

## Educational Leadership and the Curriculum Implementation Process: The Devolution Gap

Ian W. Gibson

Paper presented at the  
1992 AARE / NZARE Joint Conference  
Educational Research: Discipline and Diversity  
Deakin University  
Melbourne  
November, 1992

School of Education  
University of Southern Queensland

### Abstract

Educational Leadership and the Curriculum Implementation Process: The Devolution Gap

In a recent study, funded by the Queensland Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum, designed to describe the perceptions of the curriculum implementation process held by educational personnel across the system, the issue of leadership in the process evolved as a major secondary factor. Significant differences in the need for and perceptions of the leadership role in the process were discovered between senior administrators, principals and teachers.

Senior administrators saw no role responsibility for the curriculum implementation process and the majority of principals in the study expressed a decided preference for non-involvement, based upon past practices, lack of training and knowledge on how to manage implementation. In contrast, teachers in the study expected curriculum and instructional leadership from the school administration in the form of general support and direction, the generation of local ownership of curriculum innovation, the development of appropriate inservice activities and curriculum maintenance processes.

This study describes a significant gap in the expectations of educational personnel concerning a critical activity central to the concept of devolving decision making responsibilities to the local level.

## Educational Leadership and the Curriculum Implementation Process: The Devolution Gap

Ian W. Gibson

### Introduction

During 1990-91 the Queensland Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum (MCCC) funded a major research project designed to investigate teacher perceptions of curriculum implementation processes within the state. Varied and large scale data collection techniques probed reactions to these processes from primary and secondary schools, rural and urban regions and from all levels of the educational hierarchy in both public and private systems. More than five hundred educational personnel across the state were contacted for their opinions at various stages of the research. The resultant data set was analysed at length and presented as a formal research report to the Minister of Education during 1991. Entitled *Springboards to Change: From Policy to Practice*, (Bailey, Berrell & Gibson, 1991), this report has been released in book form, and distributed to schools across the state to encourage debate among the practitioners most affected by the curriculum implementation processes which form the major focus of the report.

In summarising the impact of the report the Chairman of the MCCC, Mike Middleton, wrote that "the study... confirmed that the perception of people involved in the process of curriculum change is largely dependent on their particular role... the implications are that all participants need to gain a unique ownership of the change process. There needs to be consultation...professional development programmes and a phasing in process which is manageable for all concerned..." In recognising that the study had uncovered critical factors in the process that needed to be addressed, Middleton agreed with the study's recognition of "(t)eachers as the key players in curriculum implementation" and concurred that they needed "acknowledgement and support if schools are going to ensure truly effective curriculum innovations." (Middleton, 1991, In Bailey, Berrell & Gibson, 1991).

The *Springboards* authors reported a wide range of conclusions from the study, some dealing with the need for teacher ownership of curriculum innovation, some with an emphasis upon collegiality, upon communication processes, ease of reading of documents, the necessity for inservice at all levels of an innovation and the need for increased financial and human resources to service the intended curriculum change.

Not all of the conclusions were new or revolutionary. Many seemed obvious or logical, given the educational contexts from which they were derived. Significant among them, however, were seemingly unrelated findings, derived from various data collection devices, that, in combination, focussed attention upon the question of leadership in the curriculum implementation process.

On the one hand, this study revealed that teachers perceived the process of curriculum implementation as one imposed by remote authorities having little understanding of the school or classroom setting. Despite this 'external leadership', teacher ownership of curriculum innovations was recorded as very low. It was clear that teachers viewed the classroom as an

autonomous setting, and organisational units remote from this classroom setting exerted little positive influence on processes governing curriculum implementation. Further, this local orientation suggested that activity occurring in the school setting is more likely to have a positive effect on teachers' attitudes and perceptions, and more likely to be effective as a change agent than more remote activities. The strong belief by teachers in the autonomy of the classroom correlated highly with a related finding, suggesting that implementation is primarily a collegial process and that interaction with colleagues is vital to success. Communication effectiveness is seen by these teachers in direct relationship to proximity to the classroom. A clear preference for school based inservice activity, school based methods, and a view that principals, teachers and subject masters make up the group responsible for the success of curriculum implementation described the focus on the local control of the process expressed by these teachers.

