Leaders will need to be able to create a culture of excellence and develop the entrepreneurial abilities to market effectively in a challenging environment.
The CSER Model of Collegiate Leadership

From the work of Caldwell and Spinks, the conceptual framework of the CSER collegiate leadership model emerged to provide a guideline for investigation of leadership in university collegiate residences. In the following chapter, there is a detailed statement of the components of the four domains of the CSER model together with an outline of the methodology adopted to test the thesis and provide answers to the research questions.
CHAPTER 3

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK, THESIS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The literature on educational leadership led to adaptation for this study of a conceptual framework which Caldwell and Spinks (1992) had developed to apply to self-managing schools. As university collegiate residences are value-adding educational institutions by definition, it was deemed appropriate to apply the framework to an investigation of the domains of leadership of collegiate residence and to identify differences which might occur between UORs and PORs.

This study proposes a model of collegiate leadership, adapting and enhancing the four domains of Caldwell and Spinks as they apply to collegiate residences. This adaptation has been carried further with the development of the Guide to Evaluating Colleges and Halls of Residence (Appendix D) for use by leaders to establish levels of effectiveness of their collegiate residence and to indicate ways in which they and their residence will need to respond to remain viable into the future.

Any leader has a variety of abilities and the ideal scenario for the future is that leaders of collegiate residences will have expertise in all four domains. Obviously, there will be considerable differences in strengths and weaknesses held by individual leaders in each domain and even within the components of each.

The major components of the Caldwell and Spinks four domains of leadership were introduced in chapter 2 and these are represented in diagrammatic form in Figure 3.1 below. A brief summary of the components of each follows:

Cultural Leadership

The critical need for leaders in this leadership domain is that they are able to identify ways of creating and sustaining a culture of excellence. This implies, firstly, an ability to describe and analyse the organisational culture of their residence in terms of its intangible values, philosophy and ideology, and the tangible (observable) manifestations which affect the way in which the residence operates as well as any internal and external perceptions.
Secondly, leaders need to understand how excellence is dependent on the provision of quality educational programmes and the underlying ideals of effectiveness, equity, efficiency and empowerment in arriving at and achieving appropriately developed goals. The ability to create an environment which can accommodate change is also important as is an ability to see appropriate change through to completion.

It could be argued that a necessary leadership domain in its own right is a flair for entrepreneurship. This has become an extremely important attribute in view of the problem which this study set out to address of collegiate residences being under threat through not being able to fill their residential places. It has been included, however, as a component of cultural leadership as being able to successfully market a collegiate residence implies an understanding of the cultural forces within it and an ability not only to know and understand the prevailing culture, but also to be able to sustain it where it is excellent and to develop it further where it is not. This should form a firm platform for entrepreneurial success but there is a further area of need. Even when a residence is operating well, if that is not known and enrolments are not forthcoming, there is a need for sound entrepreneurial activity to redress the problem. Entrepreneurship is necessary to raise the quality of the residence, to position it successfully in its market area and to develop further market opportunities.

**Strategic Leadership**

In the strategic leadership domain, effective collegiae residence leaders will be able to provide a pathway from formulation of a vision for the residence through to its achievement. In effect, leaders need to have an ability to create a vision for the residence and see it through to completion, that is, what will be in place when all strategies have been successfully implemented. This requires that they are in a position which is supported by their immediate community and in which a strategic plan for the future is able to be formulated and executed.

The process will generally follow three stages. The first stage is the development of the mission (beliefs and goals) under which the residence will operate. Once the mission is in place, a strategic or master plan, aimed at achieving the vision is undertaken to identify strengths, weaknesses and limitations, opportunities and threats to determine what is in place and what more is required. This is commonly known as a SWOT analysis. Priorities are then established and strategies formulated to achieve each component of the plan. If
successful, over time leaders may achieve the original vision but it will be a dynamic process and the vision and the analysis should not be seen as a one-off activity. Master plans are typically mapped out to cover multiples of five year periods but such plans should be capable of revision within that period if priorities change. Understanding of this process and that it should be dynamic are important components of a conceptual framework within which leaders of collegiate residences should work.

**Educational Leadership**

The domain of educational leadership implies that effective leaders play a nurturing role in ensuring that the collegiate residence is a learning community. To facilitate this, an organisational structure capable of supporting the vision must be put in place and supported and the first component is sound selection of staff and students who will be able and willing to support the vision. Secondly, such leaders will work to ensure adequate provision of financial and other resources and establish supportive procedures which will ensure the development and commission of an educational programme of quality.

**Responsive Leadership**

Responsive leadership is the latest of the domains to emerge. The trend has been to make leaders increasingly accountable and may be seen as a relatively recent phenomenon. Effective collegiate residence leaders require a full awareness of their immediate and wider communities to whom they are accountable. This implies overseeing satisfactory levels of operational performance and ensuring appropriate indicators are in place to evaluate all procedures. In the first instance, this involves evaluation of educational programmes, pastoral care and academic success of students and staff performance levels. Secondly, it involves being accountable to the community of the residence for all financial and other resource use through adoption of sound management practices.
**CULTURAL LEADERSHIP**
('Creating a culture of excellence')
1. Describe and Analyse the 'Culture'
2. Define the elements of a culture of excellence
   - Excellence = Q + E + E + E where
     Q = Quality of the educational programme (in terms of goals)
     E = Effectiveness (in achieving goals)
     A = Equity (in terms of achievement by all)
     E = Efficiency (in use of resources)
     E = Empowerment (through involvement in decision making and implementation)
3. Create an environment for change
4. Implement the changes necessary
5. Market the culture (Entrepreneurship)

**EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**
('Nurturing the learning community')
1. Develop an Organisational Structure
2. Select staff (administrative, educational and pastoral)
3. Select students
4. Provide support and resources for the professional development of staff/students
5. Establish procedures for staff/students to participate in decision making (Empowerment)
6. Provide support and resources for staff/students to develop the educational programme

**RESPONSIVE LEADERSHIP**
('Coming to terms with accountability')
1. Identify responsibility (accountability) requirements to:
   (a) the immediate community
      - Council/Head/Staff/Students/past/present/future/Parents
   (b) the wider community
      - Affiliated universities and colleges/halls
      - Business/Industry/Government/Society in general
2. Develop indicators and evaluate all procedures and programmes
3. Develop indicators and appraise all staff and students
4. Develop indicators and evaluate accountability for all financial and other resources

**STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP**
('Taking Charge of the Agenda')
1. Formulate a process to develop a strategic plan
2. Establish Authority and Responsibility
3. Review the Mission (Beliefs about programmes/broad goals)
4. Identify threats and opportunities provided by external pressures
5. Appraise resources/current strategies and recent outcomes to determine strengths and limitations (weaknesses)
6. Generate a list of strategic issues (in order of priority) on the basis of Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats (SWOT Analysis)
7. Formulate strategies for action for each of the strategic issues
8. Describe a vision when all strategies have been successfully implemented
3.2 THE THESIS

The very existence of collegiate residence is being challenged. Just as there are competitive and other pressures on university leadership, the university residential environment is facing increasing pressures and survival is threatened in some cases. For collegiate residences to remain viable and succeed in a changing environment and not to become irrelevant, or even extinct, collegiate residence leaders will need to adapt and a pressing question is what kind of leadership will be needed in future.

Therefore, the central thesis is that:

Leadership styles of the past may no longer be adequate and, to be successful into the future, leaders of collegiate residences will need to adopt an operating framework which encompasses leadership activity across a number of domains and which embraces several key concepts. These include a willingness to understand the values and philosophies within which the organisational culture currently operates and an ability to modify such, where necessary, together with the creation of a strategic vision, structures, resources and programmes which aim to achieve excellence and for which there is accountability to the immediate and wider community.

The study proposes the CSER model of collegiate leadership, adapted from the writings of Caldwell and Spinks (1992) and encompassing the four domains of Cultural (C), Strategic (S), Educational (E) and Responsive (R) leadership. This CSER model provides a new operating framework within which collegiate residence leaders are able to develop future directions.

Research Questions

This study was instituted to investigate collegiate residence and headship of collegiate residence in terms of past and present patterns and what will be required in the future. It attempts to answer two sets of questions about collegiate residences and their heads:
Collegiate Residence

* What are the present patterns of colleges and halls in terms of year of foundation, location, size, composition of residents and organisational structure?

* How will current and future changes in universities and other pressures affect collegiate residences and how will they have to respond?

* What administrative changes, additional facilities and programme provisions will be necessary for collegiate residences to be effective and successful into the future?

The Head of Collegiate Residence

* Where do heads of collegiate residences come from in terms of gender, age, nationality, qualifications, academic field(s), previous experience, career path, position title and status (i.e. full or part–time), and years in the position?

* Under what assumptions and leadership theories and practices do heads of collegiate residences currently operate?

* How will heads of collegiate residences need to change to be effective and successful into the future?

3.3 METHODOLOGY

To obtain the information to respond to the research questions and the central propositions of the thesis, it was decided to use three methods: a general survey of heads of collegiate residences, case study visits to specific residences and consultations with those identified as having particular understanding or expertise of the university residential sector.

Given that both quantitative and qualitative information was being sought, such an approach had to be comprehensive. It also needed to be justifiable and this was supported by similar methods having been adopted in previous research of this nature. In particular, survey instruments had been used by Beswick (1984) and McInnis and James (1995) in Australia, Brothers and Hatch (1971) in the United Kingdom and Upcraft (1991) in the
United States to provide both quantitative and qualitative information. As Yin (1984:17) indicates, surveys largely provide answers to questions who, what, where, how many and how much, while case studies answer the research questions how and why. In this study, the survey instrument would provide both forms of information but the approach of case study visits to a representative sample of case studies and wider consultations was deemed appropriate, particularly as more comprehensive qualitative information was being sought.

Survey Instrument

A survey of practice through a questionnaire (Appendix A) sent to the heads of colleges and halls of residence at Australian universities was aimed at identifying leadership philosophies, structural patterns, current practices and encouraging some crystal-ball gazing to identify future expectations and needs. It was intended from the study to develop an evaluation instrument, based on the CSER model of collegiate leadership, which heads and others responsible for leadership of collegiate residences could use to analyse their culture and identify specific issues so that they might better position their residence into the future. With this in mind, the questionnaire design (Appendix A) had four sections:

* **Profile of College/Hall** – designed to identify year of foundation, location, size, composition of residents (e.g. gender, undergraduate and/or postgraduate) and organisational structure.

* **Profile of the Head of College/Hall** – designed to identify gender, age, nationality, qualifications, academic field(s), previous experience (in colleges and elsewhere), career path, position title and status (i.e. full or part-time), and years in the position.

* **Leadership Positions in the Organisational Structure** – designed to identify structural models in operation.

* **Leadership of a College/Hall** – designed to identify from the heads' perspectives leadership philosophies under which they operated, perceived pressures of the position and factors they felt to be associated with present and future success/effectiveness for themselves and their residences.
The response rate was high with 95 of the 113 member Heads of AHAUCHI responding in one of three ways. Firstly, 54 provided a written response to the full questionnaire sent out in October 1995. Another 18 written responses were received to an abbreviated form of the questionnaire sent out in February 1996. In addition, 33 verbal responses were obtained to the abbreviated questionnaire by direct telephone contact with heads.

These telephone contacts were most rewarding as they were warmly received and provided additional verbal feedback as well as direct responses to the questions. This, together with the relatively high response rate to the questionnaire, indicated the considerable level of interest shown by heads in the research. It could be surmised that, in addition to providing an opportunity for professional development, an uncertainty about the environment in which they were operating provided an incentive to participate.

**Case Studies**

Case study one or two day on-site visits to twelve collegiate residences identified from the survey as providing a representative range of characteristics (i.e. ownership, size, era of foundation, student composition, including gender and academic level of residents) were conducted in May 1996.

Structured interviews were undertaken with the head of residence (Appendix B) aimed at identifying perceptions of success/effectiveness, pressures facing residences and some crystal-ball gazing into the future. During each visit, unstructured contacts were made with other key personnel (e.g. senior staff, tutors and other residential staff, administrative staff, student leaders and Council members) with the intention of achieving a wider understanding of the operation, as far as possible, given the constraints of time. Items relating to the culture or organisation of each college/hall were collected and observations were made, where possible.

The overall intention was to identify the likely needs of future heads and residences by analysing the responses from the case study visits to obtain an indication of where the strengths and weaknesses of contemporary residences and heads lie in the four leadership domains of the CSER model. A systematic approach was taken to analyse and interpret the responses of the twelve heads to the interview questions and observations of the researcher to assign values of high, medium or low for each component. The results were then collated and are presented in tabular form in Appendix G. The final assessment of the
current position of each head and his or her residence in each of the four domains has been presented in Figures G.1 to G.4 in chapter 7.

Consultations

Over a period of five years from 1992 to 1997, in preparation for the research phase and subsequently, consultations were made with a number of university and collegiate residence professionals, known to have a wide and detailed knowledge of the operation of collegiate residences, with the intention of expanding the knowledge base and context for the study. Although it was not possible to identify all, some are named in the acknowledgement section. In general, the emphasis of these contacts was either on setting the scene for the research or looking into the crystal-ball in order to provide further insight into assessing the future leadership needs of collegiate residences.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Information obtained from responses to the questionnaires and interviews of heads was categorised into sections which fell within the purview of each of the research questions. Within each question, the source of information was sub-divided into whether the head was from a UOR or a POR. A further minor sub-division of PORs was completed to differentiate between independent and church affiliated residences where such was deemed to be appropriate. Similarly, there was some differentiation between heads operating single entity and central administration–multiple residence structural models within the UOR sector.

Analysis focussed, firstly, on developing an understanding of global trends for all residences and all heads and, secondly, on differentiation between the sectors and within each sector. The technique employed in each case was to identify common themes. Qualitative data, particularly written and verbal responses, was grouped by theme and quantitative data was tabulated and is presented in chapters 4 and 5 and Appendix E. Where possible, conclusions have been drawn from either or both qualitative and quantitative forms. Quoted responses have been included for clarification or support of the conclusions being drawn.

From the questionnaire emerged comparative profiles of the defining characteristics of collegiate residences which indicated some of the differences between residences in each
of the two sectors. These comparative profiles are identified in chapter 4 and from them the selection of twelve residences for case study visits was made. The choice aimed at ensuring that the coverage was as representative as possible in relation to the various categories and characteristics of collegiate residence and heads which had emerged from the questionnaire and other sources such as the AHAUCHI directory. In particular, it aimed to satisfy the following criteria by including:

(i) residences from both university and privately owned sectors,

(ii) residences which provided a range of characteristics in terms of era of foundation, geographical location, size, composition of residents (i.e. gender, undergraduate and/or postgraduate) and organisational structure (i.e. single entity or multiple residence – central administration), and

(iii) heads who provided a range of characteristics in terms of their position, role and personal characteristics in terms of gender, age, nationality, qualifications, academic field(s), previous experience (in colleges and elsewhere), position title and status (i.e. full or part-time), and length of tenure.

In summary, the selection of collegiate residences and heads attempted to provide, as far as possible, a representative sample. The characteristics of the twelve collegiate residences and heads of residence chosen for these visits are provided in Appendix F, including the ratios of characteristics of the collegiate residences and heads selected for the case study visits compared with the percentage ratios of these characteristics for the respective populations. Analysis of the ratios provides a statistical view of the degree to which the sample was representative of the population against each characteristic. It is contended that such an analysis supports the view that the sample was as representative of the population as could be expected, given the number of characteristics to be satisfied.

Trustworthiness and Authenticity

It can be stated that, if an audit trail was conducted, the data collection and analysis would be seen to satisfy concepts of being trustworthy and authentic. Given the nature of the research, it was felt that it was more appropriate to establish that the findings were credible, transferable, dependable and confirmable, as suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1989), than to apply the traditional criteria for validity, reliability and objectivity,
although confidence would be held satisfaction of these where such might be appropriate.

In terms of credibility and dependability, as noted in section 3.3, the response rate to the questionnaire was relatively high for this form of research and this source provided comprehensive and detailed information. The support of heads for the study and considerable and thorough efforts in follow up activity ensured this to be the case.

In terms of transferability and confirmability of information, apart from the high response rate to the questionnaire was that the selection for case study visits was as representative as possible. Particular care was taken to ensure that appropriate procedures were implemented and that results and conclusions could be verified.

The researcher has a background of previous postgraduate study, practical leadership at senior levels in primary, secondary and tertiary levels of educational institutions in public and independent sectors and current involvement in a university residential college through occupation of a senior position. This background has led to sound credibility within the university collegiate residences of Australia and overseas. It is acknowledged that background brings some implicit viewpoint to the discussion but there was no particular agenda or vested interest.

From this unique position, it can be concluded that some confidence is held for the findings of the study and that this would be confirmed by conducting an audit. Throughout the study, there is an integrity in approach to heads and their collegiate residences in terms of confidentiality, information gathering methods and intention to develop positive outcomes which provide a useful guide for the future.

**Limitations of the Study**

There were some limitations of the study and these have been acknowledged although they are not perceived to be critical to any findings. Although a great deal of effort was invested to ensure that the study method was sound and comprehensive and that there was considerable support from those working in the sector, financial resources and time were limited. As these were largely provided by the researcher, it was only possible to visit twelve collegiate residences and there was a need to rely heavily on heads of collegiate residences as the source of information, particularly to test the thesis.
This restriction in source of information led to two further potential limitations. Firstly, it was recognised that there were other potentially valuable sources, such as students, residential and administrative staff, Council members and others. However, further extensions were generally not possible, except in the form of informal consultations. Secondly, although it had been hoped that an assessment might be possible of the state of knowledge of current leadership theory, it was found that many of the heads had little grounding in leadership theory even though they had strong views from reflections on the actual practice of leadership.

Of particular disappointment was that the scope of enquiry did not allow the role of student leadership to be explored. Student leadership and governance and relationships with the head of residence would provide an important further study of its own.

It could be suggested that any study which has taken four years (from 1995 to 1998) to complete may be based on shifting ground and that would be true of this period as the environment has been ever changing. In particular, the financial climate in Australia in general and the university sector in particular, together with the development and use of information technology, have changed markedly over the period. Therefore, the information and views from 1995 and 1996 may have altered before the conclusion of the study in 1998. This is not seen as a limitation of large proportion and anecdotal evidence would tend to suggest that the observations noted and predicted trends have been supported by the reality. Nevertheless, the potential of this apparent limitation is recognised.
PART B

THE CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT
CHAPTER 4

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESIDENCE AND HEADSHIP

To develop approaches for the future, it is important to establish an understanding of what currently exists. This chapter provides an analysis of information drawn from the survey and interviews of heads and the AAHCHI (1995) *Handbook of Australian University Residences*. The defining characteristics of contemporary collegiate residences and their heads are identified and the analysis develops profiles of collegiate residence and headship. A further analysis of the assumptions and leadership styles adopted by current heads adds to this picture and provides a context for leadership of collegiate residences into the future.

For collegiate residences, an obvious starting point is an understanding that they fall within two sectors, that is, those which are owned by their university (UORs), and those which are privately owned (PORs) but affiliated with at least one university. This distinction was noted in chapter 1 and is central to an understanding of university residence in Australia.

Although there are similarities and differences within each sector, major differences exist between these two sectors and are, to a large extent, attributable to historical, geographical and structural factors. There are also differences to be found in student composition, particularly in terms of gender, as the only single-sex colleges are PORs. In the following analysis, some of these differences are brought out in order to develop a statement of the defining characteristics of collegiate residences as they currently exist. Drawn together, the various strands provide profiles of what might be seen as typical UORs and PORs. Further tables and figures supporting the analysis are located in Appendix E.

As with collegiate residences, to develop thoughts on leadership of collegiate residences into the future, it is important to understand the patterns in existence. Section B of the questionnaire (Appendix A) focussed on a range of characteristics, such as gender, age, academic background and professional experience, on which heads of residences could be compared and the later analysis in this chapter identifies similarities and differences in a global sense and by sector and gender. Using a similar approach to that adopted with collegiate residences, it draws the information together to identify who might be seen as
typical female and male heads of UORs and PORs. Tables and figures in Appendix E again provide supporting information.

Having analysed the headship in this way, it was important to identify the influences on which heads base their leadership style. In the questionnaire, heads were asked which leadership theory or personal philosophy most influenced their leadership style and the case study interviews asked heads to describe their leadership style. Analysis of these responses complete the chapter which set out to provide an overview under three headings:

(i) The Defining Characteristics of Contemporary Collegiate Residences
(ii) The Defining Characteristics of Contemporary Heads of Collegiate Residences
(iii) Leadership Theories and Styles of Contemporary Heads

4.1 THE DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTEMPORARY COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES

The principal defining characteristic of collegiate residences is their ownership and Table 4.1 reveals the clear demarcation between the two sectors. In 1995, UORs were in the majority, accounting for 80 of 139 collegiate residences. Of the 59 PORs, 18 classified themselves as independent and 41 identified with a church affiliation of which the Catholic, Uniting and Anglican churches formed the three largest denominations supporting church affiliated colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total No. of Collegiate Residences by Sector (as at 30th April 1995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UORs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of names or titles employed to identify collegiate residences in Australia and a difference exists between the sectors on this dimension. There is some basis for the distinction of PORs being referred to as colleges and UORs as halls of residence, but this does not represent the complete picture. Underlying this use of terms has been a perception that differences in the level of offering may exist between the two
sectors, with private colleges providing a more collegial environment and a greater degree of fulfilment of the components of 1979 definition of collegiate residence than UORs. However, it is not as simple as this.

College provides a universal name for PORs, with 92% having that title, however, the same cannot be said for UORs which have much greater diversity with 33% being identified as Hall, 29% as College, 16% as House and a further 23% with other variations. It would have simplified this study greatly to adopt terminology comparing private colleges with university halls of residence. It would be appropriate to use College to collectively describe PORs but Hall is not a clear choice to represent UORs. For this reason, the acronyms, UORs and PORs, have been adopted to represent the respective sectors.

