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ABSTRACT

Toward a theory of Pedagogical Change: The role of Leadership and Teacher Professional Learning for Pedagogical Reform

The implementation of the Australian Curriculum has brought unprecedented curriculum change in New South Wales (NSW) primary schools for the first time in two decades. This study focuses on the way in which two schools in NSW have worked to enact the new English syllabus. The study uses a constructivist grounded theory methodology which assumes that people form meanings from their actions in relation to space, time and circumstance, acknowledging that they gain new meaning from their actions and perspectives.

This research sought to understand how teachers and leaders in two primary schools implemented this significant curriculum change, and the extent to which the new curriculum was used as a catalyst for pedagogical change. Grounded in the data, this research builds towards a theory of pedagogical change. It explores school culture, leadership and pedagogy during change, acknowledging their contested, complex, interdependent relationship.

The research highlights salient issues related to the interplay of practice and inquiry during a period of imposed change; teacher understanding and enactment of pedagogy, particularly considering the emergent tension between holistic and individualised approaches to learning on the one hand, and pedagogies that lean toward measured collective school improvement on the other; and professional development and learning.

Pedagogical leadership and teacher professional development and learning are seen to be key to shaping curricular and pedagogical change, and the study explores the different manifestations of these in the two contexts, and their implications for the school communities. In particular, it highlights the critical role of school leaders in building distributed pedagogical leadership, fostering collegiality and collaboration, and cultivating trust during curriculum change.

The study contributes to the body of research on pedagogical leadership by exploring teacher professional learning about curriculum change. Its key contribution lies in the way that it builds a grounded theory of pedagogical change, highlighting the importance of leadership and teachers’ involvement in building pedagogical practice. This theory emphasises the importance of trust and teacher professional autonomy while developing individual pedagogical identities as well as a collaborative and shared collective pedagogy.
LIST OF MAJOR TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

**ACARA:** The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. ACARA was established under Section 5 of the *Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority Act* on 8 December 2008. ACARA’s functions include development of national curriculum, administration of national assessments and associated reporting on schooling in Australia.

**AITSL:** Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership. AITSL provides national leadership for the Australian State and Territories in promoting excellence in the profession of teaching & school leadership.

**Australian Curriculum:** [www.australiancurriculum.edu.au](http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/)
The Australian Curriculum sets the expectations for what all Australian students should be taught, regardless of where they live or their background.

**CGT:** Constructivist Grounded Theory

**Head of School:** Name given to a school principal leading a defined part of the school. At Crownwood the Head of K-6 is the principal of the primary part of the school. At Greenville the Head is principal of Years 3-6.

**Key Learning Areas:** The primary curriculum Key Learning Areas (KLAs) are the subject areas in which we teach the Australian Curriculum outcomes. The NSW K–10 Curriculum is organised into broad groupings of subjects referred to as Key Learning Areas

**K-6 and K-12:** Kindergarten to Year 6 (Primary) and Kindergarten to Year 12 (Primary and Secondary)

**IB:** Founded in 1968, the International Baccalaureate® (IB) is a non-profit educational foundation offering four highly respected programs of international education that develop the intellectual, personal, emotional and social skills needed to live, learn and work in a rapidly globalizing world. Schools must be authorised, by the IB organisation, to offer any of the programs.

**Independent (non-government) schools:** Families in Australia may choose to send their children to a non-government school. These types of schools are referred to as private schools because they are not part of the government school system. There are two such sectors – Catholic (systemic) and Independent.

**Junior School:** A Junior school is a type of school that provides primary education to children, often in the age range from 8 and 12, following attendance at Infant school, which covers the age range 5-7.

**MySchool:** [www.myschool.edu.au](http://www.myschool.edu.au): *MySchool* is a resource for parents, educators and the community to give readily accessible information about each of Australia’s just over 10,000 schools and campuses. *MySchool* now has eight years of data enabling
comparisons to be made among schools serving students from similar socio-
educational backgrounds, using the ICSEA index of community socio-economic
advantage.

**NAPLAN:** The National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN)
is an annual assessment for students in Years 3, 5, 7 and 9. It has been an everyday
part of the school calendar since 2008. NAPLAN tests the skills that are essential for
every child to progress through school and life, such as reading, writing, language
conventions (spelling, grammar and punctuation) and numeracy. The assessments are
undertaken nationwide, every year, in the second full week in May.

**NESA:** The NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA). NESA replaced the Board
of Studies, Teaching and Educational Standards NSW (BOSTES) on 1 January 2017.
NESA took over responsibility for setting the state’s K-12 curriculum; accreditation
of teachers, registration of schools and home schooling; delivering the Higher School
Certificate (HSC); and approving tertiary teaching degrees, including minimum entry
standards and a pre-graduate literacy and numeracy test.

In 2015, schools started teaching the new NSW English K–10 Syllabus to all students

**PISA:** the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA)

**Primary School:** A primary school or elementary school is a school in which
children receive primary or elementary education from the age of about five to twelve

**PYP:** The International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme (PYP) is an
educational program managed by the International Baccalaureate (IB) for students
aged 3 to 12. While the program prepares students for the IB Middle Years Program,
it is not a prerequisite for it.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Change is only another word for growth, another synonym for learning.”
Charles Handy

“Learning without thought is labour lost. Thought without learning is perilous.”
Confucius

“We cannot learn without pain.”
Aristotle

This thesis investigates pedagogy and pedagogical leadership in the context of curriculum change in two Australian schools located in the state of New South Wales (NSW). The purpose of this research was to discover more about the professional development practices and specific learning cultures in two schools during the implementation of the NSW English syllabus for the Australian Curriculum, and to provide insight into pedagogical practice and pedagogical leadership during curriculum change. The research explored the ways teachers learn about curriculum and pedagogy and their professional learning practices within school culture. It sought to ascertain teachers’ knowledge and understanding of pedagogy essential for bringing about change in classroom practice. It also sought to understand how teachers and leaders in two primary schools were implementing curriculum change and the extent to which new curriculum was used as a catalyst for pedagogical change.

This research investigated how far the leadership practices employed by pedagogical change agents made a difference to teacher professional learning during curriculum
implementation and teachers’ conceptions of pedagogy, inviting a discussion about the link between pedagogy, curriculum change and student outcomes. Scholarly debate about leadership attributes was examined, and the use of distributive or distributed, collaborative, transformational, instructional, and relational leadership as a part of pedagogical leadership practice critiqued. These areas require further scrutiny in the context of pedagogical change and curriculum change. Leadership as practice acknowledges the complex role that school culture and participants play in the co-construction of leadership. Participant responses in this thesis show how the depth of curriculum knowledge of teachers was determined by the professional learning practices in each school that either enabled or constrained learning during the year of implementation. This thesis builds toward a theory of pedagogical change in order to understand and explain how trust, autonomy and collective pedagogy enable and constrain pedagogical change during curriculum change. This chapter provides a rationale for the research. It defines key terms, provides a brief background to the research and outlines the specific focus and direction of the research based upon these.

**Rationale**

As a former primary school principal I sought to understand how school leaders implemented new pedagogy during curriculum change. I wanted to ascertain upon what basis school leaders adopted new pedagogical practices, particularly during rapid curriculum change in Australia. The adoption and review of the Australian Curriculum, coupled with ongoing discourse about teacher quality, is creating a culture of rapid change in education, opening up new areas for Australian educational leadership research.

Growth in the depth of curriculum knowledge of teachers during the implementation of the English Curriculum has been determined by the professional learning practice traditions in each school derived from their school culture. These practice traditions have either enabled or constrained learning and pedagogical change. A key objective of this research was to find out how the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school are determined and who determines them and the extent to which internal and external forces influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school. In order to
understand these forces, pedagogy and pedagogical leadership was explored in these schools.

**Research Questions**

This research provides insight into pedagogical change during curriculum implementation in two primary school settings within K-12 schools. It analyses the leadership practices of principals, middle managers and teachers within these two contexts based upon their multiple perceptions, providing a layered understanding of the two school cases. The case studies analyse the implementation practices of the NSW K-6 English syllabus for the Australian curriculum in each school, building theory about pedagogical change in this specific context.

This research sought to question:

1. How are the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school determined and who and what determines them?
2. To what extent do internal and external forces influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school?
3. What are the links between school culture and the pedagogy adopted in the school?