On the other hand, data collected from the educational leaders in the

school situation clearly indicated that there was a degree of professional discomfort on their part when the question of responsibility for curriculum implementation was raised. Principals did not see themselves as an integral part of the curriculum implementation process, felt ill-prepared to manage any curriculum implementation and did not feel it was their role to assume overall responsibility for curriculum administration. Primary school principals, in particular, believed that they were not generally responsible for the implementation of curricula.

These findings present a disturbing view of the gap in expectations of teachers and administrators that appears to be tied directly to the redefinition of roles resulting from the devolution of curriculum decision making authority and responsibility to the local school community. By focussing upon the relevant findings of the Springboards project, this paper will explore in greater detail, this critical contradiction in expectations between teachers and principals and senior administrators.

#### Literature

An analysis of the literature dealing with curriculum implementation, educational change and innovation reveals many factors seen as necessary in guaranteeing success in the process. Among the variables that are critical to success is that of the role of educational leadership (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan & Lee, 1982; Deal & Petersen, 1990; Fullan, 1991). That is, the role of the principal is seen to be pivotal when success is achieved.

Musgrave's (1979) research clearly links the nature of school leadership with the successful implementation of curricula. Principals are often seen as fulfilling the functions of an advocate and acting as a catalyst for change (France, 1986; Duignan, 1987; Wood, Nicholson & Findley, 1979), particularly when dealing with the tension and conflict often so much a part of the change process (Roe & Drake, 1980; Duignan, 1987, Kefford, 1987). Others suggest that the 'leading professional' (Jones, 1988) must be involved to guarantee on-going support for the innovation, and that the need for direction was pre-eminent among the responses of teachers to a model of the process of implementation posed by Renner (1990).

Support for the process and maintenance of innovations is also critical. Among other things, the literature indicates that teachers require materials, time and support in order to introduce new documents into the classroom. The role of the principal is seen to be central to the provision of these resources. Dodd (1980) emphasises the need for administrators to give more thought to the consequences of actions initiated by the curriculum implementation process.

In studying effective curriculum implementation, Hord & Huling-Austin (1986) suggest that recent research reveals key factors that are often overlooked. Among them is the realisation that various types of actions supporting teachers will be required and that the identification of who is responsible for facilitating the changes that teachers will make rarely occurs. In reporting upon their one year study of the actions of principals as change facilitators, and the effects of their actions on the classroom practice of teachers, Hord & Huling-Austin concluded that the more interventions provided by the facilitator, the better the implementation of the programme by teachers. The location of the intervention and the style of the facilitator also affected the rate of implementation success displayed by teachers.

#### Methodology and Findings

The data for the original study were collected in four distinct phases. Each phase was characterised by the use of a unique data collection device. Stage 1 was designed to tap the reactions of educators to the general concept of curriculum implementation and provide a focus for the development of data collection devices in later stages. A nominal group technique was used at this stage with four different groups of teachers and two different groups of principals.

Stage 2 focussed upon the collection of data from senior administrative personnel from both regional and head offices in both public and private systems. Semi-structured interviews were developed for this purpose.

The third stage, and most extensive data collection activity, was guided by the development of a questionnaire designed to tap the perceptions of teachers across the state who were representative of all geographical locations and size of schools, to the question of curriculum

implementation.

The final data collection activity took the form of a small school case study. The information in this section was collected by telephone interviews and presented as a composite picture of the perceptions of teachers in very small schools regarding the curriculum implementation process.

The data that follows has been organised to contrast the attitudes of teaching personnel to those of their administrative colleagues.

For the purpose of this paper, the definition of curriculum leadership is defined as that activity motivated by the actions of the school principal designed to direct and support the instructional programme. The question of support mechanisms should be seen as a function of the role of an educational leader and not an element of leadership itself. Therefore the role of the consultant, in-service etc. will not be viewed as leadership

acts themselves, but rather a support role called into operation by the action of the educational leader responsible for the process.

### Teacher Attitudes Towards Leadership in the Curriculum Implementation Process

Of seventeen questions in the teacher survey designed to tap the attitudes and perceptions of teachers regarding the roles and contributions of key parties in the curriculum implementation process, six specifically related to the issue of leadership. These questions specifically asked for reactions regarding the effect particular people had on the process, the frequency of staff meetings regarding new curricula and indications of where the ultimate responsibility for implementation rested.