One of the clearest differences between the sectors has been that there have been two distinct phases in the establishment of collegiate residences. The first phase saw almost exclusive development of PORs but the trend has reversed completely, with the watershed appearing to be World War II, although it is arguable that the conclusive change occurred in the early 1970s, after which no PORs have been founded.

The first college, Christ College, opened in 1846 and by 1900 there were 11 collegiate residences in existence, 9 of which were PORs. By the Second World War, there were 27 collegiate residences in the 6 capital city universities, 23 of which were PORs (70% church sponsored) and 9 of which were single-sex female residences. The most important feature of this pre-Second World War development was that the vast majority (85%) were privately sponsored and there was limited public provision.

| Table 4.2: Historical Development of Australian Collegiate Residences |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                                              | 1846–99 | 1900–39  | 1945–95  | Total    |
| UORs                                         | 2        | 2        | 76       | 80       |
| PORs                                         | 9        | 14       | 36       | 59       |
| Total                                        | 11       | 16       | 112      | 139      |
The post–Second World War period has seen the complete opposite, particularly after 1974. In the fifty years following World War II (1945–95), 112 collegiate residences opened their doors with 76 (68%) being UORs and 36 being PORs. The greatest period of growth was in the 1960s and 1970s which coincided with an expansionary period of new universities, largely in outer–metropolitan and regional areas. It is notable that the last POR to open was in 1974 with all subsequent residences being UORs.

A major reason for the post–Second World War trend towards university ownership was that 30 new universities have been established, most of them away from inner–city areas, both in metropolitan (suburban) areas and regional centres, and, as noted, private sources have not been involved to any extent in this provision. By 1995, 58 (42%) residences were located in regional areas whilst the remaining 81 were in urban areas of which 60 were inner–city (within 5 kilometres of the CBD).

The post–war development of universities in the metropolitan and regional areas also saw the emergence of a new phenomenon of what might be called a central administration – multiple residence structural model. This involves a central university housing office with a managing head and administration co–ordinating a number of residences. In 1995, 87 (63%) of the 139 residences were operating in the traditional structural pattern as single entities but only 29 of these were UORs. In comparison, in 13 metropolitan and regional universities, the remaining 52 residences were operated in multiples of two and six halls of residence with a central university–based administration. All but one of the 52 were UORs.

The trend to a central administration – multiple residence structural model of organisation relates to the historical development and geographical location of residences with the more recently established residences being in regional areas and almost all employing this approach. Only 18 (21%) of the 87 single entity organisations were located in regional areas compared with 40 (77%) of the 52 multiple residence structures. No centrally administered structures existed in the inner–city universities although two (operating 12 residences) were in metropolitan suburbs. All others were in regional centres.

The student composition of collegiate residences produced some differences between the sectors. In 1995, 25,833 residential places were available in the 139 collegiate residences but there was a difference between UORs and PORs in terms of size and gender composition. There was a difference in size of residences with UORs being larger on
average. Across both sectors, the average number of places per residence was 186 but UORs ranged from 53 to 516 places with an average number of 193 places per residence compared with a range from 25 to 328 places with an average of 177 for PORs.

All of the UORs and the majority of PORs favoured the co-residential form with 125 (90%) being co-residential. However, there were 14 present day PORs which were single-sex residences (eight female and six male). This single-sex form dominated the early history and it is notable that 37 residences changed from single-sex to co-residential form, largely in the 1970s. It is also notable that the 14 single-sex residences were confined to five universities in three states (seven in New South Wales, six in Queensland and one in Western Australia). Against the trend to co-residence, five single-sex residences commenced in the post-World War II period.

**Towards a Typical Collegiate Residence**

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, to develop approaches to the future, it is important to establish an understanding of what currently exists. Table 4.3 provides a statistical summary of UORs and PORs in 1995 which, together with the previous analysis, can be used to make conclusions on what are the defining characteristics of the contemporary collegiate residence.

In summary, UORs were dominant in post-Second World War development, particularly in terms of their growth in the metropolitan and regional areas and use of a central administration – multiple residence structural model. They were more diverse in name and, on average, larger in size. On the other hand, PORs were dominant in the pre-Second World War period, tended to be smaller and located in the inner-city regions, as affiliated residences of the older universities, and operating as single entities with some having a single-sex student population.

An interesting end to this component of the study was to refine the information one step further and propose a typical profile of the contemporary collegiate residence from each sector. In answer to the question, "Is there a typical UOR and POR?", the profile for each sector could read as follows:

*The typical university owned residence* has Hall in its name and has just under 200 undergraduate male and female students in residence. It opened in the 1970s to provide
collegiate residence accommodation for a regional university and is one of four similar halls of residence administered from a central office within the university. In comparison, the typical privately owned residence has College in its name and has around 175 undergraduate male and female students in residence. It is a single entity with a church foundation and opened as a single-sex college prior to World War II in one of the six inner-city universities but went co-residential in the 1970s.

| Table 4.3: Summary of Statistical Information for University Owned Residences (UORs) and Privately Owned Residences (PORs) as at 30th April 1995 |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| * Number of residences                          | UORs  | PORs  |
|                                                | 80     | 59     |
|                                                | 58%    | 42%    |
| * Number of heads                               | 55     | 58     |
|                                                | 49%    | 51%    |
| * Size                                          |        |        |
| Smallest No. of res. places                     | 53     | 25     |
| Largest No. of res. places                      | 516    | 328    |
| Av. No. of res. places                          | 193    | 177    |
| * Era of Foundation                             |        |        |
| Pre WWII                                        | 4      | 23     |
|                                                | 15%    | 85%    |
| Post WWII                                       | 76     | 36     |
|                                                | 68%    | 32%    |
| * Location                                      |        |        |
| Inner-city                                      | 10     | 50     |
|                                                | 17%    | 83%    |
| Metropolitan                                    | 18     | 3      |
|                                                | 86%    | 14%    |
| Regional                                        | 52     | 6      |
|                                                | 90%    | 10%    |
| * Structure                                     |        |        |
| Single entity                                   | 29     | 58     |
|                                                | 33%    | 67%    |
| Central admin – multiple residence              | 51     | 1      |
|                                                | 98%    | 2%     |
| * Gender                                        |        |        |
| Single-sex female                               | 0      | 8      |
|                                                | 0%     | 100%   |
| Single-sex male                                 | 0      | 6      |
|                                                | 0%     | 100%   |
| Co-residential                                  | 80     | 45     |
|                                                | 64%    | 36%    |
| * Student Academic Level                        |        |        |
| Undergraduate                                   | 78     | 57     |
|                                                | 56%    | 44%    |
| Postgraduate                                    | 2      | 2      |
|                                                | 50%    | 50%    |

Having reached a point where a picture of the contemporary collegiate residence for each sector has been drawn, the next step was to repeat the process for the heads of residences and the following section provides such an analysis.
4.2 THE DEFINING CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTEMPORARY HEADS OF COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES

The survey produced some differences between the heads of collegiate residences and these are brought out in the following analysis which concludes with an identification of defining characteristics of male and female heads of UORs and PORs. An important distinction is drawn between the position of head of residence and the person in the position. The position title, nature of appointment being full-time or part-time and length of tenure relate to the position whereas the age, nationality, qualifications and experience of incumbent heads are personal dimensions.

Out of a population of 113 heads who were members of AHAUCHI in 1995, the number of responses to specific sections of the survey varied between 102 and 108. In the following analysis, percentages are used to provide an indication of trends rather than raw figures as the slight variation in response rate for different characteristics would make comparison more difficult. Table 4.4 shows that, by gender, 25% of the heads were female and 75% were male and, by sector, 45% of the respondent heads were from UORs compared with 55% from PORs. Whilst heads of UORs were thus in the minority, 58% of all residences were in that sector and, therefore, they were running larger operations on average than their privately owned counterparts (i.e. average of 193 residential places compared with 177).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UORs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The title adopted by each collegiate residence to identify its position of head of residence provides some important distinctions between the two sectors and genders. The most common title was Principal (30%) followed by Head (19%), Master and Warden (16%), Rector (7%), Director (5%) and Manager (4%). Heads of UORs were most commonly known as Head (32%) followed by Warden (21%) and Principal (15%), whereas heads of PORs were most commonly known as Principal (41%), Master (23%), Rector and Warden (11% each).
An important trend to be noted in title nomenclature is a move to gender neutral terminology. As noted, the gender neutral Principal was the most adopted title overall and for female heads it accounted for 59% and, together with Head (22%), it almost encompassed the field. Male heads had a more diverse range of titles for the position with a relatively equal distribution between Master (21%), Principal (20%), Warden (19%) and Head (17%).

The nature of appointment to the position, in terms of whether a head is employed full-time or part-time, provides another point of comparison. 19% of heads were part-time in the position and it was notable that all of these had other positions in universities either in academic, administrative or research positions. A higher proportion of heads of UORs (32%) were part-time compared with their counterparts in PORs (9%) and the proportion of male heads (23%) who were part-time was higher than for female heads (7%). Male heads of UORs were more likely to be part-time than any other category with 42% being part-time. No female head of a UOR was part-time. The evidence suggests part-time headship, combined with an appointment in the affiliated university, is seen as appropriate in some UORs with male heads whereas in PORs the position is most commonly seen as requiring a full-time commitment.

In terms of the personal characteristics of heads, the median age for both sectors and both genders fell within the 51-55 year age bracket. With no head younger than 30 years of age, it is a position for persons who have worked in other arenas before taking up headship. Also, it is a profession in which heads of UORs tend to be younger than heads of PORs and female heads tend to be younger than male heads. Both female and male heads of UORs tend to be younger than those in PORs. It appears that heads of UORs see collegiate residences as a profession earlier in their careers, rather more like the American experience where there is a clearer career structure and accreditation for housing professionals, whereas heads of PORs tend to graduate to the position later in their careers.

The nationality of heads provided no surprises with the vast majority (82%) being Australian born and with those born overseas coming mostly from the UK or NZ. This may have been different in the pre-war years with perhaps a higher proportion appointed to headships in the traditional colleges from overseas but that no longer exists to any extent. There were proportionately more overseas born heads leading UORs with 25% born overseas and male heads were more likely to have come from overseas with 20%
An analysis of academic qualifications showed that 75% of heads had a Masters degree or doctorate. Using academic qualification levels at this level as a guide, heads of PORs (77%) were more highly qualified than heads of UORs (71%) and male heads (83%) were more highly qualified than female heads (50%). Male heads in PORs (83%) were most highly qualified, followed by male heads of UORs (82%), female heads of PORs (56%) and female heads of UORs (40%). It would appear that greater store may be placed on academic qualifications in choosing heads in PORs although observation of 1996 and 1997 headship appointments indicates that doctorates now tend to be seen as a pre-requisite, irrespective of sector which indicates an overall upward trend in expectation.

In an attempt to identify the academic background from which heads come, heads were asked to specify their academic field(s). With the possibility of more than one field per respondent bringing 169 responses, any analysis of apparent differences between the sectors and genders can only be stated as tendencies. Many more heads had a background in the humanities than the sciences although heads with science backgrounds appeared to be more prevalent in UORs but for mathematics the reverse was true. For backgrounds in mathematics and the humanities, heads of PORs were more prevalent.

There were particular areas of the humanities in which either sector was dominant. More heads of UORs had backgrounds in commerce and administration whereas heads of PORs were dominant in the fields of theology and theological studies, social science/politics and, to a lesser extent, in psychology/counselling and education. There is an historical basis for this with many PORs having a church foundation and a high expectation of pastoral leadership. With the larger central administration – multiple residence structures, there may be a tendency for heads of these UORs to be perceived more as overall managers and less as requiring a close relationship with students.

There was little difference between academic backgrounds of male and female heads with only a marginally higher proportion of female heads from the sciences than male heads and vice versa for the humanities. The main female domains appeared to be mathematics, English, English literature, languages, administration and education. The main male domains appeared to be the non-earth sciences, theology, psychology/counselling, social science/politics, and commerce.
Three measures of experience of current heads were surveyed: the period in the present position, what position they had held previously and what experience they had in collegiate residence as a student, tutor or other senior position.

There was a high turnover of heads with half (50%) having taken up their current position in the last five years. However, there also appeared to be stability, once established, with 25% having held the position for longer than 10 years and 11% for longer than fifteen years. The initial period is obviously one which is difficult to negotiate but, having done so, longer tenure follows.

The initial turnover of heads in the first five year period of appointment was higher in PORs (52% compared with 47%), but once established a marginally higher proportion of heads of the PORs appeared to stay longer than 10 years (26% compared with 22%). The gender pattern was the same with more male heads having taken up the position in the last 5 years than female heads (53% compared with 42%) but, once established, a higher proportion of male heads had remained for fifteen years or more (12% compared with 8%).

In answer to the question, "Where do heads come from?", the largest source was university positions (40%), followed by senior collegiate residence positions, including another headship (19%), schools (16%) and church positions (9%). A higher proportion of heads of UORs (68%) came from university and senior collegiate residence positions than of heads of PORs (53%). Conversely, school and church positions provided a higher proportion of heads for the PORs (35%) than UORs (11%). A gender comparison showed that female heads came from university (31%), school (31%) and senior collegiate residence (23%) positions whereas male heads came from university positions (44%), senior positions in collegiate residences (18%), church (12%) and school positions (12%). That is, higher proportions of male heads came from university positions whilst female heads came more from school and senior collegiate residence positions, but not headships. No female head had previously held a headship position as compared with ten of the male heads.

Arguably the most outstanding statistic to emerge was that more than a quarter of heads (26%) had no prior experience of collegiate residences before taking up headship. Of those who had previous experience, the most common experience was as an undergraduate and/or postgraduate residential student (45%), followed by those having held a senior
position (31%) and tutor (20%). The proportion who had no previous experience of collegiate residence was higher for heads of PORs. However, heads of PORs formed a higher proportion of those with experience as a tutor whereas Heads of UORs formed a higher proportion of those who had been students or held a senior position in a collegiate residence. A slightly higher proportion of female heads (28%) than male heads (25%) had no previous experience but male heads formed a higher proportion with experience as residential students, tutors and deans or other senior positions.

The question of previous experience is an important one for the future, particularly if the trend of over a quarter of heads not having any experience of collegiate residence continues. It has ramifications in a sector which, as outlined in chapter 1, is facing a range of pressures and where survival may be threatened. A number of issues emerge from this finding and relate to the future. Of particular interest must be the answer, if there is one, to the question: "Should there be a career structure for heads with previous experience being desirable or necessary, or are there advantages to be gained from bringing in leaders from outside the profession?"

Towards a Typical Head of Residence

As noted at the commencement of this chapter, any projection into the future begins with an understanding of the status quo. From the above analysis of information on components of the position and characteristics of persons in the position, as at 30th April 1995, it is possible to draw together an overall profile of the defining characteristics of heads of collegiate residences and comparative profiles by sector and by gender.

Summarising the above analysis produces the following combined profile of the position and heads in the position. The most common title is Principal (30%) followed by Head (19%), Master and Warden (16%), Rector (7%), Director (5%) and Manager (4%) and 19% are part-time with another responsibility within the university. By personal characteristics, 75% are male, the median age is between 51 and 55 years, 82% are Australian born, 75% have a Doctorate or Masters degree and considerably more come from backgrounds in humanities than sciences. 50% have taken up the position in the last 5 years whilst 25% have held the position for more than 10 years. In experience brought to the position, most come from university positions (40%), followed by senior collegiate residence positions (19%), schools (16%) and church positions (9%) and 26% have no previous experience of collegiate residence. Of those with such experience, most
commonly it was as a residential student (45%), senior collegiate residence position (31%), or tutor (20%).

The analysis can be carried further to develop comparative profiles of heads by sector and there appear to be few major differences, simply tendencies. For heads of UORs the most common title is Head (32%) followed by Warden (21%) and Principal (15%). They are more likely to be part-time (32%), younger and from overseas, less qualified and more from the humanities but with a higher proportion from the sciences, commerce and administration. Tenure is slightly more stable in the first five years but they are less likely to stay for longer periods. They have more tertiary education experience with a higher proportion coming from university and senior collegiate residence positions and also experience as residential students.

Heads of PORs tend to be called Principal (41%), Master (23%), Rector and Warden (11%) with a lower likelihood of being part-time (9%). On average they are older, more highly qualified, still largely in the humanities, particularly theology, social science, psychology, counselling and education. They have a higher initial turnover but, once established, they stay longer in the position. A high proportion are from school and church positions and a higher proportion have no previous experience of collegiate residence.

A parallel step is to develop comparative profiles for each gender. The majority of female heads are called Principal (59%) followed by Head (22%) and a small proportion are Part-time (7%). They are younger on average than male heads, less likely to come from overseas and fewer have a Doctorate or Masters degree (50%). A marginally higher proportion come from the sciences than male heads with main domains being mathematics, English, English literature, languages, administration and education. Their turnover is lower in the last five years than male heads but they tend to have a marginally shorter length of stay in the position. Higher proportions come from university positions but they also have higher proportion with no previous experience of collegiate residence but not one female head had come from a previous collegiate residence headship.

Male heads have a wider range of titles with Master (21%), Principal (20%), Warden (19%) and Head (17%) with a higher proportion being part-time (23%). They are older on average than female heads, are more likely to come from overseas and are more highly qualified with 83% having a Doctorate or Masters degree. A marginally higher proportion come from humanities than female heads with their main domains being non-earth
sciences, theology, psychology/counselling, social sciences/politics and commerce. Their turnover is higher in the last five years than female heads but they have a marginally longer length of stay in the position. A higher proportion come from school and senior collegiate residence positions and a higher proportion of the latter had previous experience as residential students, tutors and deans and other senior collegiate residence positions, including headship.

As for collegiate residences, an interesting end to this component of the study was to take the information one step further and develop a global profile of typical characteristics of current day heads and comparative profiles for each sector and for each gender. The following statements attempt to answer the question, "Is there a typical head of collegiate residence?", and the profiles for each could read as follows:

*The typical head* is a 53 year old Australian born male Principal of a privately owned College, a position he has occupied for 4 years. He has a PhD in social sciences and came to headship from a university academic teaching position and was previously a residential student of a privately owned College.

*The typical head of a university owned residence* is a 47 year old male operating a full-time position at a university owned Hall with the title of Head of Residence. He is Australian born and has a Masters degree in humanities and some background in administration. He has been in the position for 7 years and previously held a university academic position and was a student and a resident advisor at a university owned Hall. *The typical head of a privately owned residence* is a 53 year old male in a full-time position at a privately owned church College with the title Principal. He is Australian born and has a PhD in theology. He has been in the position 4 years having previously been a professor in a Theological Hall. He had no previous experience of collegiate residence before taking up the position.

*The typical female head* is Principal of a university owned Hall, a full-time position. She is 45 years old and Australian born with a Bachelor of Arts majoring in English literature and French. She has held the position for 3 years having come from a senior position in secondary education and she had no previous experience of collegiate residence before taking up the position.*The typical male head* is Master of a privately owned College which is a full-time position. He is 54 years of age, was born in Australia and has a PhD in social science and psychology and a background in counselling students. This is the
third year of his second collegiate residence headship and, prior to his first, he was a residential student and tutor in a privately owned College and later Dean of a similar College.

4.3 LEADERSHIP THEORIES AND STYLES

Having analysed the position of headship (by title and nature of appointment) and identified aspects of the profile of current heads by (age, nationality, academic field(s) and qualifications, years of tenure, previous positions held and experience in collegiate residences), it was considered worthwhile to attempt to identify the influences on which current heads base their leadership styles. The questionnaire posed the question: "Do you have a leader, leadership theory or personal philosophy who/which most influences your leadership style as Head?" Table 4.5 indicates that responses to this question were received from 49 heads (20 from UORs and 29 from PORs) and these were many and varied, ranging from the quick-fire to the elaborate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Themes</th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative/Consultative/Devolution of Responsibility/Empowerment/ 'Team' Leadership/Guided Democracy'</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian principles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Themes</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The open nature of the question did not tie heads to tight response parameters but the overall impression was that most heads did not operate under one distinct espoused theory of leadership, although each appeared to have a general framework of thought within which he or she worked. Only four heads identified clear allegiance to a leadership theorist with Stephen Covey (Principle Centered Leadership and Seven Habits of Highly
Effective People) and Robert Greenleaf (Servant Leadership) being mentioned. However, a number of leadership concepts from the literature on leadership emerged, such as primus inter pares, chaos theory, transformational, consultative and collaborative leadership.

The range of responses indicated the diversity of theories or philosophies which heads bring to their performance in the role. However, amongst the 63 identified themes, the two most obvious frameworks which appeared were those which indicated operating within Christian principles and those who indicated operating within a collaborative and consultative framework. These two effectively covered two-thirds of the themes to emerge and the remaining responses were discretely different and did not seem to fall within an identifiable collective framework.

By sector, heads of UORs displayed a greater diversity with a little over half nominating other themes compared with a quarter of their counterparts in PORs. They also tended to operate slightly more under a collaborative and consultative framework. Typical comments from heads of both sectors were:

"Consultation wherever possible with residents and staff, provided that they understand the final decision is mine! Maybe the term 'Guided Democracy' could be used – turning more and more to Stephen Covey's work."

"My basic leadership style is democratic, counselling staff and students frequently, getting their feedback and allowing them to exercise initiative. Within this, there are times when I need to be autocratic to maintain the direction I want the College to take and to implement the policy of the Council. I am also, when necessary a transformational leader, encouraging staff to follow a vision for the College and not being afraid to make...any changes."

"A leadership of shared responsibility and encouragement among the staff. All are invited to be pastorally involved with the students in a manner appropriate to their own duties within the College and their special gifts of personality. A similar invitation is offered to the students as they are called to be a community."

The really obvious and anticipated difference lay with the third of POR heads who nominated operating under Christian principles. Not one of the heads of UORs signified operating within this framework. Examples of responses of heads of PORs who identified operating under Christian principles were:

"I believe in the relevance of Christian values to this style of living – and the challenge of living a community life well!!"
"The leadership style of the Master of a Christian University College should be that of the Christian scholar...."