These questions about school leadership, pedagogy and school culture formed the basis of a qualitative case study analysis using a constructivist grounded theory approach inquiring into the interaction of pedagogy, school culture and leadership within two primary schools implementing the NSW K-6 English syllabus. I sought to use constructivist grounded theory to research how schools implement new pedagogy during curriculum change. It became evident from my reading that there was a gap in the research in the area of how schools implement new pedagogy during curriculum change. A picture of pedagogical change grounded in the data was constructed from multiple participant viewpoints in order to build theory about pedagogical change, drawing together their multiple perceptions about curriculum change, pedagogical leadership and pedagogical practice.
This current research into teacher professional learning during curriculum change has highlighted the need for teacher support in their work as the agents and enactors of curriculum, building their professional capacity and autonomy (Bruner, 1959; Duignan, 2012; Kemmis et al., 2014; Munro, 2011; Printy, 2013). My current research suggests that teachers can self-actualise (Maslow, 1970), or to grow in their self-knowledge and understand of their ongoing pedagogical identity in practice by reconciling new curriculum with preferred classroom practices, through learning and discarding pedagogical approaches while enacting new curriculum. Understanding pedagogical change may assist school leaders in reflecting upon and adopting leadership practices that support teachers with pedagogical change during curriculum implementation. Furthermore, understanding pedagogical change may highlight the limitations of hierarchical and administrative leadership practices that may have the potential to constrain professional learning communities and endanger trust.

This research points toward ways of redesigning leadership away from administrative constraints to practice pedagogical leadership with and among teachers, students and parents. The theory of pedagogical change developed in this study seeks to move beyond current notions of distributed leadership practice involving delegation and beyond a transformational and instructional leadership debate. Rather, pedagogical leaders base their leadership around individual and collective learning to help all educators to embrace their own evolving pedagogical identity in the knowledge that collaboration through inquiry and dialogue can build autonomy, trust and positive communities of practice for students and teachers.

**Context**

To explain the contextual background to this research, in 2009 the Federal Government introduced the *MySchool* website. This was one of a suite of reforms introduced by the government, including standardised testing with the National Assessment Program: Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) tests introduced in Primary schools, the Australian Curriculum, and the introduction of teaching and leadership standards and teacher accreditation. Published data from the majority of Australian schools utilising students’ NAPLAN test results are updated annually and published on *MySchool*. Australian primary school principals were being asked to account for
the publicly available results in literacy and numeracy for the first time. The results of a former qualitative grounded theory study about pedagogical leadership study where five primary school principals were interviewed about their own perceived impact on student learning outcomes showed that some principals perceived that they had a minimal impact on student learning outcomes in this context, while others reported that their leadership impact was significant (Grice, 2012). This came alongside other research into the connection between leadership and student learning outcomes (Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Harris, Leithwood, Gu, Brown, Ahtaridou & Kingdon, 2009, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008). Empirical findings showed that principals’ perceptions were based upon their pedagogical identity and their knowledge and understanding of data and student learning outcomes. Responses of principals varied in accordance with their pedagogical leadership frameworks, inspiring further questions about pedagogical leadership practices. ‘Pedagogy’ was entering the vernacular of Australian schools in the late 1990s, amid a growing international context of evidence-based teaching (Petty, 2006) and the translation of pedagogical practices between global contexts, one of numerous examples being assessment for learning (Black & Wiliam, 2001; Petty, 2006). In this context, pedagogy was being redefined as the application of measurable teaching techniques for the purpose of evidence-based teaching. In order to interpret the inherent forces influencing pedagogy, my research first sought to ascertain how teachers and leaders defined and understood the meaning of pedagogy.

As the initial quotations in this chapter suggest, professional learning, growth and unlearning during curriculum change can be a painful process for individuals and schools. Rapid curriculum implementation risks the peril of limited reflection time where the time constraints of schools have the potential to inhibit reflective and critical thinking syllabus implementation in specific school contexts. Even more perilous than failing to tailor the new English syllabus to a specific school culture, is enacting the new English syllabus without deeply considering its ideological and pedagogical principles. Without the professional learning that many teachers desire, deserve and require, participants shared that some teachers avoid the pain and return to former, known curriculum and pedagogical approaches, leaving the syllabus in their intended planning, or on the shelf. The alternative to this negative, but realistic
description of curriculum change is a professional learning culture where a shared understanding of curriculum change and pedagogical change develops between educators. Mutual trust in teachers and leaders is fostered through professional learning practices that seek to enable continuous learning.

**Specific focus**

In 2014 the NSW K-6 English Syllabus for the Australian Curriculum became mandatory, prompting a change in the NSW primary English curriculum for the first time in two decades. In response to the Australian curriculum, syllabus documents in every key learning area in NSW were updated during a process of rapid curriculum change over a five-year period. Syllabus change significantly affected Primary teachers who generally teach across all key learning areas, altering key aspects of their teaching, and requiring professional learning and unlearning. Curriculum change and syllabus change seek to alter pedagogical practices because syllabus outcomes emphasise not only knowledge, but also the skills that require pedagogical practices to change in the classroom.

Specifically, the most significant changes to the NSW English syllabus and the introduction of the Australian Curriculum K-6 emphasised the use of reading, writing, and talking and listening as communication tools to specific audiences, rather than as discrete skills. There is increased emphasis on phonics and functional grammar, and less emphasis on the use of text types for teaching writing. It introduces multimodal texts as a form of teaching reading and writing, requiring the use of technology in all Australian classrooms. Handwriting and digital technology skills are taught as part of visual literacy. It mandates the use of assessment for learning practices, a specific pedagogical practice of formative assessment in the classroom. Even the use of stages¹ rather than year groups in the NSW syllabus has pedagogical implications, enabling schools to structure their student groupings in stages rather than year groups, which is different from the Australian Curriculum. A pedagogy of inclusion through

---

¹ Schooling in NSW primary schools is organised into three Stages of Learning:
- Stage 1 = Kindergarten to Year 2 (Kindergarten is referred to as Early Stage 1)
- Stage 2 = Years 3 and 4.
- Stage 3 = Years 5 and 6.
differentiation is emphasised in the new syllabus. All of these approaches to teaching and learning required professional learning for teachers in grammar, literacy, technology and the teaching of reading and writing for students of all abilities in addition to revamping school planning documents.

This level of detailed change implemented concurrently across all key areas in the Primary Curriculum required teachers and leaders to commit themselves to professional learning in curriculum change in specific key learning areas throughout the school year over several years. Therefore, a climate of rapid curriculum change provided a timely opportunity to examine pedagogical leadership frameworks in practice in two schools and to capture from participants their experiences and emotions during curriculum and pedagogical change.

This leadership research is situated within contemporary Australian education policy reform, particularly with respect to the Australian Professional Standard for Principals and Leadership Profiles developed by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2014). The purpose of these documents is to support pedagogical leadership: to “empower school leaders across the country to develop and support teaching that maximises impact on student learning” (AITSL, 2014, p. 2). The Australian Professional Standard for Principals define leadership through actions rather than attributes. They acknowledge the diverse contexts of Australian principals’ work and attempt to match their knowledge, qualities, experiences and skills through outcomes, connecting pedagogical leadership with school culture. This new emphasis on pedagogical leadership as a standard is a shift in educational policy in Australia.

**Toward a definition of school culture, leadership and pedagogy**

In order to understand how school culture, leadership and pedagogy interact during the process of curriculum change, it is necessary to define these contested terms

---

2 *Key Learning Areas in NSW (subject areas):*
- English;
- Mathematics;
- Science and Technology;
- Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE);
- Creative and Practical Arts
- Personal Development, Health and Physical Education (PDHPE).
within the context of this research. However, it is also important to note that adequately defining these complex and sometimes slippery terms is challenging, and that the literature review will further outline the background research that enabled these definitions.

School culture has inherent complexity. To explore it from this pedagogical perspective, school culture can be identified as the individual and collective practices that enable or constrain student learning and teacher professional learning within a school. This definition encompasses aspects of leadership that enable and constrain learning as well as any aspect of learning in a school, broadening the possibilities of this definition of school culture to numerous aspects of schooling. Schein (2004) defined organisational culture as:

The pattern of basic assumptions that a given group has invented, discovered or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaption and internal integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to these problems (p. 205)

My definition of school culture acknowledges that there are aspects of school culture that are organisational, as Vennebo and Ottesen (2012) also suggest, but there are also elements of school culture that are ‘owned’ by individuals that can be described by participants and altered by individuals.