Figure 1 - Who in the School should have responsibility for curriculum implementation?

Figure 1 clearly indicates that 70.5% of teachers in this survey believe that school administrators (principals, 26.5% or subject masters, 44%) should accept some organisational responsibility for curriculum implementation along with teachers (29.5%). It is obvious that regardless of the substantial responsibility teachers place upon themselves for implementation success, there is an expression of need for the type of leadership responsibility and direction that can only be provided by those having formal responsibility for the coordination of local school based processes that go beyond classroom decision making activities.

Table 1 - Perceptions of Ultimate responsibility for Curriculum Implementation

Person	Percentage
Principal	28.7
Yourself and other teachers	27.5
Subject Masters/Other School Administrators	15.2
Director General of Education	7.0
Regional Director	5.3
Regional Supervisor of Studies	4.1
BSSSS/Qld. Dept. Ed.	3.5
Head of Curriculum Services	1.2
Consultants	0.6
Regional Inspectors	0.6

Table 1 provides a more detailed view of where teachers see the ultimate responsibility for curriculum implementation to reside. In responding to a

question asking teachers to indicate who they felt should have ultimate responsibility for implementing curriculum at their school, the largest

group of teachers saw the principal carrying this burden while seventy percent of teachers saw the responsibility to be local and shared between school administrators and teachers. This 'local' orientation to curriculum decision making processes and control of the implementation cycle is clearly evident in this table when one analyses the reaction 'external' personnel received in this question. This finding recurred repeatedly throughout the study. Educational personnel who are not located on site are seen to be responsible for very little when it comes to implementation. Even those whose positions appear to be designed specifically to support such processes (consultants) seem to lack the effectiveness required for such responsibility.

Table 2 - Rank Order of the first Choice for the most Positive Effect on Curriculum Implementation

Group	Percentage
Yourself	38.6
Colleagues	22.8
Subject Masters	22.2
Principal	4.7
Consultants	3.5
Local Panels/Subject Associations	0.6

Table 3 - Rank Order of the Second Choice for the most Positive Effect on Curriculum Implementation

Group	Percentage
Colleagues	37.4
Yourself	21.9
Subject Masters	13.5
Principal	10.3
Consultants	9.7
Local Panels/Subject Associations	2.3
Inspectors/ Supervisors/Senior Regional Staff	1.9
BSSSS/Qld. Dept. Ed.	1.9
Head Office Curric. Developers	0.6

Tables 2 and 3 rank order the perceptions of teachers to the question of who has the most positive effect on curriculum implementation. Both tables state emphatically the needed support envisaged from colleagues and the leadership of the school, subject masters and the principal. A close analysis of Table 2 will reveal the weight of responsibility for the

process taken by teachers themselves, despite the ever present need for supporting structures provided by local school administrators. In looking at the second choice of teachers regarding those having a positive effect on the process, the local responsibility remains unvaried despite an increased emphasis upon the responsibility of school administrators.

Table 4 - Groups causing most problems in implementing  
a new syllabus - first choice

Group	Percentage
Head Office Curric. Developers	51.4
BSSSS/Qld. Dept. Ed.	14.2
Yourself	12.8
Subject Masters	4.7
Colleagues	4.7
Parents	4.1
Inspectors/ Supervisors/Senior Regional Staff	3.4
Local Panels/Subject Associations	2.0
Principal	2.0
Consultants	0.7

Table 5 - Groups causing most problems in implementing  
a new syllabus - second choice

Group	Percentage
Yourself	25.0
BSSSS/Qld. Dept. Ed.	14.2
Head Office Curric. Developers	16.0
Inspectors/ Supervisors/Senior Regional Staff	10.4
Colleagues	9.7
Consultants	5.6
Subject Masters	5.6
Principal	4.2
Parents	4.2
Local Panels/Subject Associations	2.8

Table 4 & 5 represent a logical inversion of the previous tables with interesting twists that seem to re-emphasise the serious approach teachers take when analysing their own responsibilities in the process and the expression of support they see necessary from the designated local educational administrators. The results represented by Tables 4 and 5 indicate a very strong challenge to those central coordinating agencies nominated as causing the most problems, to examine the effectiveness of their role in curriculum processes in the state.