"As a Uniting Church Minister, I see my work as Master as the form of Christian ministry to which I have been called."

"Christian discipleship, including some 'non-conformist' elements. (Management team with Master 'primus inter pares' i.e. first among equals)."

An extension of the philosophical or theoretical leadership modes under which heads operated was obtained from the smaller sample of twelve heads whose residences were visited as case studies. They were asked directly: "How would you describe your leadership style?" Five heads identified with the term consultative while only two gave responses which would not fit within this framework although there was a progression of the degree of devolution and consultation from considerable to minimal. By sector, there was an impression that the heads of PORs tend towards the more open consultative end of this continuum, which was in line with the findings under theoretical or philosophical influences, although with such a small sample this could not be seen as significant. The following responses (the first from the head of a POR and all others from heads of UORs) serve to illustrate that progression:

"I operate under the 'Principle of Subsidiarity' – whatever a small body can do a larger body should not do. I play the position like a centre in basketball feeding the ball to others to do the job in a sense of delegating."

"Set the structure in place, devolve the authority and responsibility and cause people to create their own accountabilities."

"'Hands on' and 'open door' with qualities of being egalitarian – equality, fairness, trusting (once established) and trusted by students because I stick to my word, rules and principles."

"Guided democracy. I try not to interfere in student affairs but...I like to be in control!"

"Strong leadership based on consultancy."

'I like to know what's going on and am 'hands on'...If I appoint someone to do a job, I like them to get on with it. I don't suffer fools gladly but they will be able to say I cannot be bribed!"
The analysis in this chapter outlines the current picture on the two dimensions of the Australian university collegiate residences and their heads. Its value, apart from the knowledge that no previous research has been completed in this form, is that it provides the contemporary backdrop for both dimensions against which the future can be considered and, as such sets the scene for the analysis in chapters 6 and 7.
CHAPTER 5

PERSPECTIVES OF SUCCESS

Having identified the defining characteristics of collegiate residences and their heads, another dimension of this study was to ascertain what perspectives heads had of the components of success in their residence. As shown in chapter 2, Boyer (1987) and Andrews (1994) had provided two perceptions of what makes a 'good' college and a number of related questions were asked of heads. Responses were received from 54 heads to questions in Section D of the questionnaire (Appendix A) and the interview questions (Appendix B) to the twelve heads whose residences were chosen for case studies.

In response to the questionnaire, heads were asked:

(i) to provide mission statements,
(ii) to identify the main goal they had for their residence,
(iii) to indicate what they believed to be the main strengths of their residence,
(iv) to indicate factors which most inhibited or constrained their ability to achieve the established aims of their residence, and
(v) to identify traits, factors or indicators which they felt made a successful or effective year.

In addition, the twelve heads who were interviewed were asked:

(i) to identify current perceptions of their residence,
(ii) to whom the residence was accountable, and
(iii) to identify how effectiveness or success of their residence, programmes, staff and students was evaluated.

The first part of the chapter is an analysis of the questionnaire responses which groups similar answers under common themes and, where possible, identifies any differences between the responses of heads from UORs and PORs. Tables categorising the number of responses under each theme are included together with selected comments. In the latter part of the chapter, selected comments from the interviews are included to illuminate themes to emerge from the case studies.
It is very important, in analysing the figures in the Tables, to understand that the number of responses from each sector was different. As a general rule, the number of responses for each question was considerably higher from heads of PORs and a mere comparison of raw numbers would be misleading. The real comparison is between the proportion of responses from each sector proposing a particular theme.

5.1 SURVEY RESPONSES

Mission Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: Mission Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Question: If a mission statement or a statement of aims and objectives exists or both, please attach a copy to this completed response sheet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ideals/Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care/caring/collegiate community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian values/principles/spiritual development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducive environment for learning, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance/understanding of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility (self-governance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Collective Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic excellence/achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/personal development or growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for life/service to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of independence/respect for individuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean, safe accommodation/quality facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, sporting and cultural programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Statements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Published mission statements (or equivalent) were provided for 48 collegiate residences and are included as a resource in Appendix H. To draw the threads together, the 228
identified sub-parts were categorised under the headings (a) ideals/Values and (b) Provisions. Table 5.1 indicates that, although these categories were undoubtedly interdependent, four-fifths of responses identified ideals/values related to the collegiate or community environment to be fostered or to individual and collective outcomes for students. The remaining responses can be seen as provisions relating to facilities and programmes. Therefore, whilst the provisions may be considered to be important, particularly clean, safe accommodation and other facilities and an extensive supporting programme, in general, achievement of ideals/values were more highly sought after by those who framed the mission statements. To be expected of educational institutions, academic achievement was strongly emphasised, but equal emphasis was placed on the creation of a caring, collegiate community. For many residences, this involved support for certain values or principles and providing support for the personal development of students beyond their academic achievements.

The Main Goals of Heads

There were some differences between the focus of heads and that of the published mission statements. Table 5.2 shows that there were 91 responses and, given free reign, the answers from heads were more diverse in range and descriptive language than the mission statements. Eight responses had to be identified as other as they did not fit within the chosen categories. However, a similar pattern emerged with two-thirds of responses emphasising ideals/values and a quarter provisions. Compared with the mission statements, where environment and outcomes were relatively evenly weighted, heads tended to emphasise outcomes more than environment. Personal growth and academic achievement were most highly rated followed by the provision of a learning environment. Even the terminology learning environment may indicate a wider emphasis on ideals such as respect for diversity rather than a more direct emphasis on such ideals as development of Christian faith, although some heads would still hold strongly to their importance.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, an awareness of the response rate from each sector is crucial in identifying any differences between the sectors. Of the 91 responses to this question, 57 were from PORs and 34 from UORs so any analysis depends on a proportional assessment rather than a direct comparison of the raw figures in Table 5.2.
### Table 5.2: The Main Goals of Heads

(Question: As you see it, what is the main goal of your College?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Ideals/Values</th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Learning environment/community of scholars</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect for individuality/different cultures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Collective Outcomes</td>
<td>Personal growth (intellectual/social)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic achievement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation for life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social awareness/service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership and responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Clean/safe/secure accommodation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>Support/guidance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic/social/cultural programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Real differences might have been expected between the sectors but, apart from a greater emphasis on provision of safe, secure accommodation from heads of UORs being largely counterbalanced by the ideal of creating a Christian environment for some PORs, the breakdown of figures for each sector was remarkably similar. An illustration of this unity with slight diversity in emphasis is shown by the following comments, the first two being from heads of UORs and the latter two from heads of PORs:

"To provide a safe, friendly environment in which tertiary students can live at the lowest possible price."

"To provide a safe and secure environment conducive to academic achievement, intellectual inquiry and the social, cultural, personal and intellectual development of all members."
"To provide an efficiently managed residential community within a Christian context that provides opportunities for each individual to achieve their personal and academic potential."

"To form a community of scholars based on gospel principles."

It would seem that virtual unanimity in the expectations of heads existed across both sectors with the one exception of heads from church affiliated colleges placing greater emphasis on Christian faith and principles.

**Perceived Strengths of Collegiate Residence**

When asked to provide perceptions of the strengths of their residences, again the tendency was for heads to see strengths in terms of the ideals/values. Table 5.3 indicates that just under two-thirds of responses fell within this category compared with a quarter nominating provisions. Within the ideals/values category, achievement of a welcoming, caring, community spirit was noted more often as a strength ahead of outcomes such as pleasing academic results or student empowerment. So there was a correlation between goals held for residences by their heads and perceptions of strengths. Again, the diversity of answers was notable with fourteen responses identified in the other category and a new category was necessary under provisions to include quality of management and staff.

In analysing the figures from Table 5.3, again it is important to remember the proviso that comparison between the sectors needs to be based on proportion of responses within each sector rather than a direct comparison of raw figures. There were 51 responses from heads of UORs and 69 from heads of PORs. On proportional figures, minor differences emerged between the sectors with heads of UORs tending to give more emphasis to the diversity of student body and quality of management and programmes:

"Its strong tolerance of cultural and ethnic diversity, and a mutual sense of purpose and support among the residents."

"Degree of responsibility given to students to run things – (this does mean risk-taking – things don’t always come-off!!)"

"Value for money – quality and variety of services per $ paid."

"That it is managed well, and is financially very successful."
Table 5.3: Collegiate Residence Strengths

(Question: What do you believe are the main strengths of your College?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>Ideals/Values</th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Community spirit/friendly/caring/welcoming</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Diversity' in student body</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong pastoral care</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian principles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong alumni association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Collective Outcomes</td>
<td>Academic results</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student responsibility/student empowerment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Services/facilities provided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordability/Value for money</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Quality of management/staff/‘team’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td>'Diversity' of programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural life/social activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Statements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heads of PORs provided a much more diverse range of responses with more emphasis on community spirit, Christian principles, academic results and services and facilities than heads of UORs:

"We are known as a 'friendly, caring' college. I believe that this is the outcome from our stated aim to be a 'Christian College in the Catholic Tradition'."

"Providing a range of services which assist students to develop their potential especially academic and professional preparation."

"It is a tertiary support institution with some educational facilities and provisions. It is not an educational facility – the two should not be confused."
Factors which Inhibit or Constrain

In analysing the factors which heads found to be constraints, the responses reflected a convergence of two main factors. Table 5.4 shows that financial constraints and inadequate facilities accounted for a third of responses and, together with lack of good tutors and staff and concerns about programme balance, the provisions category accounted for more than half of the concerns. Student behaviour, traditions & alcohol and lack of university support and bureaucracy were seen to provide significant constraints to achieving the environmental ideals heads had for their residence. Some were concerned that low enrolments and high student turnover made it difficult to achieve their goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.4: Factors which Inhibit or Constrain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Which factors most inhibit or constrain your ability to achieve the established aims of your College?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Ideals/Values</th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behaviour/traditions/alcohol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University direction/lack of support/red tape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Collective Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low enrolments/high student turnover</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial constraints</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of good 'tutors/staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of balance academic/social/sporting programme</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Statements</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into account the different response rates with 37 and 63 from heads of UORs and PORs, respectively, there were differences in emphasis on constraints between the sectors. Proportionately, financial constraints, inadequate facilities, lack of university support and bureaucracy were more keenly felt by heads of UORs:
"Financial constraints - majority of our residents are from rural areas. Fees are currently at the limit of affordability."

"The fabric of the building greatly limits group social interaction - there is only one small common room. The fabric is also close to the end of its economic life, and the present location of the Hall has uncertain but very limited life."

"Lack of understanding of senior university staff of the possibilities for halls and colleges"

"Incredible red-tape bureaucratic processes of the University"

Heads of PORs were more concerned about student behaviour, traditions and alcohol, lack of good tutors and staff, and a number of other concerns:

"A dying tradition of 'Private School' style of bullying, bastardization, sporting worship."

"So-called traditions like 'freshenerisation', community's abuse of alcohol."

"Lack of residential facilities for postgrads/married students."

"Difficulty in getting excellent tutors."

It was notable that heads of PORs identified a range of additional concerns. Four heads of PORs noted concerns about their Board/Council in terms of its large size or lack of support or specific abilities. Another three heads of PORs were concerned about a duality of operation with their college attempting to cater for both theological teaching and university residence and three further comments expressed concern about the limited horizons of students.

**Measuring Effectiveness and Success**

Heads were asked to identify traits, factors or indicators which they felt would indicate that their residence had been effective or successful at the end of a year. Table 5.5 reveals four dominant responses, all within the ideals/values categories, which accounted for a little over two-thirds of responses. Full occupancy, a high proportion of returning students and high numbers of applications were clearly seen as the most positive indicators acting as a vote of confidence from existing students and the market in performance of the residence against expectations. Supportive positive exit survey responses reinforced success from a student perspective as did the head's subjective assessment of a pleasing...
community spirit or happy feel. Academic achievement was also highly rated as being indicative of effectiveness or a successful outcome flowing from support given within the residence to its students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 5.5: Measuring College Effectiveness/Success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Question: At the end of a year, what traits/factors/indicators would make you feel that the College had been effective/successful?)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) <strong>Ideals/Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 'feel/community spirit/‘Happy campers’'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/Collective Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications/occupancy/retention rate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic results</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive exit survey responses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial viability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Statements</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even allowing for the different response rates of 44 and 62 from heads of UORs and PORs, respectively, there were great similarities between the sectors although heads of UORs tended to focus more directly on the environment and outcomes:

"Happy campers who want to return or affiliate with their College."

"Academic results, bearing in mind that not all residents are HD material."

"Recent resident survey gave us a mean score of four out of five for staff responsiveness...."

Heads of PORs also tended to focus on environment and outcomes, but they indicated a higher proportion of other traits, factors or indicators on which they judged effectiveness
or success. These included factors such as staff retention and morale, consensus on achievement of goals, achievement of a balance in college culture and even the state in which rooms have been left by departing students:

"As I look around the dining room I see residents who sit at different tables with different people each meal time and these meal times are characterised by warmth of communication."

"Academic results which show that the students' learning has been enhanced and not hindered by their being in College."

"Well run College in terms of value for money, staff relationships and service and administration."

"An effective environment for study. This presumes an awareness of the needs of others and an effective balance within each individual between the intellectual, social, physical and spiritual growth."

Conclusions from the Survey

There were a number of conclusions to be drawn from the responses to the sections of the questionnaire reviewed above. Overall, there were many similarities but the responses also provided an indication of the differences in emphasis of heads from each sector and the following provides a brief summary of those conclusions:

(i) The collected mission statements clearly identified ideals/values of a caring collegiate community environment and individual or collective outcomes ahead of the provision of facilities and programmes.

(ii) The responses of the heads, when asked to identify their main goal, were more diverse than those espoused in the mission statements. There was still an emphasis on the environment and outcomes ahead of provisions but this was not as marked. Little difference was noted between heads from the two sectors, with the one exception that heads from church affiliated colleges placed greater emphasis on Christian faith and principles.

(iii) There was a correlation between the main goals of heads and their perceptions of strength for their residence although an even wider diversity of responses emerged, including a category to include quality of management and staff. Minor differences were noted between the sectors with heads of UORs giving more emphasis to
student body diversity and quality of management and programmes whereas heads of PORs were more diverse in placing more emphasis on community spirit, Christian principles, academic results and services and facilities.

(iv) The main inhibiting or constraining factors were lack of finances and facilities and concerns about lack of university support, student behaviour, staffing and programme. The lack of finances and facilities and concerns about the relationship with university were felt more by Heads of UORs whilst Heads of PORs gave more emphasis to student behaviour, particularly in terms of traditions and alcohol, lack of good tutors and staff, and a diverse range of other concerns, including the relationship with their governing body.

(v) High occupancy and retention rates, academic success, together with positive feedback from exit surveys and a subjective assessment of community spirit were the dominant indicators of success for both sectors. The only real difference between the sectors was that heads of PORs indicated a wider range of indicators, including staff retention and morale and achievement of a balance in college culture.

5.2 CASE STUDY RESPONSES

In addition to the analysis of responses to Section D of the questionnaire, the heads of twelve representative collegiate residences (seven UORs and five PORs) were interviewed using the format outlined in Appendix B. Their responses to three questions provided a further insight into the thoughts of heads on components of effectiveness or success.

Current Perceptions

The twelve heads were asked the question: "How would you describe current perception(s) of...College/Hall? Are you doing anything to alter these?" In particular, responses were sought on perceptions from inside and outside. Inside and outside were taken to be synonymous with the immediate and wider communities identified in Figure 3.1. Perceptions from inside were universally seen as positive and some statements reflecting this were:
"Very good – students returning from NAAUC Conference say how good it is."

"...is the place to be!"

"We are proud of what we are!"

Identification of outsider perceptions, including those from the affiliated university and beyond, were more diverse and ranged from the positive to the negative. At the positive end, such comments as the following were forthcoming:

"Parents give us good 'vibes'."

"The University Council and faculties are pleased with the transformation, purpose, focus and standards. The community sees our involvement in sport and community service as being positively involved in the community."

"...we have a good name in the town."

"The perception is changing to the positive and there is starting to be an acceptance of the Colleges into the University. They are recognising the $ value of Colleges to the University (We've done a lot of lobbying!) and the International Office guarantees a number of places."

"The vast majority of University people are happy that we look after our students extremely well with a minimum of fuss and fandango!"

There were those who identified both positive and negative perceptions:

"Many academics for and many anti. Those anti see it as an unsuitable academic environment with too much sport and social life. Faculty lunches help to build bridges as does the Vice-Chancellors hope that academics will be attached to a College."

"...is seen as a university college with very high standards...The general university students see...as a place for privileged students, but this is not necessarily the case."

At the negative end, the heads were extremely open about perceptions held by some, as shown by the following comments:

"All girls who can't live in co-ed – scared of guys!"

"Animal House! There are some negative perceptions from some of the university hierarchy."

"There is a strong perception that...is 'elitist' and for the wealthy and self-satisfied, more concerned with social prestige than academic excellence."
As might be expected, the heads who identified the more negative perceptions, especially those relating to single-sex attitudes and behaviour, wealth and privilege, were from the PORs. Each indicated that these perceptions did not necessarily reflect the reality. It was clearly apparent that efforts were being made to address issues giving rise to negative perceptions, particularly through enhanced liaison with university staff and through behaviour modification in the residences, but some perceptions were seen to be entrenched and, therefore, very difficult to change.

**Accountability**

The question asked was “To whom/which groups do you see...College/Hall being accountable? To whom do you see yourself accountable?” Under the responsive leadership domain of the CSER model, heads would understand accountability on two levels similar to those of inside and outside in the previous question. That is, there would be accountability to an immediate community, including the students (past and present), parents, staff (residential and administrative), Council, and to a wider community, including the University, business and industry, government and society in general.

On accountability to the wider community, there was an obvious difference in structure with all PORs having a College Council. Although two UORs had a Board, the more common arrangement was a direct reporting function from the head to the university through a member of the administration (e.g. Deputy Vice-Chancellor). In any case, all of the heads of UORs indicated accountability to the university whereas only one of the heads of PORs identified this level of accountability. Only one head identified accountability beyond the university, nominating accountability to the community and state and federal governments, although four of the five heads of PORs identified accountability to church authorities. It could be argued that the university and church are, for their respective sectors, immediate community rather than a wider community. However, it was notable that eleven of the twelve heads did not identify with a concept of accountability to wider community which would include business and industry, government or society in general.

In relation to the immediate community, it was most striking that four heads (two from each sector) did not nominate accountability to their students. However, four placed them first and one referred to them as “customers – our clients” and another as “members”. One head of a UOR identified a very close accountability by using the saying "He who pays
the piper, calls the tune." Heads were evenly divided between sectors in identifying parents (4) and residential tutors (2) and one head of a POR identified past students. As with all heads of UORs expressing accountability to their university, heads of PORs all nominated accountability to their Council.

In making any overall assessment, it was worth noting that the makeup of governing bodies, generally including members representing various groups, could be seen to provide a subliminal form of accountability upon which heads could rely. However, it was notable that only one head identified accountability in its broadest form which could mean either that heads do not understand accountability as a wide concept or that they interpret narrowly their emphasis on accountability to specific groups within the immediate community.

It is feasible that, in future, heads will need to adopt a wider concept of accountability and part of that will be to ensure a continuous monitoring of all aspects of their operation in relation to the mission and vision held for their residence both from inside and outside. The responses here supported the contention in the thesis that heads perceptions of responsive leadership may be limited and that in future a wider conceptual understanding may be required.

Evaluation and Appraisal

With the concept of accountability (and responsive leadership) in mind, the twelve heads were asked to identify ways in which they evaluated effectiveness or success of (i) their residence, (ii) programmes, (iii) staff and (iv) students. This was an extension of the previous section in which all AHAUCHI heads, were asked in the questionnaire to identify traits, factors or indicators of effectiveness or success for a particular year. Whilst there was some overlap, the purpose was to make an assessment of the extent to which heads had evaluative processes in place for the four sub-categories.

The impression gained was that these were not particularly well developed and that subjective evaluation by the head, and others, and incidental feedback were considered to be very important. One comment from a head of a UOR and another from a POR serve to illustrate:
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"Whether people are happy - intuition - You can see it. There is no formal evaluation....Because I've been around so long, it is all second nature. My antennae are up all the time. Bells are ringing if there is a problem. There could be a danger of getting complacent with no formal evaluation."

"I'm not aloof. We immerse ourselves to have some 'gut reaction' and are sympathetic and encourage input. We operate an open door policy with encouragement of constructive comment. If we don't know about it, we can't do anything about it."

There appeared to be greater use of formal evaluation in UORs. Heads of two residences (one in each sector), had just completed a full scale review. One of these, from a POR, took the form of developing a ten year strategy plan. Five heads indicated that there was some form of annual exit survey covering all aspects of College operation, including provision for comment on programme and staff performance. Four of these five were from UORs and the other two heads from UORs indicated that exit interviews were conducted. That is, there was some evaluation in all UORs.

On the question of staff appraisal, the UORs had more formal processes in place. No head of a POR indicated a formal process was in place, although one was about to introduce such and two indicated that there was an informal review or interview for residential staff. All but one of the UORs had a form of annual review of residential staff, three taking the form of a formal appraisal and involving self-assessment and assessment by a peer, a student and a member of the hierarchy. In addition, heads of two UORs indicated that there was formal appraisal of administrative staff.

Evaluation of student progress was not completed through any formal process in any residence, except through monitoring university results as an indicator of success. There was a general expectation that tutors or residential advisors would take some form of mentoring role but it was not possible to deduce the degree to which this was effective, although one head indicated fortnightly meetings of tutors were held for this purpose. Equally divided between the sectors were four residences which engaged in student interviews, at appropriate times during the academic year, either globally of all first year students or targeting students considered to be at risk. If a central purpose of residences is to support academic success, it would appear that there are few formal evaluative processes in operation and the impression is that it may be ad hoc, even if there is a great deal of personal support and care offered. Of course, there may be no guarantee that formal processes would be more effective nor, given an emphasis on transition to
adulthood, more appropriate but it was notable that such did not seem to exist.