The theory of practice architectures (Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edwards-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer and Bristol et al., 2014) provides a theoretical basis for understanding the day-to-day practices that create, enable and constrain pedagogical change in school learning culture. The day-to-day practices are understood in my research through the descriptions of participants, building a picture of the practice architecture of school culture in each school, which are, in turn, contributors to and products of school culture. The theory considers the notion of praxis and practice referring to actions and activities that enable connectedness, materiality, subjectivity and morally informed action, acknowledging the power of social context in developing teachers’ practices (Kemmis & Smith, 2008). Therefore, collections of participant descriptions build a picture of school culture, which shifts as it is built and rebuilt by practices.
Previous research into school cultures has defined and labelled pedagogical school cultures as communities of practice and professional learning communities (Eaker & Keating, 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991; MacNeill, Kavanagh & Silcox, 2003; Mulford, 2007; Printy, 2008; Wenger, 1998). In acknowledging the complex social nature of learning, the theory of practice architectures contests the concept of a community of practice as a social learning system full of individuals (Wenger, 1998; see also Lave & Wenger, 1991). The key difference in the theory of practice architectures is that its focus is not on the individuals within the community but on the fact that practices are preconfigured in the social, enabling and constraining practice within school culture through interactions (Schatzki, 2002). The theory of practice architectures builds upon Wenger’s (1998) concept of learning architectures that are created by organisations to enable learning, as “architectures enable and constrain practices themselves” within school cultures (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008, p. 57). Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edwards-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer and Bristol’s, (2014) theory of practice architectures details the elements of a community of practice that transcends those other cited individual characteristics. The theory seeks to make meaning from the artefacts of school culture for deeply analysing how specific aspects of school culture connect to practices and praxis by examining the intersubjective spaces in a school that ‘stir’ participants into practices of sayings, doings and relatings. Coleman (2016) calls intersubjectivity contiguity, the intertwined interaction of the inquiring self with and between others and their thoughts that create artefacts that are constantly changing. Practices are not static and dichotomies and conflicts occur where culture, curriculum and leadership interact. Rather than being mutually supportive, practices can be at odds with one another, almost contradicting each other. The intersubjective spaces within a school connect with and depend upon each other and lead to learning or compliance. These are the elements of school culture that are explored in this research in Chapter 6 and 7.

School culture can be understood by observing the practices, traditions and organisational behaviours of schools to discern their values, rules and assumptions. School culture is inextricably linked and interdependent with practice, leadership and change. Analysing and interpreting the practices within school culture provides
insight into why different pedagogical approaches and leadership practices are adopted by principals and middle leaders. Participant feedback and reflections about school culture created a picture of the tensions evident during change and the disaffection that institutional traditions can bring for new teachers seeking to contribute to school culture. Results suggested that respondents have their own perception of school culture that arises from their personal pedagogical approaches and how these match the pedagogical approaches in the school. In addition, the interaction teachers have with school leadership also influences their perception of school culture and directs their organisational behaviours, values, dialogue and assumptions.

If pedagogical leadership can be understood through evidence of practices within the school then pedagogical leadership is redefined as a practice. The extent that leaders influence school culture is contested in the literature (Day & Armstrong, 2016; Evers & Eacott, 2017; Hargreaves, 1994; Lakomski; Schein, 2004). This research explores the role of leadership in two schools to determine how pedagogical leadership influences school culture during curriculum and pedagogical change. School leadership and culture are inextricably linked (May, Huff & Goldring, 2012; Mulford, 2007; Starratt, 2011). Hallinger (2007) suggests that studying principal leadership without reference to school culture is “meaningless” as effective leaders read and respond to the needs of their school culture in distinctive ways specific to their setting (2007, p. 5).

Pedagogical leadership in this research is not conceptualised as something enacted by particular titled individuals but rather incorporates principal, middle leadership and teacher leadership, acknowledging the metaphor “leadership as pedagogy and pedagogy as leadership” of Lingard, Hayes, Mills, and Christie (2003). My research draws upon practice and concludes that leading is pedagogy. Teachers require the autonomy, agency and ability to be the pedagogical leader of their classroom, a “leader of learning” (Hallinger, 2007). Rather than assuming that pedagogical leadership is the sole responsibility of the principal or a middle leader this research highlights the critical role of teachers as pedagogical leaders.
The complexity of pedagogical leadership is shown in how it is practised. In this research, administrative hierarchies and interactions in both settings were shown to potentially enable or constrain teachers’ pedagogical leadership identity, practice and professional learning. Previous research has explored how genuinely distributed leadership in communities of practice (Spillane, 2006; Wenger, 1998) shares accountability among teachers, having a positive effect upon teaching and learning outcomes (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Hallinger, 2007; Lakomski & Evers, 2017; McKenzie, Mulford & Anderson, 2007). The type of distributed leadership required for pedagogical leadership is also addressed in this research.

The outcome of successful pedagogical leadership is identified by the quality of pedagogy provided by teachers and the engagement of students in learning (Pettit, 2010; Hallinger, 2007; Davies, 2005; Macneill, Cavanagh & Silcox, 2003). Building trust is a key area of leadership in building communities of practice (Wenger, 1988). These elements of pedagogical leadership are further explored in my research, building toward a theory of pedagogical change.

Pedagogy is a commonly used and misinterpreted term. Rather than defining pedagogy as teaching techniques, this research acknowledges a more encompassing definition of pedagogy as articulated by Alexander (2008):

> Pedagogy does not only refer to the act of teaching. It also includes all elements that inform, sustain and justify teacher’s actions, values, ideas, theories, beliefs, history and evidence as well as their relationship with the local and global context… making teaching an educative process rather than a merely technical one. (p. 210)

This research explores and compares notions of pedagogy with curriculum. Curriculum can also be defined broadly as every element of pedagogical practice or narrowly as syllabus documentation (Alexander, 2004). Ideological and philosophical aspects of curriculum will be further explored in Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6. However, for the purposes of clarity in this research, curriculum will be referred to as syllabus documentation, enabling pedagogical practice to speak for itself.
The term *pedagogy* is not articulated in the NSW English Syllabus. This could be interpreted as an implicit ideal that affords teachers the freedom to teach from any philosophical or pedagogical basis. This is the case for NSW schools that incorporate alternative curriculum perspectives. One participating school in this research study had incorporated the International Baccalaureate curriculum alongside the NSW syllabus, adopting an inquiry approach. There are, however, implicit pedagogies in the NSW English syllabus, and if Alexander’s (2004) definition of curriculum stands this would be inevitable in a syllabus document because pedagogy can be inherent within curriculum. Therefore, if pedagogy is viewed more broadly as professional practice, teachers make decisions about curriculum adoption, educational research and theory. At a deeper level they also enact their moral philosophy, or praxis. Concurrently the pedagogical approaches they adopt are derived from the global context applied in the local context making teachers educators rather than technicians (Alexander, 2008). Therefore, Alexander suggests that curriculum documentation lacks the holistic pedagogical rigour it requires for teachers to understand curriculum ideology. This narrow framing of curriculum as outcomes enables alternative pedagogical approaches to be employed in a range of school contexts, acknowledging the complex mix of knowledge, skills, behaviour and values that may appear different in every school. However, this leaves pedagogical leaders in schools free to interpret pedagogy during curriculum change. This research investigates the efforts made in two primary schools to create pedagogical change using the implementation of the NSW K-6 English Syllabus. It explores the manner in which pedagogical leadership was exercised and professional learning was invited and the resultant changes or resistance to change in school culture.

This research demonstrates that the essential component interweaving school culture, leadership and pedagogy, enabling or constraining pedagogical change is trust. Trust is an expectation, hope or belief in professional reliability. It is defined in the context of school leadership and culture during curriculum change, as it is essential for change and adaption. The subjectivity of perceived trust and mistrust during pedagogical change is acknowledged. Trust is distinguished from cooperation, compliance, or coercion: three practices that could be disguise mistrust (O’Neill, 2002). Trust is fundamental to functional leadership, and both are necessary for
building school culture. Curriculum reform, performance management and contested teacher leadership can build mistrust. The extent to which distributed leadership brings trust is evaluated by analysing delegation, collaboration and competition. This research demonstrates how trust is built through solidarity, and relational leadership during curriculum change. It builds towards a theory of pedagogical change, highlighting the importance of two-way trust. Building pedagogical practice autonomously through teacher professional learning encourages solidarity and enables trust. Trust supports teachers and school cultures to develop their individual and collective pedagogical identity through a practice-based understanding of pedagogical change theory during curriculum change.

**Research Approach**

In constructivist grounded theory reality is understood as subjectively perceived, interpreted and co-constructed by the researcher and participant in specific contexts. Responses were sought from primary school principals, deputy principals, English coordinators, curriculum coordinators and teachers in two schools implementing the NSW K-6 English Syllabus. Semi-structured interviews with leaders and teachers provided an understanding of pedagogical leadership and school culture from each participant’s perspective.