Figure 2 - Level of useful communication by primary or secondary school

When the question of the source of the most useful communication in the implementation process is raised, teachers were in agreement that colleagues were most useful with regard to providing information about implementation of new syllabus or guidelines. Figure 2 suggests that there are several other useful sources of information for each class of respondent. For primary teachers, principals very clearly represented a dependable source of information, while other school administrators (Subject Masters), and regional consultants whose task was to provide inservice on the document being implemented were the next most frequently mentioned source. Secondary teachers appear dependent upon the information provided by subject masters and to a lesser extent, local subject panels, consultants and the principal. Assuming that a score of 50 (mid-point) on this figure indicates an overwhelmingly positive response, teachers at both levels clearly prefer the process to be local and to be informed by both practitioners and administrators.

Table 6 - Level of continued support required in post-implementation phases

Person	
Response	
Colleagues	72.2
Subject Masters	72.1
Consultants	67.4
Principal	62.6
Head Office Curric. Developers	55.4
Local Panels/Subject Associations	54.9
BSSSS/Qld. Dept. Ed.	48.8
Inspectors/ Supervisors/Senior Regional Staff	39.5
University/College Staff	38.2
Parents	37.1

One question asked respondents to indicate the level of continued support they would like to receive from various educational personnel. Table 6 provides a summary of the responses to this question and once again emphasises both the local orientation of the useful support required and the critical role seen to be played by principals and subject masters following the initial introduction of a new curriculum.

In summarising the results of the survey, it is clear that teachers see the responsibility for the process of curriculum implementation to be shared jointly between principals, teachers and subject masters and that they want more support in the curriculum implementation process, particularly from colleagues, administrators and consultants. If the results of this survey leave any doubt regarding the expected role of the principal in implementing curriculum, data from the nominal group process and the small school case study reinforce these findings.

Key concepts, words or themes which emerged in the nominal group sessions for both primary and secondary school teachers were summarised as issues relating to leadership, resources, ownership, in-service provisions and time constraints. The most frequently mentioned of these concepts for both primary and secondary teachers was the issue of leadership. While emphasising the important role seen to be necessary from principals in the local control of curriculum, teachers were clear that some forms of leadership were definitely unacceptable. For example, change motivated by a philosophy of "change for change's sake" among senior managers at head office imposed unrealistic demands upon classroom teachers, lacked

professional validity and was seen to typify the negative leadership so common from central administrations. In opposing this 'leadership at a distance' approach, teachers supported the concept of human and financial resources being allocated by an informed and aware local instructional leader. In addition, classroom teachers saw the role of the principal as very important in administering the process, ensuring that goals were reached and staff were adequately motivated and informed. Many teachers felt that it was the principals role to provide an appropriate leadership model for the administration of the curriculum implementation process. However, it was the perception of primary teachers that some principals seemed averse to becoming significantly involved in the introduction of new syllabi. This attitude was the source of some professional difficulty in the eyes of many, as the data presented above clearly indicate a need for the involvement of the school administration in the process. Such an attitude by principals at the secondary level was not seen to cause a problem of the same magnitude as secondary teachers received the leadership necessary through the actions of their subject masters who compensated for the non-participatory role of some principals.

In analysing the information derived from the small school case study, corroborating data was severely limited because the majority of the schools had no principal per se. However, common responses from these schools emphasised the importance of the timing, frequency and quality of assistance provided by regional offices in the form of time spent with consultants, inspectors and specialist teachers. This form of communication and 'off-site leadership' was seen to be pivotal in the successful implementation of curriculum innovations in small rural schools. These data emphasised the fact that teachers required frequent professional interaction and leadership, particularly when faced with curriculum innovations.

There seemed no doubt that the teachers in this study recognised the need

for involvement of the school principal or other school based administrator in providing the leadership functions seen to be necessary in guaranteeing the successful implementation of curriculum innovations.

