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SYNOPSIS

The symposium is based on a collaborative research project (funded by the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the Queensland Department of Education) which focuses on curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching. Partners in the project include members of the Research Concentration in Curriculum Decision-making at Queensland University of Technology and the Effective Learning and Teaching Unit of the Queensland Department of Education. The collaboration began in
1993 and 1994; it continued in 1995; and it is now proceeding as an ARC-funded collaborative research project in 1996 and 1997. The chief investigators listed in the ARC application are Bob Elliott, Stephen Kemmis and Ian Macpherson, while the chief collaborator for the industry is Greg Thurlow. The project has the full support of the Director-General of Education. Members of the Research Concentration now involved in the project include Tania Aspland, Ross Brooker and Christine Proudford; members of the Effective Learning and Teaching Unit now involved include Joan Jenkins, Leonie Shaw and Chris Woods. The Senior Research Assistant for the project is Adrian McInman.

The project defines curriculum leadership as a phenomenon which involves everyone who facilitates learning. It is enabled by certain qualities within a school curriculum environment; and there a number of mediating factors which work on the individual psychologies of teachers which give them a predisposition to engage in curriculum leadership practices.

The four papers in this Symposium recount the story of the research. How we began and how we have continued to theorise curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching within an action research approach is the focus of the first paper. A feature of the methodology within an overall action research approach is the emphasis on multi methods; and so the second and third papers report on the quantitative and qualitative methodologies respectively. The fourth paper reflects on the work done in 1996 as a platform for further research and action in 1997.

The authors of each paper acknowledge that the ideas emanating from the project and reported in the papers are jointly owned by all members of the research team, as listed above.

The participation of schools in both the quantitative and qualitative components of the study, thus far, is gratefully acknowledged.

The chairperson for the symposium is Bob Elliott/Ian Macpherson.

The plan for the symposium is a short introduction by the symposium chairperson followed by four short paper presentations with a general discussion following.

The papers are led by Tania Aspland, Ross Brooker and Ian Macpherson.
PAPER TITLES AND ABSTRACTS

1. Developing the partnership and the concept of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching via an action research approach
Ian Macpherson, Tania Aspland, Ross Brooker, Bob Elliott and Greg Thurlow.

This paper traces the history of the project from its small antecedent projects in 1992 and 1993, to a larger study completed in 1994, to the development of the ARC Collaborative Research Grant application in early 1995, to the pilot study with four schools in 1995, to the first year of the ARC-funded Collaborative Research Project in 1996. It focuses on an action research approach which is both critical and collaborative and which facilitates the use of multi-method methodologies. It is an approach which celebrates the centrality of teachers in curriculum decision-making; and involves, therefore, notions of empowerment for engaging in transformative practice. The paper reflects on progress to date substantively, in terms of articulating an evolving model of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching (based on data reported at greater length in the second and third papers); and procedurally, in terms of using action research to build new partnerships in educational research.

2. Insights into curriculum leadership: the state of the field
Bob Elliott, Ross Brooker, Greg Thurlow and Adrian McInman

This paper reports on the quantitative study of curriculum leadership in Queensland State primary and secondary schools. The instrument to survey the field, built from the model of curriculum leadership formulated during the pilot studies, is discussed. It is discussed in terms of the four elements isolated during these studies viz social relationships in the school, images of curriculum for effective learning and teaching, school infrastructure and a range of teacher psycho-social variables. The paper outlines the sampling process in which approximately 2,500 teachers from 109 primary schools and 20 secondary schools were selected for study. The sample is deemed to represent teachers across the state in these schools. The results of the analysis are considered and implications for the emerging model and for further research and action are discussed.

3. Insights into curriculum leadership: taking a narrative turn
Tania Aspland, Ross Brooker, Ian Macpherson, Christine Proudford and Stephen Kemmis.
The qualitative research methodology in the various phases of the project has celebrated the richness of the narrative as a research genre that captures the contestations implicit in the complex processes of teaching and learning. Part A of this paper describes how the narrative has evolved over the years in the social sciences, and has been characterised in differing ways that are responsive to its research purposes (Clandinin and Connelly, 1990; Johnston, 1992; Carter, 1993). The early work of Scholes (1982) has been instructive in reconceptualising the narrative genre in the latest phase of our study, revealing the varying modes of inquiry possible through the narrative. The ways in which it has been useful will be briefly outlined, offering insights to others as to the richness of each genre within educational research. Of greatest significance for us has been the "story as fiction", a form of narrative that lends itself to identifying modes of curriculum leadership inherent in teachers' practices of effective teaching and learning. The rationale for adopting this genre in a study of this nature unfolds in Part B of the paper. Part C of the paper focuses specifically on our most recent adventures with the narrative in this light. As such, narrative brought to this research context the value of each subject's experiencing of curriculum leadership and highlights the importance in this project of the self constituted being- a phenomenon to date that has not been recognised in the essentialist work that dominates this field. The eliciting of stories as fiction through the narrative recognises the teaching self within the phenomenon of curriculum leadership; subjectivities that are no longer characterised as a unitary cohesive cohort but "selves and worlds operat(ing) in many modalities" functioning in a "multiverse of experiences" (McHale, 1992: 247) common to leadership of this type. In conclusion it is argued that this orientation to the narrative promotes a notion of participatory research, at the heart of which is found a view of knowledge arising through curriculum leadership struggles required to transform a situation - struggles that in turn, contribute to the professional growth of the participants, both as teachers and researchers.

4. Projecting to 1997 - what still needs to be done? actions and ongoing research
Ross Brooker, Tania Aspland, Ian Macpherson, Joan Jenkins, Chris Woods, Bob Elliott, Christine Proudford and Stephen Kemmis.

This paper takes up the story of what has emerged from the project thus far, and anticipates the possibilities and opportunities for action, development, reporting and further collaborative research. From an analysis of data from the quantitative and qualitative elements of the project's methodology in 1996, the research teams expect to develop a set of strategies for implementing curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching more widely in schools in 1997. These strategies are elaborated in this paper and plans for enacting these strategies in 1997 are outlined. The analysis of data and the development of strategies are set in the context of theorising associated with the
second and third papers and other reviews (for example the Systemic School review) currently being undertaken by the State Education Department.
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PAPER #1

Developing the partnership and the concept of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching via an action research approach

Ian Macpherson, Tania Aspland, Ross Brooker, Bob Elliott and Greg Thurlow.

AN EXPLANATORY NOTE
This paper tells a story of how a group of university researchers from Queensland University of Technology and a group of systemic personnel from the Effective Learning and Teaching Unit of the Queensland
Department of Education began a collaborative relationship and are continuing to use collaborative Action Research as a means of collaborative inquiry and transformative action. The substantive focus of the story is on curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching. It is set within the Queensland State Department of Education commitment to a set of principles for effective learning and teaching. The story (much of which is detailed elsewhere - see Macpherson et al, 1995, Macpherson et al, 1996 and Macpherson et al (draft), 1996) outlines the studies conducted thus far and reflects on the collaborative approaches as a means of conceptualising an approach to collaborative inquiry at the institutional level. This approach is described as critical collaborative Action Research. Within this approach, a view of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching is emerging. The paper concludes with an attempt to identify what we have learned so far from being part of the events upon which the story is based and leads into the content of the fourth paper of this symposium.

INTRODUCING THE PAPER

Antecedents of the learning partnership which began in 1994 are to be found in a number of smaller research efforts which focussed very heavily on research as a collaborative relationship involving university and school personnel. These smaller efforts might be regarded by some as more valid examples of collaborative research than the learning partnership presented in this chapter. The focus of the story in this chapter involves the establishment and maintenance of a partnership which is a facilitating framework for university and schools personnel to research matters relating to effective learning and teaching at the school level. The partnership per se is not so much an example of collaborative research as it is a facilitating framework which supports collaborative efforts at the levels of critical inquiry and transformative action in various parts of a large system.

Such a focus does not lessen the significance of the story. In fact, we believe that such a focus strengthens the contribution which this story can make to the insights and understandings about collaborative work. Why? Simply because we are working at a level which traditionally is much closer to the levels of systemic policy making, and consequently to the sources which shape systemic cultures. Working directly with teachers is undoubtedly essential in talking about collaborative forms of research. However, to focus on these efforts alone is to deny the parallel necessity to collaborate at other levels in order to challenge and reconstruct (via hearing, listening to and taking account of teachers' voices) systemic hegemonies which continue to exhibit hierarchical and linear tendencies. We believe that our work is, in a sense, a conduit which allows teachers' voices to heard and listened to in the heady corridors of policy-making.
The story, then, is our living educational theory (see McNiff, 1993) about working together in developing a view of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching, and using this ever-evolving view to inform ongoing curriculum change through transformative action by teachers at the school level. At this point, the story is not finished and it will continue for at least another year.

DEScribing the context of the research partnership

The Principles of Effective Learning and Teaching

The recently-released Principles of Effective Learning and Teaching by the Queensland Department of Education reflect a commitment "to ensuring that all students attending state schools are provided with the opportunity to obtain a comprehensive, balanced and equitable education" (1994:1). All five principles place a heavy emphasis on learning in the belief that the education alluded to above "promotes the holistic development of each individual, and ensures that students are provided with opportunities to prepare them for their present and future lives" (1994:1).

The principles, developed in 1993, were derived from a review of exemplary practices in years P-12 across the State, and from an extensive literature review. The Principles were developed collaboratively with approximately 200 teachers, and drafts were circulated to all State Schools for comment during the developmental stage.

The five Principles are as follows:

Effective learning and teaching is founded on an understanding of the learner.

Effective learning and teaching requires active construction of meaning.

Effective learning and teaching enhances and is enhanced by a supportive and challenging environment.

Effective learning and teaching is enhanced through worthwhile learning partnerships.

Effective learning and teaching shapes and responds to social and cultural contexts.

The rationale in developing the Principles was to formulate a corporate position on learning and teaching which would draw attention to exemplary practices that would enhance learning and assist individual school communities in this task. They were designed to focus on the
fact that effective learning and teaching is not a final state to be achieved but, rather, a way of thinking about learning and teaching so that continual improvement occurs. Similarly, they were designed to highlight the fact that the school is a learning community and learning refers to all members in the community. Thus, the Principles were seen as underpinning teacher learning as much as student learning.

In 1994 a statement of the Principles was distributed to all State Schools together with a set of possible awareness-raising activities. In a letter to School Principals, the Director General of Education indicated that every Principal should take up these suggestions in order to introduce the Principles into the school communities for which they were responsible. Schools reacted to this directive in diverse ways, and it is this diversity that we have tried to capture through our research.

For our story, the fourth principle of effective learning and teaching is particularly relevant. It states that:

Effective learning and teaching is enhanced through worthwhile learning partnerships.

Aspects of this principle include:

Learners and teachers take time to reflect critically and creatively on their practices.

School administrators, parents, caregivers, paraprofessionals, specialist support teachers, and other members of the community participate in the learning-teaching process.

This paper develops within the context of this principle and its accompanying aspects; it links the principle with Stenhouse's (1975) well-known quote which states "It is teachers who, in the end, will change the world of the school by understanding it"; it argues for a worthwhile learning partnership based on collaborative inquiry into the effective learning and teaching principles as an example of curriculum policy formulation and practice; and it sharpens the focus for this inquiry to curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching.

It would appear that the processes associated with developing the Principles of Effective Learning and Teaching statement reflect Stenhouse's assertion. Here you have a set of principles which may be applied in a variety of mixes in the diverse range of learning settings across the system; and which emerged from an identification and recognition of already-existing exemplary practice in teaching/learning settings.
There is also a claim which Fullan (1993) makes. He believes that "connection with the wider environment is critical". He says:

For teachers and schools to be effective two things have to happen. First, individual moral purpose must be linked to a larger social good. Teachers still need to focus on making a difference with individual students, but they must also work on school-wide change to create the working conditions that will be most effective in helping all students learn. Teachers must look for opportunities to join forces with others, and must realise that they are part of a larger movement to develop a learning society through their work with students and parents. It is possible, indeed necessary, for teachers to act locally, while conceptualising their roles on a higher plane. (pages 38-39).

How effective learning and teaching might be understood by teachers who will change the world of the school through collaborative inquiry; how notions of curriculum leadership might sharpen the focus of such inquiry; and how Action Research which is both critical and collaborative might provide an overall approach for collaborative inquiry are important considerations for us as we continue to theorise our work.

Antecedents of the Research Partnership
Small-scale collaborative research studies (See Macpherson & Proudford, 1992; Aspland, Macpherson & Proudford, 1996) which focused on curriculum policy formulation, interpretation and implementation within the context of senior school curriculum policy provided one starting point for the establishment of the learning partnership. These studies attempted to celebrate the centrality of teachers in curriculum decision-making and their voice on matters relating to curriculum policy formulation, interpretation and implementations was reported to policy makers at the systemic level.

With the arrival of the Effective Learning and Teaching Principles, personnel from the Effective Learning and Teaching Unit approached the University to explore possible ways of working together in the area of effective learning and teaching. Using our small-scale research studies as a basis, we entered into negotiations with personnel from the Unit concerning possible collaborative working arrangements. Both the University and the Unit made funds available to support work in 1994. And so it was that the birth of the collaborative research group took place.

While the proposed intentions of such a project were clear, and strong commitment to the project in place, the way forward remained problematic. It became the source of anxiety and uncertainty in the formative stages of the project as we tried to professionally articulate our interests in the project and juggle the differing agendas that were significant at this stage. We had to be responsive to
the emerging relations within the team - each member cautiously putting forward his/her claims while at the same time remaining sensitive to those of the other partners, particularly those who were entering the research field. In many ways such cautiousness prolonged the beginning phases of the study, but in the long term proved to be fruitful in establishing a positive collegial working ethos that continues to this day.