Constructivist grounded theory acknowledges the interpretive place of the researcher during the constant comparative analysis as decisions are made about interpretive truths (Charmaz, 2014). The coding and data analysis highlighted emerging themes. Scholarly research outlined in the literature review provided a theoretical background, demonstrating the limitations of current research into pedagogy, leadership and school culture. Reflexive use of the data and the extant literature enabled the research to move toward a theory of pedagogical change.

The case study schools were both non-selective independent schools in the Sydney metropolitan area. Both schools were established over a century ago, and both have
similar ICSEA\textsuperscript{3} scores, over 1.5 standard deviations above the mean score. The two primary Heads of School who consented to their school’s involvement in the research project were both new in their roles in the year in which the study took place. Over the course of the study, the researcher attended several staff meetings and small group meetings in both schools as well as reviewing curriculum documentation, visiting staffrooms and chatting informally with teachers in each setting. Extended interviews were conducted with Heads of Schools, Deputy Heads, Curriculum coordinators, English coordinators and classroom teachers.

The following diagram conceptualises the relationship between leadership, school culture and pedagogy. These three main elements of this thesis directed the initial reading of the research literature. However, in keeping with constructivist grounded theory during the data analysis, the relationships between the three elements took new clarity, leading to other key themes emerging that fell into the joint spaces between these three terms. This led to further literature review into pedagogical leadership, distributed leadership and student learning outcomes, teacher professional learning, and praxis and curriculum change. In constructivist grounded theory literature review is continuous. Deeper conceptualising also enabled me to determine the central theme and theory that emerged from the literature and the data: trust and the development of the theory of pedagogical change. Developing versions of Figure 1.1 throughout this thesis, helped to visualise how the emergence and construction of theory arose from the data.

\textsuperscript{3} The Index of Community Socio-Educational Advantage (ICSEA) as defined by the NSW Department of Education and Training, is a measure that enables comparisons to be made across schools on the MySchool website. ICSEA measures key factors that correlate with educational outcomes.
Chapter Outline

The remainder of this thesis is structured as follows. The Literature Review in Chapter 2 clarifies the purpose and place of a literature review in constructivist grounded theory. It maps the field of educational research into school culture, leadership, pedagogy, trust and professional learning, selecting the most pertinent research and theory, in order to contextualise the clarifying definitions from Chapter 1 within the research and explaining the interconnections between these contested terms.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology and research design. It builds a case for the use of constructivist grounded theory for this study. Chapter 4 and 5 present the data and analyses the findings from both schools separately using key themes. The analysis is grounded in the key themes found in the semi-structured interview data, following a constructivist theory methodology. The themes include school culture, pedagogy and curriculum change, student learning outcomes, pedagogical leadership, distributed leadership, relational leadership, communication and trust. Chapter 6 brings the data from both schools and the literature together under key themes in an analysis that builds toward a theory of pedagogical change. It examines the practices that enable
and constrain pedagogical change during the implementation of a new curriculum. Chapter 7 explicates a theory of pedagogical change based upon findings from the two schools and returns to the research questions. It outlines the limitations of the study and makes recommendations for future research. The following chapter contextualises this research within the current literature, outlining some of the concepts to be investigated in order to further establish its purpose and importance.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Use the literature review without letting it stifle your creativity or strangle your theory. The literature review gives you an opportunity to set the stage for what you do in subsequent sections or chapters. Analyse the most significant works in relation to what you addressed in your now developed grounded theory.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 308

Introduction

The purpose of the literature review is to outline the empirical research into school culture, leadership, pedagogy, curriculum and student learning outcomes, and the influence of professional learning, curriculum change and trust upon these themes. Section one explores school culture and its inseparable connection with leadership and pedagogical approaches. Section two examines leadership theories and frameworks as a basis for ascertaining how far leaders and teachers determine pedagogical approaches in a school, and the internal and external forces that influence pedagogical leadership and pedagogy. Theories of trust are explored in response to themes that emerged from the data about leadership and change. Section three focuses on curriculum theories and the internal and external forces that impact upon pedagogical approaches and student learning outcomes including professional learning during curriculum change. The literature review attempts to unravel the inextricable connections between these themes and concepts by further clarifying the definitions explained in Chapter 1 with reference to the literature. The notion of
praxis and the theory of practice architectures are considered as a framework for understanding the intersubjective spaces within and between practices. The theory of practice architectures accounts for changing practices that examine how global forces concurrently influence and produce everyday practices (Kemmis & Mahon, 2017; Kemmis et. al, 2014). This Australian research is contextualised within its local and global context with reference to policy, national leadership and teacher standards, and national curriculum documentation, during the implementation of the NSW English syllabus for the Australian Curriculum in schools. The way that this study intends to fill specific gaps in the research is outlined throughout. This fulfils the overall purpose of this research, to build toward a theory of pedagogical change in order to transform professional learning practices, and leadership practices, in order to build curriculum and pedagogical understanding in schools for the benefit of students.

In accordance with constructivist grounded theory research, initial reading was based on key themes of school culture, leadership and pedagogy in order to contextualise the research. The preliminary scoping of the research fits a constructivist grounded theory approach. For research integrity, abiding in part the assumed view from more traditional views of grounded theory that reading might ‘contaminate’ the data, the research data were initially coded, categorised and themed to build theory without reviewing the relevant literature a second time until after the analysis when theory was built (Thornberg, 2012). Constructivist Grounded Theory draws upon prior theoretical knowledge through a process of pragmatic abduction during literature review. Abduction is a form of co-construction between the literature and data (Charmaz, 2014). The Constructivist Grounded Theory researcher has the freedom to discover themes in the data by separating data analysis and literature review and then joining them, building new theory from current theory (Thornberg, 2012). Following extensive data analysis, I returned to the literature connecting professional learning, curriculum change and trust, redefining themes grounded in the data and reviewing extant literature in Constructivist Grounded Theory as a “source of scientific creativity” (Thornberg, 2012). Heath (2006) accuses Constructivist Grounded Theory of not being emergent from the data alone. The alternative is scoping the literature following the analysis. Constructivist grounded theorists recognise that building new theory without initial reference to literature, may risk research findings limited in
depth and scope. Constructivist Grounded Theory suggests that research is inevitably influenced by knowledge, and utilising raw data without literature review is potentially limiting for providing research context (Charmaz, 2014; Silverman, 2000). “Theoretical virginity” as termed by Clark, (2005) describes the attempt to build new theory without reference to prior theory as missed opportunity. The Constructivist Grounded Theory researcher takes a critical stance to ‘emergent’ concepts, and evidence from the field, linking extant theories (Thomas and James, 2006) in order to reframe a construct and build new theory still grounded in the data but cognisant of the context.

The following diagram, figure 2.1, demonstrates the development of themes in the literature review. Literature review into school leadership highlighted the importance of pedagogical leadership and how it connects with learning. Literature review into school culture revealed the importance of teacher professional learning cultures and how they connect with leadership. A tension within curriculum and pedagogical change is that of personalised learning versus collective learning and student outcomes. The connection between pedagogical leadership, pedagogy and curriculum is the theme of change. In the diagram these concepts are encased in a circle of change. Trust is a central theme in the research that enables learning, determines the value of the others and builds toward a theory of pedagogical change.
SECTION ONE: SCHOOL CULTURE

The purpose of investigating school culture is to determine how it connects with and influences pedagogy and leadership. Research that explains the reflexive relationship between school culture, pedagogy and leadership is further explored. Section One moves toward a definition of school culture for the purposes of this research, contextualising school culture within school learning cultures and teacher professional learning cultures. Also acknowledged are limited definitions of school culture from the literature that have the potential to render school culture empirically meaningless.
The evolution of school culture research in recent decades is outlined within the current global and local Australian context of productivity. Theories and conceptual frameworks for determining school culture and its practices are presented, in order to contextualise definitions.