Conclusions from the Case Studies

The overall impressions on these three questions gained from undertaking the visits to the twelve residences were as follows:

(i) The heads identified insider perceptions of their residence(s) as generally positive whilst outsider perceptions were divided between negative and positive with the more negative perhaps being directed towards the PORs. Some efforts were being made to reduce the negative perceptions, with some success, particularly through involvement of university personnel in residential life and attempts to change behaviours and the prevailing college culture.

(ii) The heads generally indicated a narrow perception of the concept of accountability not seeing beyond the university or their religious affiliation to the wider community, business and industry or government. There may have been a slightly broader view from the heads of UORs with their focus being on accountability to their students and their university whereas the focus of heads of PORs was focussed on their students and their Council.

(iii) Generally, the heads relied heavily on subjective evaluation and incidental feedback. There appeared to be more use of formal evaluation in UORs, particularly in the areas of surveying student opinion and staff appraisal. There appeared to be a lack of formal processes to evaluate student progress.
PART C

FUTURE DIRECTIONS
CHAPTER 6

THE COLLEGIATE RESIDENCE AND HEADSHIP OF THE FUTURE

This chapter identifies changes considered necessary for collegiate residences and their heads to ensure effective or successful operation into the future. In response to Section D of the questionnaire, heads were asked a number of specific questions in order to probe their thoughts on the nature of changes required and the twelve case study heads were asked to respond to questions tracing the relationship between universities and collegiate residences and to crystal-ball gaze about their residence in the future. This method produced an important statement of what will be required to be successful in future.

As noted in chapter 1, in 1995, 39% of existing residences recorded less than full occupancy with more places being unfilled in regional colleges and halls than their capital city counterparts. Against the backdrop of existing pressures, but without the knowledge that the scene will also be affected by the most recent changing external factor of the downturn in Asian economies, the heads provided an insight into the future directions they believe collegiate residences will need to take. The following analysis reveals that they see a central need to provide enhanced facilities and supporting programmes which could be described as value adding and this fits well with the definition of collegiate residence. It is a case of more of the same and more of the new, particularly in terms of technology support, if students are to continue to be attracted to collegiate residence. The additional dynamics of the combination of trends to postgraduate study and globalisation of education means that the collegiate residence of the future will be different from that of the past or the present.

To meet these challenges, heads and other leaders will need to adopt an operating framework for their residence and in the latter part of this chapter, key attributes of future leadership are identified together with the AHAUCHI "Guide to Heads and Governing Bodies of Colleges and Halls on the Employment of Heads". This leads into the analysis in chapter 7 which relates the CSER model of collegiate leadership to the operation of heads in their residences.
6.1 FUTURE UNIVERSITY CHANGES

Australian universities are responding to a variety of pressures and the changes will impact on the leadership of the existing collegiate residences and the possibility of establishing further university collegiate residences. It was, therefore, appropriate to trace the view of heads on anticipated changes to their affiliated universities to identify any likely effects on collegiate residences. In answer to a question probing anticipated changes in universities in the next ten years and the effects on residences, 99 responses were received from 48 heads (19 from UORs and 29 from PORs). This question brought a diverse set of responses which were difficult to analyse. However, as can be seen from Table 6.1, when categorised into student enrolment issues, administrative, financial and accountability issues, teaching and technology issues and other issues, some themes emerged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.1: Anticipated Future University Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Question: In the next ten years, what significant change(s) in affiliating universities will most affect your College, and how?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UORs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Enrolment Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in postgraduate student numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in alternative university housing increasing competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansions/amalgamations/increased competition from new/regional universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in overseas and full-fee paying students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased international links/exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative/Financial/Accountability Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in government funding/full cost recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in expectations of upgraded facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching/Technology Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to university teaching with technology for distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative semester arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown of university tutorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The two major expectations were seen to be that a greater proportion of students would be postgraduate and that information technology will provide changes to teaching delivery methods with a probable increase in students learning from home and, therefore, the demand for collegiate style residential accommodation could fall. Examples were:

"Growth in proportion of post-graduate students, which will need to be reflected in the College's accommodation and life-style."

"Information superhighway may mean that students study from home and do not come to University personally or need to live in a College."

"Impact of information technology on teaching. College will need to link in. High start-up costs."

Even allowing for an excellent offering, when a cheaper alternative exists there can be no guarantee that the collegiate residence of today will survive in its present form and another concern was from heads affiliated with universities which have to compete with new regional universities and alternative cheaper housing. Without hindsight of the downturn in Asian economies in late 1997, heads expressed an expectation of increases in numbers of full fee-paying students, largely from overseas but also from Australian students, together with increased international links between universities were also to the forefront:

"An increase in places...in alternative accommodation provided by the University."

"Growing acceptance of regional universities and demographic changes (e.g. smaller families) – fewer school leavers seeking...University."

"Increasing proportion of international students from a wider range of sources – requiring greater flexibility in support programmes and organised sporting and recreational facilities."

"Universities will expand the capacity to take in full-fee paying students."

"Increase in Exchange Programmes for International/Australian students."

This last expectation of greater linkages between universities in different countries suggested a two-way emphasis with more students and staff from Australian universities studying and working overseas than previously. Obviously, heads believed the overseas student flow to study in Australia will increase further. However, the decline in the economic position of Asian countries and technology changes could have a restricting effect on this inflow as well due to an ability to transmit part or whole courses overseas.
A smaller number of heads noted an expectation of greater financial independence from universities and government funding and others noted a rising student expectation for upgraded facilities and the additional cost implications. Perhaps these expectations of upgraded facilities are now taken for granted by heads as they have had to deal with this trend previously:

"Decrease in government funding and push to attract/compete for outside funds - cost-cutting measures applied to colleges by University administration insensitively."

"Full cost recovery commercial pressures."

"Changing demands of students and the resulting financial implications."

By sector, there were no particularly outstanding areas of future change for heads of UORs although there was a tendency for them to be more aware of the reduction in government funding and full cost recovery, the increased competition from new regional universities and the increase in overseas students. Heads of PORs tended to highlight more an expected increase in postgraduate numbers, alternative forms of accommodation and technology changes, all of which could impact on the more traditional collegial offering in these colleges.

6.2 PRESSURES ON COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES

Perceived pressures on collegiate residence are noted in overview in chapter 1 and it was an important part of the research to identify the pressures which heads felt most. The case study interviews provided a considerable list and some interesting comparisons between sectors.

Heads of UORs tended to be concerned by a number of pressures. The first was their university connection with comments such as "poor marketing by the university", "diminished ability of the university to assist with finance" and "accountability reduces flexibility but there is little guidance", indicating some tension or disappointment with the relationship.

There were also financial concerns relating to having to set fees at a level students from lower socio-economic groups and rural areas could afford and one head identified some bad debts. Related to having to set lower level fees was a difficulty in meeting rising
expectations of residential provision, with one head expressing it as "no longer bed and tucker" and another head concurred. He had adopted an approach which considered residents as clients or customers and "we believe that the ultimate measure of quality performance is customer satisfaction but we find that customer expectations are always increasing." In effect, it was seen as a balancing act between expectations and what students are able and prepared to pay.

Another competitive pressure was felt to be the availability of the "alternative cheap price housing" at lower rates than collegiate residence fees, even when they were at the lower end. For the purposes of comparison with shared housing self-catered rental, which would also vary considerably, the lowest 1995 full board fee in an AHAUCHI affiliated collegiate residence was $120 per week or a little under $4,000 for the academic year. The highest was $262 or more than $8,000 for the academic year.

Other pressures mentioned by heads of UORs, in no particular order were, "keeping up with technology", "difficulty in regional area to attract conferences and other forms of non-fee income", "inadequacy of buildings", and the potential of "litigation" with respect to the increasing areas over which heads are being expected to provide level of care. One head mentioned pressure from his "they know it all!" Board.

An impression emerged that the heads of PORs were less pressured from outside although two mentioned concerns about external perceptions about student behaviour and "declining community tolerance to Colleges, although still incredibly tolerant." Significant financial pressures also existed for these two colleges which related to the above perception and some difficulties in getting enrolments with the need to market strongly because they were "at the end of the feeding chain!" However, whilst more income would be always be seen to be advantageous, the other heads of PORs did not voice any direct concern about finances. They did mention pressures which would reduce with the availability of more income, such as "need to improve facilities", and "pressure on students" through "greater competitiveness for employment" although the latter was seen to be beneficial as "academic seriousness has increased over the last 20 years" with much less of the "born to rule attitude with Daddy having a job waiting for them." A final pressure being felt was "increasing expectations of greater professionalism and accountability" which were seen to be similar to those in universities but one head expressed a concern that this emphasis was eroding her time from creating a university experience conducive to student needs.
6.3 FUTURE COLLEGIATE RESIDENCE CHANGES

The final question of the questionnaire sought to elicit expectations from heads on the most significant differences or changes which would occur within their residence by the year 2000. The response rate was high with 84 out of 113 AHAUCHI member heads (36 from UORs and 48 from PORs) providing 142 different responses. Responses were analysed using the categories of student enrolments, administration, facilities and services, programmes, status quo and other, as shown in Table 6.2.

The overwhelming impression gained from the responses was that most of the changes would be in the area of providing additional or enhanced facilities, including technology provision, which together accounted for a little under one-third of responses:

"Technological advances used to enhance student learning with computer access from all rooms."

"We are planning to expand to a fifty to sixty bed College, hopefully with a new building and new facilities."

"New Resource Centre/Library/Computer Rooms/Lounge."

If programmes to build community and increase academic, intellectual and cultural achievement (including making the culture less male) were combined, they would rate equally with those expecting changes in technology provision:

"A more broadly based inclusive community – greater social and ethnic diversity."

"Plan to raise the intellectual development of College members. Have succeeded to large degree in raising profile for both cultural and academic life. Intellectual life – a genuine interest in ideas etc – is our next goal."

There were four Heads who mentioned a concern that the technological revolution could lead to a breakdown of the collegial atmosphere in residences and were, therefore, resisting certain aspects of extension of technology, such as installation of internet into individual rooms. An example of this area of thought was:

"The impact of the use of data/technology on university education; the increasing importance of the role of community in the face of this 'disembodied' technology."
The remaining responses were evenly spread across expectations of increases in postgraduate and international students, changes in personnel (especially new heads) and programme changes. Five heads indicated no change with a "status quo – running beautifully – if it ain't broke don't fix it!" approach. Finally, the 13 responses under other suggested that these heads will focus on a number of diverse initiatives for the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2: Collegiate Residence in the Year 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Question: What do you think will be the most significant difference/change to have occurred in your College by the year 2000?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrolments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in postgraduate student numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in diversity of student population/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Head/change in structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of effective management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious to lay administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade in technology provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New buildings/facilities/refurbishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased size/more accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to self-catering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative facility use and additional income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generating services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes to build community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(esp. with increase from overseas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased emphasis on academic, intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and cultural achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in culture (less male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was little to choose between responses from the heads by sector, particularly in the larger areas of response such as enhanced facilities, technology and internationalisation. The only suggested future changes where heads of UORs were more defined than their counterparts were in moves to self-catering, programmes to build community and reduced occupancy:

"We may have been forced to phase out catered halls accommodation. We will probably be forced to reduce the overall number of places available (due to reduction in the number of undergraduates studying at the...campus) and we are likely to become more reliant upon post-graduate students (a growth area)."

"It will have developed from being a series of boarding houses to being a genuine college/halls of residence with many of the associated collegiate and community activities established."

"Much more transient population – perhaps students living in one week in five, while studying at home for the other four weeks."

However, in the overall scheme, these response areas were small. Heads of PORs made proportionately more references to expectations of changes in personnel, academic, intellectual and cultural achievement and increasing postgraduate numbers:

"I am not a prophet but it is very probable I shall have moved on and new principal may have different ideas."

"All being well: Strong postgraduate membership which will impact life at the undergraduate level. Result: an intellectual 'cauldron' ethos, which is difficult to achieve at the moment."

Further Crystal-Ball Gazing: Tucker, Tutes and Technology?

In addition to the analysis from the questionnaire, a final interview question of the twelve case study heads asked them to crystal-ball gaze to identify future changes and how their college or hall might look in the year 2000. It was notable that, even with such a small sample, the most common vision aligned remarkably closely with the previous analysis. As above, in the category of facilities and services, nine out of the twelve heads included building or upgrading existing facilities identifying projects to enhance facilities. In addition, three heads mentioned an enhancement of services.
On the administration dimension, four heads identified structural and staffing changes they would like to make and three heads identified a change in number of places offered; two to become smaller to have "a smaller student body to increase the 'cohesive environment' and one larger to be able to increase staff support and raise the offering. Two heads referred to the need to modify their governing body and two were looking at introducing a development and alumni support model. Not one head mentioned directly any matter related to student enrolment except that one single-sex college was beginning to consider the possibility of becoming co-residential.

There appeared to be less emphasis on programme changes, although two heads saw the importance of breaking down the "boys will be boys" attitude and "emphasis on alcohol" with "social engineering – plugging away to create a culture in which music, drama, creativity can 'survive' without negative peer group pressure" and one head mentioned a move to a more "self-regulating community with 'members' rather than 'students'".

The relatively small size of the sample and the open-ended nature of the interview format made it difficult to identify any further differences between the expectations of heads from the two sectors. It would be reasonable to assume that the above conclusions would be similarly reflected in this sample.

Summary – Changes to the Collegiate Residence of the Future

The views of heads from UORs and PORs obtained from the questionnaire and interviews, and the following summaries provide an illumination of the themes which emerged in the analysis. Effectively, it is a statement of the expectations of changes that can be expected to fashion the collegiate residence of the future. The initial overall statement, under the four headings adopted for analysis, is followed by a side-by-side comparison of what heads from each sector felt in terms of pressures upon them and their residences and expected future changes.
Overall Future Expectations of Heads from Both Sectors

Student Enrolments

* Increased postgraduate
* Increased fall-fee paying (both Australian and overseas students)
* Increased international links requiring more flexible occupancy patterns and sensitivity to cultural differences
  * more overseas students
  * two way links between universities and colleges
  * short courses for overseas students

Administration

* Increased professionalism
  * Appointment of staff
  * Leadership and management techniques
  * Strategic planning
* Increased accountability
  * Programmes
  * Staff (residential and administrative)
* More entrepreneurial
* Student government

Facilities and Services

* New buildings and refurbishment to provide more than basic accommodation
* Value added services ("collegial community")
* Rising student expectation
  (often without ability to increase fees – increasingly looking to possibilities of fundraising and development)
* Increased technology
  * residences wired for internet
  * changes to delivery allowing more flexible occupancy patterns
* Alternative forms of accommodation (e.g. self-catering)

Programmes

* Enhanced programmes to support academic achievement, intellectual and cultural development of students
* Increased focus on support mechanisms (e.g. mentoring) and pastoral care for students
* Changes to university semesters
Expectations of Heads From Each Sector

University Owned Residences

Pressures

(most concerned about the effects on customer/client satisfaction, finances, administration and facilities)

* Failure of some universities to market
* Drawing from lower socio-economic group or rural sector
* Difficulty in regional areas to attract conferences – limited non-fee income
* Some residences have no selection criteria except acceptance to study at the university (i.e. no interview)
* Potential effects of Federal Government funding cuts and changes to HECS
* Accountability
* Need to improve facilities (often inadequate) and services at reasonable fee to compete with alternative cheap accommodation (e.g. rental housing)
* Keeping up with technology
* Some bad debts
* Litigation/legal requirements

Future Changes

* Facility improvement including internet connection
* Central administration model to be extended
* More financially accountable
* more expectation of full cost recovery with less funding from their university and government
* Increased competition from new regional universities

Privately Owned Residences

Pressures

(most concerned about the effect on traditional collegial environment and need to be entrepreneurial)

* Need to attract students where there is lack of enrolments
* Increasing expectations of greater professionalism and accountability
* Pressures of managerial efficiency as opposed to concentration on student needs
* Financial pressures
* Need to improve facilities
* Need to improve/change external perceptions (especially of university staff)
* Male atmosphere
* Pressures on students
* Competitive pressure on students to get good marks

Future Changes

* Increase in postgraduate students
* Alternative forms of accommodation (e.g. self-catering)
* Technology changes
* External perceptions
* Enhanced student support programmes
6.4 THE HEAD OF THE FUTURE

A central thrust of this study was to move from the analysis in chapter 4 of the defining characteristics of current heads to seek some insight into the attributes which will be required of heads in the future. To assist with this, the twelve case study heads were asked to identify ways in which they had changed in the role of headship and the questionnaire to all heads asked for identification of key attributes they would advise their governing body to look for in a successor.

How had the Heads changed?

The twelve heads gave an almost universal indication that there had been a learning curve and that they had matured into the position and changed over time. In general, they indicated that they had gained a greater understanding and confidence and moved to adopt a more consultative approach. Although it was not possible in this study, it would be interesting to relate these thoughts to the rate of turnover of heads to identify how and why those who move on quickly do so. Clearly, the position requires some considerable adaptation from other positions. The following comments (the first two from heads of UORs and the latter two from heads of POks) illustrate this trend to greater confidence and consultation:

"At first I was 'adversarial' and I have learnt to become more of a 'peacemaker'. So I moved from 'top-down' but I still lead from the front. I believe the leader needs to be visible. I now give more credence to staff as people and I have learnt more about negotiating."

"I am more aware of different issues and am more diplomatic."

"I would hope that I am learning to listen more....I have a restless mind and I felt so much needed to be done that, at first, I was like a volcano! I have become more realistic and more direct and simple to staff in an effort not to hurt people and also to be more professional."

"I have greater confidence in myself and my ability to handle the position and control the political pressures. It has been a time of great personal growth....I can understand why in Australia generally there is such a turnover of Heads. I had a terrible time initially but the greatest achievements have been in my last five years."
Key Attributes of the Head of the Future

The 49 respondent heads (21 from UORs and 28 from PORs) to this section of the questionnaire provided a list of 117 key attributes for future headship based on their experience of the position. These are identified in Table 6.3. With such an open ended question and diversity of response, to provide a basis for analysis these were categorised under five headings: Attributes, Abilities/Skills, Attitudes, Experience/Background and Values. Overall, it would appear that the heads tended to favour Attributes, Abilities/Skills and Attitudes ahead of Experience/Background and Values. However, a values framework must underline other areas. The lower priority to Experience/Background was in line with the finding that 26% of current heads had no experience in collegiate residences prior to taking up the position. The most commonly identified were those which coming within the meaning of strength, courage, patience, wisdom, sense of humour and administrative and management skills.

From an overall perspective, probably the most important finding was that there were so many different and complementary attributes mentioned. No really clear direction emerged. The real benefit of the question was that it identified the diversity of attributes which heads may bring to the position and that has certainly been borne out by the previous analysis which revealed the diverse backgrounds of current heads.

There were, however, some interesting differences to be observed between the sectors. The clearest difference was to be expected, given their church affiliation, that Christian ethos was supported by five of the responses from the heads of PORs whereas it was not identified by any head of UORs. What might also be seen as a flow on from Christian ideals was the considerably higher emphasis by heads of PORs on such characteristics as patience, wisdom, a sense of humour, sets high standards, empathy, inspiring to young people. And further, but to a lesser extent, heads from this sector were more disposed to mention caring, pastoral, forgiving, compassionate, proven leadership record, intellectual ability and academic background.

The area which heads from UORs favoured more strongly than their counterparts in PORs was the abilities and skills, particularly administrative and management skills, interpersonal skills and communication, negotiating, listening, diplomatic skills. This provided an indication that the role may be seen differently in this sector, particularly given the existence of the centrally administered model and what might be called systemic
issues from which the heads of PORs are, to some extent, shielded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength/courage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience/wisdom/sense of humour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets high standards/empathy/inspiring to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/commitment/resilience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities/Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/management skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/negotiating/listening/diplomatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work as a team leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/pastoral/forgiving/compassionate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility/tolerance/commitment to diversity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven leadership record</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual ability/academic background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in this environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian ethos/moral integrity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix I provides a selection of responses illustrating the diversity of views and providing an insight into the differences existing between heads from the two sectors on key attributes required for the position in future.
Requirements of the Position of Head in the Future

The twelve case study heads were asked to respond to the question how they saw collegiate residence headship changing in the future. There was a general feeling, with some reluctance, that it was changing and would change in the future although two or three heads felt it would be more of the same or that any changes in their residence would only come with the appointment of a new head. One head of a POR indicated that she wished to "take a more modest role allowing the students to take responsibility for more but to remain aware of the consequences." Another sought "more space to go back to the position of the old Master and have time to read and think."

Only two of the twelve heads provided any real vision for the position in the future. Both were from UORs and it may reflect a perspective that there has been more change in recent times and that there may be more in the future in that sector. Two comments perhaps hinted at a difference between the sectors in terms of attitude to administration. The first comment was from the head of a POR and the second from a head of a UOR:

"The last thing I wanted to be was an administrator. I have a perception that leadership is being yourself."

"Change is inevitable. We are changing every day....Tertiary education has changed from an elitist intellectual activity to a mass pastime. As administrators we need to be so well prepared to handle change every day of our lives. From a personal point of view, I have changed from an academic to an administrator. There are some headaches but I suppose I enjoy the pain!"

However, this apparent distinction was diminished by his further comment revealing a wider perception of the role:

"However, I do not want on my tombstone – He was a great administrator!"

A further comment from the head of a UOR perhaps best summed up the direction of future change:

"Meeting with other heads has shown me that the demands of the position will call for less background in academe and more in management and business. There seems to have been a paradigm shift as heads have become more accountable and many Heads are feeling 'out of their depth' dealing with new issues for which they are ill-experienced and ill-prepared. The figurehead is diminishing to being an
accountable CEO within an academic environment. Today heads need the skills of strategic management, property management, financial management and an understanding of teaching and learning styles. Perhaps there should be a course for heads."