The two small-scale research studies provided a launching-pad for further investigation. The Effective Learning and Teaching Principles statement appeared to be eminently suited to provide a policy-type context for such investigation. An investigation which focused on its formulation at the system level, interpretation at the school level and implementation at the classroom level (as experienced and perceived by classroom teachers) would provide further insights about curriculum decision-making practices of systems, schools and teachers. Such insights would continue the attempts by systems, schools and teachers to work together in worthwhile learning partnerships with a view to the enhancement of effective learning and teaching. Such insights, we claimed, come powerfully and perceptively from the world of teachers, and it is teachers who, in the end, will change the world of the school. We believed that it is teachers who best understand the world of the school, and it follows that policy makers in the broader contexts of schools, systems and society listen to the messages which their understandings bring to our processes of policy formulation, interpretation and implementation. We considered it important to explore how the Effective Learning and Teaching Principles statement had listened to teachers' messages and what the spin-offs have been in the daily lived experiences of teachers and learners in classrooms.

BEGINNING THE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP
And so we had a focus to begin work. We decided to investigate the processes of dissemination of, and subsequent practices associated with, the Effective Learning and Teaching Principles Statement developed by the Queensland Department of Education. In particular, the research was concerned with the extent to which teachers felt that their existing practices were in harmony with these principles; the extent to which the principles influenced their practice; and particular conditions that were conducive to changing practice to be more in keeping with the principles. In order to investigate these issues, two parallel projects were established.

Project A focussed on the levels of awareness and use of principles by teachers, managers and support personnel in a range of schools across the state. To this end, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to teachers in a range of different school types. Four rural high schools, four rural primary schools, ten provincial high schools, ten provincial primary schools, five metropolitan high schools and five
metropolitan primary schools were included in the sample. Schools were selected to be representative of the various interests of the State system.

This project highlighted the fact that:

- there are significant variations between regions concerning the introduction and acceptance of the principles;

- while individual teachers reported awareness of the principles, considerable work is still required for them to consider the principles collaboratively;

- there are differences between the way males and females responded to the principles.

In general, the project indicated the need for curriculum leadership structures to be well established in order to infuse the principles in schools' practices.

Project B consisted of in-depth studies in eight schools - including metropolitan, provincial and rural schools. Staff from each school (teachers and administrative staff) were interviewed in face to face situations in metropolitan contexts and through teleconferences for others. From the accounts of these interviews conclusions about factors which would promote acceptance of the principles and factors which facilitate educational change were identified.

With reference to the former category it was concluded that a number of factors were significant. These included a recognition and acceptance of good practice; appropriate professional development programs; promotion of collaborative efforts; linking of the principles with teachers' needs; and curriculum leadership and a supportive community. In the latter category were factors such as a sense of ownership; facilitative styles of leadership; receptiveness to change; and professional development.

In general the study concluded that while the initiative and its documents had been useful in assisting a number of teachers to improve practice, the impact was even across schools and even within schools. In this sense, the fact that both projects highlighted the importance of leadership in schools is significant. The broad conclusions were based around five integrated themes - the language of the documents, schools as learning communities, leadership in schools, prioritising initiatives and conditions of development. These themes are described elsewhere at length (see Macpherson et al, 1996).

TAKING TIME OUT TO REFLECT ON THE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP SO FAR
In both the antecedent research studies and in the 1994 study, our research emphasis was working with teachers not on teachers. Teachers were researching with us on matters of mutual professional interest. All three studies had teachers participating with us in collecting, analysing and reporting data. From the antecedent study in 1993 we concluded that:

the collaborative nature of the approaches used in the study engendered an interest in participation in terms of both the collection and interpretation of data;

the opportunities provided for group sessions contributed to the analysis and validation of data; to the professional development of participants; and to the transmission of significant messages to administrative personnel;

the use of teachers' voices as a means of communicating significant messages about their curriculum decision-making to administrative personnel; and

the use of negotiation with the participants and stakeholders in determining further investigations and action.

(Aspland, Macpherson & Proudford, 1993:27)

It was at this point that we considered it important to inform our emerging living educational theory of working collaboratively with a review of relevant literature (Feldman, 1993; Levin, 1993; Lieberman, 1992; Miller, 1992; Knight, Wiseman & Smith, 1992; Beck & Black, 1991; Campbell, 1988; Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik, 1986; Kyle & McCutcheon, 1984) which found that there can be limitations as well as benefits in collaborative forms of research. However, it was noted that Johnston (1990) argues that all projects are not suited to the collaborative approach, nor is less collaborative research necessarily less adequate.

We also discovered that there are benefits to be achieved from collaborative research that focused on practical problems which are experienced and defined by teachers for it has the ability to produce prolific results not only for the improvement of practice, but also more productive development of curriculum theory itself (Kyle & McCutcheon, 1984). Collaboration between teachers and researchers promotes engagement in critical thinking and practice, thus constructing knowledge and cultivating the participants' capacity to structure and appropriate their knowledge and understandings (Beck & Black, 1991). This, therefore, increases the credibility of the interpretations of the data as all participants contribute to the interpretations (Johnston, 1990).
Collaborative inquiry, we found, leads to improved professional performance of university researchers and school teachers as well as other unanticipated benefits. These include increased awareness of effective instructional practices; sharing ideas among group members; giving teachers a voice to communicate significant ideas; and a supportive atmosphere for problem-solving regarding instructional challenges (Aspland, Macpherson & Proudford, 1993; Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik, 1986; Stevens, Slaton and Bunney, 1992). Collaborative procedures can lead to a wide range of questions about educational theory and practice becoming the subject of systematic inquiry (Kyle & McCutcheon, 1984). Writing about collaboration is much easier than doing collaborative research (Levin, 1993).

From this brief review, we summarised the limitations of collaborative inquiry as follows: ethical concerns; moral and political problems; value conflicts; issues of power and authority; democratic participation; inequalities in the actual circumstances of individual involvement, and in the process itself; and contradictions and role dilemmas when teachers come to suspect 'a hidden agenda' behind the researchers' self-proclaimed promise to a teacher-defined and teacher-directed approach to professional development. Consequently, differences in perspective between the researchers and the teachers could lead to a context which embodies difficulties, dilemmas and misinterpretations whilst attempting to relate research as a process of inquiry to the needs and concerns of teachers.

We noted in our reading that, in more recent years, university researchers were moving towards viewing teachers as participants in research rather than seeing them as subjects. (Feldman, 1993). The teachers' reflections in our 1993 study (See Aspland, Macpherson, Proudford & Whitmore, 1996) emphasise their appreciation of this change in the relationship between the university researchers and the teachers and of the researchers' attitude concerning the object and purpose of the research. Research by Day (1991) supports the teachers' reflections, and he points out that research and staff development can be one and the same enterprise, and that it can be practical and emancipatory for all participants if it is a 'partnership model'.

The teachers in our 1993 study felt that it was significant that they were able to interact with others and to be given the opportunity for valuable reflection. Stevens, Slaton and Bunney (1992) see this as an unexpected benefit of collaborative inquiry. It was also noted in the reflections that understanding about the need to value ideas of other individuals when developing policy was also reinforced. Feldman (1993:342) as well as Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik (1986:547) support this by quoting a definition by Tikunoff, Ward & Griffin (1979) who claim that "...collaboration recognises and utilises the insights and skills provided by each participants..."
Power and authority, as argued by Miller (1992), are issues which tend
to challenge 'the fit' of some research projects with the collaborative
inquiry mode. The teachers' reflections showed that the administrative
management styles and the politics at play between the different
organisations can impact on a collaborative inquiry approach.

Not all written reflections were positive ones regarding the 1993
study. The responses stated that their understandings were already at
a very high level because of their involvement in curriculum
decision-making at their school. It was stated that the other schools
in the project were not operating at the same level of curriculum
decision-making for teachers.

However, the teachers appreciated that they were not tied to the
constraints of an established agenda of research hypotheses. Rather,
they valued the flexibility achieved through an agenda of questions and
concerns, as advocated by Oakes, Hare & Sirotnik (1986), which often
changed as different levels of working consensus were reached. This
type of feedback was useful in reshaping our work in the following
year.

The 1994 study (Projects A and B) proved valuable in developing
collaborative links between the Effective Learning and Teaching Unit in
the Queensland State Education Department and the Curriculum
Decision-Making Research Concentration at Queensland University of
Technology. It formed the basis of applications for funded
collaborative research projects focussing on curriculum leadership to
facilitate effective learning and teaching in schools and the basis for
a further study in 1995 which aimed to develop a model of curriculum
leadership for effective learning and teaching.

But reviewing literature and documenting reflections were insufficient
in themselves to take our living educational theory further. We needed
to theorise about what we were focussing on and how we were working
together. We pondered for some time as to what was happening within the
partnership as well as the project, and why it was happening in
particular ways. It was from this theorising that we conceptualised an
approach to collaborative research and a view of curriculum leadership
for effective learning and teaching.

CONCEPTUALISING AN APPROACH TO COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH: CRITICAL
COLLABORATIVE ACTION RESEARCH
From the reflections presented above, we were now at liberty to argue
that the collaborative approach to research used in the three studies
has the potential to assist personnel at systemic and school levels to
better understand and transform the processes associated with
curriculum policy formulation, interpretation and implementation.
Central to this is our reliance on and faith in the use of teachers' voices to convey powerful messages to system and school level personnel. The Stenhouse quote with which we began: "It is teachers who, in the end, will change the world of the school by understanding it", perhaps needs to be extended to read: It is everyone associated with schools who, in the end, will change the world of the school by understanding it critically, collaboratively and transformatively. Increasingly, the boundaries between university and system/schools personnel were becoming blurred. Working as equal partners in a research project of common interest, albeit from different perspectives, was becoming more and more a feature of our work.

The collaborative research approach to which we are actively committed has been conceptualised as critical collaborative action research because it is research which had an emancipatory intent of empowering its participants; not just to understand their social reality within their school settings but to change it (Smith, 1993) in ways that are personally meaningful at differing levels to all participants. We were proposing that critical collaborative research could be characterised in the following ways:

*COLLABORATIVE - practitioners and researchers engaged in collaborative action work together as a group continually defining and redefining the purposes of the research;
*Critical - underlying assumptions and beliefs are acknowledged; curriculum trends, policies and practices are seen to be problematic and contestable; and further action is tied to critical frameworks which focus on social justice and empowerment for all;
*ACTION-ORIENTED - demanding direct involvement and influence from the real world experience of practitioners where the problems of practice are framed, possible solutions are determined, solutions are enacted, and results are reviewed, reflected upon and reconstructed;
*HONEST - generating high levels of trust and relationship building amongst all participants;
*CONTRIBUTORY - roles are negotiated not imposed and responsibilities are clearly defined and self determined;
*COMMUNICATIVE - interaction among group members occurs;
*REAL - realistic expectations are set regarding time lines, and what's possible in particular contexts;
*EQUITABLE - power and authority over design, process, and outcomes are shared;
*MEANINGFUL - teachers are valued as persons not as research objects, they are actively involved in the research process, they can tell their story;
*REPRESENTATIVE - acknowledgment of the professional, social and emotional needs of teachers takes place;
*SUSTAINED - time for reflection and reconstruction is an integral feature of the process; and
TRANSFORMATIVE - empowerment to make change happen and not just to explain or understand it is of utmost importance.
(Aspland, Macpherson, Proudford & Whitmore, 1996)

As we entered the next phase of the alliance, we called on these characteristics to be guiding principles for continuing the learning partnership which was seeking to understand the complexity of factors which impact on teachers as they try to live out in their classrooms the implications of policies and curriculum statements associated with effective learning and teaching.

If research aims to interpret and reflect upon such lived experiences, as well as upon the beliefs and understandings of teachers, then, the collaborative approach, in the form of critical collaborative action research, can be argued as the way to proceed. It offers to teachers, as researchers, opportunities to tell stories of their experiences in ways that inform and transform future practices in a critical and enlightening manner.

Research partnerships that adopt these principles of procedure have the potential for teachers to feel empowered as curriculum practitioners and leaders in their respective professional work contexts by:

*Accessing opportunities to contest current trends, policies and imperatives at national, state and systemic levels which are seemingly centralising control over curriculum decision making;
*Making connections with significant others in planning for transformative action at local and broader levels of context; and
*engaging in research which allows them, within a collegial community to critique their practice, transform their work and be accountable for their actions.

Within this approach to collaborative inquiry, research methodologies became very much associated with research relationships so that teachers' voices could ultimately be heard in conveying messages. To strengthen this relationship, and as teachers' stories became central to the research community, we decided in 1995 to enhance our Action Research, by adopting narrative methodologies to elicit teachers' views about curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching.

A range of authors have successfully incorporated narratives as a central feature in the analysis of teachers' professional knowledge (Clandinin, 1985; Clandinin and Connelly, 1988, 1990, 1992; Johnston, M. 1990; Johnston, S. 1988, 1990; Miller, 1992; Paley, 1990). Narratives are the most successful way to access teachers' thinking about their practice (Carter, 1993) for teachers are best positioned to know their practice. Teaching episodes, such as the ones under investigation here, are reported as "narratives in action", expressions
of themselves and their thinking in a particular situation. (Clandinin and Connelly, 1985:195).

Based on Gough's recent work (1994), we began trialling an innovative way of interpreting narrative as "fiction". This, we believed could prove more useful in research inquiries of this nature, for it offers to the research community greater opportunity to generate links between existing practices or "present reality" and "past or future possibilities" that have emerged or are likely to emerge in teachers' work. (Gough, 1994:47). These opportunities, it was contended, are likely to be more enriching than the simple interpretation of narrative which traditionally has been arrived at through processes of reflection and reflexivity, processes that sometimes fall short of the proactive thinking that is central to informative research. Moreover the specific development of the narrative advocated by Gough (1994) proposes that the use of fiction brings to the research context a "diffracting lens" - a phenomenon that is useful in the reconstruction of teachers' curriculum thinking.