**Toward a definition of School Culture**

School culture has been used in research to measure the attributes of schooling, learning and achievement of students and teachers. School culture has been defined in order to harness productivity, mandate change and improvement, and to explain and understand how the purposes of education are lived out in schools. A broad, holistic view of school culture is necessary for understanding its complete capacity and impact, but it is difficult to fully encapsulate school culture as a term. Hartman and Khademian (2010), Prosser (1999) and Alexander (2008) describe the elusive nature of school culture in that it becomes a ‘catcall’ for anything educational researchers find difficult to measure such that: “If culture is the key to everything, it is the key to nothing” (Hartman & Khademian, 2010, p. 846). These broad definitions may limit the ability for empirical researchers to make meaning from school culture. In addition, school culture is inadequately defined by interchangeable, alternative terms such as context, atmosphere, tone and ethos, or school climate (Fullan, 2005; Prosser, 1999). School culture means more than each of these individual terms, as multifaceted aspects of schooling help to form school culture. As Schein (2004) writes, culture “is an abstraction, yet the forces that are created in social and organisational situations that derive from culture are powerful” (p.3). Organisational culture is a public expression of those combined forces (Geertz, 1973), evident within school culture. It is an enactment of the deeply held traditions, values and beliefs of its members that form specific practices. Fullan (2007) describes school culture as the way a school operates based upon its guiding beliefs and values. Every school has a culture of its own (Waller, 1932). School culture is made up of all the intricate parts that define a school: the prescriptions and practicalities, unwritten rules, traditions, norms, and expectations that permeate people’s actions, dress, conversation, relationships and collaborative efforts (Deal & Peterson, 1999). These become what Maehr and Midgley (1996) and others describe as the architecture, symbols and myths of the organisational structure. The component parts of school culture may be named,
categorised and described as artefacts or architectures even if the whole cannot be described (Kemmis, et al., 2014).

School culture attempts to explain what schools are like. This suggests that school culture is an individual notion, owned by the participants within school cultures and therefore difficult to define within a context of multiplicity. Every school culture is different. If school culture is to be understood and defined in educational research, individual context needs to be considered when explaining school practices and their inherent meanings and values (Alexander, 2008; Johnson, 2010; Prosser, 1999). Acknowledging each context, school culture needs to be understood and defined within notions of school learning cultures and the contexts of teacher professional learning cultures. If school culture is narrowly defined as the way pedagogy and leadership influence practice, it has inherent complexity. Both individual and collective practices enable or constrain student learning and teacher professional learning. There are organisational aspects of school culture (Vennebo & Ottesen, 2012) and individual elements that can be described by participants and altered by individuals. Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edwards-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer and Bristol’s, (2014) theory of practice architectures details the elements of a community of practice. The theory seeks to make meaning from the artefacts of school culture for deeply analysing how specific aspects of school culture connect to practices and praxis by examining the intersubjective spaces in a school that ‘stir’ participants into practices of sayings, doings and relatings. The theory of practice architectures (Kemmis et al., 2014) provides a theoretical basis for understanding school culture in the day-to-day practices that create, enable and constrain pedagogical change in school culture, acknowledging the power of social context where collections of participant descriptions of practices build a picture of school culture (Kemmis & Smith, 2008). Practices are not static where culture, curriculum and leadership interact and practices can be at odds with one another. The intersubjective spaces within a school connect enable elements of school learning culture to be described and analysed. The theory of practice architectures seeks to explain from multiple participant viewpoints what schools are like. It builds a detailed picture of school culture by analysing the intersubjective spaces in schools from multiple participant descriptions of practices, while at the same time acknowledging the inevitable
incompleteness of any theory to encapsulate school culture.

Practice is derived from practice theory, which draws attention to the social nature of practices and the ontological nature of practice (Grootenboer, Edwards-Groves & Choy, 2017a). Practices are formed by being in and participating in the social world as they are enacted, composed and developed. The role of the individual can only be understood within the arrangements that enable and constrain practice as it is experienced among other practices ecologically arranged within the site as they unfold and struggle with tension in time space (Grootenboer, Edwards-Groves & Choy 2017a). Practices acknowledge that there are activities and people involved: not just leaders, but leading, and not just teachers but teaching, and practices over practitioners. Practice is an active form of praxis, or moral purpose, where social actors make sense of their own practice through reflection (Hardy & Garrick, 2017). ‘Sayings, doings and relatings’ are ‘emeshed’ or ‘bundled together’ in a distinctive project. A practice perspective makes certain sayings, doings and relatings visible or invisible to understand the ‘intersubjective lifeworld’ where activities can be remade or transformed through their enactment (Grootenboer et al., 2017b). Teacher professional identity is grounded in praxis or moral purpose and therefore praxis is central to teacher professional learning practice (Mockler, 2013).

**The Evolution of School Culture Research**

The main emphasis in this literature review is upon research that uses the term “school culture” in order to define and describe it. Terms such as “school climate” and “school character” have also been used in empirical research to explore similar, more quantitative elements of school culture. Prosser (1999) and Schein (2004) outline the evolution of school culture research. In the 1960s and 1970s the emphasis of school culture research was on management theory and the quantitative measurement of school climate through organisational tools, scales and questionnaires. These instruments covered specific elements of school culture but they ignored the holistic nature of school culture. In the 1980s and 1990s predetermined conceptual frameworks were used to assist in identifying and mapping the elements, processes and outcomes of school culture from organisational theory including by Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1999), Walters (1994), and Hargreaves
Although organisational theory provided an illustration of school culture, these frameworks were unable to account for the complexity of leadership and the micro-politics of school culture that were changing the nature of school culture itself.

School improvement research in the 1990s connected characteristics of school culture with academic outcomes, narrowing definitions of learning to measurable attributes for productivity and external accountability (Hargreaves, 1994). For example, Deal and Peterson (2009) promoted positive school cultures for improving school effectiveness, achievement and productivity (Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012). In contrast, Hartman and Khademian (2010) critiqued ‘school character’ research for measuring the perceived atmosphere, character, ethos, tone, cultural values and beliefs of school cultures. They argued that such research promised practical applications while still narrowly ignoring the subversive ‘values and beliefs’ and ‘artefacts’ within subcultures that may promote or inhibit learning, providing an incomplete picture of school culture (Prosser, 1999; see also Hargreaves, 1994). The school improvement literature may not provide adequate insight into why school cultures have positive or negative elements or explain how values and beliefs are enacted, and yet they deeply influence school culture and its impact.

Moving toward the 21st century, research further critiqued measures of school culture. Prosser (1999) suggested that we should be wary of attempts to measure school culture as if it were a product, deeming school culture as an active process where the processes of school culture are tested during change. This research sits chronologically within an era of the school effectiveness agenda where teachers are encouraged to utilise evidence-based practice in their classrooms (Hattie, 2009; Petty, 2006). This is known as a school culture of evidence-based practice. The measurable and accountable nature of school culture is critiqued in this research and rejected by others including Thomson, Lingard & Wrigley (2012); Hinton, Fischer & Glennon (2012), rather proposing that school culture encapsulate an ethos of democratic inclusion where well being, intellectual engagement and achievement connect students in school communities in transformational ways so that children are not objectified by their attainment (Thomson et al., 2012), but rather that the heart of school culture encapsulate the celebration of the learning processes of children.
It is widely acknowledged and intended that the overall purpose of schooling is learning and that learning ideally pervades all aspects of school culture. Learning will be further explored in Section Three of this chapter alongside curriculum and pedagogy. School effectiveness research makes the assumption that student achievement is the purpose of school culture, placing a different emphasis on schooling from learning, that enables a more tangible focus on specific learning traits (Hattie 2009; Petty, 2006). Achievement only examines the end point of assessment without looking at the process of learning, which is the core purpose of schooling. Achievement is important, but it is only attained through learning, which may include growth and failure. School effectiveness research potentially ignores the complexity of school culture, narrowly conceptualising pedagogy as a set of homogenous teaching techniques that can be applied in a range of school cultures (Hattie, 2009), rather than a holistic educational act that accounts for the diversity of student ability and different school cultures (Alexander, 2008). As Alexander (2008) explains:

   Teaching is presented as value-neutral, content free and entirely devoid of the dilemmas of value and circumstance that confront real teachers daily. It conceals the technical deficiencies of the research and implies a degree of homogeneity in schools, classrooms and lessons that cannot be sustained empirically (p. 31).

Nevertheless, the notion of the impossibility of homogeneity is largely ignored and research into high performing cultures and cultures of achievement prevail (Bulach, Lunenburg & Potter, 2008; Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012; Negis- Isi, Gursek, Kuramve Uygulamada, 2013). High performing, effective, or productive school cultures claim to help teachers overcome the unpredictable nature of their work by focussing on data-driven performance measures where the focus is on a school culture of productivity, performance and improvement measured through data-driven decision-making (Roby, 2011; see also Hattie, 2009; Hess, 2009; Petty, 2006). Educators may establish what effective learning strategies work for students within a particular class in their school culture. This will change from student to student and from year to year. Therefore, unless the organics and individual nature of school culture of learning and achievement is acknowledged within the collective, educators will continue to struggle to grasp the complexity of how schooling is effective for all
students. Therefore the transference of effective practice between classrooms is not consistent or sustainable (Dimmock & Walker, 2000). Fostering a school culture of academic optimism, teacher morale and building teacher-student relationships with differentiated rather than homogenous strategies can impact student performance at individual and school level (Di Paola & Hoy, 2012; Fahy, Wu & Hoy, 2010; Werblow, Robinson & Duesbery, 2012). This is a return to the positive school culture agenda, but their research focuses more specifically upon personalised student learning for individual and collective achievement. The tension between the individual and the collective and student learning outcomes will be further explored in Section Three.