#### Attitudes of Central Office Managers Towards Leadership in the Curriculum Implementation Process

Careful review of the interview transcripts indicated that neither head office personnel nor senior managers at regional level perceived that their role should include curriculum implementation. According to those interviewed at head office, this managerial role was mainly filled by senior managers at the regional level. In the view of these regional managers, however, the bulk of the work involved in implementation was seen to be the responsibility of teachers and principals at the school level. There was a distinct tendency in these responses to pass the bulk of responsibility for implementing curriculum to the school level. Senior regional managers also suggested that there were not enough regional consultants to ensure effective implementation of the new curricula. Many alluded to the limited staffing and resource base that inhibited any adequate feedback from schools. Managers also felt that there was inadequate discussion and consultation with schools, specifically with principals and classroom teachers prior to the introduction of new curricula. Regional managers also inferred that they were not in control of establishing their own timelines for the adoption of curricula. Both head office and regional personnel believed that communication was a critical component of the implementation process but that communication was generally poor between principals and teachers. One area in which there was no disagreement was the importance of the role of the principal in curriculum implementation. All those interviewed identified the principal's role as instrumental. It is interesting to note that the officers at either level did not single out teachers as being responsible for successful implementation. Their role was seen to be neutral, while principals were frequently cited as being responsible for success or failure. All those interviewed made allusions to the 'intended' versus the actual role that principals take. A general perception was the critical nature of the principal's role, and there was consensus that principals were not doing enough for the process to be effective. This perception was strong at the

primary level where it was seen that the principal ought to be providing both curriculum leadership and an atmosphere to facilitate change. In secondary school, it was the subject master that was seen to be responsible for those processes.

In summary, senior managers generally perceived that if a breakdown was to occur in the chain of responsibility for the curriculum implementation process, it would be located at the school, at the level of the principal. They believed that school principals did not generally view the curriculum implementation process as a priority area and that principals did not feel that the administration of the process was an area in which they should take a major role. Both head office and regional managers agreed that neither were responsible for the curriculum implementation process and that

many factors 'out of their control' agitated against the success of curriculum implementation.

#### Principals Attitudes Towards Their Role in the Curriculum Implementation Process

In reacting to the question of their leadership role in the curriculum implementation process, principals listed many factors that worked against their involvement. Factors such as a lack of time, inadequate expertise, little professional training, no organisational support and the suggestion that 'teachers generally preferred working with colleagues instead of authority figures in these matters' pervaded the reasons for principal non-involvement.

Additional comments made by principals during the nominal group process regarding curriculum implementation indicated that they did not see themselves as part of that process. Their role lay in providing support to teachers when implementing curriculum. While principals tended to agree that they should influence the curriculum and be leaders, they indicated that this was at a superficial and general level. One principal stated that if he had a relevant area of expertise he would assist, but it was generally agreed that teachers preferred working with peers, and that this was especially true when adopting a new curriculum. Generally, principals did not perceive their role as being one associated with providing leadership in the area of curriculum implementation. They felt that with the volume of change taking place, and the lack of time at their disposal that they were inhibited in participating in curriculum innovation. Principals also expressed the opinion that they were ill prepared at the middle management level for overseeing any curriculum implementation. There was a lack of personal and professional development for principals, including that which would provide leadership expertise in the area of curriculum implementation. Principals claimed that the level of communication and information received prior to the delivery of curriculum documentation was often negligible, or even non-existent. They also stated that they were constrained by a lack of resources needed to support teachers during the process.

#### 5. Conclusions

While there appeared to be general agreement in the study regarding the critical variables leading to the successful implementation of curriculum innovations, the one area of significant contrast was that dealing with the source of leadership necessary in the process. In considering this major difference between the perceptions of teachers, principals and senior administrators, the role of the principal provided the focal point. Primary school teachers in particular believed that the principal played an important role in the process and that, where a principal took a leading role, the process worked well. Secondary teachers were not so dependent upon the involvement of principals as they were on the leadership role adopted by the middle managers in the high school context, the subject masters. Nonetheless, all teachers in this study recognised the need for instructional leadership from an educational administrator. Teachers felt that the attitude of the principal can be considered a vital factor in the success or otherwise of curriculum Implementation. In this way, this study reinforces those findings discussed in the literature proclaiming the role

of the principal as critical in this process.

Principals, on the other hand, simply did not feel it was their role to assume responsibility for implementing curriculum. Generally too busy, untrained, unsupported or unwilling to participate, principals preferred to

leave this task to teachers.