In 1995, we invited teachers in four schools (two primary and two secondary) to participate in the writing of narratives, engaging in follow-up conversations, collaborating in analysing the narratives and eliciting themes which will contribute to our tentative model of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching. Teachers enthusiastically participated in each of these phases and found it a worthwhile experience, both professionally and personally.

While this work was proceeding as a negotiated action emanating from our earlier work in 1994, we were also working together in developing an application for an Australian Research Council (ARC) Collaborative Research Grant to support our ongoing work in 1996 and 1997. Happily, we were successful in receiving this grant, and we are now at the point of finishing the first year of the research project.

As the collaborative inquiry has continued in 1996 and will continue in 1997, we are further developing our principles guiding critical collaborative action research as one way of engaging in collaborative inquiry. During 1996, we have used multi-method methodologies (Brewer & Hunter, 1992) at both system-wide and site-specific levels. These methodologies are the focus of the second and third papers. Our work continues to focus on an elaboration of our conceptions of curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching and to implement actions which are appropriate for the ongoing empowerment of teachers and learners. In 1997, the focus will shift more to the conceptualisation, implementation and evaluation of actions which are appropriate for the ongoing empowerment of teachers and learners as they seek to transform practice in the area of curriculum leadership.
CONCEPTUALISING A VIEW OF CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE LEARNING AND TEACHING

Our work to date (which, remember, began back in 1992!) has brought us to the point where we want to continue our theorising about curriculum leadership. We are keen to develop a view of curriculum leadership which is empowering for teachers and transforming for their curriculum practice. The notion of curriculum leadership is the substantive focus for our work, and it is a focus which has developed as part of our living educational theory. It has not been something which has been imposed upon our work. A background for this view was needed, and so we returned to further reviewing of literature and theorising our ideas. This theorising is outlined in the following paragraphs.

Leadership is well recognised as a key phenomenon in considering how organisational priorities can be realised in a diverse range of settings, including education and curriculum (Sergiovanni, 1984). Recent curriculum research has indicated that there is much to be gained by viewing a curriculum leader as anyone interested in improving the current situation, and monitoring, improving, and implementing curriculum changes (Alberta Department of Education, 1992; Hannay & Seller, 1991). However, real processes of curriculum leadership in schools are complex, subtle, incorporate many different power forces, and can be exclusive to the educator who wishes to be a curriculum leader (Cairns, 1981; Kee, 1993; McIntyre, 1984). This is due, in part, to the limited voice teachers have at present (Hannay & Seller, 1991). Although the research and theory in the field of curriculum has long had a rich conceptual dialogue (see for example, Schwab, 1969), there remains little evidence that this dialogue has affected school practices (Harris, 1986). Teachers seeking to exercise curriculum leadership in the classroom often have an understanding of professional phenomena in limited terms framed by inadequate discourses and inappropriate theories (Elliott & Calderhead, 1993; Hannay and Seller, 1991). When this occurs, it is likely that participants in the processes have views of curriculum leadership framed by technologies of management, administration and power rather than framed by the human context of their work. This is the way leadership has been defined in school contexts, and this is the view which is supported by the literature which addresses curriculum leadership as an issue for Principals and administrators (see for example, Bailey, 1990). Our continuing collaborative inquiry is seeking to identify those social and professional preconditions that are necessary for the development of curriculum leadership that facilitates effective learning and teaching and to identify those processes that assist participants to move towards adopting personal theories which incorporate such ideas.

The articulation of a living educational theory about curriculum leadership (Whitehead, 1989) is leading to the development of a model of curriculum leadership that will hopefully facilitate effective learning and teaching in schools. Generating a living educational theory has called on us as participants to produce descriptions and
explanations of our own development in their professional work in education (McNiff, 1993; McNiff, Whitehead, & Laidlaw, 1992; Whitehead, 1993). In the present instance, the living educational theory has been the participants' personal theories of curriculum leadership. These personal models, or living educational theories, have been converted into the beginnings of a model of curriculum leadership. Such a model extends curriculum theory and professional knowledge about curriculum leadership. It will, therefore, be of value to both partners - to the university, in terms of curriculum studies as a field of inquiry in higher education programs; and to the State Department of Education, in terms of improving curriculum practice as it relates to effective learning and teaching. In addition, our work will be of value to teachers and, most importantly, to students. It will provide the basis for the empowerment of teachers as curriculum leaders who see their role in terms of leaders leading learning. This focus on learning is a national priority in terms of improving the effectiveness of Australian schools, which in turn, benefits students' by enhancing the quality of education that they presently enjoy.

Our thinking assumes that abstracted theories of curriculum, leadership or current curriculum leadership per se, will not shape curriculum leadership practice. To date, literature within curriculum as a field of inquiry has centred on curriculum, leadership and curriculum leadership from an organisational perspective (e.g. Brady, 1992; Chapman, 1990; Glatthorn, 1987; Havelock, 1973; Huberman, 1973; Morrish, 1978; Huberman & Miles, 1984; Marsh, 1988a, 1988b; Owens, 1987). It has only been in more recent times that there has been a discernible shift to a focus on their personal - the teacher as an individual in the pursuit of professional practice as a curriculum practitioner (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Elliott et al., 1993; Fullan, 1992a, 1992b; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Gitlin, 1992; Goodson, 1992; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Johnston, Macpherson, & Spooner, 1991; Rudduck, 1991; Ross, Cornett & McCutcheon, 1992; Simon, 1992). It is more person-oriented and inside-out perspective of curriculum and of the teacher as a curriculum practitioner which theoretically informs the developing understanding and living educational theory of curriculum leadership in this inquiry.

Thus, our efforts are seeking to understand curriculum leadership within curriculum studies as a field of inquiry and to guide a system's support of its teachers as curriculum leaders from an inside-out rather than from a top-down perspective of policy shaping, interpretation and implementation. We are taking a critical, yet constructive perspective of policy formulation (see Pinar, 1992; Smith, 1993).

IDENTIFYING WHAT WE ARE BECOMING MORE AWARE OF IN THE RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP
It is always useful to reflect on experiences and to elicit growth
points from them (see, for example, Macpherson, Trost, Gorman, Shepherd & Arcodia, 1994). Already in this story, we have identified progress points upon which further investigations and actions have been built, keeping very much in mind the overall Action Research approach within which our work is situated.

In telling our story, we have probably been using the Action research cycle more implicitly than explicitly. Nevertheless, we have tried to highlight some aspects which we value strongly and feel committed to. These aspects are summarised in the following statements:

We are working with people as partners and not on people in our research efforts;

We are developing substantive and procedural agendas out of our working together and our mutual understanding of work contexts and priorities;

The focus of our ongoing work is discussed and negotiated rather than imposed from without or from the perspective of one party in the learning partnership - we are making connections with each other;

Our efforts endeavour to transcend an exclusive emphasis on technical and practical matters and to incorporate critical and emancipatory perspectives through reviewing of literature, theorising our work and building an ever-evolving living education theory about both the substance and the processes of our work;

We are aware of the need to sustain the learning partnership by paying attention to such details as principles and procedures which will facilitate and strengthen our partnership and hopefully avoid (or at least mitigate the effect of) tensions and dilemmas which are inevitable in any relationship; and

We have a commitment to engage in research as a relationship (a learning partnership) which has benefits for all parties in the partnership (action components, therefore, are most important as part of our ongoing work).

We are looking for ways of documenting our work, both within the boundaries of the project and in broader professional forums in ways that are ethically sensitive to such issues as the handling of “tricky” data and intellectual property in relation to authorship.

These statements are signposts which we cannot ignore as we move ahead. On pausing to read these rather broad signposts, we have also engaged in a self-renewing process asking ourselves: 'What have we become more aware of as we have established and sought to maintain the research partnership?'
Here are some of the things we have learned, and are continuing to learn about:

About Collaborative Inquiry
Collaboration is not easy. Sustaining collaboration is even more difficult.

Expectations of the different partners may not always be shared in terms of the substantive and the procedural elements of a collaborative investigation.

Different institutional constraints and pressures need to be understood through regular discussion, and built into plans for proceeding.

Levels of collaboration within each set of partners and between both sets of partners need to be clarified and reconstructed to address changing situations.

Accountability and intellectual property issues (including authorship) need to be considered up-front in order to avoid tensions and debates which could damage partnerships.

The sorts of characteristics about critical collaborative Action Research outlined earlier cannot be assumed - they have to be worked on consciously and deliberately, and they must permeate all aspects of coordinating and participating in the project.

About Curriculum Leadership for Effective Learning and Teaching
You may expect too much to happen too soon. For example, an emerging model of curriculum leadership might have been expected by the end of 1995, but the difficulties associated with trying to reach workable consensus quickly need to be recognised. A set of ideas that may be the ingredients of a model of curriculum leadership are probably easier to identify than the articulation of a workable model at this stage.

Nevertheless, signs of progress at this stage are exciting; and they are motivating the members of the research partnership to persist with and elaborate emerging ideas.

The overall methodological framework must not be forgotten, and it is easy to be bogged down with the frustrations of the present, and to forget that the present is only part of a bigger picture. Partners must remind themselves that they are in it for the long haul, and that in two years time, if we are at the same point that we are now, then the project will have failed. There still may not be definite and conclusive answers even then - rather there may be new questions!

Everyone who facilitates learning is a curriculum leader. We are quite clear that it is enabled by certain qualities within a school
curriculum environment (which has three elements at least), and that there a number of mediating factors which work on the individual psychologies of teachers which give them a predisposition to engage in curriculum leadership practices (which we see as having two categories). The dynamic and ongoing interplays among these various elements, factors and practices need to be captured in an articulated model of curriculum leadership which can then be used as a tool to provide broad-brush pictures of curriculum leadership as well as detailed and specific pictures of patterns of and possibilities for curriculum leadership at particular school sites. The tool has investigative as well as action-oriented aspects to it. It provides opportunities to be critically reflective of the "what is"; to be critically informed; and to be empowered to transform the roles and practices associated with curriculum leadership.

About Future Collaborative Inquiry and Action

It takes a long time to establish a collaborative working relationship

In ongoing work, all partners must ensure that something worthwhile is being gained from the collaboration - one partner should not be seen to getting all the benefits. The ongoing dilemmas associated with the balance of theory and practice; the acceptance or the contestation of policies; and the complexities of teachers' work provide a necessary context for considering outcomes.

Ongoing work needs to documented and advocated in appropriate forums, in order to address the dilemmas and complexities alluded to above in meaningful and constructive ways.

Ongoing work should increasingly be seen as having an impact upon policy and practice, which in a sense advocates and legitimises Action Research approaches.

Ongoing work needs to have both investigative and action components, if it is to satisfy all partners, and if it is to have an impact upon the transformation of curriculum practice by teachers who see themselves to be empowered curriculum leaders.

An emphasis on "institutionalising" change processes associated with Action Research approaches is important so that they will be supported after research funding is finished. This could occur, for example, with the partnership having a culture which seeks further collaborative funding.

CONCLUDING FOR NOW

On reflection, our experiences upon which this story is based affirm the usefulness of an Action Research approach as a basis for working together for curriculum change. This approach, taking account of the
things we have been made more aware of should, we believe, be both critical and collaborative and reflect those characteristics which we have identified. Then, teachers have the chance to be curriculum leaders who are empowered to contest existing trends and policies; to collaborate in planning for transformative action; and to reconstruct their roles and practices in ways that will impact on continuing curriculum change.

The story becomes more detailed in the second and third papers, and we shall return to some of matters we have become more aware of and are continuing to learn about in the fourth paper. This, then is our story, and our living educational theory to date. Our account of the events is an imperfect one, and certainly one which is incomplete! Our learning partnership is currently involving two parties – university and systemic personnel. As events unfold, the partnership will grow, new challenges will emerge, and exciting opportunities will become available in order to expand and refine our living educational theory about collaborative ways of approaching curriculum change and about curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching.
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Insights into curriculum leadership: the state of the field

Bob Elliott, Ross Brooker, Greg Thurlow and Adrian McInman

INTRODUCTION

Historically, curriculum leadership in schools has been regarded as the responsibility of principals and administrators (Bailey, 1990). There are various reasons why this is so. Firstly, literature within the curriculum field itself has cast an organisational perspective on curriculum activity (see Brady, 1992; Chapman, 1990; Havelock, 1973; Huberman and Miles, 1984; Owens, 1987). Secondly, although there is a theoretical distinction between leaders and managers (Kotter, 1988), many discourses about leadership have been framed by technologies of management, administration and power, often derived from outside education rather than the particularities of school settings which are often characterised by quests for equity, empowerment and participation.

These points are amply illustrated in the review of the meaning of leadership undertaken by Bass (1990) in his handbook on leadership. There, leadership is considered in terms of role definition, power relationships and behaviours of those who may be characterised as leaders. One reason for the tardiness of an emerging theory of leadership which is integral to educational practice may be related to the fact that educational practice does not appear to have a language of its practitioners. Elliott and Calderhead (1993) have deduced that teachers do not have appropriate language to articulate their profession and this may be a reason why they often feel excluded from the discourses of leadership.