Alongside pedagogical change brought about by the school effectiveness agenda, this research is also contextualised alongside curriculum change in Australia where the new Australian Curriculum and the subsequent NSW syllabi have altered the primary school curriculum in each key learning area. Teacher professional learning was required in every primary curriculum subject in order for teachers to update their curriculum and pedagogical skills. Therefore, school cultures were being influenced by significant curriculum change.

In addition to curriculum change, teacher professional learning was being mandated through the National Standards and through the Australian Charter for the Professional Development of Teachers and School Leaders and the Essential Guide to Professional Learning (AITSL). Evidence-based practice became the emphasis of student learning, and also teacher professional learning in Australia. The AITSL Australian Professional Standards for Teachers and School Principals enabled teaching competencies to be appraised and learning measured while teachers continuously update their accreditation, significantly changing the nature of school culture and the teacher professional learning culture. Although there are many positive attributes of the standards, encouraging teachers to reflect upon base competencies and mandating that teachers be entitled to continued professional learning, their success is dependent upon the local, state and national learning culture within which teachers operate. The standards risk categorising the desired attributes of teachers and school leaders as a product, rather than a co-created or shared process.
or practice from teachers and leaders enacting education. Categorising the attributes of teachers as individuals within the school culture is said to influence transparency and accountability (Fink, 2016; Thomson, Lingard & Wrigley, 2012). These notions of teacher professionalism for teachers to attain a set of outcomes separate control and compliance from collegial professional development (Day & Sachs, 2004). Moreover they have the potential to damage teacher identity (Mockler & Sachs, 2012) as teacher identity becomes conflicted between what teachers are required to know and do and how they seek to develop in their learning. The ways in evidence-based practice enables and inhibits teacher professional learning and influences teacher identity will be further explored below in the section on teacher professional learning.

Recent models and theories have attempted to explain school culture and its connection with the purposes of schooling in the current context. The depth and complexity of school culture is represented in Starratt’s (2011) ‘onion model’ of schools as a conceptual framework. At the core of the onion are the deeply held myths of schools that construct our core humanity and identity. Myths involve the lived purposes of schooling, or the hidden curriculum that explore a student’s identity, destiny, courage and heroism. These may be explored in assemblies and class time, on the sporting field or in student teacher interactions or between the students themselves. The outer layer of the onion represents the operational culture. Peeling the onion inwards exist layers of organisation, programs, policies, goals and purposes, beliefs and assumptions. In a functional school culture the outer layers of the onion reflect the inner, infusing and aligning the school culture as a whole. The core purpose of leadership is to work with the inner parts of the onion in a strategic and operational sense and build alignment to the outside of the onion. In some schools the myths and values are not aligned and may not permeate and therefore the onion model does not extend beyond programs, policies and products to inherent purpose due to external neo-liberal pressure and a culture of school effectiveness (Starratt, 2011). The role of leadership is to create that alignment between school culture and curriculum and pedagogical. It could be argued that schools appear to enact their core myths, even if they remain dangerously unacknowledged. This research will show how deeply held values, shared understanding of curriculum and commonalities build
collegial relationships that produce trust to enable pedagogical change, or how misunderstandings can create mistrust and constrain pedagogical change.

Another model that seeks to explain school culture is the metaphor of the human service organisation. Its core purpose is “welfare and transformation” (Johnson, 2010 p. 6). Similar to school culture, the goals of human service organisations are ambiguous to measure, numerous in objectives and frequently contested (Johnson, 2010). Humans create inherent complexity by the extent to which individuals change the organisation and organisations change the individual (Johnson, 2010). Conflicting demands between goals and expectations cause confusion. For example, individual and the collective requirements, leadership and agency alongside complicated bureaucratic, hierarchical, political and institutional structures alongside supervision and standardisation (Johnson, 2010; Sergiovanni, 1992). The human service organisation is a limited conceptual framework for understanding school culture. The complexity of schools as human service organisations with a core learning purpose is that they may offer multiple possible outcomes for individual students daily with numerous possible pedagogical processes. However, at the heart of teaching are ‘encounters’ between humans (Connell, 2013). This makes school cultures the most complex of human service organisations where the human aspect is the most important.

Models of cultural reproduction (Johnson, 2010; Maehr & Midgley, 1996; Prosser, 1999), translation theory (Wilkinson, 2017; see also Dimmock & Walker, 2000), or reculturing (Fullan, 2011) seek to explain how school culture is replicated and reinvented by the internal and external forces of human movement, as teachers and leaders move locally and globally and the sharing of educational research and practice globally. Models of cultural reproduction suggest that school culture is built and rebuilt by participants’ assumed knowledge and interactions with school systems. Recent research into the notion of cultural reproduction has an influence upon individual school cultures as they seek to implement and emulate new pedagogies. Johnson (2010, p. 17) explains how “the institution of education reinvents the culture in which it exists through the people it produces and reproduces.” It does this internally through the way people within school cultures perceive the school culture.
As Maehr and Midgley (1996, p. 68) explain, “school culture is in the minds of individuals”, created by human interaction and thought. Students, parents, teachers and leaders co-create create school culture and their identities and voice play a role in its formation (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015; Mockler, 2013).

Cultural reproduction also responds to external forces. Prosser (1999) explains:

School culture is not only the particular patterns of perception related to behaviour, but also the system of relationships between those relationships…
Culture is not in a vacuum but is part of and related to regional, national and international cultures (p. xii).

Therefore, classroom climates are directly or indirectly influenced by wider external contexts that influence the role of schooling such as curriculum, policy and assessment. These purposes become the actions and processes that define school culture. Teachers utilise certain proliferations of pedagogical frameworks and assessment practices as a result of policy that influence and become the artefacts of school culture.

The translation or potential reproduction of pedagogical approaches from one school culture to another is problematic. If policy makers do not understand the intricate parts or artefacts that made the school culture successful the cherry picking pedagogical approach may not necessarily be successfully replicated (Sahlberg, 2015). As Alexander, (2008, p. 17) explains, if educators:

Detach an educational strategy from the values and conditions that give it meaning and ensure its success, transpose it to a context where these may be diametrically opposed, and yet expect it to deliver the same results it may not.

Translation theory neglects to acknowledge the internal influences upon school culture that enable or constrain teaching and learning (Wilkinson, 2017; see also Dimmock & Walker, 2000). Furthermore, translation practices create tensions within school cultures by disconnecting the daily work of teachers and students and expectations from political interests and global educational measurement projects. External pressure on schools to alter school culture has resulted in a ‘culture crisis’ brought about by standardised national and international testing and externally imposed teacher standards that make education a product rather than a process (Maehr
& Midgely, 1996, p. 11; see also Barber, 2011). In addition in Australia current external pressure for outcomes-based compliance is directed from national curricula. This will be further explored in Section 3.

‘Reculturing’ describes the process leaders use to change school culture (Fullan, 2011). This problematic notion suggests that there are activist leaders of change and participants either being changed or passive recipients of change within school culture, unless everyone is a leader. If ‘reculturing’ is about leadership changing school culture as Fullan (2011) suggests, teachers also need to be seen as pedagogical leaders able to influence change. Teachers and students are not products to be recultured, but integral parts of school culture, able to enable and disable change. William and Blackburn (2009, p. 60) allude to this below:

Educators know that something needs to change; they analyse data, build a plan and provide professional development, yet little changes. Often that is because they fail to take into account the culture of their schools. Culture reflects the complex set of values, traditions, assumptions and patterns of behaviour that are present in a school.

Teachers and students and families and communities perform the values, traditions, assumptions and behaviours of school culture and they therefore become school culture. Therefore, individuals and groups within school culture can choose to resist such leader-centric change when they are not involved in the planning or if they are being recultured. Williamson and Blackburn (2009) suggest that unless the teachers are involved in the process or allowed to lead it, and their emotions are acknowledged, change may be stilted. Cultural transformation occurs most effectively with a high rate of participation, and a shared core purpose for learning, fostered by leadership (Prosser, 1999; see also Maehr & Midgley, 1996). Fullan (2011) assumes that collaboration, constructive dialogue and professional learning will enable change through pedagogical leadership. However, the time constraints upon teachers in schools may constrain change.