This comment clearly reinforced the appropriateness of the conceptual framework for the thesis that there will be a growing need for heads in both sectors to have developed expertise in the four dimensions of cultural, educational, strategic and responsive leadership. This conceptual framework for future headship is further supported by an interim document developed by AHAUCHI at its Canberra Conference in 1995 and endorsed at its Hobart Conference in 1996 entitled "Guide to Heads and Governing Bodies of Colleges and Halls on the Employment of Heads" (Appendix C) which showed a compatible framework. It commenced its preamble:

"No decision that a Governing Body of a College or Hall makes is more important than that which appoints the College Head. It is not difficult to enumerate the qualities sought in a Head – a person of academic distinction and/or standing within the University and the community; a person with qualities of character, especially the ability to bring out the best in people; a person of administrative competence and ability."

This document acknowledged the differences which exist between residences but attempted to codify, under the heading Role and Responsibilities of a Head, what was to be expected so that both heads and interested parties could have a better appreciation of the tasks to be undertaken:

"Put simply, the role of a Head of College is to provide the optimum residential environment for a student to succeed at University. The Association sees this primary function as having two major components: a leadership role and management supervision. the balance of these roles varies with the size of the College and the prevailing management structure....

This document, therefore distinguishes between leadership tasks, which are common to all Heads, and management tasks, some or all of which the Head may undertake directly or through other staff members, depending on the size of the College or Hall.

A Head’s role encompasses eight major areas. Leadership within these areas, however, is not undertaken without constraints. Beyond the usual limits of time and money, are the expectation of Governing Bodies and Universities as well as those of parents and students, the requirements of statutory bodies and regulations, the need to be sensitive to prevailing community standards, as well as the professed ideology of the College or the less formalized ethos which may have developed over decades of operation. As leader of the community, the Head has to negotiate
between these often conflicting and sometimes unrealizable expectations to secure the optimum environments for residents as well as the security and viability of the College."

The AHAUCHI document further identified eight areas which were seen to constitute the head's role and provided itemised details of the leadership and management tasks within each. The eight areas of responsibility nominated were:

(i)  Vision
(ii) Planning and Financial
(iii) Accommodation
(iv) Facilities and Services
(v)  Academic and Educational Programs
(vi) Community Life and Pastoral Care
(vii) University
(viii) Personal

In addition, under the section Appointment, Review and Reappointment of a Head of a College or Hall, there is a statement provided on what would constitute an appropriate statement of duties for a Head of College or Hall. It included the following:

"The Head of College or Hall is the Chief executive Officer responsible to the Governing Body and/or Advisory Board for all aspects of the academic and pastoral oversight, professional management and cost effective conduct of the operations of the College or Hall to achieve its stated mission and objects."

There are seven principal accountabilities listed for the position encompassing the areas of responsibility listed above. The terminology has revealed an evolutionary process and the document developed the full complexity of the role of Head and responsibilities of the position, as it operated in 1996, and effectively it has provided a framework within which it will continue to evolve into the future.

This AHAUCHI document, together with the previous analysis, served to illustrate that the role of headship has changed and will change further in the future. It will require an ever increasing range of understandings and abilities across a wider range of dimensions. An understanding of the AHAUCHI guide to the position, together with the CSER model of collegiate leadership and use of the collegiate residence evaluation guide (Appendix D) would provide an excellent starting point for the 'Head of the Future'.
CHAPTER 7

A SYNTHESIS: THE DOMAINS OF LEADERSHIP

It was envisaged that this study would find that current leaders had a developed understanding and expertise in cultural and educational leadership but, on the strategic and responsive leadership dimensions, their understanding and expertise would be less well developed and there may even be a resistance to expanding the role further to encompass these latter two domains.

7.1 CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

To test the thesis and to identify the likely future needs of heads and collegiate residences, the adopted methodology was to analyse responses from the case study visits for indications of the strengths and weaknesses of heads and their residences in the four domains. This was achieved by drawing on the CSER model of collegiate leadership and the identified conceptual framework of component parts for each of the four domains shown, as outlined in Figure 3.1. The responses of the twelve heads, to selected interview questions from Appendix B, together with observations made during each visit, were analysed to assign values of high, medium or low on each component.

The results are collated and presented in tabular form as Tables G.1 to G.4 in Appendix G and the final assessment of the current position of each head and his or her collegiate residence is presented in the following analysis made in association with Figures 7.1 to 7.4.

The desired position for each domain under review is for both head and residence to rate high–high which indicates a position of strength and which would be shown as the top right position in Figures 7.1 to 7.4. The corollary is that a low–low combination in the bottom left position provides cause for concern as it indicates a weak position where the pressures may most affect future survival of both heads and residences. High–medium, high–low, medium–medium and medium–low are the in-between positions which identify respective strengths and weaknesses of heads and residences and provide a guide to where effort may need to be placed to address specific areas of weakness.
Cultural Leadership: ('Creating a culture of excellence')

Figure 7.1 was derived from Table G.1 (Appendix G) and it indicates that, although there were no high-high combinations, in the domain of cultural leadership a satisfactory position existed. Four heads and two residences were identified as high and only one head and one residence raised any cause for concern with a low rating. In combination, there were no low-low ratings.

![Figure 7.1: Cultural Leadership](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U,U,U</td>
<td>U,U,U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>U,U,P,P,P</td>
<td>U,P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: U = UOR  
P = POR  

(N.B. Each letter relates to one of the twelve Case Study Collegiate Residences and Heads)

There were some differences between the sectors and it was notable that the only four heads to receive a high cultural leadership rating overall were from UORs and, interestingly, three of them were the only heads whose entrepreneurial skills were assessed as high. However, they also operated the only three residences assessed to have low quality educational programmes. It could be argued that their entrepreneurial flair was
being devoted to areas other than giving priority to educational support of their residents and a lack of commitment to this expectation outlined in the 1979 definition of a collegiate residence, as outlined in chapter 1. One even stated it as baldly as follows:

"It has been my vision to first meet Maslow's basic needs of providing nourishing food and comfortable shelter. The college cannot survive with a tutorial programme but it can survive with a comfortable bed and good meals."

From this small sample has come a pointer that may be indicative of a more widely held difference in commitment between the sectors with heads of UORs being generally aware of the domains of cultural leadership but less committed to this central expectation of providing quality educational programmes than heads of PORs. Of course, the financial ability to commit resources does affect what is possible and would be relevant to this discussion.

It was an important finding that two heads, one from each sector, were assessed to be experiencing some difficulty with marketing their respective residences. As noted above, only four heads were rated as high in this domain and it had been surmised that this skill component of cultural leadership is one which heads will need to possess in future. The assessments from this sample did nothing to deny this and it would be difficult to dispute that the most likely scenario to emerge will be that heads with residences which are struggling to survive will need developed entrepreneurial skills in order to position their residence more strongly in the market place. This contention was supported by observations made during the visits.

Strategic Leadership: ('Taking charge of the agenda')

Figure 7.2 was derived from Table G.2 (Appendix G) and indicates that there were six heads and their residences assessed as low-low and this provided a cause for concern when matched against expectations of strategic leadership under the CSER model of collegiate leadership. Only two of the twelve residences provided evidence of a developed strategy plan and only six provided a written mission statement. Awareness and understanding of the components of strategic leadership for heads was assessed as being slightly higher with two heads assessed as high and four as medium. Critically, this still left six heads assessed as low on this dimension.
By sector, it was notable that four of the six assessed as low-low were from PORs, although one of the two registering a high-high assessment was also from this sector. There appears to be more emphasis on strategic direction in UORs and an apparent lack of such in PORs points to an area of concern for residences in that sector in the future.

Educational Leadership: ('Nurturing the learning community')

Figure 7.3 was derived from Table G.3 (Appendix G) and indicates that there were no low-low assessments to give rise to real concern in this domain and this was reinforced by a majority registering medium or better. In isolation, two heads and three residences, all from UORs, were separately assessed as low. On the other hand, there were two heads (one from each sector) assessed as high and, in combination, one head and his POR which registered as high-high.

The inter-relationship of cultural and educational leadership was in evidence with some overlap to be expected. Observations about differences between the sectors were similar on the educational leadership dimension to those of the cultural leadership domain. For example, the quality of educational programme, previously suggested as a significant
component of cultural leadership as possibly providing a difference in emphasis between the sectors, would also be important in assessing levels of educational leadership as it was considered to be central to educational leadership. As an example, all three residences assessed as low on educational leadership were the same which registered low on this component under cultural leadership. In addition, two heads of UORs were assessed as displaying low educational leadership levels whilst there was no head or residence from the POR sector assessed as less than medium on this domain.

![Figure 7.3: Educational Leadership](image)

**Responsive Leadership: ('Coming to terms with accountability')**

Figure 7.4 was derived from Table G.4 (Appendix G) and indicates that there were no low-low assessments although three heads (two from UORs and one from a POR) were assessed as low on this dimension. Two heads (one from each sector) and four residences (all UORs) were assessed as high. By sector, it would appear that there was little to differentiate between heads but a greater awareness was evident in UORs, perhaps due to the relatively recent pressures on such colleges from their university, particularly in terms of a tightening of funding and a greater expectation to be self-funding.
7.2 CASE STUDIES FINDINGS

Although the sample of twelve case studies was limited in number and the observation and method of analysis was largely subjective, the preceding analysis made it possible to reach some findings in relation to the thesis.

Cultural Leadership

The central finding was, as surmised, that heads and residences were generally able to satisfactorily meet the requirements of cultural leadership, assessed against the conceptual framework of components developed for this domain of the CSER model and there was no reason to question that changing in the future.

It was difficult to develop any definite conclusions of differences between the sectors. It is entirely possible that a wider review might support the contention that the development of entrepreneurial skills will become increasingly important, particularly where residences are under threat, and that such might be more concern in one or other sector but nothing of this nature emerged conclusively from this analysis.
Strategic Leadership

The contention, that heads will have less developed skills and understanding of the dimension of strategic leadership, was supported. As surmised, to be positioned to meet the pressures facing residences, there will be a need for heads and other collegiate residence leaders to undertake future strategy planning for their residences and they will need to develop greater understanding of the components of strategic leadership. If this sample was representative, there is a void to be filled.

There may be a difference in need between the sectors. The evidence from this sample tended to suggest that understanding of the components of strategic leadership was more highly developed amongst heads of UORs which would mean, assuming pressures threatening the existence of residences apply in each sector, that the greater need in future may be amongst heads in the PORs.

Educational Leadership

As surmised, the heads and residences were largely in tune with the requirements of educational leadership and there did not appear to be any real cause for concern in terms of a low–low assessment. Even allowing for the smallness of the sample and the subjective assessments, it is reasonable to come to the general conclusion that heads will not require greatly enhanced educational leadership skills to satisfy the requirements in this domain in the future.

Responsive Leadership

There was not any indicated area for concern in terms of a low–low rating. The findings did not seem to support the contention that heads and residences will need to develop understanding and skills on this dimension. There was a general acceptance of this domain of responsive leadership as part of the role of headship and a reasonable understanding appeared to exist. Even allowing for this finding, it is possible that some significant enhancement will be needed in future, particularly on certain components such as developing more definitive evaluation and appraisal techniques, as a number of low scores were registered and the analysis in chapter 5 provided support for this view. An understanding of the increasing pressures on collegiate residences and their leaders would help to sustain the view that heads will be required to move from medium to high in this
domain to be able to respond effectively in such a challenging environment. A larger sample would be required to develop a full refutation of the contention that a more developed responsive leadership will be required in future. It may still be that there is a more widespread cause for concern in this domain into the future even if, on this evidence, it appeared that such was not necessarily the case.

Summary of the Findings

The central proposition was that, in future, heads and their collegiate residences will need to have an understanding and expertise of all four domains of this CSER model of collegiate leadership. As a general conclusion, the implicit contentions of the thesis were largely supported by the assessments and observations from the twelve case studies. Heads and the collegiate residences chosen for the case studies were assessed and observed to show sound understanding in the domains of cultural and educational leadership.

In the cultural leadership domain, the question of possible weaknesses in levels of entrepreneurial skill indicating an area of future need was raised but it was not possible to reach a definitive conclusion from this sample even though the logic appears obvious. Irrespective of this indefinite finding from the available evidence, the inevitable logic is that entrepreneurial flair and marketing will become increasingly important if student numbers are down and cultural and educational programmes are to be supported. In its simplest terms, it will come down to numbers providing the income to survive and numbers will only be attracted if the offering is sound and seen to be sound. The reality and perceptions will need to match.

The clearest conclusion from the case studies was that the contention there would be less well developed understanding and expertise on the strategic leadership domain was strongly supported. This was observed to be the greatest area of weakness and, therefore, the greatest area of need given the mounting pressures on heads and their residences. There is a clear need for enhanced understanding and expertise in strategic leadership.

A surprise finding was that the case study analysis did not support the surmised concern about the level of heads and residences on the domain of responsive leadership. The finding was that an apparent acceptance and understanding of this aspect of the role existed even if there were some indications that individual components within the domain of responsive leadership could need attention in some residences. A larger study may
reveal a different picture but this small sample did not provide evidence of a major concern.

By sector, there were some indications that heads of UORs had more developed skills and understanding of strategic leadership whereas it appeared that heads of PORs had stronger commitment to components of the cultural and educational leadership domains. From this apparent difference in emphasis between the sectors, it could be surmised that heads of UORs are better equipped to meet future pressures. Such would need to be the substance of another study and, in any case, the methodology did not provide any weighting to the respective domains.

Despite the limited number of case studies, the basic contentions of the thesis were proved. In response to the problems and pressures on collegiate residences, an enhanced operating framework will be required and it was found that the heads and their residences were strongest on the domains of cultural and educational leadership and weakest on strategic leadership. A larger study would be needed to reveal more about the position on the responsive leadership domain and the entrepreneurial component of cultural leadership. The relative weighting for each domain could be an issue and it may be that survival in the future will be more dependent on value added under cultural and educational leadership than strategic and responsive leadership but, no matter, understanding and expertise in all four domains will be essential.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

'Leadership in the Australian University Colleges and Halls of Residence: A Model for the Future' began as a response to a perceived problem. In 1995, 39% of Australian university collegiate residences were operating at less than full capacity and facing a number of pressures from changes to universities and other sources and the study set out to provide guidance on ways to be successful into the future. The literature provided a number of themes, including what makes a 'good' college, support for a future role for collegiate residences and a conceptual framework. Responding to the research questions, the study provides an insight into the characteristics of contemporary collegiate residences and headship, perspectives of what is entailed in being effective and successful and guidance into the future.

This final chapter summarises how the conceptual framework was employed to provide a four domain conceptual model of collegiate leadership and how the research questions were approached, what findings emerged and what conclusions have been reached. It further provides recommendations for the future requirements of heads and collegiate residences and an evaluation guide which provides a starting point for the analysis of any particular residence. It concludes with reflections on the study methodology and further areas for study which have emerged.

8.1 SUMMARY

The conceptual framework employed was an adaptation of the conceptual framework developed by which Caldwell and Spinks (1992) to apply to self-managing schools. The CSER model of collegiate leadership proved to be an appropriate framework for an investigation of leadership of collegiate residence and it formed a sound basis for the research and development of a evaluation guide. In particular, it provided a thesis to be tested and a set of lenses through which the research questions could be framed and viewed.

Using the CSER model of collegiate leadership, a central proposition was developed that in future heads and their collegiate residences will need to have developed an understanding and expertise in all four domains. As seen in the previous chapter, it was
then possible to assess that the implicit expectations of the thesis were largely supported. That is, the study found that heads had a developed understanding and expertise in the domains of cultural and educational leadership but, in the strategic leadership domain, their understanding and expertise was less well developed. The findings on their perceptions of responsive leadership were less conclusive.

Heads and residences were assessed and observed to show sound understanding in the domains of cultural and educational leadership although there was some questioning of the adequacy of entrepreneurial skills particularly given concern about pressures on survival into the future. The clearest indication was that heads and residences had a need for development in the strategic leadership domain. There was less concern in the domain of responsive leadership as an apparent acceptance and understanding of this component of the role exists even if there may have been some indications that individual components could need attention.

It was possible to obtain some indications that heads of UORs had more developed skills and understanding of strategic leadership whereas it appeared that heads of PORs had stronger commitment to components of the cultural and educational leadership domains. This made it possible to suggest further that heads of UORs may be better equipped than their counterparts in PORs to meet future pressures, although such would need to be substance of another study.

The Collegiate Residence of the Future

In future there will be important differences between collegiate residences within and between each sector as a result of variations in operation brought about by differences in tradition, regional location, student composition and organisational structure, including the structural differences between single entity and central administration – multiple residence operation. In chapter 6 some expectations were discussed which can be drawn together to begin to conceptualise the collegiate residence of the future. The following summary, developed from this research, provides future expectations in terms of enrolments, administration, facilities, services and programmes and an outline of the different pressures and likely future changes collegiate residences from each sector will need to make to remain viable.
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With respect to student enrolments, the collegiate residence of the future will become more international and more responsive to alternative arrangements. Enrolment of higher proportions of overseas students will occur and with changes to technology making alternative forms of delivery possible, residences will need to be more flexible to accommodate alternative forms of intake. This will include overseas students attending their Australian university for shorter periods than previously which will impact on occupancy rates and accommodation contract periods. Changes to university semester structures and accommodation expectations may lead to shorter stays which in turn will have an effect on collegial life. As part of this, there will be more postgraduate students from overseas as well as from within Australia as universities become more orientated towards postgraduate research. Overall, these changes to student enrolment patterns will have a significant effect on the substantially undergraduate residences of today in terms of student profile and programme.

Strategic planning will become a necessity and the administration of residences will become increasingly professional and entrepreneurial. Pressures to survive and the above changes to enrolment patterns and demands for flexibility, efficiency and accountability will draw this response. Facilities will need to be substantially enhanced to attract students and to cope with increasingly sophisticated demands from a more senior student body. Central to this will be the provision of information technology capable of adequately supporting postgraduate study, in addition to generally increasing expectations from undergraduates. The atmosphere may become more serious, with less emphasis on enjoyment as the focus moves more to the individual than induction into the whole with bonding through the collegial activities being important for all. The educational programmes on offer will need to become more sophisticated and take heed of the different social, cultural and pastoral needs of a student body which is older on average and less undergraduate by nature. As now happens with multiple residences where individual residences specialise, it is probable that in future more residences will not be willing to cater for all comers and will look to specialising in niche markets.

In considering differences between collegiate residences in the two sectors, in future there will be notable differences between those UORs and PORs which are single entity as opposed to those UORs which are part of a central administration—multiple residence structure. As noted above, the latter arrangement allows for greater specialisation and, given the expectation of greater specialisation, this model could be better placed to respond to a need for specialisation as each residence within the group can cater
specifically for a different specialist grouping. For example, it may be possible to have individual residences within the group which provided the options of being self-catering or fully catered as well as different residences for undergraduate and postgraduate students. It is anticipated that more existing UORs will band together under central administrations than at present. The need to adopt ways of providing economies of scale and the increased flexibility this model makes possible will also mean that any new collegiate residences will most likely emerge under this structural model. On the contrary, if demand continues to decline in certain regions, as has already happened, some residences will close. Another possibility to emerge is that UORs which are not viable may opt for privatisation. At least one campus of a regional university has developed a strategy plan to explore the option of offering the residences for private ownership and two inner-city universities have already supported the establishment of private non-collegiate residential accommodation.

There may be a danger of residences becoming less collegial and more accommodation orientated. Already the inability of a significant proportion of students to pay high fees for residence has had a limiting effect on programmes with some residences providing little beyond 'bed and tucker' and a trend to tighter budgeting is likely to continue. It is probable that the privately owned single entity residences will become increasingly postgraduate and international whilst still operating within a traditional framework as this sector values highly the ideals of providing a collegial environment and there would be a concern to avoid the offering becoming less so. For those with this concern, the emphasis will be more on adding value than cost cutting.

Although both sectors will place emphasis on becoming more cost efficient and entrepreneurial, it is probable that the former will be more marked for UORs and the latter more the province of the PORs. Specialisation and niche marketing will be adopted by some to ensure survival. It is difficult to predict accurately any further trends. Changes are occurring continuously, particularly in response to the pressures which already have some residences under threat. To move forward into the future will be a significant challenge as the environment is constantly changing.

The Head of the Future

Although there will be a number of differences in background experiences for the heads from the two sectors, and even within sectors there will be differences brought about by
different traditions, locations and structures, there will be a number of common requirements of the head of the future. As has been proposed using the CSER model, an understanding and some expertise within each of the four domains of collegiate leadership and an ability to fulfil the various component tasks will be required. The extent of this requirement will depend on situational factors such as the size and structure of operation and expertise on particular components provided by other senior staff and Council members, where appropriate.

Quite apart from the supportive conclusions of this study, the validity of the CSER collegiate leadership framework has been supported by the AHAUCHI "Guide to Heads and Governing Bodies of Colleges and Halls on the Employment of Heads (Appendix C) which provided a slightly different but compatible framework of seven principal accountabilities. Further, the collegiate residence evaluation guide (Appendix D) provides a starting point of appropriate questions which heads and others may use to assess the current position of their residence and areas to address in order to ensure viability into the future.

A clear recommendation to emerge from this study would be that an understanding of the AHAUCHI guidelines for headship, the CSER model of collegiate leadership and an assessment through use of the evaluation guide would see the head of the future well equipped to perform the role in any collegiate residence context.

8.2 REFLECTIONS ON METHODOLOGY AND CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

The methodology of questionnaires, case study visits and consultations proved to be a sound approach for the purpose. Data collection and analysis was time consuming but rewarding as it was 'ploughing an largely untilled field' and members of AHAUCHI were most interested in what was being found and extremely supportive, as shown by the response rate and numbers of enquiries made throughout as to progress.