Analysis of this data reveals a view of the curriculum implementation process that should be cause for concern for those involved in the provision of educational services in Queensland. While teachers clearly see themselves as central to the success of the process and willingly take on the classroom responsibility necessary in guaranteeing that success, they also describe a critical need for leadership and support at the local level, which, with the exception of the role played by their colleagues, appears to be non-existent. What is disturbing in this analysis is the lack of involvement and responsibility for the process displayed by senior administrators at local, regional and state levels. This sparse picture of administrator involvement appears contrary to the weight of evidence presented in the literature proclaiming the pivotal role of educational leadership in the success of curriculum innovation.

On one hand, head office personnel and senior management at regional office level did not perceive their role as including any involvement in curriculum implementation while the majority of principals expressed a decided preference for non-involvement in the process. On the other hand teachers from all levels, regions and systems within the state have indicated that educational leadership in the process, generally seen as part of the role of the principal, is necessary for success. With the increasing autonomy of the school setting, the lack of effective influences from outside and the very clear expression of need for local, on-site educational leadership in the curriculum implementation process by teachers, the potentially important role principals and other school administrators can have as facilitators and change agents in school and community based curriculum processes becomes critical.

This re-analysis of the findings of the Springboards project indicates a worrying lack of understanding of the implementation process and of the needs of teachers on the part of curriculum authorities in Queensland. These findings present a challenge to the educational administrators in the state to fill the gap appearing in a process which is central to the development and evolution of curriculum change. With the frequency of curriculum revision and change that is likely in Queensland during the remaining years leading up to the twenty-first century, it is incumbent upon all professional educators in the system to clarify the new roles and responsibilities required in an increasingly devolved system of educational decision making, rather than ceremoniously 'washing one's hands' of the responsibility and hoping for success.

## Bibliography

- BAILEY, J.; BERRELL, M & GIBSON, I.W. (1991) *Springboards to Change: From Policy to Practice*. Consultation and Research Series No. 2, Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum, Brisbane.
- BOSSERT, S., DWYER, D., ROWEN, B., & LEE, G. (1982) *The Instructional Management Role of the Principal*, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.
- DEAL, T.E. , & PETERSON, L.D. (1990). *The Principals Role in Shaping School Culture*. Washington, D.C. , US Government Printing Office.
- DODD, J. (1980) 'Mainstreaming' in *The English Journal*, April.
- DUIGAN, P.A. (1987) 'The Principal's Role: Problems and Pressures' in *Principal and Change: The Australian Experience* University of New England Teaching Monograph, Armidale, NSW., Chapter 3.
- FRANCE, G. (1986) 'Principals Learning and School Developing: Review of a Project of National Significance' in *The Australian Administrator*, Vol. 7, No. 5, Oct.
- FULLAN, M. (1991) *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (2nd ed.) New York, Teachers College Press.
- HORD, S.M., HULING-AUSTIN, L. (1986) 'Effective Curriculum Implementation: Some Promising New Insights' *IN Secondary School Journal*, Vol. 87, No. 1.
- JONES, A. (1988) *Leadership for Tomorrow's Schools*, Basil Blackwell Ltd., Oxford.
- KEFFORD, R.E. (1987) 'The Problems and Positive Role of the Principal in Independent Schools' in *Principal and Change: The Australian Experience*, University of New England Teaching Monograph, Armidale, NSW., Chapter 4.
- MUSGRAVE, P.W. (1979) *Society and the Curriculum in Australia*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, Chapter 6 - 'Curricula Change: Some Conclusions'.
- RENNER, J. (1990) 'Planned Educational change, Statewide Implementation of a New Curriculum in Western Australia' in *Curriculum Perspectives*, Vol. 10, No. 2, May.
- ROE, H.R., DRAKE, T.L. (1980) *The Principalship* (second edition), Macmillan Publishing, New York.
- WOOD, C.L., NICHOLSON E.W. and FINDLEY, D.G. (1979) *The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc..

Intended Publisher

Journal Details: Journal of Educational Administration

Affiliation: UNE & MCB Univ. Press

4 issues per annum

A4 - double spaced, photo ready tables, references seriatim end of article

Abstract 250 words max.