Every school culture is different, making reproduction models problematic for those seeking to create pedagogical change. Within every school culture subcultures exert influence. Subcultures are created from multiple interactions amongst groups within a
school culture including pupils, teacher, leaders, support staff, and parents (Hargreaves 1994; MacGilchrist, Mortimore, Savage & Beresford, 1995; Roach & Kratochwill, 2004). School subcultures promote or subvert leadership by resisting or embracing reform (Roby, 2011; see also Hewitt, 2007). Their actions, or inaction powerfully determine what does or doesn’t happen in schools (Hargreaves, 1994; Mulford, Silins & Leithwood 2004). Subcultures are where learning happens. They support or inhibit the enactment of new curriculum and pedagogy. Subcultures have their own leaders. Sergiovanni (1992) suggests that exposing potentially negative or covert practices within school subcultures can make individuals uncomfortable enough to leave a school. However, understanding school subcultures can assist positive change (Prosser, 1999). This research explores how valuing the individuals within subcultures and acknowledging their role in pedagogical change is possible by understanding the influence of the intersubjective spaces within the learning culture using practice architectures as a conceptual framework to analyse and describe school culture (Kemmis et al., 2014). This requires an understanding of group dynamics within schools and their rituals, values and ideologies (Schein, 2004).

**School Culture and Teacher Professional Learning**

If the purpose of school culture is learning then teacher professional learning forms a significant part of school culture. Teacher professional learning and teacher professional development are terms that have been used interchangeably in research and practice. Currently teacher professional learning is a 21" century buzz-word (Mockler, 2013). Teacher professional learning also forms the space in school culture for pedagogical and curriculum change. Research by Kilinc (2014) demonstrates that school cultures that support task-oriented learning increase professionalism, and school cultures that do not protect teachers from bureaucracy and administration decrease professionalism. Teachers benefit from professional development resourced by their school (Wiliam, 2016) as it is directly relevant to their school culture and context (Sales, Miliner & Amat, 2016).

Teacher professional learning occurs both individually and collectively. AITSL acknowledges the individual and collaborative nature of teacher professional learning in accordance with the standards, and in accordance with the Australian teacher
performance and development framework. The AITSL Australian Charter for professional learning for teachers and school leaders suggests that collaborative professional learning occurs face-to-face and online in formal and informal conversation. Teachers work together to research, plan and design using professional dialogue, observation and feedback and take collective ownership of learning. The Australian Charter also acknowledges significant barriers to collaboration including lack of time, trust and enthusiasm, confusion of purpose, and hesitation to share feedback. Enablers include creativity, relational trust, supporting the collaborative culture, shared research, a variety of data, and a shared vision. No suggestions as to how these barriers can be overcome are provided, but educational research into teacher professional learning provides some suggestions. As Mockler (2013) explains, teacher professional learning policy in Australia is both part of the problem and the solution to the creation of learning cultures. Teachers don’t want learning that is generic, mandated or scripted (Mockler, 2013). At its most cynical, teacher professional learning is seen as a policy solution for creating great schools in a doctrine of teacher centrality where teachers are seen as both the problem and the solution to school achievement (Connell, 2009; Larsen, 2010). At the same time, teacher professional learning is not taking into account how teachers learn, or how important learning is to them (Liebermann, 1995; Mockler, 2013). The professional standards are tools for reflection rather than learning themselves (Netolicky, 2016; Talbot, 2016). This research explores how school culture can create the barriers and enablers of teacher professional learning and pedagogical change.

Learning is important to teachers. Professional learning forms part of teachers’ professional growth, which creates shifts in knowledge, practice and identity (Mockler, 2013) or professional capital (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012) of the individual and the collective, connecting it deeply with school culture. Professional learning that is transformational for teachers engages emotion, cognition and capacity (Drago-Severson, Blum De-Stefano & Ashgar, 2013) or ways of knowing, doing and being (Netolicky, 2016). It may be highly individualised and at the same time collective. Teachers learn through collaboration in professional learning communities, with participatory action research (Timperley, 2005), coaching and mentoring (City, Elmore, Fiarman & Tietel, 2009). Learning is owned by individuals and therefore it is
helpful to teachers if the drivers of professional learning are from teachers themselves, rather than leaders, or from middle leaders, and yet there is little research on middle leadership and teacher professional learning (Netolicky, 2016) where leadership is a key factor of school improvement through teacher professional learning (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

Teacher professional learning helps teachers to form their professional identity, grounded in praxis and moral purpose, and connecting with values about leadership, welfare, equity and foundational skills (Mockler, 2013). At the heart of teacher professional development is praxis. Hardy (2008) refers to teacher professional development as ‘praxis development’ when it is context specific, teacher-led and genuinely collaborative, achieved through inquiry learning (p. 149). However, policy supporting inquiry learning in school learning cultures that invite praxis has been constrained in schools by conflicting neoliberal pressure, increased ‘ministerialisation’ and ‘managerialist’ ideas (Hardy, 2008; Sachs & Groundwater-Smith, 1999). Praxis needs to be recovered by teachers themselves through professional learning. Praxis is exposed by analysing the ways practice architectures are enabled and constrained within school culture (Ax, Ponte, Mattsson & Ronnerman, 2008; Mahon, Kemmis, Francisco & Lloyd, 2016). Reflection, role modelling, collaboration, and an activist approach are the attributes of a praxis-enabled teacher. Teachers upholding praxis understand that it is evaluated by moral and social terms, because teacher identity and agency affects the way they live as educators and not efficacy or efficiency (Kemmis & Smith, 2008, p. 273). Kemmis and Smith (2008) seek to revitalise European traditions of pedagogy in teacher professional learning. Their findings resonate with Alexander’s (2008) notions of pedagogy, towards learning supported by inquiry and the holistic nature of school culture itself.

If school culture is identified and described in the intersubjective spaces then within school culture praxis-oriented teachers seek to transform practices in schools both morally and politically as active participants (Kemmis & Smith, 2008; Mahon, Kemmis, Francisco & Lloyd, 2016). Praxis enabled teachers participate in planned opportunities to engage in professional learning and reflection based on their own
classroom practice, giving them control over their interactions and consequences (Edwards-Groves, 2008).

Professional learning raises student achievement positively through collaboration, action research, further study, social media, research participation and conferences, or negatively through performativity, fear, competition and compliance (Fullan, 2011; Fullan & Quinn, 2016; Netolicky, 2016;) that create mistrust (Fink, 2016). This research explores how teacher perceptions of coaching, mentoring and appraisal may be positive or negative professional learning experiences depending upon the participant experiences within school cultures. Teaching influences student achievement (Drago-Severson, 2012; Wiliam, 2016) and student voice is also critical (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015).

**Professional practice and Professional learning communities in school culture**

Teachers are social learners; teachers learn and exchange pedagogical knowledge, solve problems of practice, and support reform in professional learning communities (Mockler, 2013). This section defines professional learning communities and explores theories and practice within school culture.

The core purpose of school culture is organisational learning. Organisational learning cultures, organisational learning communities and knowledge communities suggest that characteristics include defined membership, shared leadership, a shared purpose and an inquiry stance (Robinson et al., 2008; see also Andriessen, 2005; Fullan, 1993; Burello & Reitzug, 1993). Community members experience connectivity, opportunities for dialogue, shared deliverables and contextualise learning in practice that is relevant to their teacher knowledge and school learning culture (Andriessen, 2005). School cultures that are exemplary learning organisations acknowledge that teachers and students are learners. They distribute leadership among teachers and give agency to students. Valuing student diversity, making students accountable for learning, and creating team configurations with shared or distributed leadership and trust, and support and concern for individual learning creates an exemplary learning organisation (Burello & Reitzug, 1993).
Professional learning communities are a popular trend in education, due to their capacity for collaboration, capacity building and distributed leadership, but there is confusion about the ‘conceptual muddle’ surrounding professional learning communities seen in school cultures because the term is used to describe sub-groups or the learning of an entire organisation synonymously (Du Four & Fullan, 2013; Harris, 2014; Harris & Jones, 2012; Fullan, 2010). Hargreaves & Fullan (2012) criticise the simplistic way in which professional learning communities have been implemented in schools, because of the complex nature of school culture that makes change difficult. They critique its prolific use as a one year ‘program’ rather than an ongoing learning ‘process’ (Dufour & Fullan, 2013, p. 3). As DuFour and Fullan (2013) state:

Professional learning communities are about people, practices and processes. They are not a program. They are fundamentally a change in culture: the way we do work around here (p. 17).

This research explores schools that used the model of a professional learning community to explore syllabus change.