The questionnaire produced a considerable quantity and sound quality of information but was expansive and needed careful refining. In particular, Section C provided a large volume of information on organisational structure but this proved to be beyond the scope of this study. Organisational structure had been an interest from the beginning but this had to give way to the central theme of leadership. Structural issues related to collegiate residence would provide an excellent future study.
The case study interview format was not directed closely enough to the conceptual framework and this made analysis more difficult and more open to a charge of subjectivity as responses were often tangential to required information and the researcher had to develop global impressions and conclusions. The contacts with heads and their residences through the on-site visits, telephone contacts and interviews provided a valuable insight into the field of collegiate residence. As a spin-off, the researcher was being consulted on a number of issues related to collegiate residence as heads and others realised the resource that was evolving both in terms of information and the personal professional development which had occurred from the research within the field.

Analysis of data was an enjoyable task for the researcher, although there were concerns about breaking down such an amount of data into a manageable form. Every attempt was made to eliminate any subjective bias and to provide quantitative assessment where available and appropriate. The combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis seemed to provide a meaningful way of approaching each segment of the study and give some confidence that any conclusions are well founded.

The approach to analyse data, firstly, for global or general conclusion and, secondly, to identify any differences between the UOR and POR sectors was consistently employed and appeared effective in providing appropriate information for comparative analysis.

The conceptual framework served the study well. Adapting the Caldwell and Spinks analysis of educational literature for self-managing schools proved appropriate particularly as the components of the four domains built up to a robust method of looking at the strengths and weaknesses of current heads and their residences. It would have been desirable to extend this analysis to a wider sample to provide a more thorough test of the thesis than the twelve interviews provided but the method and the framework provided sufficient information to suggest that the model was appropriate to such an enlarged task and that a collegiate residence evaluation guide could legitimately be constructed adapting this framework.

8.3 CONCLUSIONS

A number of areas for further study emerged. In particular, the study concentrated on the leadership of the head and did not delve into any form of collaborative leadership, even if such may have been implied throughout. For example, where it indicated that heads would
need a particular strength for leadership of their residence, it could be translated to also apply to other members of the leadership team. As previously noted, there could only be limited reference to organisational structure differences even though there was found to be a considerable variety of positions and combinations. A worthwhile further study would be one focusing on organisational structural models for collegiate residence.

Another particularly interesting issue for further study would be the role of students in leadership and governance. Although some information was collected, the scope of the study had to be limited and analysis of this dimension was not possible. Some collegiate residences were observed to have an ethos based on student leadership whilst others were more traditional or hierarchical with residential staff taking on roles of leadership. A study outlining the various operational models would be valuable for future reference.

Two further suggestions to emerge for further studies could be the relationship of heads with their governing bodies or university line supervisors and advisory committees and the leadership and management role of second-line leaders such as deans, tutors or resident assistants.

In conclusion, this research study commenced in 1992 as part of the Doctor of Education programme at the Faculty of Education at the University of Melbourne which had collected together a number of professionals who were at the cutting-edge in the international field of educational administration. The doctoral programme was designed to attract leaders from the various sectors of education to conduct research into an area in which they were working at the time. This study fits within that category and contributes to research into the field of leadership of university collegiate residence.

The exercise was particularly rewarding from a personal and professional development point of view and the expectation is that the reader will acquire an enhanced knowledge of an important component of tertiary education in Australia. For those working in the field, the study provides a way of evaluating the performance of their residence and gaining some insights into enhanced practices. In a time of considerable pressure and change, it provides a framework for remaining viable and a way of aiming for excellence in the future.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRE:

THE STRUCTURE AND LEADERSHIP OF AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES AND HALLS

With the approval and encouragement of the President, this questionnaire is being sent to all member Heads of the Australian Association of Heads of Colleges and Halls Incorporated. I am undertaking research to identify:

(i) structural and leadership patterns existing in Australian university residential colleges and halls, and

(ii) structural and leadership characteristics to best achieve an effective college.

(Please note that the term "college" is used throughout to cover all residential colleges and halls).

Respectfully, you are asked to provide answers to all the questions and to return the questionnaire to me, in the reply paid envelope provided (no stamp required), by 30th November 1995. If insufficient space has been provided for any section, please attach further comments cross-referenced to the page and question. All information will be treated with complete confidentiality. However, parts of answers (not attributable to a particular person, college or hall of residence) may be quoted in the final report.

I am well aware of the demands on Heads but systematic research underlying this questionnaire has not been pursued and it will be valuable to Heads in setting future strategies for residential colleges and halls.

The final report (to be completed in 1996) should be relevant to all Heads and a high response rate will ensure greater reliability and validity. All respondents will be sent a summary of the findings from this survey when it is completed.

If you are able to enclose in the envelope provided, copies of information sheets or brochures which would help to provide a greater understanding of your College and its operation, that would be most appreciated.

For any further clarification, I may be contacted after hours on (03) 9349 0523 or at work on (03) 9349 0751.

Robert Nethercote
Vice-Master
Queen's College
University of Melbourne
PARKVILLE VIC 3052
A. **PROFILE OF COLLEGE/HALL**

1. Name of College/Hall

2. Address

   ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________ Postcode_____

3. Year of Foundation ____________

4. 'Ownership/Sponsor' (e.g. University of Melbourne, Uniting Church in Australia)

   ____________________________________________

5. Affiliating university/universities (if applicable)

   (i) ________________ (ii) ________________

   (iii) ________________ (iv) ________________

6. Number of places available for residential students

   __________

7. Residential Student Enrolment (as at 30 April 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduates (Year of Course)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Non-residential Student Enrolment (as at 30 April 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduates (Year of Course)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Residential Staff (Non-student) (as at 30 April 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Non-Residential Staff (Non-student) (as at 30 April 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. PROFILE OF THE HEAD OF COLLEGE/HALL

1. Full Name ____________________________________________

2. Gender
   [ ] Female    [ ] Male

3. Age
   [ ] <30 Years    [ ] 30–35 Years    [ ] 36–40 Years    [ ] 41–45 Years
   [ ] 46–50 Years    [ ] 51–55 Years    [ ] 56–60 Years    [ ] >60 Years

4. Nationality ____________________________________________

5. Highest Academic Qualification/Institution
   ________________________________________________________

6. Major academic field(s)
   (i) ____________________________________________________
   (ii) ____________________________________________________

7. Title of Position of Head (i.e. Title given to the position of Head in your College – e.g. Principal, Warden, etc.)
   ________________________________________________________

8. Position Status
   [ ] Full-time    [ ] Part-time

9. If part-time, please identify:
   (i) 'notional' percentage of time as Head of College/Hall    [ ]%
   (ii) 'actual' percentage of time as Head of College/Hall    [ ]%

10. If part-time, please identify other source(s) of employment/occupation
    (i) ____________________________________________________
    (ii) ____________________________________________________

11. Years in the current position
    [ ] 0–5 Years    [ ] 6–10 Years    [ ] 11–15 Years    [ ] >15 Years
12. Previous position and institution

13. If your previous position was as Head of another college, please indicate below the position held immediately before that and the institution

14. Please identify the complete range of your experiences in colleges/halls prior to your current appointment (e.g. Undergraduate student – X College [1955–58], Tutor – Y College [1960–61], Dean – Z College [1975–80] etc.)
C. LEADERSHIP POSITIONS IN THE ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

1. If an Organisational Structure Chart or similar exists, please attach it to this completed response sheet.

2. If any statement on the formal organisational structure of the college and how the college operates exists, please attach it to this completed response sheet. (E.g. numbers of leadership positions in the organisation, part-time or full-time, job descriptions, methods/criteria of appointment and by whom, responsibilities in the running of the college of students/college administration, positions on College Council, etc.)

3. Please list the major positions (including your position) in the 'formal' organisational structure of the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender (M/F)</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please identify positions (if any) held by students in the 'formal' organisational structure of the College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender (M/F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. If any statement on leadership roles played by students and residential staff exists, please attach it to this response sheet. If not, please make a brief statement on the leadership roles played by each.

(i) Students

(ii) Residential staff

6. If there are one or two features of the culture, structure and leadership of your College which, to your knowledge, may be seen to be distinctive or unique, please provide a brief statement below.

(i) 

(ii) 
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1. If a mission statement or a statement of aims and objectives exists or both, please attach a copy to this completed response sheet.

2. As you see it, what is the main goal of your College?

3. Do you have a leader, leadership theory or personal philosophy who/which most influences your leadership style as Head? Please elaborate.

4. Given your experience in the position of Head, which two key attributes would you advise your governing body to look for in a successor?

   (i) 

   (ii) 

5. At the end of a year, what two traits/factors/indicators would make you feel that the College had been effective/successful?

   (i) 

   (ii) 

6. What do you believe are the two main strengths of your College?

   (i) 

   (ii)
7. Which two factors most inhibit or constrain your ability to achieve the established aims of your College?

(i) ______________________________________________________

(ii) ______________________________________________________

8. In the last five years, what significant change(s) in affiliating universities, and in the wider university context, have most affected your College, and how?

(i) ______________________________________________________

(ii) ______________________________________________________

(iii) ______________________________________________________

9. What initiatives/changes has your College taken in the last five years to ensure it remains viable and academically credible?

(i) ______________________________________________________

(ii) ______________________________________________________

(iii) ______________________________________________________
10. In the next ten years, what two significant change(s) in affiliating universities will most affect your College, and how?

(i)  

(ii)  

11. What steps is your College taking to 'cope' with these university changes?

(i)  

(ii)  

12. What do you think will be the most significant difference/change to have occurred in your College by the year 2000?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Will you authorise access to the material relating to your College/Hall held by the Association of Heads arising from the Ferris–Norton (1975) and Beswick (1984) surveys?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Thank you for your assistance.
APPENDIX B:

CASE STUDY INTERVIEWS

The following interview format is designed to be held with Heads of 12 selected Colleges to be visited in May–June 1996. The Colleges are selected to provide a diversity of characteristics including: year/era of establishment, location, sponsorship/ownership, student composition and gender of the Head.

The aim of the interviews is to determine the nature and extent of the skills and understanding of Heads on the Cultural, Strategic, Educational and Responsive Leadership dimensions. The thesis is that they will have developed Cultural and Educational Leadership skills and understanding but that these will be less developed on the Strategic and Responsive Leadership dimensions.

The visits will also be used to make contact with other staff and students to observe (and participate in) the College in operation to obtain a background understanding of the College.

INTERVIEW FORMAT

PREAMBLE

My understanding of...College/Hall is that....Is that right?

Although I contacted you on the phone to set my visit up, I imagine that you are really wondering why I'm here and what I want to do during our time together.

Well, as you'll recall, my first step was to send a questionnaire to all Australian Heads. The response rate was 105 out of 113 Heads which seems to show tremendous support for further research on Colleges/Halls and I'll be presenting a paper on that in Hobart.

Now, as a second phase, I am visiting Colleges to interview Heads further and to take a professional opportunity to soak up the culture. I am in the process of visiting 12 Colleges chosen for their diversity of characteristics such as size, age, student composition, location and ownership. In particular, what I hope to do is to gain a greater insight into (i) how the Colleges/Halls operate, (ii) how the Heads think about their role and (iii) how Heads see the future through a little crystal ball gazing. At the end of the exercise, I may even attempt to develop a checklist which Heads could use to evaluate their College/Hall.

The contents of the interview will not be reported individually in a way that could be attributed to you or...College/Hall although direct quotations may be used in the final report.

Do you have any concerns about this interview? Are there any areas into which you would rather not delve? (Please feel free to pass on answering any question.)
QUESTIONS

1. Let's commence by asking:
   (a) What would you say...College/Hall stands for?
   (b) Is there anything which gives it a distinctive flavour of its own?

2. How would you describe current perception(s) of...College/Hall? Are you doing anything to alter these?

Recently I read the Higher Education Management Review (Hoare Report – December 1995) which identified a number of pressures which universities are facing such as: demands for greater accountability, more direct competition, mass participation and greater student diversity and increasing expectations of employees for greater flexibility.

3. Are there any external pressures affecting the operation of...College/Hall? The catch-cry of the 1990s seems to be a call for accountability.

4. (a) To whom/which groups do you see...College/Hall being accountable?
   (b) To whom do you see yourself being accountable?

5. How do you evaluate the effectiveness/success of (i)...College/Hall generally, (ii) programmes, (iii) staff and (iv) students?

6. Do you have any difficulty getting good (i) staff and (ii) students?

I am always intrigued by what brings people into a particular profession. I came through teaching and school principalship into residential college life. You came through ...

7. (a) What was it about College/Hall headship which appealed to you?
    (b) How have you and it changed?
    (c) Do you see you and it changing in the future?

8. How would you describe your leadership style?

9. What major initiatives has...College/Hall taken in the last five years? What would you see as your greatest achievement(s)?

10. What links do you have with other Colleges/Halls and...University? Do you share any resources?

11. How would you describe the 'climate' of the relationship between...College/Hall and...University?

Finally, I'd like to bring out the crystal ball and ask you to project yourself beyond the year 2000.

12. How do you see...University changing?

13. Is there a shared vision of the ideal for...College/Hall in this setting in the future? How would you describe it?

14. If you were to start from a zero base, would you change the organisational structure of...College/Hall to achieve the vision you've described?
15 (a) What else would you change to bring about the vision?
(b) What major initiatives do you see...College/Hall taking by the year 2000?

ITEMS FOR COLLECTION

Statements of the values, philosophy, ideology on which the College bases its existence?
Strategic Plan?
Organisation Chart?
Evaluative instruments?
Publications

POINTS FOR OBSERVATION

Verbal, visual and behavioural symbols (manifestations) of College/Hall as it operates?

Verbal
(e.g. aims & objectives, programs, metaphors, organisational stories, heroes, etc.)

Visual (e.g. facilities, artefacts, memorabilia, crests, mottoes, 'uniforms', etc)

Behavioural
(e.g. rituals, ceremonies, teaching and learning, operational procedures, rules and regulations, psychological and social supports, community interaction patterns, etc)

Facilities
Programs
Organisational Structure
Degree of Collegiality/Leadership

Autocracy ~ leaders have the power and the right and duty to use it
Paternalism ~ those in power are obligated to take care of those not in power
Consultation ~ all levels have relevant information to contribute but power remains in the hands of leaders
Participation ~ information and skill at all levels are relevant to organisational performance; hence power must be shared as appropriate
Delegation ~ power must be placed where information and skill reside but that accountability remains a managerial role
Collegiality ~ organisation members are partners who share full responsibility for total organisation

Excellence = Q + E + E + E + E where
Q = Quality of the educational program (in terms of goals)
E = Effectiveness (in achieving goals)
E = Equity (in terms of achievement by all)
E = Efficiency (in use of resources)
E = Empowerment (through involvement in decision making and decision implementation)
APPENDIX C:

GUIDE TO HEADS AND GOVERNING BODIES OF COLLEGES AND HALLS ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF HEADS

(Printed with the permission of the President of AHAUCHI, Mr Brian Abbey, Mary White College, University of New England, Armidale, NSW)

Preamble
No decision that a Governing Body of a College or Hall makes is more important than that which appoints the college head. It is not difficult to enumerate the qualities sought in a Head - a person of academic distinction and/or standing within the University and the community; a person with qualities of character, especially the ability to bring out the best in people; a person of administrative competence and ability.

If the appointment of the right person is essential, then the process by which this appointment takes place is no less important. At the time of advertising a position and interviewing candidates, a Governing Body has many expectations of what it hopes the new appointee will accomplish. The appointee also has his or her hopes and dreams. Some of these expectations are stated in the advertisement, some become the subject of discussion during the interview process, and still others are formalized in the duty statement given to the appointee when taking up the position. The basis for mutual satisfaction of Governing Body and College Head in the subsequent performance of the appointee can be found in a series of documents which fully recognise the special responsibilities of the position and provide the best conditions for realizing them. All too often in the urgency to have the appointee take over, important elements of the negotiations are overlooked.

The Association of Heads of Australian Colleges and Halls Incorporated (The Association) has developed three documents which it hopes will assist both Governing Bodies and appointee Heads to undertake these negotiations as conclusively as possible. Not every clause in every document will apply to every Head or College - self catering colleges, for example, will have no use for arrangements relating to catering. However we hope that both Heads and Governing Bodies will consider the three documents in total and attempt to draw up their various documents having considered all the elements raised.

1 Role and Responsibilities of a Head
This is the first of the three documents and it describes the role and various responsibilities of a Head of College. The document distinguishes between leadership tasks, which are common to all Heads, and management tasks, some or all of which the Head may undertake directly or through other staff members, depending on the size or complexity of the College or Hall. In Colleges where the numbers of staff are limited, the Head may have a direct role in providing services to residents; in larger Colleges with more complex staffing arrangements, the Head's involvement may be directed through others. In both kinds of Colleges, the Head has primary responsibility for leading the organization, whereas the direct supervision of, and delegated responsibility for, management roles and tasks may vary considerably between Colleges.

We hope that Governing Bodies will make use of this document with its clear delineation of leadership and management responsibilities when writing duty statements and establishing criteria for appointment.

2 Terms and Conditions of Employment of a Head
This document, as its name suggests, is a guide to the terms and conditions of employment of Heads. It covers matters such as tenure, remuneration, and benefits. We hope appointee Heads and Governing Bodies will find it useful in establishing the terms and conditions under which the Head is employed.
3  Appointment, Review & Reappointment of a Head
The third document describes the process the Association recommends in appointing or reappointing a Head. In these increasingly litigious times it is incumbent upon all parties to undertake the negotiations professionally and equitably. If there is a common failing among parties at the time of appointment it is to establish clearly the criteria on which future reviews will take place. Any appointee is entitled to know at the time of appointment the grounds on which the Governing Body will establish whether or not his or her performance is satisfactory, leading to the appointment being confirmed, further reviewed or terminated. Failing to establish these grounds at the time of the initial appointment will place an appointee at a serious disadvantage and leave a Governing Body open to a charge of unfair dismissal should reappointment subsequently not take place.
ROLE & RESPONSIBILITIES OF A HEAD OF COLLEGE OR HALL OF RESIDENCE

The role of a college head is complex, with many apparently conflicting responsibilities. This document represents an attempt by the Association to codify what is expected of a Head, so that both the Head and interested parties may better appreciate the wide range of tasks to be undertaken.

Put simply, the role of a Head of College is to provide the optimum residential environment for a student to succeed at University. The Association sees this primary function as having two major components: a leadership role and management supervision. The balance of these roles varies with the size of the College and the prevailing management structure. In Colleges where the numbers of staff are limited, the Head may have a direct role in providing services to residents; in larger Colleges with more complex staffing arrangements, the Head's involvement may be directed through others. In both kinds of Colleges, the Head has primary responsibility for leading the organization, whereas the direct supervision of, and responsibility for, management roles and tasks may vary considerably between colleges.

This document, therefore distinguishes between leadership tasks, which are common to all Heads, and management tasks, some or all of which the Head may undertake directly or through other staff members, depending on the size of the College or Hall.

A Head's role encompasses eight major areas. Leadership within these areas, however, is not undertaken without constraints. Beyond the usual limits of time and money, are the expectations of Governing Bodies and Universities as well as those of parents and students, the requirements of statutory bodies and regulations, the need to be sensitive to prevailing community standards, as well as to the professed ideology of the College or the less formalized ethos which may have developed over decades of operation. As leader of the community, the Head has to negotiate between these often conflicting and sometimes unrealizable expectations to secure the optimum environment for residents as well as the security and viability of the College.