Min. three referees - blind

Address:

The Journal of Educational Administration

University of New England

Armidale NSW 2351

Extracts from Articles appropriate to the leadership question  
Effective Curriculum Implementation: Some promising new Insights  
Hord & Huling Austin 1986

Implementation does not equal delivery of an innovation (new curriculum, programs, processes, etc.), as has been widely assumed in the past (Fullan & Pomfret, 1977). In fact, as simple and straightforward as the process of implementing a new curriculum might seem, when it comes to actual practice, recent research shows that at least three key factors that are often overlooked are important: (1) a realization that various types of actions that support teachers will be required; (2) identification of who is responsible for facilitating the changes that teachers will make; and (3) an understanding on the part of facilitators that change takes a great deal of time.

A 1-year study of the actions of nine elementary school principals is exactly what principals and others do on a day-to-day basis as what influence these actions have. Key research questions of the study concerned what principals and others do in the process of facilitating change and what effects their interventions have on the implementation of specific programs at the classroom level.

Each district was implementing a different district wide curriculum innovations and was in a different year of implementation.

Program implementation can be negatively affected if the persons expected to implement the program judge it to be of poor quality or not appropriate for their situation and thus are not enthusiastic about its use.

The primary focus of the study was on the actions, or interventions, of principals as change facilitators and the effects of their actions on the classroom practice of teachers.

Implementation success is an elusive concept.

Stages of Concern. One major dimension of the CBAM focuses on the "concerns" of individuals as they are involved in change.

The second judgement of success is based on improved pupil achievement.

Developing supportive organizational arrangements.

Traditionally, principals' and other administrators' academic training has emphasized the behaviours and skills of the support and organizational arrangements function.

In-service training and staff development have been regarded for many years as very important for helping teachers to implement new curricula. What we now understand is that helping teachers change their practice is a process. Thus, scheduling staff-development sessions for teachers as they develop understanding and skills regarding a new curriculum are much more effective than a 3-day in-service workshop supplied prior to the opening of school.

One critical link in the process of implementing new practices that has not been given much attention in the past is that of individualized and ongoing assistance to teachers.

By definition, consultation and coaching interventions are directed to individual teachers. As implementation progressed through year 2, consultation interventions continued to be important and increased in percentage. In early stages of most change efforts, teachers as a whole

start at or near the same point and need the same general kinds of information and assistance in becoming acquainted with a change (Hord & Loucks, 1980). Thus, it is reasonable to provide interventions that are less individualized at the beginning of implementation. During the ensuing stages, teachers' skill in use of the new curriculum develops at varying rates and in diverse ways, and teachers require more individualized attention to support their innovation use, thus the need for even more consultation in year 2.

We believe that the success or failure of implementation is determined by the frequency and effectiveness of one-to-one follow-up interactions with teachers that focus on their problems and concerns about changing their teaching practices.

One variable that correlated strongly with overall Implementation Success, in the schools was the number of incident interventions from the principal and the second change facilitator. Thus, the more interventions that these two facilitators provided, the better the teachers implemented a program.

Third, the number of principal's incident interventions that occurred at the school in locations other than the school office or classrooms correlated significantly,  $r = .57$ ,  $p < .05$ , with overall Implementation Success. For the most part, these "other locations" were likely a combination of media centres where faculty meetings and staff development activities were convened, teachers' lounges, hallways, et cetera.

The variable that correlated most significantly,  $r = .74$ ,  $p < .01$ , with overall Implementation Success was the qualitatively derived dimension of principal change-facilitating style (Hall, Rutherford, Hord, & Huling, 1984). Three change-facilitator styles were also investigated in the PTI study: "Initiators" hold a vision of what a school can become; they push staff to improve practice so that students will gain; they support teachers and work with them in these efforts. "Managers" maintain a well-organized, smoothly running, and efficient school; they understand teachers and provide assistance to them; they protect teachers against demands on their time and energy. "Responders" believe that teachers are professionals and can handle classroom instruction; they respond to teachers' requests; they are interested in the happiness of teachers and students. In the study, researchers and site representatives ranked the principals on a continuum ranging from responders to managers to initiators, and these scores were correlated with the Implementation Success data. Using this procedure, this correlation indicates that the more than principals were perceived by researchers to represent the initiator style of facilitator, the higher the Implementation Success of teachers. It is also interesting to note that there was a significant correlation,  $r = .61$ ,  $p < .05$ , between principal style and the total number of interventions that occurred in the implementation studied at a school. Again, the more the principal was perceived to be the initiator style of facilitator, the more interventions occurred.