Contemporary theories of leadership, such as transformative leadership theory, while incorporating concepts which address the context, inevitably express leadership ideas in terms of leaders and followers. Such theories often assume the phenomenon of leadership to be exclusively aligned with behaviours of leaders, defined as an elite few. While there have been attempts to integrate ideas of contexts and personal characteristics into such theories, context tends to be conceived as either a cause, or an effect, of individual leaders exhibiting specific behaviours and the importance of personal characteristics is considered in terms of causes of particular behaviours. Thus, there appears to be limited theory which integrates both individuals and their setting into a position where leadership is regarded as a phenomenon of the context itself. In other words there is currently little in the way of theoretical explanation of leadership which can be applied to a whole setting as opposed to selected leaders and their immediate situation.
There are other studies which are beginning to build on that central
eendeavour of the school concerned with learning through curriculum.
These illuminate the wider phenomenon of leadership by referring to the
concept of curriculum leadership and they identify the more complex
processes that teachers in varying contexts are playing or could play.
For example, Brubaker (1994), in introducing the concept of "creative
curriculum leadership", looks for ways of addressing the dilemma of
teachers who are energised for action through the possibilities and
opportunities which exist in their schools and the feelings of being
beaten down by "external pressures". The important point in Brubaker's
work is that it does relate the notions of leadership to the central
aim of schooling and extends the idea of leadership beyond individuals
to all teachers in the school.

Continuing in this direction, Henderson and Hawthorne (1995) have
developed a comprehensive approach to curriculum leadership built on
the seemingly incompatible theories of Tyler, Dewey, Eisner, Apple and
Greene. From these theories they have elaborated ideas of "emancipatory
constructivism" in which all teachers in differing school contexts work
alone and collaboratively in forms of reflective practice.

They propose a process of "transformative curriculum leadership"
consisting of five interrelated, recursive phases (p.12):
Phase 1: Enact constructivist activities in the classroom and other
relevant settings.
Phase 2: Practice critical reflection on these enactments with
reference to a comprehensive understanding of human liberation.
Phase 3: Promote curriculum design, development, and evaluation
activities that support critically aware constructivist activities
Phase 4: Create supportive learning communities. Facilitate the changes
in personal beliefs and related organisational structures that are
necessary to sustain an emancipatory constructivism over time.

Phase 5: Practice action and formal inquiry that supports the
reflective practices of the first four phases

Not withstanding Henderson and Hawthorne's theoretical contributions to
the area of curriculum leadership, their conclusions are normative and
theory driven. To complement such thinking there is a need for other
studies which seek to articulate those personal theories of curriculum
leadership held by teachers in their own school context. Such studies,
in Whitehead's (1989) terms, should seek to articulate the living
educational theories about curriculum leadership held by teachers. The
rationale for such studies is that abstracted theories of curriculum
and curriculum leadership are less likely to shape practice of teachers
than those living theories held by practitioners.

THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY
The study reported in here is in keeping with this shift away from the
abstract and theoretical to the personal. This study seeks to place the concept of curriculum leadership within the field of curriculum as a field of enquiry rather than leadership per se. Hence it seeks to provide an understanding of the curriculum leadership phenomenon from the practitioner's perspective and to highlight the centrality of such practitioners. In this sense it takes a critical, yet constructive, perspective of policy formation at this level (Pinar, 1992; Smith, 1993). The study seeks to consider leadership as a phenomenon of the school context incorporating all teachers and the culture of the school.

The study had its origins in a study of the acceptance and implementation of the Principles of Effective Learning and Teaching for schools which were distributed to Queensland State Schools in 1994 (Elliott et al., 1994). As a result of a state wide survey of schools to investigate how the principles had been implemented, leadership was identified as a key factor. Respondents commented on the key role of their colleagues in disseminating and adopting the policy. They reported on collegial relationships not simply within schools but between schools. Such factors appeared to be central to identifying those schools which had made progress in adopting the spirit and practice implied by these principles.

Broadening this perspective, four schools were involved in 1995 to identify those factors which the teachers in those schools believed were important in influencing the levels of curriculum leadership within the school. Information was sought by asking volunteer teachers in these schools to write narrative accounts about aspects of curriculum leadership in which they had been engaged. From these narratives, and the ensuing conversations about them with the teachers, interpretative accounts about the phenomenon of curriculum leadership for each school were developed with and about each of the schools. Emerging from these accounts and dialogue about them, a set of propositions were developed about curriculum leadership.

Examples of such propositions included:
∑ The teachers' perceptions of social dynamics in a school setting influences the nature and extent of curriculum leadership activity in that setting.
∑ The organisational and administrative structure of the school influences the nature and extent of curriculum leadership in the school
∑ The ways in which teachers think about curriculum (images of curriculum) influences the ways in which they engage in curriculum leadership.
∑ A range of individual psychosocial factors are important in influencing the ways in which individual teachers engage in curriculum leadership. Further, these psychosocial factors are embedded in cultural contexts as well as individual, and institutional histories.
Propositions such as these were regarded as worthy of further study and, to this end, were developed as part of a theoretical framework and investigated in a large scale research study. The aim of this paper is, consequently, to build on this pilot work to investigate levels of participation in curriculum leadership as well as personal qualities and school context aspects which are significant in facilitating curriculum leadership.

THE STUDY
From the pilot studies noted above, various aspects of school cultures and organisation, as well as individual factors, were identified for further investigation. The aspects which seemed to recur from one site to another and those which teachers indicated were most appropriate to them were the ones which were chosen.

Such items were used to develop a questionnaire which was trialed with two groups of teachers in two different schools. In each case the scales of response and individual items as well as the design of the questionnaire were modified. The final version of the questionnaire was distributed to teachers in Queensland State Schools in April, 1996. This questionnaire was designed to examine the:

(1) extent of teachers' participation in curriculum leadership at both the whole school level and in subsettings of the school (for example year groups, subject departments etc);
(2) aspects that participants believed influenced their curriculum leadership at these different levels; and
(3) personal factors participants believed influenced their curriculum leadership at these different levels.

The population under investigation was the teachers and schools in Queensland, Australia. A random selection of 109 primary schools (10.2% of all Queensland State primary schools) and 20 secondary schools (11.1% of all State secondary schools) was drawn from all state schools. All teachers from these schools were supplied, via the principal or nominated coordinator, with a copy of the questionnaire and were invited to participate in the study. Altogether 2805 teachers received the survey instrument. The selection of schools was made by stratifying the population of schools by Band 1 and location (metropolitan, provincial and rural). Returns were received from all 129 schools sampled. From these schools 1510 questionnaires were returned and these were taken as the data set. Of these, 823 (54.5%) of the respondents were from primary schools and 687 (45.5%) were from secondary schools. 513 (34.0%) respondents were male, 991 (65.6%) were female and 6 (0.4%) did not identify their gender. Appendix 1 provides full details of the sample and response rates.

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION IN CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP
As can be seen from Table 1, teachers reported varying extents to which
they engaged in the activities of curriculum leadership at the whole school level (i.e., those activities aimed at improving teaching and learning as it referred to the whole school). The table indicates the percentages of the different sub-samples who responded to the question at different levels.

One of the important points to note in this table is that a significant proportion of respondents (approximately 60%) indicated that they did not participate in curriculum leadership activities at the whole school level to any considerable degree. This figure is also echoed for participation within small groups.

Differences between primary school and secondary school respondents is worthy of note but the most significant point in this table is the difference between classroom teachers and administrators. While approximately 85% of administrators reported that they engaged in curriculum leadership activities extensively, only 29% of classroom teachers believed they participated to that extent. This suggests a number of possibilities. For example, a majority of classroom teachers may see themselves as mere implementers of programs in classrooms or alternatively, the teachers may well be undervaluing their efforts. While both interpretations are probably accurate to some extent, the latter interpretation is one which is supported by qualitative work as part of this research.

Table 1
Extent of engagement in curriculum leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extr extens</th>
<th>Consid extens</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% prim teachers</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% sec teachers</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% males</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% females</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% administrators</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% classroom teachers</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% all teachers</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASPECTS OF SIGNIFICANCE.
Participants were asked to indicate the significance of a number of personal factors and school context factors which may influence their levels of participation in curriculum leadership. In doing so, they were asked to respond, irrespective of their actual level of participation. In other words, an aspect may be significant in influencing a staff member irrespective of whether they participated at a high level or not at all.

Appendix 2 provides information about the levels of responses for the
different questions as they relate to whole school curriculum leadership and small groups.

As can be seen from these data the six items from the school context which teachers indicated were most significant in influencing their levels of participation in curriculum leadership at the whole school level were as follows.

- A non threatening atmosphere
- An emphasis on learning and learners
- Budget support for curriculum initiatives
- Well developed communication networks
- Administrative support for curriculum initiatives
- A focus on positive aspects in the school

Similarly, the six personal factors judged to be most significant in influencing participation were as follows.

- Openness to new ideas in curriculum leadership
- Committed to ongoing curriculum leadership
- Trusting others to take curriculum initiatives
- Believing that personal contributions are important
- Confidence to engage in curriculum leadership
- Sense of responsibility to engage in curriculum leadership

CLUSTERS OF SIGNIFICANT ITEMS
As a way of identifying clusters of items which seemed to be significant in influencing levels of participation in curriculum leadership, factor analysis of the responses was undertaken. The aim was thus to identify items from the scale which appeared to cluster together and hence indicate a coherent set of factors which may be significant in influencing actions of curriculum leadership in school settings. To determine such clustering of items, separate maximum likelihood analyses, using oblimin rotations were conducted on the different sections of the questionnaire. In order to ensure reliability of the factors which were identified, five maximum likelihood analyses were conducted using different groupings from the sample (total sample, males only, females only, primary school staff only, secondary school staff only) for each section. These were followed by confirmatory factor analyses using the LISREL VI (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989) package on SPSSX. This program tests whether the covariance structure adequately fits the data. Appendix 3 provides the results of this factor analysis for participation at the whole school level. Participation only at this whole school level is considered here because the results for participation in small groups parallel these results.

In considering the factor analysis of school context items, it was
noted that item seven loaded considerably weaker than other items in that factor. Similar observations can be seen for item eighteen while item thirteen cross loaded with two factors. Accordingly, these three items were eliminated from the factors under consideration. A confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL with the remaining 17 items, specifying a three factor solution, produced a significant chi-square value ($c^2=543.57, p=.00$). The adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI), which is independent of sample size, was .942. Cuttance and Ecob (1987) suggests that models with AGFI's above 0.9 are acceptable, while Bentler and Bonett (1980) suggest that models with goodness of fit below 0.9 should be substantially improved.

Because one of the factors appears to relate to how the curriculum is perceived by teachers this factor is referred to as "Images of Curriculum". A second factor relates to how the school is organised and is consequently referred to as "Organisational Structures" while the remaining factor is called "Social Dynamics" because it refers to patterns of interaction amongst the teachers in the school.

Table 2 below provides the identified set of three factors deemed to be significant in influencing curriculum leadership in schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>No items</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Images of Curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A clear vision statement for the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An emphasis on learning and learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative support for curriculum initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit decision making processes are known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance for removal of constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities to take initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget support for curriculum initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Dynamics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Positive role models for curriculum leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A focus on positive aspects in the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of the initiatives of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A non threatening atmosphere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar analysis was undertaken for those personal items which were seen to influence curriculum leadership. On this occasion only one factor was found consisting of all items. The eleven items in the scale...
are those noted in Appendix 2 C and D.

EXISTENCE OF ITEMS SEEN AS SIGNIFICANT IN FACILITATING CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP leadership.
As well as investigating whether items were significant in influencing levels of curriculum leadership, the characteristics of school environments were also investigated. For this latter investigation the same twenty items were adopted. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed these twenty items actually existed in their school - irrespective of the extent to which they engaged in curriculum leadership.

The same factor analysis strategy was undertaken to identify clusters of items that respondents felt existed in their school contexts. On this occasion a two factor solution was found. The results of the analysis are noted in Appendix 4.

For consistency the three items which were removed from the scales previously were also removed here (although item 13 actually loaded quite highly here). Further, in the two factor structure, the Images of Curriculum factor was identified as identical to that from the earlier analysis of items seen to be significant in influencing curriculum leadership. However, the second factor identified here is a direct combination of the factors previously referred to as Organisational Structures and Social Dynamics.

The reasons for the emergence of only two factors here are probably complex. One possible reason is that when the teachers were asked to focus on particular curriculum actions they might undertake in the school, and what factors may influence those actions, they are more able to differentiate specific context items. However, when they are asked to identify whether such items generally exist in the school environment they do not so readily differentiate amongst them.

CONCLUSIONS AND ONGOING ANALYSIS
This paper has identified items in the school context which appear to be significant in influencing curriculum leadership activities. The results indicate that only 40% of respondents engage in curriculum leadership at level they feel is significant and there is considerable room for improving levels of involvement. This point is even more relevant when administrators are compared with classroom teachers. There are obvious implications here for professional development programs for teachers and administrators. The study has identified clusters of items, or factors, which appear to be worthy of further investigation for developing a scale to identify school environmental factors which are significant in influencing involvement in curriculum leadership. In other words, the identification of these items and factors is pertinent to a development of a scale for mapping changes in aspects of school contexts and the teachers who work in them. To this end, future work will be undertaken to develop strategies designed to
modify school cultures and individuals' personal qualities in order to encourage them to participate further in curriculum leadership. The scale which will be developed will then be used to track such modifications.

At the same time the current data is under investigation to determine how differences in participation may be attributable to a range of variables such as role and school size. For example, analysis is currently being undertaken to see whether teachers in larger schools report higher levels of participation than teachers in smaller schools and whether teachers in these different sized schools believe different aspects of the school are significant in influencing levels of participation in curriculum leadership.

In a similar vein analysis is being undertaken to see whether there are differences between males and females concerned with the various factors identified in this paper, and whether teachers in different size schools believe different elements facilitating curriculum leadership in the school actually exist.