Following are details of the leadership and management tasks contained within the eight major areas which constitute a Head's role.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Leadership Tasks</th>
<th>Management Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 plan to meet projected requirements; anticipate and identify future trends</td>
<td>1.1.1 undertake strategic planning; develop challenging and achievable plans for Governing Body approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 optimize present facilities; set goals - raise standards</td>
<td>1.2.1 manage residence to achieve agreed strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 share the vision - make the mission &quot;real&quot;</td>
<td>1.3.1 motivate residents and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 interpret &amp; promote College ethos</td>
<td>1.4.1 reflect and promote College ethos on College occasions and in College activities, eg in all College communications with residents and resident groups, and in promotional literature and Handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 ensure congruence of values - values of Head must be congruent with College ethos</td>
<td>1.5.1 College ethos is reflected in the interaction of the Head with the Governing Body, individual residents and resident groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>Management Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planning &amp; Financial</td>
<td>2.1 Undertake financial planning</td>
<td>2.1.1 establish budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Optimize utilization of resources</td>
<td>2.1.2 exert financial control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Maintain appropriate staffing policies &amp; structures including review procedures</td>
<td>2.1.3 establish accountability procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Mandate quality procedures and standards</td>
<td>2.1.4 develop a maintenance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Promote the College within and without the College, University &amp; community</td>
<td>2.2.1 establish a debt reduction program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Ensure statutory compliance</td>
<td>2.2.2 provide resource protection eg: insurance, depreciation and/or contingency reserves, assets register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7 Ensure procedures are in place for crisis management</td>
<td>2.2.3 promote conference trade as an ancillary activity to optimize the use of facilities and thereby provide extra resources - financial and physical - for the benefit of residents. (see also #4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.1 select, train and develop staff with a view to the quality of the College operation and equity and job satisfaction for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.2 negotiate contractual agreements if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.1 evaluate all aspects of College operations against TQM principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5.1 ensure the College is promoted through its literature and activities and through occasions which reflect the College in a positive light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5.2 encourage the development of foundation/ alumni associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.1 review policies in light of Government regulations relating to health &amp; safety, equity, harassment etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7.1 establish procedures for crisis management (eg: death/suicide of a resident, incident involving criminal activity, charge of harassment against senior staff member, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>Management Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Accommodation</td>
<td>3.1 ensure appropriate standards of accommodation and supporting facilities</td>
<td>3.1.1 provide student rooms which are secure, comfortable, clean and conducive to study and sleep; &quot;a home away from home&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 provide buildings which are attractive, convenient, optimally arranged, properly serviced and maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.3 provide grounds which are attractive, tidy, and conducive to active and passive recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.4 provide common facilities which are supportive of residents' academic &amp; social needs. (see also #4 and #5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>Management Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Facilities &amp; Services</td>
<td>4.1 exploit the possibilities inherent in communal dining and ensure quality in catering provided</td>
<td>4.1.1 provide attractive, nutritious meals prepared in a hygienic manner; menus meeting different dietary needs and conducive to social interaction; meals supportive of developing residents' appreciation of food quality and variety; and the notion of dining as a social activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 utilize conference trade as the pretext and means for the development of residential facilities</td>
<td>4.2.1 develop conference trade ancillary activity to optimize the use of facilities and thereby provide extra resources - financial and physical - for the benefit of residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 provide for a variety of social and recreational needs of residents</td>
<td>4.3.1 provide the following facilities as appropriate to the mission of the College: teaching areas and equipment; libraries and learning resources; computer rooms, games and recreational facilities and equipment; kitchenettes, party rooms, laundries, bike sheds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>Management Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Academic</td>
<td>5.1 ensure the primacy of academic focus, with emphasis on accountability and accessibility</td>
<td>5.1.1 provide relevant support through qualified tutorial staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 provide academic opportunities</td>
<td>5.2.1 provide appropriate facilities &amp; support, eg library, computers, tutorial and study rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 promote University interaction</td>
<td>5.3.1 provide interactive opportunities, eg faculty dinners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs</td>
<td>5.4 promote personal development</td>
<td>5.4.1 provide social awareness programs eg: drugs, sex, alcohol, AIDS, harassment etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 provide educational opportunities to the University community and on behalf of the University to the wider community</td>
<td>5.4.2 develop cultural awareness: eg. through theatre trips, opera, ethnic festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.3 promote intercultural activities amongst residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.4 promote intellectual pursuits eg. debates, chess, writers-in-residence, workshops, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5.1 provide public lectures and debates, music, drama. events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>Management Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Community Life &amp; Pastoral Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 provide a caring environment for residents and staff</td>
<td>6.1.1 appoint general staff and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.2 provide Orientation Programs which emphasize peer group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.3 develop programs which promote resident care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 establish clearly understood behavioural standards</td>
<td>6.1.4 develop a crisis care safety net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 act as advocate for residents or staff when appropriate</td>
<td>6.2.1 develop disciplinary procedures to ensure community standards are upheld</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 promote debate regarding ethical issues and socio-political considerations</td>
<td>6.3.1 provide moral and practical support to residents and staff in appeals to University and civil authorities where this can be undertaken in good conscience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3.2 provide a community environment which is supportive of minorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4.1 provide a community environment which is aware of national and international crises and accepts some personal and communal responsibility towards these events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Responsibility</td>
<td>Leadership Tasks</td>
<td>Management Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 University          | 7.1 promote interaction with University; establish credibility with University | 7.1.1 seek membership on University Committees  
7.1.2 seek "visibility" of the College and the Head within the University  
7.1.3 undertake an advocacy role with University authorities on behalf of the College and/or individual residents (see also 6.3)  
7.1.4 invite University personnel to College functions  
7.1.5 contribute to University life and foster public debate (see also 5.5) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Leadership Tasks</th>
<th>Management Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 be active in pursuing personal responsibilities</td>
<td>8.1.1 clarify your understanding of the terms &amp; conditions of your employment, including criteria for review or reappointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 be active in undertaking professional development and in considering career alternatives</td>
<td>8.1.2 clarify your needs and expectations when negotiating with your employer</td>
<td>8.1.3 reserve adequate personal time and space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1.4 seek privacy for self and family</td>
<td>8.2.1 regularly attend conferences or undertake other professional education and opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2.2 maintain and update professional associations and qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX

A statement similar to the one offered below reflects a widespread understanding of what constitutes an appropriate statement of duties for a Head of College or Hall.

1.1. The Head of College or Hall is the Chief Executive Officer responsible to the Governing Body and/or Advisory Board for all aspects of the academic and pastoral oversight, professional management and cost effective conduct of the operations of the College or Hall to achieve its stated mission and objects.

1.2. The Head reports to the Governing Body and/or Advisory Board and carries out the duties and responsibilities of this key position under the general direction of the Governing Body.

1.3. The principal accountabilities associated with the position of Head of College or Hall are:

(i) as the chief executive officer and senior member of the community, to articulate a vision and develop a collegiate ethos to promote the mission and objects of the College or Hall;

(ii) to ensure that academic and pastoral support, fostered through collegiate activities, structures, personnel and the provision of suitable amenities and services for the student residents, complement and supplement the stated mission and objects of the College or Hall;

(iii) to ensure that the College or Hall is operated cost-effectively through the efficient management of its financial, physical and personnel resources and business enterprises;

(iv) to appoint and supervise the staff of the College or Hall with appropriate attention to performance management, equal employment opportunity, workplace health and safety, staff development, employee relations and duty of care priorities;

(v) to offer membership of the College and Hall to students seeking residence and to foster the academic progress of resident members by providing appropriate support through tutorial programs and other support facilities;

(vi) to foster social, cultural, educational and sporting activities appropriate to a collegiate university residence;

(vii) to represent the College or Hall within the university and wider community.

...
APPENDIX D:

A GUIDE TO EVALUATING COLLEGES AND HALLS OF RESIDENCE

Caldwell and Spinks (1992:80) developed a checklist which they called 'Appraising the Marketing Culture of your School'. What follows is an adaptation, drawing further on the thoughts of Bolman and Deal, Sergiovanni, Schein, Andrews and Boyer. The format which has been developed accommodates the CSER Model of Collegiate Leadership and the guide is directed towards use by leaders of Australian university collegiate residences to evaluate their residence and to point to ways in which its effectiveness may be enhanced.

A rating scale could be developed for each question and each set of questions to provide indications of specific areas of need and an overall evaluation of the standing of the residence.

1. COMMUNITY EXPECTATIONS OF YOUR COLLEGE/HALL

(Who are you and where is your support base?)

Is there a clearly understood perception of relationships between the College/Hall and each of the constituents of your immediate and wider community?

(i.e. The immediate community may include the College/Hall Council, Head, Staff (administrative, residential and non-residential) and Students (past, and present and future). The wider community may include 'affiliated' universities, business and industry and government).

Are the expectations of current and potential students and parents in your community (your market) well known to the College/Hall Council, Head and staff?

Are there clearly defined processes for understanding and monitoring the expectations of your community?

Are there processes in place for 'unfiltered' monitoring where your College/Hall may be falling short of community expectations?

Is communication with your immediate community frequent, varied in intent and two-way?

Has any analysis been made of the role played by past students in relation to the mission, vision and values and how their contribution may be enhanced?

Are appropriate opportunities created for the university, business and industry and government to be involved in a form of 'corporate citizenship' of your College/Hall?
2. MISSION, VISION AND VALUES

(What is your raison d'etre? How well have you defined and communicated your culture? What makes a 'good' College/Hall?)

Does your College/Hall have a statement of mission, vision and values (or equivalent), setting out the primary purpose for its existence in your community?

Is this statement revisited regularly to ensure that it remains current and relevant?

Is this statement clearly understood, accepted and supported by the Council, Head, and staff?

Is it consistent with the expectations of current and potential students and parents?

Are details of mission, vision and values and educational programme communicated to current and potential students and parents in an effective manner which makes clear how these are consistent with expectations?

Are there clearly defined processes for ensuring alignment of mission, vision, values and educational programme with your wider community's expectations?

3. STRATEGIC DIRECTION

(Where are you heading? How do you involve those with the ability to contribute?)

Is there a developed master/strategic plan/direction for the future which has been endorsed by Council members, Head, staff and current students and which incorporates responsibilities for each?

Is there a capacity, willingness and time-availability for strategic leadership among Council members, Head, staff and current students? Are opportunities provided for 'collaborative' involvement?

Are priorities set and re-set according to a continuing appraisal of opportunities and threats; strengths and weaknesses (i.e. SWOT analysis)?

Are strategies acted upon once determined? Is there an environment which is supportive to taking desired changes through to the fulfilment?

4. SYMBOLS

(How do you celebrate College/Hall life? How well do members of the community own the 'symbols'?)

Is there an up-to-date history of your College/Hall which is available for members of your immediate and wider community, particularly new students and staff?

Have the 'symbols' of your College/Hall been identified?
Are traditions, past 'heroes', ceremonies and rituals celebrated?

Is there any attempt to analyse and evaluate the role and importance of these symbols to College/Hall life? Are changes needed?

Do members of the your immediate community feel appropriately 'initiated', educated and welcomed into and involved in the life of the College/Hall?

Can members of your wider community feel included and able to be appropriately involved in the life of your College/Hall?

5. CULTURE

(What are the key identifiable aspects of the culture of the College/Hall culture? Do they need refinement and how?)

Have the broad spectrum of elements which make up the culture of your College/Hall been identified and analysed?

Is there a 'culture of excellence' in your College/Hall?

Is success important to the College/Hall community?

When and where success is not achieved, is this appropriately recognised and 'remedial' steps taken and encouraged without recrimination? Is there an environment conducive to appropriate change?

How well developed is the culture of caring in your College/Hall? Is everyone happy?

Does the culture of the College/Hall foster a passionate commitment to use all available resources to create new ideas and actions that will enrich the quality of education, and life generally, within the College/Hall and its community?

Is there a sharing of resources with other Colleges/Halls and your affiliated universities which may be viewed as a 'collaborative' culture?

6. ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

(How well does your organisational structure work?)

Have you identified the structural relationships which exist within your College/Hall and have alternative forms been considered?

Is your structure formalised or are relationships loosely coupled? Is it the best possible and the most responsive to support the needs of your College/Hall? Are students appropriately involved?
Has there been any assessment of the effectiveness of communication procedures between staff and sections of your College/Hall?

Does the way your structure works encourage a sharing between Council, Head, staff and students which may be viewed as 'collaborative'?

Are staff and students regularly encouraged to contribute to the design of their responsibilities and to the the design of the overall structure?

Are the views of current students represented and heard on your Council?

Have you considered how the operation of your structure contributes to where your College/Hall would rate on the following continuum: autocracy - paternalism - consultation - participation - delegation - collegiality? Having assessed such, and would any change in focus be advantageous?

7. HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

(How are staff/students attracted employed and valued? How can others in the community be positively involved?)

Is staffing appropriate for your needs in terms of number and quality?

Have appropriate priorities been set to attract and retain quality staff and students?

Do extrinsic and intrinsic rewards reinforce the achievement of this ideal?

Are appropriate equity procedures in place?

Is there an effective staff appraisal programme in place?

Are appropriate support and financial resources provided for staff professional development?

Are staff encouraged to contribute to the design of their responsibilities and goal setting?

Are appropriate problem solving and conflict resolution procedures in place?

Have those with particular flair and expertise (in both the immediate and wider community) been systematically identified and appropriately involved in achieving the College mission, vision and values?

Are staff and students empowered through opportunities to participate and collaborate on decisions related to the development and implementation of the educational programme?
8. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME

*(How do you ensure provision of a sound educational programme?)*

Is the educational programme of your College/Hall consistent with the statement of mission, vision and values and expectations of current and potential students and parents?

Have you recently evaluated ways of enhancing your College/Hall relationship with affiliated universities and the effect of such on your educational programme?

Is the educational programme offering evaluated on a regular basis?

How effective are your academic programmes in complementing and supplementing university teaching to provide additional academic support to your students?

How effective are the non–academic programmes and activities offered by your College/Hall or organised by current students in meeting the needs of students, particularly their social and cultural development?

Have efforts been made to align interests and expertise of particular members of staff with particular facets of the educational aspirations of current and potential students and parents?

9. FINANCIAL/FACILITY MANAGEMENT

*(How well are the finances/facilities managed?)*

Are finances adequate, not just for current needs, but also to enable the strategies in the strategic plan to be implemented?

Have regular assessments been made of your facilities to consider their functions for current students and attractiveness for potential students?

Have opportunities for alternative sources of finance other than fees been investigated and employed, as appropriate, without compromising the College/Hall mission, vision and values?

Have alternative uses of facilities been similarly considered?

Has the expected life of all physical facilities and equipment been identified and action taken to prolong life?

Has financial planning been implemented to ensure that funding will be available to provide for replacement at the end of the expected life of physical facilities and equipment?

Are indicators in place to evaluate accountability for use of financial and other resources in terms of sound management and contribution to the vision?
Has a 'development' model been adopted to ensure that alumni and fundraising activities are supporting the financial viability of your College/Hall?

Are financial contributions, sponsorship and other forms of support sought in an appropriate manner from the immediate and wider community with recognition and opportunities for further involvement for those who make financial contributions?

10. MARKETING/ENTREPRENEURSHIP

(What is your marketing environment? How is your College/Hall special? How can product differentiation be used to advantage?)

Has the uniqueness ('product differentiation') of your College/Hall been identified and utilised in marketing efforts?

Is attention paid to the marketing potential of special events and, especially, ordinary day-to-day activities, including the manner in which students, parents and others in the College/Hall community are welcomed, ceremonies are conducted, mail and telephone calls are initiated and answered?

Is the basis of all marketing activities, the agreed mission to address the needs of all current and potential students and are marketing efforts regularly evaluated to ensure they reflect current needs?

Do all members of the Council, staff (including the Head) and students (past and present) appreciate that they have a role to play in the marketing effort?

Are marketing implications considered as a matter of course in the planning processes of the College/Hall? In these and other respects, is marketing seen as a continuous ongoing 'development' activity rather than a discrete event of short duration for a particular purpose such as increasing enrolments or raising funds.

Is there consistency between the values evident in marketing your College/Hall and those underpinning its culture? Is this consistency clearly evident?

Is there an appropriate level of budget allocation for marketing and communication?

Are printed materials and other means of communication of the highest quality or at least consistent with the standard set by competitors?

Is there an entrepreneurial spirit in the marketing effort?
APPENDIX E:

TABLES AND FIGURES ON COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES AND HEADS OF RESIDENCES

Table E.1: Location of AAHCHI Colleges/Halls (1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITIES</th>
<th>RESIDENCES</th>
<th>HEADS</th>
<th>CAPITAL CITY</th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of NSW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ballarat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaTrobe University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Qld</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Qld</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Adelaide</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of WA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Maritime College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure E.1: Location of AAHCHI Colleges and Halls

[Bar chart showing the number of AAHCHI Colleges and Halls across different universities. The universities are listed on the x-axis, and the number on the y-axis. Different colors and symbols represent the categories Inner, Metro, and City/Town.]
Table E.2: 'Ownership/Sponsorship' of AAHCHI Colleges and Halls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Owner/Sponsor'</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Anglican 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Catholic 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Uniting (UCA) 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCA/Lutheran 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCA/Presbyrn 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presbyterian 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baptist 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.2: 'Ownership/Sponsorship' of AAHCHI Colleges and Halls

Denominations of Church Colleges or Halls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denominations</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniting (UCA)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCA/Lutheran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCA/Presbyrn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E.3: Foundation Year of Colleges and Halls
(124 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sub - Totals</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>4, 16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-95</td>
<td>13, 97</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E.3: Foundation Year of Colleges and Halls
### Table E.4: Foundation Year of Colleges and Halls by 'Ownership/Sponsorship'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840-1899</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1945</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1995</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E.4: Foundation Year of Colleges and Halls by 'Ownership/Sponsorship'

The figure illustrates the distribution of colleges and halls founded in different years based on their 'Ownership/Sponsorship'. The bars represent the number of institutions founded in each year category, differentiated by type: Church, Independent, and University. The vertical axis represents the number of institutions, while the horizontal axis shows the years: 1840-1899, 1900-1945, and 1946-1995.
Table E.5: Gender of Heads
(106 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.5: Gender of Heads
### Table E.6
Gender of Heads by Gender of Colleges and Halls
(106 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Colleges/Halls</th>
<th>Female Heads</th>
<th>Male Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-sex (female)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-sex (male)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-residential</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (106)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E.6
Gender of Heads by Gender of Colleges and Halls
Table E.7: Age of Heads
(101 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.7: Age of Heads
### Table E.8: Nationality of Heads
(102 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian/British</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian/American</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian/Pakistani</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E.8: Nationality of Heads

![Bar chart showing the distribution of nationalities among Heads, with Australian having the highest count at 84 responses.]
Table E.9: Highest Qualification of Heads
(102 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Qualification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors (Hons) degree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.9: Highest Qualification of Heads
Table E.10: Major Academic Field(s) of Heads
(167 responses)
N.B. Some respondents listed two fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Academic Fields</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics/Statistics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Literature</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Counselling</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Management</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>167</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure E.10: Major Academic Fields of Heads
### Table E.11: Position Title of Heads of Colleges and Halls

(105 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation/Residential Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Chairman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head/Head of College/Hall</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. + Some combinations occurred:

- CEO/Master/Head of College
- Principal/Rector
- Head/Master

### Figure E.11: Position Title of Heads of Colleges and Halls

![Bar chart showing the position titles and their counts.](image)
Table E.12: Position Status of Heads
(105 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.12: Position Status of Heads
Table E.13: Part-time Heads
(For those who are part-time, the Notional and Actual % of time as Head of College or Hall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages (part-time)</th>
<th>Notional</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Defined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.13: The Notional and Actual % of Part-time Heads
Table E.14: Years in Current Position  
(104 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15 years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.14: Years in Current Position
Table E.15: Previous Position of Heads
(105 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Head</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Academic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Chaplain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Senior Position</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Teaching Position</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Chaplain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Position</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Servant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.15: Previous Position of Heads

![Bar chart showing previous positions of heads with counts for each position.](chart.png)
Table E.18: Previous Experience of Heads in Colleges and Halls
(100 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Experience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student only</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor only</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Senior Position only</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Tutor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Dean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor and Dean</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Tutor and Dean</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure E.16: Previous Experience of Heads in Colleges and Halls
### APPENDIX F: CHARACTERISTICS OF CASE STUDIES

#### Figure F.1
**The Twelve Case Study Residences and Heads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>UORs</th>
<th>PORs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Heads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Heads</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that 139 collegiate residences and 113 heads could have been selected for the case studies, Figure F.1 and the following ratios are provided in support of the choice of 12 residences and their heads being as representative as possible of the total population of each.

#### Characteristics of Collegiate Residences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Ratios of 12 Case Studies</th>
<th>% of all Residences (1995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UORs:PORs</td>
<td>7:5</td>
<td>58:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-WWII:Post-WWII</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>81:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Entity:Central Admin.</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td>72:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-residential:Single-sex</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>90:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban:Rural</td>
<td>8:4</td>
<td>58:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate:Postgraduate only</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>97:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Characteristics of Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Ratios of 12 Case Studies</th>
<th>% of all Respondent Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female:Male</td>
<td>3:9</td>
<td>25:75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time:Part-time</td>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>81:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate:Masters or less</td>
<td>4:8</td>
<td>45:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian born:Overseas born</td>
<td>9:3</td>
<td>82:18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX G: CASE STUDY RESPONSES AND OBSERVATIONS

### Table G.1: CULTURAL LEADERSHIP

Key: H = High, M = Medium, L = Low  
(Based on interview questions 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9  
related to components of Figure 1)  
Case Studies 1 ~ 7 = UORs, 8 ~ 12 = PORs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Culture</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Educational Program</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table G.2: STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

Key: H = High, M = Medium, L = Low
      Y = Yes, N = No
(Based on interview questions 3,9,13,14,15
related to components of Figure 1)
Case Studies 1 – 7 = UDRs, 8 – 12 = PORs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Pressures</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of SLOT Analysis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Vision</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assessment from Observation</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |
| Existence of a Strategy Plan | N | Y | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | Y |
| Existence of Mission Statement | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | Y | N | N | N | Y | Y |
| General Assessment from Observation | M | H | M | L | M | M | L | L | M | L | L | H |
| OVERALL                | M | H | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | H |
Table G.3: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Key: H = High, M = Medium, L = Low
(Based on interview questions 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14
related to components of Figure 1)
Case Studies 1 – 7 = UORs, 8 – 12 = PORs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Organisational Structure</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Selection</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment Procedures</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Educational Program</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |
| OVERALL (based on assessment of quality of educational program) | L | L | L | M | M | M | M | M | M | M | M | H |
### Table G.4: RESPONSIVE LEADERSHIP

Key: H = High, M = Medium, L = Low  
(Based on interview questions 3,4,5,10,11,12 related to components of Figure 1)  
Case Studies 1 - 7 = UORs, 8 - 12 = PORs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### HEADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Accountability (to Immediate and Wider Community)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Programs</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Appraisal Program</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Student Progress</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Accountability</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGIATE RESIDENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL (General Assessment from Observation)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H:

MISSION STATEMENTS FOR COLLEGES/HALLS

The following is the collection of mission statements (or equivalent) of Colleges/Halls affiliated to AHAUCHI provided in response to Section D of the questionnaire:

* To provide an economic quality residential College...University undergraduate students.

* A College is more than a hall of residence or hostel. To say that the core function of a college is to provide a place of accommodation is to define only a part of the core; another part of the core is to provide for the advancement of the Christian religion and morality and the promotion of useful knowledge. Both parts are at the core of what a college is. So a Christian college is not only or even primarily a hall of residence. It is an academic endeavour, which provides community and institutions for the advancement of godly learning....

A college is a society of scholars formed for the purpose of study and instruction in connection with a university. The functions appropriate to such an institution ... are very broad. They include the provision of religious services; training and instruction both theological and secular to students for the sacred ministry ...

Each of the four branches of the College has its own motto and mission:
1. "Preparation for Life, Leadership and Service" (by practising service and efficiency in community and by witnessing to the values of altruism and compassion)
2. "Reaching and Teaching People to be Followers of Christ" (by seeker-sensitive services, outreach events, systematic Bible teaching, and training programmes)
3. "Education for Life and Ministry" (by courses in theology and spirituality
4. "Scholarship for Mission and Ministry" (by research, writing, seminars and conferences, publications, and archives

(Our vision is of a caring community, preparing young people for lives of service, leadership of society and church by means of community-building, teaching, research, evangelism and worship)

* ...College aims to provide an environment where the individuality of residents is respected. This environment encourages academic excellence/commitment and at the same time offers the opportunity to extend personal talents and interests through social, cultural, sporting and community service activities.