The results of the PTI study indicate that, despite the importance of the principal, the principal was not the sole change facilitator. In every school, one or two additional persons who played a major role in supplying

implementation interventions were identified.

Thus, it appears that the source of leadership in school improvement is a shared one involving persons with a variety of roles and functions. For example, our data indicate that a large number of the principals' interventions focused on developing supporting and organizational arrangements (41%); 3% involving training, 16% consultation and reinforcement, and 28% monitoring. On the other hand, most second change facilitators concentrated less on organizational activities (35%) and more than principals on training (6%), on activities related to consultation and reinforcement (24%), and on monitoring (30%) (Hord, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 1983).

There is a high price to pay for implementation - intervention time. The integration of substantive improvement in practice cannot be incorporated into classroom use in 1 year. The data in Table 5 clearly demonstrate that the second and third years of implementing a new practice require as many interventions and as much facilitating time and energy as year 1. The data paint a clear picture of how complex implementing new curricula is, considering the large number and variety of interventions conducted by many persons. At the end of the study, all of the principals expressed surprise at how many interventions they and others had made related to these programs during the school year, since each of the innovations studies accounted for only a small portion of the schools' total instructional programs.

Correlational data from the PTI Study suggest that no single type of assistance is sufficient to bring about educational change; rather, a combination of different types of assistance. Ongoing monitoring and consultation and reinforcement are associated with effective curriculum implementation.

Finally, the facilitation of school improvement is not solely the principal's role. A second change facilitator was involved to enhance and complement the principal's leadership.

leftovers

Primary principals are more useful sources of information than secondary principals.

Teachers prefer school based inservice and rate school based methods as being most effective

Subject masters are useful sources of information

Teachers assert that they are inadequately prepared to implement new curricula.

Colleagues are a vitally important source of help in curriculum implementation

Curriculum implementation appears to be a collegial process.

As a group, primary teachers still believe that the principal has an important role to play in the curriculum implementation process, and where a principal took a leading role, these teachers generally felt that the process worked well. However, in many schools, the principal was perceived

to be indifferent to the introduction of new curriculum documents.

#### Pro-Instructional leadership

Among many factors recognised by teachers as being critical to the successful implementation of new curricula, several focussed upon the need for effective leadership in the school setting. Prime among them was the need for curriculum leadership and instructional leadership from school administration with a sense of ownership of the new documents. To support this feeling of ownership that resulted from the local modification of curriculum documents, teachers felt that suitable levels of in-service about new documents, conducted in their schools was necessary. Primary school principals believed that they were not generally responsible for the implementation of curricula.

#### Recommendations from Study

An emphasis upon school based decision making which ensures training, support and maintenance systems for the innovation.

a clarification of the roles and expectations on consultancy personnel

- Organisational units remote from school having little positive influence on curriculum implementation
- Preference for content rather than framework documents - problems arising in schools with one or two teachers
- Access to university staff, subject masters
- Performance of consultants in the process
- Need for more support from colleagues, consultants
- Curriculum Implementation is a collegial process

#### Conclusions from P.51

- required regional, cluster area, district involvement in development of curriculum guidelines etc. that dictate practice.

confusing effect of devolution on the delineation of role responsibilities

#### Role of the Advanced Skills Teacher

Use the devolution process as an excuse to remedy a situation requiring clarity

#### 6. Recommendations

Appropriate training for personnel involved with curriculum implementation

School level preparation of personnel responsible for instructional leadership roles

- Sources for curriculum information with no principal
- Inadequately preparation for innovations

Concepts that should be considered as part of the discussion on leadership resulting from the Springboards research.

#### Ownership

School Based Decision making

Local Control / Involvement / autonomy

Local activity being an effective change agent

curriculum implementation is seen by teachers as a collegial, local activity

See inservice as critical but look to the leadership of colleagues and principals and senior administrators for leadership in the field.

School leadership is critical from either subject master of principal

Table of Contents

Introduction

Purpose of the Research

Methodology / Sample

Purpose of this Article

Literature Review

Research Findings

Conclusions

Bibliography

x·{·|●É·Ñ·M.M.Berrell

J.Bailey, M.M.Berrell, J.Bailey

~Document ~ is too complex to include; merge terminated.