Such findings will be of significant interest to the Queensland Education Department, who are co-researchers in this study, as they will point to how schools could be structured and developed in order to ensure maximum likelihood of curriculum policy initiatives being incorporated into school based curricula.
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1. Band is a complex classification system of schools in Queensland which takes into account size, function and socio-economic context.

Appendix 1
A. Characteristics of the Total Sample by Band and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>96.98</td>
<td>90.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>20.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>111.63</td>
<td>1147.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>53.88</td>
<td>50316.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>118.53</td>
<td>118.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>43.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1511.63</td>
<td>1511.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1310.08</td>
<td>1310.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1511.63</td>
<td>1511.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1310.08</td>
<td>1310.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1511.63</td>
<td>1511.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1310.08</td>
<td>1310.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>43.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>75.43</td>
<td>75.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>43.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. Characteristics of the Primary School Sample by Band and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Band</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>32.75%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>98.26%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>10.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>21.83%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1513.76%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>54.59%</td>
<td>1151.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1110.09%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>43.67%</td>
<td>192.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>65.50%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>87.34%</td>
<td>607.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>1211.09%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>1311.93%</td>
<td>18122.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>43.67%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>87.34%</td>
<td>5418.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>Provincials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>10.92%</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>32.75%</td>
<td>759.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Characteristics of the Secondary School Sample by Band and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>315.00</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Isolated</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>420.00</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>23.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 20687

D. Characteristics of All Respondents (N = 1510)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX: Male</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Female 99 165.6
Missing Data 60.4

YEARS OF TEACHING:
Less than 1 year 583.8
1-5 years 209 13.8
6-10 years 362 24.0
11-15 years 261 17.3
Greater than 15 years 61 640.8
Missing Data 40.3

YEARS AT PRESENT SCHOOL:
Less than 1 year 317 21.0
1-2 years 278 18.4
3-5 years 354 23.4
Greater than 5 years 557 36.9
Missing Data 40.3

ROLE:
Principal 111 7.4
Deputy Principal 48 3.2
Head of Department 121 8.0
Class Teacher 93 061.6
Advanced Skills Teacher 19 713.0
Guidance Officer 14 0.9
Resource Teacher 43 2.8
Teacher Librarian 32 2.1
Special Education Teacher 60.4
Other 50.3
Missing Data 30.2

------------------------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------

Appendix 2
A. School Variables that Influence Curriculum Leadership Participation at the Whole School Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A clear vision statement for the school</td>
<td>14662.060</td>
<td>0.8414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>An emphasis on learning and learners</td>
<td>14601.600</td>
<td>0.7314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession</td>
<td>14631.89</td>
<td>0.7514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole</td>
<td>14602.020</td>
<td>0.7814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>1.910.7414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>1.910.7414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.060.7514
7. Power to make decisions is handed over to committees 14582.320.8314
8. Administrative support for curriculum initiatives 14601.680.7514
9. Explicit decision making processes are known 14581.950.7914
10. Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate 14602.090.7914
11. Assistance for removal of constraints 14202.110.8114
12. Opportunities to take initiatives 14491.870.7514
13. Well developed communication networks 14491.670.7714
14. Budget support for curriculum initiatives 14521.630.7514
15. Positive role models for curriculum leadership 14481.820.8014
16. Collaboration in the school 14491.720.7414
17. A focus on positive aspects in the school 14531.700.7514
18. Existence of factional groups 14242.650.8514
19. Recognition of the initiatives of others 14501.890.7714
20. A non-threatening atmosphere 14561.520.7314

B. School Variables that Influence Curriculum Leadership Amongst Small Groups
1. A clear vision statement for the school 14632.100.8214
2. An emphasis on learning and learners 14631.480.6514
3. Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession 14651.790.7514
4. Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole 14622.010.7714
5. An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds 14641.820.7414
6. Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future 14642.020.7414
7. Power to make decisions is handed over to committees 14532.390.8714
8. Administrative support for curriculum initiatives 14591.760.7714
9. Explicit decision making processes are known 14621.970.7914
10. Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate 14641.990.7814
11. Assistance for removal of constraints 14262.080.8114
12. Opportunities to take initiatives 14561.730.7114
13. Well developed communication networks 14571.640.7414
14. Budget support for curriculum initiatives 14571.550.7414
15. Positive role models for curriculum leadership 14531.780.7914
16. Collaboration in the school 14551.770.7414
17. A focus on positive aspects in the school 14561.730.7514
18. Existence of factional groups 14292.690.8714
19. Recognition of the initiatives of others 14521.840.7614
20. A non-threatening atmosphere 14591.490.7214

C. Personal Variables that Influence Curriculum Leadership at the Whole School Level
1. I feel confident to engage in curriculum leadership activities 14402.040.7714
2. I feel a sense of empowerment to engage in curriculum leadership 14292.300.8514
3. I feel no peer pressure to exercise curriculum leadership
4. I am open to new ideas in curriculum leadership
5. I feel encouraged to participate in curriculum leadership
6. I feel a sense of responsibility to engage in curriculum leadership
7. I have a commitment to ongoing curriculum development
8. I believe my contributions are important in this school
9. I trust other teachers to take curriculum initiatives
10. I am a risk taker in regard to curriculum matters
11. I am trusted to make curriculum judgements in the school

D. Personal Variables that Influence Curriculum Leadership amongst Small Groups
1. I feel confident to engage in curriculum leadership activities
2. I feel a sense of empowerment to engage in curriculum leadership
3. I feel no peer pressure to exercise curriculum leadership
4. I am open to new ideas in curriculum leadership
5. I feel encouraged to participate in curriculum leadership
6. I feel a sense of responsibility to engage in curriculum leadership
7. I have a commitment to ongoing curriculum development
8. I believe my contributions are important in this school
9. I trust other teachers to take curriculum initiatives
10. I am a risk taker in regard to curriculum matters
11. I am trusted to make curriculum judgements in the school

------------------------------------------------------------------------

Appendix 3.

A. Oblimin-Rotated Factor Loadings using Maximum Likelihood Extraction of the 20 School Variables that influence Curriculum Leadership at the Whole School Level

Factor 1 Factor 2 Factor 3
1. A clear vision statement for the school -.07.63.15
2. An emphasis on learning and learners.03.52.16
3. Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession.15.58
4. Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole.02.75-.01
5. An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds.22
    .56-.08
6. Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future -.03 .43.29
7. Power to make decisions is handed over to committees.00.10.38
8. Administrative support for curriculum initiatives.01.08.67
9. Explicit decision making processes are known.06.10.63
10. Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate-.01.12.63
11. Assistance for removal of constraints.19-.05.54
12. Opportunities to take initiatives.24.01.50
13. Well developed communication networks.46.00.36
14. Budget support for curriculum initiatives.27.02.40
15. Positive role models for curriculum leadership.64.04.10
16. Collaboration in the school.68.10.04
17. A focus on positive aspects in the school.68.24-.11
18. Existence of factional groups.27-.00.09
19. Recognition of the initiatives of others.67.05.05
20. A non threatening atmosphere.66-.04.06

SS Loadings8.350.710.47
% variance41.73.52.3
Cum. % variance41.745.347.6

B. Completely Standardised Solution of the 17 School Variables that influence Curriculum Leadership at the Whole School Level

Factor 1Factor 2Factor 3
1. A clear vision statement for the school.68.00.00
2. An emphasis on learning and learners.68.00.00
3. Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession.72.00 .00
4. Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole.72.00.00
5. An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds.66 .00.00
6. Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future.65 .00.00
8. Administrative support for curriculum initiatives.00.00.72
9. Explicit decision making processes are known.00.00.73
10. Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate.00.00.70
11. Assistance for removal of constraints.00.00.66
12. Opportunities to take initiatives.00.00.70
14. Budget support for curriculum initiatives.00.00.64
15. Positive role models for curriculum leadership.00.74.00
16. Collaboration in the school.00.78.00
17. A focus on positive aspects in the school.00.76.00
19. Recognition of the initiatives of others. 00.74.00
20. A non threatening atmosphere. 00.67.00

Appendix 4.
Oblimin-Rotated Factor Loadings using Maximum Likelihood Extraction of the 20 School Variables with regard to the Perceived Existence in the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A clear vision statement for the school.</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An emphasis on learning and learners-.01.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession.16.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole-.04.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds-.02.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future.09.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Power to make decisions is handed over to committees.33.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administrative support for curriculum initiatives.64.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Explicit decision making processes are known.57.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate.64.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assistance for removal of constraints.67.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Opportunities to take initiatives.72-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Well developed communication networks.75.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Budget support for curriculum initiatives.69-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Positive role models for curriculum leadership.68.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Collaboration in the school.74.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A focus on positive aspects in the school.56.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Existence of factional groups-.11.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recognition of the initiatives of others.66.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A non threatening atmosphere.68.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS Loadings8.51.71
% variance42.53.5
Cum. % variance42.546.1
Completely Standardised Solution of the 20 School Variables with regard to the Perceived Existence in the School

Factor 1

1. A clear vision statement for the school. 67.00
2. An emphasis on learning and learners. 70.00
3. Teachers are encouraged to be learners in their profession. 78.00
4. Teachers are encouraged to view curriculum as a whole. 74.00
5. An understanding of students' cultural and social backgrounds. 61.00
6. Teachers are encouraged to think of curriculum for the future. 63.00
8. Administrative support for curriculum initiatives. 00.71
9. Explicit decision making processes are known. 00.70
10. Opportunities for curriculum exploration and debate. 00.71
11. Assistance for removal of constraints. 00.72
12. Opportunities to take initiatives. 00.68
14. Budget support for curriculum initiatives. 00.65
15. Positive role models for curriculum leadership. 00.72
16. Collaboration in the school. 00.77
17. A focus on positive aspects in the school. 00.74
19. Recognition of the initiatives of others. 00.72
20. A non-threatening atmosphere
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Insights into curriculum leadership: taking a narrative turn

Tania Aspland, Ross Brooker, Ian Macpherson, Christine Proudford and Stephen Kemmis

INTRODUCTION

This paper reports on a qualitative research project that is an integral component of an ARC Collaborative project conducted by a university team from QUT in partnership with the Queensland Department of Education. This part of the study complements the quantitative survey work completed earlier this year and so doing explores further the factors that have been identified as significant within the phenomena of curriculum research. At the outset it was envisaged that a number of cases across school sites would become the foci of the qualitative work with a view to:
bringing a richness to the survey data;  
triangulating the data in seeking a convergence of findings;  
searching more fully for an understanding of the factors implicit in curriculum leadership;  
exploring the degree of consensus or resistance to such phenomena;  
and  
enhancing a full understanding of the instances under study.

In pursuing these goals within the parameters of a multi-methods research project we adopted a form of research commonly referred to as narrative inquiry. It was anticipated that narratives would provide us with "thick" descriptions of both positive and negative instances of curriculum leadership in differing school sites.

Throughout the various phases of the project, and leading up to the project in 1994 and 1995, we have celebrated the richness of the narrative as a research genre that effectively captures, both retrospectively and proactively, the contestations implicit in teachers' curriculum work.

Part A of this paper briefly describes the evolution of the narrative within the social sciences while Part B offers the project teams' rationale for adopting narrative as our research genre. Part C offers ways in which the narrative has enhanced our growth as teachers, researchers and as a collaborative research collective through noting a number of learning moments within our research journey. In closing, we offer to the reader some personal insights from our team concerning our reactions to the narrative as a research genre.

PART A  THE NARRATIVE: WHERE DID IT COME FROM AND WHERE IS IT HEADING?  
The framing of the dialogue within this research community was significantly shaped, in the pilot phase, by the "narrative" literature, considered both a mode of inquiry as well as a research method. It has been argued that narrative (Clandinin and Connelly, 1990) is the most appropriate form of research set in educational institutions where the research participants are given the opportunity to access their own thinking about their experiences in a particular setting at any point in time. These well recognised authors put the case that each individual can recount their experience through "stories" (or narratives) that bring to the fore "the images, rituals, habits, cycles, routines and rhythms" that constitute their daily experiences of teaching and learning. Whilst the origins of narrative stem from literary theory and have been most effectively used as research method in history, literature, philosophy and psychotherapy (Mitchell,1980) as well as teaching contexts, the adaptation of the concept is becoming more common within a number of disciplines both as a research method as well as a research paradigm. It is well recognised
as both a form of "inquiry in narrative" and "narrative inquiry" (Clandinin and Connelly, 1990:2).

As it has evolved over the years in the social sciences, the narrative has been characterised in differing ways that are responsive to its research purposes (Clandinin and Connelly, 1990; Johnston, 1992; Carter 1993), but the early work of Scholes (1982) has been instructive in conceptualising the role of the interviewer within narrative genre. He argues that the narrative reveals:

- a situation emerging from a conflict, tension or struggle experienced by the participant;
- an animate protagonist who has a purpose within emerging relations; and/or
- a sequence of events that reveal a "story" or a "plot" by way of action taken in response to a conflict or tension with a view of resolving what is problematic. (Adapted from Scholes, 1982:59).

As such, narrative brings to this project the value of each subject's engagement in curriculum leadership and highlights the importance in the study of the personal factors in curriculum leadership - a phenomenon to date that has not been recognised in the essentialist work that dominates this field. The eliciting of stories through the narrative invited teachers to recount a significant instance of curriculum leadership in which they had recently engaged. In doing so they were asked to consider the personal factors, images of curriculum, organisational factors and the social climate of the school. Such a request recognised the uniqueness of each instance valuing the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon and the nature of curriculum leaders as individuals. From this perspective, the teachers are not characterised as a unitary, cohesive, context free cohort, rather as "selves and worlds operat(ing) in many modalities" functioning in a "multiverse of experiences" (McHale, 1992: 247).