* 'Fellowship in Learning': The mission of...College is to foster the intellectual, social and personal growth of its students. It aims to provide a friendly and stimulating environment to assist in the transition to the wider world. The...College experience of 'Fellowship in Learning' aims to lead to a lifetime of fulfilment.

* The central purpose of the College is the assistance of academic achievement, in a community concerned with the promotion of the social and personal well-being of residents.
* At a basic level...College provides residence and board for students attending the University of...Its purpose, however, goes beyond this:
* to establish an environment for serious study;
* to form a happy community of students in different disciplines, from differing backgrounds;
* to cater for recreational and sporting interests.

Aims:
* Pursue the Study of Truth
* Enable the personal development and academic accomplishment of the individual within a challenging community of peers
* Foster excellence in all activities – academic, cultural, sporting and social – and to nurture the development of the total person
* Promote Christian values in a Catholic and Christian environment
* Continue the work of parents and schools and to foster in each student a sense of self-worth, independence of thought, and service to the community.

Goal: To provide access to sufficient affordable high quality residential accommodation which assists the University in the pursuit of its aims.
* The provision and the promotion of a variety of accommodation styles to meet the needs of students, staff and visitors.
* The provision of residential services to students at a level of fees which is as low as practicable.
* The promotion of the academic endeavours of residents of the halls.
* The development of a healthy and supportive community spirit within the residential halls and the encouragement of residents to take some responsibility for the operation and the environment of their halls.
* To ensure that sufficient funds are put aside annually to maintain the infrastructure of the halls.
* To ensure the delivery of high standard domestic and food services to the halls.
* The provision of an Advisory Service for students, staff and visitors seeking private accommodation.
* The regular review of the Strategic Plan.

The central objective of the College is to provide a living environment that will help to promote academic achievement by its residents, and to infuse their time at University with the highest goals of academic life – receptivity to new ideas and ways of viewing the world, intellectual vitality and discipline, and a passion for creativity and innovation.

Our mission is to bring about collegiality, academic excellence and service to society, founded on Christian faith and values.

The policy of the...University is based on the following missions:
* To provide educationally oriented student colleges with a learning environment;
* To provide a clean, well maintained, safe and comfortable living environment that enhances personal growth and provides developmental opportunities for students;
* To provide education programs and learning facilities which support academic goals of students and educational objectives of...University.
* ...is established by the University:
* To provide suitable residential and associated facilities, which may include
tutorial and other services for both Australian and international students of
the University, and
* To promote understanding and fellowship between people of different
nationalities and cultures, including not only residents of..., but other
members of the Broader University community, by social interaction and
the exchange of knowledge.

* The aims of the College are:
* To provide an environment where residents will find the support and
friendship of a welcoming community; and
* To promote the intellectual and personal development of its students in a
Christian environment within the Catholic tradition.

* The purpose of the College is to foster Catholic scholarship within the University
and to provide a centre for the spiritual, moral and intellectual development of its
members.

The Colleges strives to:
* Establish an environment for serious study;
* Promote study of the Catholic faith;
* Facilitate personal development so that its students move towards an ever
more responsible role in the University, the Church and the world
* Encourage students to be committed to and enjoy learning, to realise their
own abilities and to develop skills to live in a fulfilling way;
* Form a genuine community of students from a variety of backgrounds in
different faculties; and
* Cater for recreational, sporting, social and cultural interests.

* The College aims to provide collegiate experience in a Christian context of
tolerance, justice and care which enables students to develop both as people and
citizens.

* To provide, maintain and develop the College as a residence for such
female students of the University of...as the Council may approve and for
related purposes: and
* To provide such assistance in the educational development of the residents
of the College who are students of the University as the Council may
decide.
* To develop and maintain a collegiate community.
* To provide facilities for the academic development (including tutorials),
enriched by extra-curricular and interdisciplinary activities.

* The purposes for which...exists are:
* To provide catered collegiate style accommodation for students of the
University
* To actively promote academic excellence by providing academic support in
the form of House Tutors, study areas and facilities, and an environment
which is conducive to study
* To provide pastoral care of residents, individually and collectively, through
programs, staffing arrangements, and specific interventions
* To provide a forum for interdisciplinary dialogue with other residents,
academics, visitors and guests
* To develop in residents and appreciation for community living and the skills required to reside harmoniously with others;
* To encourage residents to take responsibility for the development of community life through the establishment of appropriate committees and programs.

* Vision: We have a vision:
* for our Halls of Residence being recognised throughout the national tertiary education sector for their friendly, community-based lifestyle, and their effective implementation of an up-dated collegiate environment;
* of being a universally known provider of excellent on-campus accommodation facilities designed to meet the needs of students from Australia and overseas;
* of being able to offer quality controlled private housing or private board to students of the University who may not be able, or who choose not, to reside in the Halls of Residence.

Mission:
1. To maintain maximum occupancy:
   * by promoting and providing quality accommodation facilities for students of the University and visitors;
   * by developing and maintaining well organised, client-conscious, associated residential services;
2. To assist students and staff of the University find suitable accommodation and resolve their tenancy problems –
   * by providing an efficient Student Housing Service.

* Vision: To provide convenient and affordable accommodation and high quality pastoral services, academic support and social activities to...students facilitating each individual's pursuit of optimum academic achievement and personal development.

Mission: To meet the needs of resident students undertaking undergraduate and higher degree study at the University by providing programs and activities which offer opportunities to students:
* to become independent adults;
* to engender in themselves a strong sense of the rights and responsibilities of living in community with others;
* to provide leadership and services to peers;
* to learn to practise balanced lifestyles;
* to contribute to the democratic processes of representation in governing the residences through the committee structures of the Group;
* to take responsibility for their own futures as members of their community by making the best possible use of opportunities provided by the Group and the University.

* In material terms, a College provides residence and board for students attending the University. Beyond fulfilling these basic needs, however, its purpose is to establish conditions for the serious pursuit of scholarship and to help a group of people in different disciplines and from different backgrounds to live and work together as a community, for their mutual benefit and support.
* The..., historically related to and affiliated to the University of..., is an incorporated association of university graduates. It
  * conducts a residential college for graduate students and academic staff
  * provides residential accommodation for academic visitors to the University of....
  * provides residential and dining facilities, meeting rooms and a library for the recreational, social, intellectual and cultural activities of its members
  * offers its members reciprocal services at like establishments both within Australia and overseas.

By its objects, The...will
  * promote the welfare of the University of...
  * encourage and assist higher education, especially postgraduate studies and research
  * foster academic, educational and cultural relations between graduates
  * provide a corporate association to carry out these objects.

* Purpose and Vision: To achieve academic success, personal growth and inter-cultural understanding through a challenging and supportive experience in international living and learning. To be recognised as an outstanding community through the excellence of our educational experience, preparing students for the valuable roles they will fulfil in their local and global communities.

* To provide quality residential facilities for graduate and undergraduate students studying at the University of..., in an atmosphere that is conducive to, and promotes, individual self development through exposure to a wide variety of sporting, social and cultural experiences....

The quality of facilities offered will extend beyond the physical environment to include a broader collegiate life underpinned by Christian principles and pastoral care from resident tutorial and management staff.

Tuition provided will be of a high standard, through residential tutors or tutorials arranged with other residential colleges associated with the University of....

In order to contribute to a breadth of educational and cultural experience the College will adopt an admission policy that ensures a wide range of academic disciplines and geographic areas are represented in the College, with an emphasis on admission from rural areas.

Considering the significant financial resources required to attain this goal, it may be necessary for the College to provide its facilities for income generating activities such as conferences and functions. The conduct of these activities must not be undertaken at a time, nor in a manner, which is in any way detrimental to the residential student population of the College.

* The mission of...is to provide a residential educational environment of SECURE SURROUNDINGS, STUDY STIMULUS, SOCIAL SUPPORT AND SPIRITUAL OPPORTUNITY for students of the University. The College operates on the Christian principle of Regard for Others.
The Mission of...is to be a safe, supportive environment which allows resident students to fulfil their academic potential. The Guiding Values which underpin this are:

* Tolerance for individual differences
* Consideration for the rights and needs of others
* Co-operation to promote an environment which is fair and productive
* Responsible financial management ... Practice of these guiding values requires all staff and students to be socially aware and self-disciplined in order to create and maintain a climate which:
* Promotes intellectual challenge and endeavour
* Provides physical and emotional nourishment and support
* Encourages responsible self-management
* Develops a commitment to positive participation in society.

...College is an affiliated College of The University of..., founded by the Wesleyan Methodist Church and responsible now to the...Synod of the Uniting Church in Australia. It was founded as both a University College and a centre for theological education, and continues to serve both purposes. The aims of the College are to establish and maintain an academic community in which:

(a) Christian worship is offered and members are encouraged to explore the truth of the Christian faith.

(b) All members are encouraged to pursue academic excellence, and to engage in a wide range of cultural, social and sporting activities.

(c) Students have an opportunity to learn by example and teaching from senior members of the University and community.

(d) Students from all faculties of the University live together and have an opportunity to get to know each other.

(e) All members, both individually and collectively, are encouraged to accept responsibility for their own affairs, and to contribute in time, talent and money to the welfare of the whole.

(f) The following values are pursued:
* freedom of intellectual inquiry
* tolerance of other people with differing views
* respect and consideration for other people and friendships that are lasting because they are based on the good of the other
* service to the community.

...College exists to equip men and women for leadership and service in church and society. It is an affiliated College of the University of...established by the...

(i) to provide theological education and training for Christian leadership and training and particularly for the ordained ministry...

(ii) to provide accommodation, academic tuition, pastoral care and social support for students attending the University of..., enhancing their development towards leadership and service in their professions and in society.

Our aim is to develop a tradition of caring and integration of cultures from around the world so that our students develop good study habits and will interact and learn tolerance and understanding. The College motto is "We think of others before ourselves".
The mission of...is to develop, within the academic environment of the University of..., men and women of outstanding calibre, whose individual capabilities are:
* enhanced by the Colleges' tutorial, academic and vocational programs;
* extended by the intellectual stimulus of living in a collegiate community together with scholars of many disciplines;
* enriched by the College's cultural, sporting and community activities;
* nurtured in a environment which fosters excellence, self-discipline, teamwork and a life-long love of learning and intellectual enquiry all within an Anglican framework which stresses Christian values, spiritual convictions, and tolerance as the basis of an integrated life of sustained service and leadership.

'The University Mission and Residential Ethos'

University is dedicated to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research and community services, and maintaining and furthering the highest University traditions of scholarly integrity and independence.

Within that mission, the...University Residences provide an accommodation facility of quality for students studying at the University. As such, the Residences are an integral part of the institution, and should contribute to the academic, social and cultural development of students.

The conduct of the Residences reflects their distinctive clientele of young adults engaged in tertiary studies for whom personal growth, self-dependence and responsibility to others and to the general well-being of community life are extremely important.

Within this framework, the goal of the Residences are fourfold:
* to provide a learning environment which supports the mission of the University;
* to create a social environment within which the most favourable human relations can take place;
* to provide a reasonably priced living environment which is clean, attractive, well-maintained, safe and comfortable;
* to provide, where, appropriate, a variety of nutritious and pleasing meals, in pleasant surroundings at a reasonable cost.

We aim to establish a tradition of college life which makes possible personal freedom with the willing and responsible acceptance of such conditions as are necessary for civilised living.

The College Mission Statement is: To enrich the quality of life for all residents by providing a collegiate environment which fosters Christian values and the spiritual, academic, social and sporting development of the student body.

The Vision Statement for the College is:
* Accept diversity
* Create community
* Strive for excellence
* Pursue spiritual, intellectual, cultural and social maturity
* Serve society
* Care for the environment.
* Vision Statement:
As a Catholic University College for women...is a community, formed and inspired
by the Christian message whose members are enabled to pursue their academic
studies and to develop spiritually, culturally and socially.

...community comprises graduate and undergraduate students of different ages,
faiths and cultures, and all College staff members. All are encouraged to be
hospitalable, to live simply, to serve the wider community, and to be involved in
world issues.

The spirit of community in the College requires members to develop their own
discipline of accepting and considering others in day-to-day living and of
complying with communally agreed-upon rules.

* The College provides an environment which fosters the development of the
individual in relation to the community, and promotes an atmosphere conducive to
academic and Christian values.

* College provides a collegiate environment in which students of the University
will have the greatest possible opportunity for academic achievement, intellectual
development, and personal growth, in a supportive Christian environment which
recognises the rights of individuals to their individuality while encouraging them to
develop a sense of community belonging, a sense of worth, and a set of high
ethical and professional values.

* is committed to providing an enriching and integrating collegiate environment
within high quality residential facilities for our university students. This will be
attained through enhancing the academic achievement, intellectual development,
and social maturity of resident students through the provision of an innovative,
supportive infrastructure which values education, difference, the development of
leadership and community, and the continual upgrading of buildings and facilities.

* To promote international understanding, tolerance and goodwill by providing for
students of the University of...:
  * a non-sectarian, a-political living-learning environment that enhances
    individual growth and development especially in areas of cross-cultural
    understanding;
  * facilities that are well-maintained, attractive, safe, clean, comfortable and
    moderately priced;
  * management services that ensure that the administration of the college is
    orderly, effective, efficient and environmentally-conscious;
  * dining facilities, catering and related services that effectively meet the
    college goals.

* College, a facility of the Uniting Church, is responsible for fostering a Collegiate
community in which University Undergraduates, Post-graduates and staff have the
best possible opportunity to grow, academically, socially, personally and spiritually.

* Mission Statement: To make...the best residential College for university students so
they can achieve personal, academic, social, cultural and sporting goals, through
the provision of value for money quality services, within the context of a
reasonably safe, secure and caring environment.
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College Mission: To foster educated women leaders.

Mission: The principal purpose of...will be to make the greatest possible long-term contribution, via housing-related activities and cultural programs, to attracting students and visitors to the campus and complementing the broader educational, social, cultural, community and commercial activities of...University.

We aim to show that:
* the effective provision of housing services is an important part of the University's ability to attract and satisfy new students;
* by creating a livelier on-campus student community we help overcome the perceived disadvantages of a community university;
* we add value to a...University qualification by improving...'s capacity to provide the broader educational experience students and employers seek.

Vision, Mission and Values:
Vision: an international community inspired to excellence through learning.
Mission: to provide a secure collegiate environment that promotes the highest standards of academic achievement and personal development for the benefit of the individual and the wider community.
Values: integrity, courage, responsibility, goodwill, self-discipline, trust, tolerance, altruism, enthusiasm, fun.

...College exists in order to provide a supportive and stimulating environment in which each student may pursue optimum academic achievement....While aiming at the pursuit of excellence in specific fields of study, the College also hopes to promote among its members a love of learning, and a critical approach to issues....

A primary aim of collegiate life is to help engender in its members a strong sense of the rights and responsibilities of individuals living in a community with others. The College encourages its members to participate in the cultural, spiritual, social and sporting events arranged under its auspices, and it values personal participation in a variety of activities.

By providing an atmosphere in which students are accepted as mature and self-responsible,...aims to make a student's stay at college a fun, enjoyable, intellectual and maturing experience.

To provide an efficiently managed residential community within a Christian context that provides opportunities for each individual to achieve their personal and academic potential

The mission of the College is to present to the Australian society an example of an academic and spiritual community striving together to achieve a mature outlook on life that will enable its residents to carry the influence of Christian values and ideals of the College to the wider community.

The College's primary aim is the provision of a conducive atmosphere for living and studying at University so that the residents become mature graduates with a balanced outlook on life based on Christian values. In this sense the College sees itself contributing to the development of quality graduates.
Contained in a document 'The...Strategic Plan'. The mission of...is to provide a safe and secure environment conducive to academic achievement, intellectual inquiry and the social, cultural, personal and intellectual development of all members. The ...affirms the right of all members to organise their own lives and conduct according to their own beliefs and values and to live, work and study free from harassment of any kind.

* 'The...Ethos':...functions as an integral part of the educational program and academic support services of...University. Its ethos centres around the concept of providing and promoting:
  * A Safe Living Environment:...flats and environs are safe, secure, well maintained and reasonably priced.
  * Communal Living: The fostering and maintenance of a sense of community and the involvement of all residents in that community is integral to the function of...The quality of life is communal and co–operative, and encourages responsible living and maturity.
  * Academic Achievement:...is supportive of the academic endeavours and achievements of all residents. Resident Tutors are available to students to provide advice and refer them to appropriate University personnel.
  * Equity: All students are treated with equality and harassment or discrimination of any kind is not tolerated.
  * A Multicultural Community:...is committed to the fostering and development of cross cultural awareness among residents and to generating multiracial and multicultural interactive opportunities within the living environment.
  * Personal Development: The personal development of all residents is strongly encouraged. Facilities and opportunities for involvement in social, cultural, sporting and other recreational activities are provided. Resident Tutors and... Assistants are available to refer students experiencing personal or academic difficulties to appropriate University services and agencies.
  * Student Participation: The...administration is committed to encouraging students to actively participate in the governance of...through the Directors Advisory Committee.

* '...College: A Statement of Aims and Purposes'

* The founders of...College designated its primary purpose to be that of a Christian–value residential community where tertiary–level students could develop and mature spiritually, intellectually, and socially. This aim continues to animate members of the College.

* ...College is by nature a Roman Catholic institution providing uniquely the opportunity for its members to integrate their religious faith with contemporary culture.

* The College is, too, an academic institution whose members are single–mindedly committed to truth, to learning, and to the intellectual life.

* Consequently, the men and women of this College strive for human breadth in their learning, and to become constructive and critically appreciative in mind. Moreover, they are willing to enter practically into achieving human excellence, wholeness and holiness.
* College does not only accept Roman Catholics who wish to pursue these goals. Others who may not share our Catholic faith—vision can, nonetheless, share our desire for mature human excellence. We welcome them also: they have much to give as well as to receive.

* College has, as its immediate practical goal, to provide adequate residential facilities primarily for students of the University of... (to which the College is affiliated) and, then as places are available, for some students of other universities in the State.

* In offering a structure of tutorials and study—supervision, together with a good basic library and other ancillary educational services, the College aims to create for its residents a learning—environment that will encourage them to engage in their studies in such manner as to lead not only to their academic success but also to a love for learning and a life—long desire to pursue truth under God.

* The peculiar hallmark of this College’s residents is dictated by that of their patron,—a tendency or bias towards giving absolute priority to truth and honesty in the face of God: to be "God’s servants first". This quality governs their every action and endeavour.

* ...was notable, too, for his recognition of the personal dignity, moral integrity, and diversity of gifts that others enjoy. Members of this College take this to heart...in their courtesy and sensitivity to others and in their concern for and sense of responsibility for the College and its good name.

* Their respect for others leads them — like their patron — to look especially to the well—being of the alienated or under—privileged: they try to promote actively a more equitable society by offering of their own time and talents to lessening material and spiritual injustice in our community.

* Under the provisions of the...University Colleges Act of December 23, 1926, the following are to be noted:—

(a) The registered owner of the land and proprietor of the College is the Roman Catholic Archbishop of...;
(b) The College itself is to be governed by a Council.

* Membership of the College Council will include some appointees of the Archbishop, and some of the University of..., as well as members of the Staff and Student body.

* A pact exists between the Roman Catholic Archbishop of...and the Society of Jesus in virtue of which the day—to—day administration, finance, discipline and studies of the College are under the control of the Jesuit Fathers, subject to rules and regulations drawn up by the Rector of the College and approved by the Archbishop and College Council.

* There is the expectation that the student body in general, and the General Committee of the Student Club in particular, will assist the Rector and the College Administration in promoting and implementing the values and the rules/regulations mentioned above.
APPENDIX I:
KEY ATTRIBUTES FOR FUTURE HEADSHIP:
A SELECTION OF RESPONSES FROM HEADS FROM BOTH SECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads of University Owned Residences</th>
<th>Heads of Privately Owned Residences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thick skinned tenacity! &quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ability to take principled decisions and 'ride' temporary unpopularity.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A sense of humour (vital) + energy.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Patient person who can live with ambiguity.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ability to relate to and deal with a wide cross-section of people.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;An outstanding ability to relate well to and develop young adults.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gentleness of spirit and touch, and a warm appreciation of the lives and diversities of the residents.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Empathetic – needs to understand where students are 'at'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Inspirational so that others may catch the spirit of what is intended or desired and share the goal that has been established or sought.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abilities/Skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abilities/Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Excellent 'people skills'.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;To find a consummate professional – leader and manager.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ability to listen and evaluate.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Good self-efficacy – all round skills with confidence in self ability.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Organisational skills coupled with evidence of an understanding of young people's needs – not their wants.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;People skills (i.e. a warm friendly personality).&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Capacity to communicate with people while being respected and the capacity to solve interpersonal problems.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ability to negotiate and maintain perspective.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Ability to work in a team and facilitate opportunities for all to contribute.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Leadership in an area related to the pastoral care of students and their academic, personal and social development.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Compassion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Flexibility.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Capacity for warmth in relating to residents.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Creative – 'visionary' as an educator NOT a manager.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of University Owned Residences</td>
<td>Heads of Privately Owned Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience/Background</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experience/Background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Broad, many-faceted experience of life - both feet on the ground.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Some academic distinction or interest in a field other than education.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Academic prestige.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Proven ability to lead efficient and intelligent adolescents or young adults.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A sound manager with considerable experience with residential establishments.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Institutional sensitivity and experience.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No responses within this category)</td>
<td>&quot;Commitment to and demonstrated practice of a Christian ethos.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Ability to set a high academic and spiritual standard and to inspire students and staff to seek to emulate the standard.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Personal: integrity and courage.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The ability to NOT interfere.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Colleges go through developmental phases. The next phase for this college involves significant fundraising for our Foundation. The next Head will need to be comfortable and experienced in this role.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Omniscience ('knowing all things'). Omnipotence ('all-powerful').&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Consultative so that persons affected by changes may have some input into the nature and implementation of change.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Someone with a broad vision - able to perceive the changing nature of society.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>