With this diversity, came the ambiguities, tensions, dilemmas and paradoxes that are so much a part of each teachers' experience as he/she tells and takes control of his/her story (Warhurst, 1992) and as such these complexities take their place as central to the research narrative.

Following on the work of Gough (1994), the narrative turn that the study has taken/is taking cannot be characterised as the traditional approach to narrative that is permeated by modernist ideals to tell the story - a story that suggests curriculum leadership as stable, underpinned by assumptions of a singular, fixed essential self (Gough, 1994:62). Nor is it seen to be the outcome of a particular set of variables that permeate a particular context. The characteristic genre of previous approaches is "the detective story in which a
questioning subject searches for a labyrinthine reality for 'one true story'" (McHale, 1992 in Gough, 1994:63). What is required in our view of narrative, is a more challenging notion of the narrative as fiction (Gough, 1994) that captures the postmodern possibilities of the pluralities of the differing orientations to curriculum leadership that evolve in many modalities (McHale, 1992).

PART B OUR RATIONALE FOR USING NARRATIVES
Each teacher in the study was invited to write stories about curriculum leadership that can be shared as conversations in an informal environment with the interviewers (university/Department of Education partners) reflecting on them in a critical manner. As is argued in the literature (McHale, 1992; Gough, 1994), these stories are read or spoken in differing contexts with a revised purpose by each person in their interactions with others. The multifaceted purpose of our research centres not only on simply coming to know the world of existing practices for each of the participants, but also, to focus explicitly on the impact of their practices, on the material and cultural relations in which curriculum leadership is set and the ways in which these relations have impacted on each teacher's practice within particular contexts. Narratives of this type are diffractive (Gough, 1994) as well as reflective as they capture the social and material realities in and from which they were generated. In this sense, they are still capable of 'making a difference' and generative of future possibilities through the impact they are having on the research participants of this study as well as the broader educational sector. It is this characterisation of the narrative that we found particularly appealing.

To move away from narratives that reproduce or simply portray the status quo was essential for us if we were, as we had hoped, to capture the dynamics implicit in the positioning of each teacher within curriculum leadership and how this positioning was shaped by factors peculiar to each individual in differing sites.

These stories, and more specifically teachers' voices, have traditionally been rendered silent by the reductionist forms of inquiry used by researchers in their quest for the "truth". This study does not want to replicate orientations to exploring leadership that have traditionally portrayed the researcher as "authoritative and distanced...an invisible, neutral and observing" participant (Jones, 1989 in Gough, 1994:56) who simply reinscribed a power dynamic to which we are theoretically opposed (Jones, 1992:18). We have tried to reconceptualise and resituate the research theories, methodologies and practices of the narrative in the everyday curriculum world of the participants and the underlying social reality (Roman, 1992) of that world, giving greater access to the dominant factors that shape and have shaped curriculum leadership for each participant. This reconceptualisation promotes a more realistic commitment to advocacy oriented critical research that fosters an understanding of the
everyday world of curriculum leadership for each teacher. This type of narrative offers to each participant an opportunity, not only to think back over a significant episode that was worthy of sharing with others but also, presents an opportunity to look forward - making connections between their existing practices and future possibilities. What was of interest to the researching partners in exploring such narratives was

the opportunity "to establish how individuals give coherence to their (curriculum) lives when they write or talk...the sources of this coherence, the narratives that lie behind them, the larger ideologies that structure them must be uncovered (Denzin,1989:62).

PART C LEARNING MOMENTS
The interview and its links to the narrative.
The narratives formed the basis of stimulated recall during a number of interview sessions with teachers, facilitating the retrospective sharing of episodes of curriculum leadership and further, the disclosure of covert thinking about the curriculum leadership phenomenon - data that is otherwise inaccessible. Such introspection brought to the study, not only the telling of stories, but also an examination of the complex phenomenon of curriculum leadership - examining why I do things the way I do? - and lastly, generated rich possibilities for consideration in thinking about - where to from here? An example of a narrative appears in Appendix A.

As a research team going into the study, we discussed whether we should preside over the study, through what could be considered to be contrived interviews, emerging as a "purportedly distant and neutral observer. This role, that requires of each interview team the design of predetermined interview procedures and questions, results in each teacher "being gazed upon but not challenged or transformed" (Roman,1992:573). A number of us felt uncomfortable with this role arguing that we did not want to do research on teachers, but rather, research with teachers.

When considering the interview as a possible research tool to fully pursue and understand the narrative, (and not lose sight of the research questions) we were confronted with a wide range of conceptualisations, ranging from a highly structured notion of the seeking of information, or the direct way of interviewing through negotiation or a more dynamic approach where the interview is simply a prompt to effective interpersonal communication. We finally agreed that the interviews in this study were designed to investigate what was important within the narratives, and thus, should take the form of a social conversation rather than an inquisition (Simons,1982:36). As such, the interviewers were able to design a key set of probing strategies (Hook,1981) around the narratives through an open-ended approach to each interview, fostering an extensive amount of flexibility and responsiveness to each unique story/stories. Listening
was considered a vital component of the interaction (Simons, 1982), and we continued to debate the importance of avoiding traditionally "neutral" attitudes (Hook, 1981) towards each participant's stories. Some of us argued that it was more important to be continually responsive to the range of social and intellectual reactions in the process of engaging the person in talk" (Simons, 1982:41) about their narratives.

As the interview teams have become inextricably bound up with the research process, we have found that we actually have been very active in the process of unstructured interviewing and this has elicited a rich data base and just as importantly, resulted in the forging of collegial rather than existing vertical relationships (Diamond, 1988) with each of the participants. The transition into a more active role, joining with each participant, through a series of interviews, observations, informal conversations and the sharing of narratives, has invited us to share (rather than interrogate) with each teacher his/her understanding of curriculum leadership and how such phenomena are constructed through the processes of meaning making in a particular school context.

Many of us have found that the interview loses its structure as discussions take on a more dynamic style, at times spontaneous and full of 'chatter' as common experiences and stories are exchanged, in a seemingly direction less manner. However, working as partners has allowed us to find a balance between such responsivity and staying on task. We have realised that the narratives have invited us into a larger research space that may, in other contexts, have been limited by predetermined research questions.

What is required of the research team then, is a necessity to engage in a dialogue that works dialectically on the relation between the phenomenon of curriculum leadership and the nature of the personal, social, curriculum and organisational relations that structure it.

Our team work has been based on "an explicitly open-ended dialogical and reciprocal manner with research subjects" (Roman, 1992:582).

Dealing with the unexpected that lies within the narrative Of particular significance in the emerging data, has been the interplay of personal factors, organisational infrastructure, social factors and the images of themselves that teachers hold about curriculum leadership. Such complexities tend to emerge as the covert agenda, implicit in conversations, rather than as explicit "answers" to set "questions" or even as specific items within the narratives. It is vital that each interview team is sensitive to and hears such implicit messages and shapes the dialogue, either in the short term or the long term, to elicit more refined conceptualisations of such thoughts that
are signalled within the narrative.

It becomes the responsibility of each of us as interviewers, to capture the essence of these fragmented experiences through tapping the innermost feelings of each teacher as he/she is prompted to act and respond to issues of curriculum leadership, or as he/she engages in differing forms of curriculum leadership. At each site these complexities became manifest in differing ways, and were identified in differing forms. It became challenging for the research teams to integrate these mysteries into our collective work and at the same time, valuing the uniqueness of the incident within the commonalities of the project. Researcher initiative was required to captured the moment in ways that enriched our work and yet remained loyal to the idiosyncrasies of the site. What was of great significance locally may not have been significant to the project. This is also true of the reverse.

Due to the exploratory nature of the project and the qualities of the narrative, we were required to keep an open mind as researchers when confronted by these moments. It was through ongoing, oft times, informal corridor discussion with our researching colleagues that we kept the mysteries of curriculum leadership unravelling. These informal discussions reassured us that each site was unique and that this was one of the most valuable aspects of our work. We kept reminding ourselves that the narrative fostered generative thinking about curriculum leadership not generalisable outcomes.

The valuable place of conversation emanating from the narrative. The interactions that emerged through stimulated recall and ongoing interviews as a result of the narratives can best be characterised as ‘conversations’. This type of dialogue complements the narrative genre in a number of ways that is significant for collaborative research of this nature. It is:

(i) continually self critical and open to question with reference to each participant's theoretical imposition of ideology with our own;
(ii) useful in engaging in an ongoing monitoring of the purposes and processes of the study as a collective rather than a team engaging in research acts upon another; and
(iii) helpful in having an ongoing commitment to representing the subjectivities of each participant in ways that generated and examined the many complex facets of curriculum leadership.

In locating oneself in a large study of this nature, each researcher needed to be cognisant of the importance of allowing his or her prior theoretical and political commitments to be informed and transformed by
the lived experiences of the person with whom he or she converses. This of course does not mean we disregard our own theorising, rather we encourage the juxtaposition of our own experiences with those of the research subjects (Roman.1992:583). The interplay of these experiences is most vividly conveyed through the research conversations that occurred throughout the project, stimulated by the narrative. Dialogical conversations (Herrman, 1989) of this nature were further enriched by a process of reporting back our initial interpretations that took the form of narratives about the narratives. Here the research team returned to the school community for validation checks or member checking procedures. This was an invaluable learning experience for us in playing with the narrative and invaluable in pursuing authenticity within our work. However it was also a useful process for the teachers participating in the study. As we mirrored their narratives and our shared understanding of their stories with them, they were able to engage in further critique of their thinking and their practices. Sure, it enhanced the authenticity of our reporting, but of equal importance, it created for teachers a snapshot of where they were positioned in curriculum leadership as individuals. Further, it allowed us to map collaboratively curriculum leadership within specific sites. This resulted in some school communities moving from stories to strategic plans! These communities opted to use the data base in designing self renewing action plans both individually and collectively. Although not all research teams used this strategy, it is our intent to develop the notion of narratives about the narratives as a basis for ongoing dialogic conversations in our future work. An example of this is attached in Appendix B of this paper.

Analysing the data that are emerging from narratives. The mode of analysis advocated by Strauss and Corbin (1990), commonly referred to as grounded theory which requires a "systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990:24) about the phenomenon of curriculum leadership was adopted within this study.

The essence of this approach to analysis is that it is an integral part of the whole study not a process that comes at the end of the data collection phase. The processes of analysis that occurs concurrently with ongoing interviewing in the first instance, are facilitated by transcribing interviews, writing memos (questions and comparisons), and generating conceptual maps. We failed to think these processes through very carefully as a research team before entering the research sites, assuming, based on earlier work, that we had a shared understanding of what was required. There have been a number of difficulties at this level, particularly relating to the issue of generating analysis across cases.

However, despite these difficulties, plentiful dialogue at the level of
analysis has occurred at three levels:

- between teacher/s and interviewer/s
- between interviewers on the research team;
- within school sites between teachers who participated in the study.

(1) Dialogue between teachers and the interviewer/s more than often centralised about the phenomenon under analysis and will be a continuing process within the life of the study. As outlined above, this process allows not only clarification of the issues under discussion but also contributes to the process of validating the data as the interviewer continually checks the accuracy and validity of his/her documented perceptions. In a sense there are many issues of this dialogue that remain locked away within the privacy of the interview. It can be argued that only the data which is reported officially through analysis documents, or captured in informal dialogue becomes public. Despite the ethical intentions of each research team writing ongoing reports, such reports will always remain partial.

(2) At significant points in the study, the research team has met in order to share the progress of the project across cases. While the purpose of case study research using narratives is to gain insights into specific cases, team talk has tended to generate discussion across cases. While there are some advantages to such discussion, particularly in affirming the outcomes of the quantitative project, we are presently discussing whether one of the outcomes of the study is to generalise across cases (as is the purpose of most interpretative research); or to use each case in a way to complement the survey work; or to enrich the factors articulated in the survey through a particular case or cases. An important task ahead of us is to continue articulating the relationship between the two projects in order to achieve the project objectives, but we must not lose sight of the significance of the narrative.

(3) A third form of collective conversations will more than likely take place at the school site as the research community within each site comes together to discuss propositions that emerge with the analysis of data collected within that particular site. During these interactions, a process of clarification and further diffraction will occur at the points of preliminary analysis and final analysis as the propositions are reconsidered, confirmed and/or reconstructed. The group might also add propositions that have been overlooked by the interview team. This type of interaction is useful in clarifying and elucidating the phenomenon of curriculum leadership as it has emerged within the social and political relations of the particular school community.

We conclude from our narrative work thus far that there is still much that remains a mystery in relation to curriculum leadership within the diversities and complexities of individual school sites.
Personal factors need to be unravelled in terms of the ways in which these operate in perceiving objective realities such as the opportunities to engage in curriculum leadership within policy imperatives and initiatives; in producing a lens through which teachers see the contextual factors; and in generating a desire to work within the context and to seize opportunities to engage in curriculum leadership.

Ways of supporting and sustaining curriculum leadership within a context of ongoing change and transformation of curriculum practice represent another challenge for both investigation and action. For example, at a broader level, the survey used in the quantitative study may be used to map patterns of curriculum leadership at a site. These patterns may then be used as a basis for ongoing planning and action. Another focus could be the way in which professional development connects with teachers at the point of how personal factors affect teachers' inclination to be involved and how such inclinations may be translated into curriculum leadership action.

CONCLUSION

While we acknowledge that narratives will produce only partial stories that become integral to a research project and school community development, at least the authority of the interviewer as the only story teller is becoming decentred (Jones, 1992). The authority of interviewer as key story teller has been displaced in search of authentic research that captures "a kind of honesty achieved through a heightened empiricism" (Barone, 1992) as each teacher scrutinises the stories he/she tells about the world of curriculum leadership around him or herself and, in so doing, captures the "thoughts, beliefs, desires and habits, in the contingencies that constitute their life worlds" (Barone, 1992 in Gough, 1994:50) concerning this phenomenon.

We are arguing that this type of narrative research promotes a form of participatory research whereby everyone is a winner! At the heart of this orientation is found a view of knowledge arising through curriculum leadership struggles that effectively contributes to the transformation of that situation. Such transformations become, not just the products of research, but contributions to the professional growth of the participants, both teachers and researchers. Teachers and researchers have reacted differently to the narrative experience and in closing we share those reactions of the research team, while still awaiting those of our teaching colleagues:

* I was really enthusiastic about using the narrative because I felt very strongly that funded projects such as this one, by their very nature, often impose, manipulate and exploit the research participants. I believed narratives would let the teachers voices come through and it
would be the voices, not the research agenda that would shape up the project. When the first set of narratives arrived, I thought "These have nothing to do with the study! What's this got to do with curriculum leadership?"

I did not however, write a set of interview questions. I thought - now let's go with the flow and see what happens. This was a great move in hindsight although I was feeling nervously unprepared in the first interview. We began by stating the usual protocol matters and moved quickly into my first and last "white lie" by stating:

I found your narrative fascinating (dreadfully irrelevant) - would you like to tell me about how this all began! (what on earth has this got to do with curriculum leadership?)

What of course I soon learned (as I ate my slice of humble pie) was that these narratives were deeply immersed in the phenomena of curriculum leadership - a world of which I knew very little. Thank goodness I didn't stifle this with focussed interview questions! This richness of the narratives, the conversations about narratives and our narratives about narratives continue to confront my very narrow view in ways that opened new and exciting windows into the living theory of curriculum leadership. (Tania)

* Initially I was ambivalent about the idea of narrative research. The idea of a teacher writing responses to some key statements or guidelines didn't seem much different from an open ended survey approach. I think the strength of the narrative approach lies in its ability to provide a text as the basis for follow up discussions. In the standard interview procedure the interviewer sets directions for the discussion through the interview questions and as such is controlling the situation. In the interview situation, following the production of the narrative, the teacher has set the scene for the interview and therefore has some ownership of the situation. The teacher-researcher relationship then is one of collaboration rather than domination-subordination. (Christine)

* Narrative approaches are opening windows into the world of teachers and their work. They capture the rich diversity of perspectives and the complexity of factors which are a part of curriculum leadership. While eliciting the narratives in the first instance has been somewhat disappointing in getting lots of written description and analysis from teachers; it has been most satisfying in terms of the ensuing conversations about what I thought were rather sketchy narratives. The research data come alive in these conversations which for me are a great vehicle for including teachers more meaningfully as research participants. They are not only generating the data but also analysing...
data with us.

A narrative approach provides a way of connecting with the world of research participants; of shaping analysis outcomes to their concerns and needs; and of bringing back emotions with desire and enthusiasm into the investigative world of curriculum theorising. (Ian)

Essentially, this is where we are at in terms of narrative research. We have lots of questions - in fact more questions than answers - questions about eliciting narratives, talking about them, taking description to levels of interpretation and transformation, considering the welfare of the story tellers, and finding ways of reporting authentically and authoritatively.

What our stories and the last paper in this symposium illustrate are the sorts of issues that we need to talk about further and accept as an ongoing challenge. We stress that our philosophical stance makes us committed to this sort of research as being something worthwhile pursuing - worthwhile in the context of our seeking to create environments that are empowering for people to transform their own practice; and worthwhile as part of our own professional growth and the professional growth of those people with whom we interact and work. So like all "good" research, we're generating new knowledge that in fact, will empower people to move forward in areas that are problematic for them and for us. For us all, we want to be advocates for narrative research as a viable and a valued means of investigating our professional work - a means which is increasingly accepted in the professional workplace at large and within the research cultures associated with the higher education sector of that workplace.

With the narrative turn we continue to struggle with a number of key issues and questions. We leave these with you for further deliberation as the symposium unfolds:

   How can we effectively continue to elicit narratives and maintain a positive working relationship with those who write the stories? (Convery, 1993).

   How do we identify the place of the research teams in encouraging the stories to be told? (Francis, 1996).

   How can we effectively handle the dilemma of building trust on the one hand and guarding against contaminating the stories on the other?

   How can we justify the information which the stories contain as trustworthy data? (Guba and Lincoln, 1982; Eisner, 1991).
How do identify the universalities from the stories for reporting collaboratively without destroying the richness of each unique context? (Simons, 1996)

How do we protect the storytellers' identity where necessary and, at the same time, raising the concerns and issues? (Davies, 1995).

How can we use narrative research to address notions of empowerment for advocacy and transformative practice within curriculum leadership? (Lather, 1991).

How can we effectively juxtapose the subjectivity of narrative research with the research necessity of drawing generative/generalisable distinctions?

As we leave you with these questions, we emphasise that the use of a narrative research approach has been insightful and worthwhile alongside the quantitative study reported in the second paper. It has confirmed and elaborated the trends reported there. It has also provided a platform for us as a research team to consider the propositions and questions arising from the cases of curriculum leadership. Samples of these propositions and questions are found at the end of the case report found in Appendix B and in an extract from another case report contained in Appendix C.
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APPENDIX A

Extracts from a beginning teacher's narrative

As a beginning teacher I don't think that I really engage in curriculum leadership although a couple of things come to mind the more I think about it. A little after half way through term 2, I was approached by my Head to write a unit of work that could be implemented across the whole of the year level by all the teachers. It was felt that the current unit was out of date and dull for the students and failed to reflect the current factors under consideration within the National curriculum.

I spent a great deal of my time visiting the local libraries and council offices to get the data to make this unit work. I wanted to get the students to present a group report and I wanted them to do a lot of field work to get to the point of reporting. This was something new for the kids and I thought they would take greater responsibility for their project........
The project has been underway for a few weeks now and all of the teachers are encouraging in their response to my work. The field work component has been considered and is in place and I am now finalising the assessment. The teachers were not totally supportive of the field work because this required the students to go into the streets. The teachers prefer a school based component and, essentially I disagree with this but have acknowledged that they know the kids better than I do.

I feel I have benefited from the confidence that the teachers have given me.

APPENDIX B

Example of narratives about the narratives

(Pseudonym: MILLTOWN)
Report to the Qualitative Team

Ian Macpherson & Ross Brooker
(November 1, 1996)

INTRODUCTION - DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOL

Milltown (a pseudonym) State High School is situated on the Sunshine Coast to the north of Brisbane. The school commenced with year 8 only in 1995 and has added year 9 in 1996. The current enrolment is 710 with a projected enrolment of 1106 in 1997.

The school describes its purpose in terms of being an:

... innovative and socially responsible school preparing young people for a productive future of active citizenship and employment in a safe, secure, well-ordered environment.

The majority of staff at the school are young and energetic and this has been an important factor in the establishment and implementation of the vision for the school.

Curriculum

At the school, the junior curriculum is focused on a core which is based on the key learning areas of English; Mathematics; Science; Studies of Society and Environment; and Health and Physical Education. In addition to the core the school offers specialised studies in the key learning areas of LOTE; the Arts; Commerce; and Technology.

All students participate in a Personal Development Program. Human Relationships Education, Religious Education, Career Education, and Gifted and Talented and remedial programs are offered, and where possible, are integrated into the curriculum structure.

Organisation

Since the beginning of 1996, two sub-schools have operated. This structure is designed to "reduce student anonymity and foster effective inter-relationships between students and teachers." Each sub-school is constituted by a group of students and staff working together, and managed by Heads of Department in conjunction with the Deputy Principal.

All policy decisions are made at a monthly meeting of the school Review committee which receives written submissions from all other school committees. At least one parent sits on all of the committees.

Workplace Reform
Consistent with the desire to introduce innovation that enhances student learning, the school is currently planning a "split-shift" timetable for introduction in 1997. When fully implemented, students in years 8-10 will attend school from 10.30am to 4.15pm, and senior students from 7.30am to 1.00pm. The most important benefit of this initiative is:

... to allow 'less crowded' periods of time for both Juniors and Seniors at the school. This has the obvious advantages of a more effective use of school facilities and an increased opportunity for more effective inter-relationships.

Other advantages were described as being:

more flexible shifts of time for teachers, a better bus service for students, increased part-time employment opportunities for students, and better opportunities for further related studies for Seniors such as TAFE courses.

RESEARCH PROCESS
Following an initial contact with the Deputy Principal at Milltown, it was agreed that the school would participate in the project and a teacher, Katrina, was identified as being interested to work with the researchers. Katrina was a young, energetic Head of Department who was a foundation staff member at the school. The work at Milltown school commenced with a visit to explain the nature and focus of our research on curriculum leadership. At that meeting Katrina agreed to construct a narrative around a particular instance of curriculum leadership at Milltown. From Katrina's narrative the researchers identified a number of matters to pursue in a conversation with Katrina and a colleague, Winona, who was associated with the instance of curriculum leadership identified by Katrina. One of the researchers visited the school to participate in the conversation. The conversation focused on the four curriculum leadership factors as they related to Katrina's initial narrative.

Following the meeting, a written account was constructed and returned to the Katrina and Winona for editing and verification that it accurately represented their views. Comment on the account was also sought from a third teacher, Richard, and from the school Principal, Graham. Richard added some comments and Graham was satisfied with the accuracy of the account from his perspective. In order to explore some of the ideas in more depth, a further conversation was held with Katrina.

It is to be pointed out that the above approach was designed to elicit an understanding of an instance of curriculum leadership at one site and at a particular point in the school's history. It is therefore
heavily contextualised but has proved fruitful material for further thought about the realisation of curriculum leadership in the school context.

A CONVERSATION ABOUT CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP
Katrina and Winona referred to the importance of keeping in touch with the workplace was emphasised as this was what parents wanted. This feedback was obtained from the parent consultation meetings at which parents, a percentage of whom come from a higher socio-economic status bracket expressed academic aspirations for their children.

Both Winona and Katrina noted that most decisions in the school are collaborative and that everyone knows the processes involving input to decision-making (eg through HOD and from teacher to committee member to Review Committee, etc). In terms of organisation structure, what was stressed was the way in which guidelines facilitated in their development by the Principal and the Curriculum Committee were used to develop the Technology subject. A factor that also was related to this area was timetabling which continued to see Home Economics and Manual Arts as two separate subjects in Year 8. This could work against the acceptance of Technology as an integrated subject in Year 8, as could the Curriculum and Timetable arrangements in years 9 and 10 where again Home economics and Manual Arts are considered as separate subjects. As far as views of curriculum were concerned, Katrina believed that even though there were changes to be kept up with and policy and systemic initiatives to be addressed, the newness of the school allowed them to start something from scratch.

Katrina highlighted personal factors relating to ownership and thought this is important if an innovation was going to be implemented successfully. The innovation also provided the opportunity for Manual Arts and Home Economics staff in the school to talk and to get to know what each was doing. This gave rise to collaboration which in turn led to a commonality of purpose and an understanding of how each subject complemented the other. Katrina who coordinates Health and Physical Education, Manual Arts and Home Economics was able to engender good communication among the staff in these areas. In addition, relationships with parents is something which the school values and there were definite attempts to find out what they wanted. They turned up in great numbers to parent consultation meetings which have continued as needs demand (e.g. nutrition; and split-shift schooling).

Winona elaborated on the Technology day which is to be held in Term IV. The idea of the day is to promote Technology with a Design/Make/Appraise approach. The emphasis is to be on an integrated approach rather than upon separation of Home Economics and Manual Arts. Students will be set a task which they can address from a wide range of disciplines. One activity will see students provided with a kit of
materials from which they are to make a merchandising product that will promote Olympics 2000.

Winona and Katrina noted that support for this day and for the Technology subject came from parents, the Key Learning Area Coordinator (KLARC) and a successful submission for funding. The newness of the school was also considered a contributing factor. Staff felt that they wanted to own the day and they saw benefits for students and for the promotion of the subject.

School philosophy was also mentioned within this set of factors. While the philosophy reflects the Corporate Goals of the Department of Education, the school as a community felt that it had space to develop programs which would also reflect local needs and responses. (The fact that the school was new and that the Principal had a core of staff whom he knew produced a sense of cohesion in terms of purpose and effort). The school had no difficulty with placing an emphasis on Technology and it embraced the challenges and opportunities that such an emphasis gave.

Katrina and Winona thought that enthusiasm was an important factor. Teachers, they said, were enthusiastic because they knew there would be a positive student outcome and that they would benefit from the program. The enthusiasm was also generated from being in a new school and having the opportunity to start something new from the ground floor. This, in turn, encouraged teachers to strive to do things better. Teachers, nevertheless, needed professional development opportunities to support and sustain their efforts to improve.

From all of this, the conversation moved to a consideration of curriculum leadership as a phenomenon. Katrina and Winona agreed that it was a phenomenon, that it did belong to the site, and that it would not be the same at all sites. They were both very positive about the opportunities that the school afforded teachers to engage in curriculum leadership. Here, they said, everyone is encouraged to take on a leadership role in curriculum initiatives.

CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP FACTORS
The following represents a distillation of elements from the case study that are significant for curriculum leadership at Milltown:

Images of Curriculum

- Staff vision for the whole school as a priority.
- A shared responsibility for curriculum.
- A curriculum that is relevant to the students.

Organisational Factors
- Opportunity provided by the newness of the school.
- Sub-schools to counteract fragmentation.
- Good support from QED.

**Social Factors**

- Openness of parents to new ideas.
- Staff are typically younger.
- The smallness and newness of the school.
- Positive relationships.
- Collaboration and communication.

**Personal Factors**

- Sense of achievement.
- Strong sense of direction.
- Ability to picture the benefits for staff and students.
- Perseverance.
- Willingness to be innovative.
- Acceptance of responsibility along with ownership.
- Excitement.
- Energy

**The Survey Instrument**

Katrina and Winona commented on their observations thus far with reference to the items in the State-wide survey. Katrina suggested that parental support be added to the Social Dynamics factors. Katrina thought she would also highlight the clientele of the school as well as the contacts which teachers had with other schools on the basis of prior involvements. As far as the Personal factors were concerned, both Katrina and Winona thought that trust and ownership should also be included.

Both Katrina and Winona considered the items in each of the four sets of factors and agreed that they personally would score towards the extreme importance end of the continuum. They also felt that the school generally would score more towards this end, although it was noted that this might not be as strong this year as in the first year of the school's operation. With Personal factors, Winona and Katrina thought that the pattern might not be so strong and consistent. They noted that everyone would not want to be a risk-taker. It was also noted that there would be differing levels of commitment among teachers to ongoing curriculum development.

The ongoing use of the survey was briefly discussed, and Winona and Katrina saw that it could be useful for a school in identifying how it might improve its performance in curriculum leadership. For example, a personal factor could be identified as a starting point in identifying professional development or other support mechanisms which would
sustain curriculum leadership activity at the school site. Again, it was pointed out that the pattern would not necessarily be the same in each school. A contrast, for example, was noted between this school and a long-established one.

**SOME PROPOSITIONS ABOUT CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING AT MILLTOWN**

- Curriculum leadership has been initiated through the creation of opportunity, in this case, the establishment of a new school.
- Curriculum leadership has been fuelled by the realisation that something new and worthwhile can be created.
- Curriculum leadership has been facilitated by the selection of staff with the energy, enthusiasm, commitment, and perseverance to respond to the opportunity.
- A whole school view of curriculum has been essential.
- Localised priorities (eg departments) have been contextualised within the whole school view.
- The propensity in people to take risks has been essential in mediating contextual opportunities to engage in curriculum leadership.
- The ability of people to look at very traditional and accepted school structures in a very different way has enhanced the possibilities for engaging in curriculum leadership.
- The four sets of factors have been confirmed as being significant in curriculum leadership but how those factors interact remains something of a mystery and difficult for teachers to identify.
- Curriculum leadership at the school is guided by a strong sense of responding to the perceived needs of students.
- Curriculum leadership needs to have the support of the broader context, in this case, the QED.
- Curriculum leadership must involve the relevant stakeholders and include those outside the boundaries of the school property (eg. parents).
APPENDIX C

Sample of propositions and questions arising from the Northside Case Report

DRAWING SOME PROPOSITIONS ABOUT CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP FOR EFFECTIVE LEARNING AND TEACHING AT NORTHSIDE

The propositions which follow were derived from a reflection on two further conversations at the school - one with a group of students, and the other with Laurel, Dave, Rose, Ross and Ian.

At Northside:

Curriculum leadership is perceived as a shared phenomenon, with opportunity for all stakeholders (with some reservations regarding the level of students' and parents' input, as they were not specifically included in this case study investigation) in the school community to participate meaningfully in curriculum leadership.

Social climate is significant in terms of making people feel valued and included through a variety of formal (e.g. meeting and committee structures) and informal arrangements (e.g. staff morning teas).

Organisational structure is significant in terms of an openness of communication which engenders feelings of ownership and involvement in and commitment to curriculum initiatives.

A clear and forward-thinking curriculum vision for the school is significant for people at the site to focus their efforts on the core business of the school - student learning.
Personal factors might better be considered as professional factors which are manifest in a strong sense of professional responsibility to facilitate optimal learning opportunities for all students.

Not all teachers at the site would necessarily have the same view of the way in which curriculum leadership operates, and the importance of the individual person standing between and mediating the site context and the engaging in curriculum leadership must not be forgotten in seeking to understand the diverse patterns of curriculum leadership at any one site.

The pattern of curriculum leadership (i.e. the mix of factors contributing to curriculum leadership) at the site might well be a diverse collection of perspectives (and personal factors may well be significant here), while at the broader level, the overall pattern of curriculum leadership at each site will most probably be unique to that site.

While all the factors are present at this site, the actual mix of factors is seen to be unique to this site.

The four sets of factors are useful in mapping patterns of curriculum leadership at particular sites and in responding to these patterns in ways that are uniquely and critically (re)constructive in elaborating and strengthening curriculum leadership actions at this site and most probably at other sites.

In further consideration of these propositions, we, as researchers, should be aware that we have merely scratched the surface to this point. Questions that could be addressed in further work include:

How could a richer picture of what happens in classrooms be obtained in order to situate curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching at Northside? The canvassing of students' perspectives could provide rich data in this regard.

While it might be assumed that the school would score highly as a whole school and within small groups in terms of the survey items, how could a more specific picture be obtained of what individual persons think about curriculum leadership? What if a different selection of teachers had been made?

How might the understandings obtained from the Northside case be used to decide appropriate interventions in terms of elaborating and strengthening curriculum leadership?

How do we address the greater variety of responses evident in relation to personal factors in the reality of ongoing curriculum leadership actions? What are the implications, for example, in relation to the
 provision of professional development opportunities?

What other stakeholders (besides students and teachers) might be included in further investigation (e.g. parents)?
INTRODUCTION
So far, the papers have presented the historical context of the research partnership; our initial theorising about curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching; some insights we have been gaining along the way about both the focus of our research and our research approach and methodology (see Paper #1); and the multi-method methodology which we have used in 1996 (see Paper #2 for quantitative and Paper #3 for qualitative). It is now the task of this paper to float some ideas for ongoing research and action in 1997. The task in 1996 has been to develop a data base upon which work can proceed in 1997. The focus in 1997 swings to an emphasis on informed action to work with people in schools to promote their engagement in curriculum leadership for effective learning and teaching. The goal of this phase of the project is to work with school personnel so that they might become empowered to transform curriculum practice.

The action in 1997 will be informed by a developing view of curriculum leadership - developing in the sense that the quantitative and the qualitative studies in 1996 have confirmed the factors of curriculum leadership identified as propositions in 1995 and the importance of personal factors which were also identified by the end of 1995.

WHAT THE MULTI-METHOD METHODOLOGY TOLD US
In multi-method methodology terms (Brewer and Hunter, 1992; Green, Caracelli & Graham, 1989), the interplay of quantitative and qualitative methods (along with the emerging data) confirmed the propositional view of curriculum leadership which we had at the end of 1995, and at the same time began to extend and elaborate the insights with respect to particular sites.

The quantitative study produced findings about both the personal involvement of school personnel in curriculum leadership and the extent to which curriculum leadership existed in respondents' schools. In terms of personal involvement in curriculum leadership, three factors were confirmed as being important at both whole school and small group levels: images of curriculum; organisational; and social. With respect to the extent of curriculum leadership that existed in schools, only two factors emerged as being important: images of curriculum; and socio-organisational. The importance of elements another factor, related to the contribution of people's personal characteristics to curriculum leadership, has been less clear.

Consequently, the survey instrument will be a useful way for a school to map its curriculum leadership profile as a starting point to thinking about the ongoing promotion of curriculum leadership in that school. Mapping in these terms offers a sound basis for strategic planning aimed at supporting the empowerment of persons to engage in curriculum leadership as a means of transforming teaching and learning
practice.

Drawing upon the propositions that underpinned the quantitative work, the qualitative studies in a number of schools have identified that all four factors are significant for curriculum leadership; but that the interrelationship between these factors still remains something of a mystery and difficult for school personnel to identify. The more detailed inquiry undertaken at schools has shown that while the patterns of curriculum leadership at different sites might be similar in broad terms, there are complexities and diversities that are unique to each site.

WHERE WE CURRENTLY STAND IN RELATION TO CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP

Curriculum leadership, in our view, is any initiative that teachers may undertake to encourage more effective learning and teaching. Our project has confirmed the centrality of teachers in curriculum leadership. We have no evidence to support a view of curriculum leadership which positions only those with designated positions in the school structure (e.g. principal; deputy principal; head of a subject department) as curriculum leaders. It is clear that curriculum leadership is an artefact of the particular school context in which it occurs and that images of curriculum, organisational and social factors, and the personal characteristics, are important in shaping curriculum leadership in that school context. Curriculum leadership is constructed out of the complexities and problematics of a rich interplay between people and their environment. We have also identified that curriculum leadership is a phenomenon that emerges in response to opportunities that occur both at macro (e.g. starting a new school) and micro levels (e.g. implementation of curriculum policy in a single class).

In summary, our work in 1996 has brought us to a point where we have identified that curriculum leadership involves those actions which are intimately related to the knowledge, values and attitudes that teachers hold about their curriculum context, which interact with their personal qualities, resulting in actions for improved learning and teaching in that context. It is worth noting that within this view of curriculum leadership:

- People are important in any learning/teaching setting;
- Collaborative effort is desirable in promoting effective learning/teaching;
- People need to seize opportunities to engage in curriculum leadership action;
- Each site of curriculum activity (whole school or small group) is
shaped by three contextual factors: the images of curriculum held by people; the organisational arrangements; and the social relationships between people:

- Individual personal factors are important in mediating the contextual elements and seizing the opportunities; and
- The mix of contextual elements is unique to each site of curriculum action and impacts upon the way individual persons mediate these elements and seize opportunities for curriculum leadership action.

PROMOTING CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOLS - STRATEGIES FOR 1997

Significance
From the discussion so far, it is evident that we have a solid platform upon which to extend the project in 1997. The state Department of Education, who is a partner in the project, is interested in our work in two ways. Firstly, effective teaching and improved learning outcomes for students have been identified as "Organisational Goals" in the recently published Strategic Plan for 1997-2001 [Department of Education, Queensland (QED), 1996]. Secondly, "curriculum leadership" has been identified as one of the target areas for the inservice professional development and training of teachers and principals (QED, 1996, Draft). The schools that we have worked with in the qualitative studies are interested as effective teaching and learning is part of their core business and they welcome any opportunity to enhance their work.

Consequently, the outcomes of our work will directly inform thinking about curriculum leadership policy, curriculum practice, and curriculum change at both system level and school sites.

Approach
In terms of our research approach, a most significant feature of our work has been on the establishing, maintaining, and sustaining our research partnerships. Such partnerships have taken on a variety of forms: between university academics and Education Department officers to form a project team; between the project team and school personnel; and at some sites, between school personnel. An almost symbiotic relationship continues to hold our work together. For example, the issues associated with effective learning and teaching (an Education Department initiative) have always informed and continue to inform the sorts of research questions we have posed and which we are continuing to investigate and act upon. Outcomes of these investigations and actions are beginning to shape systemic thinking in such areas as policy making and professional development. Members of the partnership bring a variety of perspectives and priorities to the project, and it is interesting to note that ideas like parity of esteem are an evident feature of our working together.
We anticipate that much of our future qualitative work will be conducted within an action research framework. This approach readily accommodates collaborative research partnerships, is critically reflexive, focuses on curriculum actions, and informs the theorising of curriculum actions.

Focus
Building on the work that we have undertaken so far, and considering the significance of the findings for current and future system and school priorities, it is most likely that our work in 1997 will explore the following areas:

- Qualitative studies (using a narrative method?) focussing on exploring further the "mystery" of curriculum leadership. This would involve developing a deeper understanding of the personal factors and the way in which these mediate between contextual factors, opportunities, and a desire to act in response to opportunities.

- Action research studies drawing upon the four factors to promote curriculum leadership in schools. As a part of this process, use the survey instrument as a reconnaissance tool to map an initial profile of curriculum leadership in a school. The map could then be used as a starting point to facilitate change.

- Action-oriented work which might initiate and trace the ways in which thinking about curriculum leadership can lead to strategic planning for change.

- Action-oriented work focussing on how the personal factors might be identified in individuals, and how they may be developed and encouraged in individuals to promote higher levels of curriculum leadership.

- Politicisation/advocacy work as a means of influencing policy at systemic level as well as informing/initiating/maintaining/sustaining curriculum leadership efforts at the local level.

- Quantitative work to refine the survey instrument and to tease out the nature and dimensions of personal characteristics for curriculum leadership.

CONCLUSION
In terms of the context of the project and the progress to date, it is imperative that we take the opportunity, with a wider audience, to reflect on the significance, approach, and focus for those ideas we are suggesting for 1997.

We invite the symposium participants, then, to discuss these areas with
us in order to refine and extend our thinking as a basis for action in 1997. The following framework is provided to facilitate the discussion.
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Qualitative studies (using a narrative method?) focussing on exploring further the "mystery" of curriculum leadership. This would involve developing a deeper understanding of the personal factors and the way in which these mediate between contextual factors, opportunities, and a desire to act in response to opportunities.

Action research studies drawing upon the four factors to promote curriculum leadership in schools. As a part of this process, use the survey instrument as a reconnaissance tool to map an initial profile of curriculum leadership in a school. The map could then be used as a starting point to facilitate change.

Action-oriented work which might initiate and trace the ways in which thinking about curriculum leadership can lead to strategic planning for change.

Action-oriented work focussing on how the personal factors might be identified in individuals, and how they may be developed and encouraged in individuals to promote higher levels of curriculum leadership.

Politicisation/advocacy work as a means of influencing policy at systemic level as well as informing/initiating/maintaining/sustaining curriculum leadership efforts at the local level.
Quantitative work to refine the survey instrument and to tease out the nature and dimensions of personal characteristics for curriculum leadership.

1. Band is a complex classification system of schools in Queensland which takes into account size, function and socio-economic context.