If professional learning communities are fundamentally about change they are not always successful. They can be ruined by practices and policies misaligned with purpose, used for short-term solutions or as appendages to existing structures, or compensation for the deficiencies of educators. Professional learning communities need to invest in educators that autonomously foster collaboration and improvement through distributed leadership, a shared mission and action research for pedagogical knowledge, skills and innovation with a commitment to continuous improvement (DuFour & Fullan, 2013; DeFour, Du Four, Eaker & Many, 2010; Harris, 2014). Professional learning communities support individual and collective learning to improve outcomes (Harris, 2014; Eaker & Keating, 2008; Printy 2008). Eaker and Keating (2008) explain that professional learning communities will not foster school improvement unless they alter daily practices.

This is challenging given the complex variables connecting with school culture. And yet an ineffective professional learning community may reinforce the status quo (Harris, 2014). The current challenges facing professional learning communities in
school cultures include: focussing on data-rich but information-poor results as a basis for comparison, retaining goals that focus on student learning and morale, having the capacity to support students with learning difficulties, utilising systematic processes for school improvement, and acknowledging the intended versus implemented and attained curriculum (DuFour & Fullan, 2013). These are all well acknowledged problems in education today.

The capacity for schools to be professional learning communities in their daily practice can be inhibited by fragmentation from subcultures, poor use of time and staff turnover. When organisational learning occurs in small, disjointed units, it limits the school’s capacity for sustainable collective learning (Robinson et al., 2008) and risks what Hargreaves (1994) refers to as ‘contrived collegiality’. Rather, professional learning communities ideally focus on collective knowledge through deep and sustained dialogue within cohesive groups that connect through belonging and trust (Stoll & Seashore Lewis, 2007). Professional learning communities are disrupted by staff turnover and mistrust around instructional practices. Teachers and leaders need to protect teacher autonomy, diminish defensiveness and collaborate to build relational trust and learning (Halverson, 2003).

Primary schools are under time pressure during syllabus change. Professional learning communities design, create and tailor curriculum to their own pedagogical context. Such learning involves slow change, time and facilitation. If school improvement is rushed it may succeed or be met with resistance and resentment (Sergiovanni, 1992). Mockler (2005) alerts us to the danger of rapid, inadequate ‘spray-on’ professional learning, lacking the depth and complexity of pedagogical knowledge and subject knowledge in context. Groundwater-Smith and Mockler (2009) investigated how practice-based inquiry in educational settings creates authentic professional learning opportunities, building trust and collegiality over time. This study builds on research into practice-based inquiry through the action research project conducted in one school. Action research enables collaboration and change within teachers, but it is critical that it comes from the needs and interests of teachers, supported by leadership where teachers are given time to adapt (DeVries, Beijjard & Buitink, 2008). This is not always possible during rapid syllabus change.
A community of practice is similar to a professional learning community. A community of practice is a social learning system (Lave & Wenger, 1991; See also Wenger, 1998). It can be conceptual, geographic or ideological and is not necessarily bordered like a professional learning community or a learning organisation, enabling it to permeate between and through school cultures (MacNeill, Kavagnah & Silcox 2003; Wenger, 1998). Schools may be a community of practice and they may have communities of practice within them. Constant (1987) used a unit of analysis to describe knowledge embedded in practice, labelling the terms ‘community’ and ‘practice’. Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of communities of practice comes from systems theory and social theory with an epistemological stance similar to constructivism (Bourdieu, 1977; Foucault, 1980; Lave, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978).

Multiple communities of practice are possible in primary schools with stage groups, key learning areas and other projects or associations (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Participants may have multiple memberships to many communities of practice on numerous multi-scale levels, connecting at school, district, regional, national, and global level. Communities of practice influence cultures and subcultures within and between schools. Surveys from the Leadership for Organisational Learning and Student Outcomes (LOLSO) project demonstrated that school learning cultures that model a community of practice have greater influence on learning than individual classroom teaching approaches in isolation (Caldwell, 2006; Mulford, 2007). This assumes that the core collective values within school cultures impact upon student learning outcomes more than individual teachers, promoting the importance of focussed innovation by professional learning communities in school cultures.

Communities of practice can be espoused as productive, effective and beneficial to learning, but they can also be ‘dysfunctional’, ‘counterproductive’ and ‘harmful’ (Lave & Wenger, 1991 p. 2; See also Caldwell, 2006; MacNeill, Kavagnah & Silcox 2003; Mulford, 2007). Passivity is possible if members merely comply or acquiesce (Lave & Wenger, 1991) as subculture research has suggested (Caldwell, 2006; Mulford, 2007). In contrast, engagement in direct experience provides members of a community of practice with an identity within the community as they align their thinking with context. When teachers share in pedagogical learning it creates
membership within school culture through the co-creation of meaning making through artefacts including words, tools, documents and resources. Social learning coordinates perspectives, interpretations and actions. Continuing membership is created over time through memory. Lave and Wenger describe realignment as a two-way learning process where experience reflects community competence while new experiences concurrently develop further community competence (1991, p. 2).

Critics of communities of practice suggest that the construct has evolved into more prescriptive practice (Hoadley, 2012). Wenger (1991) warns that prescription “loses the very insights that made it useful” (p. 8). Other critics of communities of practice suggest that Lave and Wenger have ignored the power relations in communities (Barton & Tusting, 2005; Jewson, 2007). Ideally communities of practice are focussed on learning rather than power, with flexible power structures enabling horizontal groups and vertical hierarchies (Wenger, 1991). This notion is explored in this study in Chapter 5 when hierarchies are discussed. Classroom-based research by Watkins (2005) distinguishes between communities of learners and learning communities, and provides some insight into the contrast between communities, learning and practice. In classrooms as engaged communities, cooperative, productive inquiry emerges where “students are crew, not passengers” demonstrating better co-constructed knowledge, understanding and transfer (p. 47). Research at classroom level provides a concrete description where this research delineates between organisational learning and communities of practice in staff professional learning.

The theory of practice architectures details specific practices within a community of practice (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2012; Kemmis et al., 2014). As a theoretical framework it seeks to make meaning from the artefacts of school culture by deeply analysing how specific aspects of school culture connect to practices and praxis by examining the intersubjective spaces in a school. Intersubjectivity is derived from Habermas’ notion of language, work and power. The subjective and the objective meet in the domain of the intersubjective, where people’s perceptions of reality and reality itself are represented in their ‘sayings, doings and relatings’ (Kemmis & McMahon, 2017). Schools are “nexuses of intersubjective spaces” bound by ecologies of practice that occur in semantic space, physical time space and social space,
exploring the seen and hidden (Kemmis et al, 2014, p. 217; Wilkinson, Bristol & Ponte, 2016; Pennanen, Bristol, Wilkinson & Heikkinen, 2016). Subjective reality becomes objective reality when it becomes a practice (Kemmis, Wilkinson & Edwards-Groves, 2012). These three dimension spaces ‘stir’ us into practices of sayings, doings and relatings. Coleman (2016) calls intersubjectivity contiguity, the intertwined interaction of the inquiring self with and between others and their thoughts, which create lived artefacts that are constantly changing. Practices change and conflicts occur where culture, curriculum and leadership interact. There isn’t seamless harmony between practices and the practice architectures that sustain them (Kemmis, Wilkinson & Edwards-Groves, 2012). Rather than being mutually supportive, practices can be at odds with one another, almost contradicting each other. The intersubjective spaces within school culture connect with and depend upon each other and in exploring pedagogical change and curriculum change, lead to learning or compliance, collectivity or isolation.

This section has outlined the research into school culture and teacher professional learning, connecting it with the purpose of this research. Teacher professional learning in school cultures that value learning in a community of practice or a professional learning community, enables pedagogical leadership and an ongoing understanding of knowledge of curriculum and pedagogy. The theory of practice architectures helps us to understand the intersubjective spaces within school culture where leadership and pedagogy intertwine from multiple participant perspectives. Section two and three further explore these themes.

SECTION TWO: LEADERSHIP

This section outlines the relevant literature about school leadership and trust during curriculum change. Historical trends in educational leadership are outlined to contextualise school leadership in the current educational climate of accountability and attainment, which has altered leadership practices in schools with increased administration and bureaucracy alongside practices that respond to accountability for curriculum reform and pedagogical change. Contradictions about the purpose of
school leadership, the style of school leadership and ‘person leadership’ will be explored. The reasoning and limitations of these constructs are explained and framed within the current discourse questioning leadership as a construct. The main focus of this research is on leadership as practice (Eacott, 2017). In engaging with the pedagogical and distributed leadership debate, this section queries: who leads learning in a school? Pedagogical leadership (Day, 2011; Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 2007; Hallinger, 2007; Lingard et al., 2003; Sergiovanni, 1998 and its capacity to be understood through practice is explored and critiqued alongside distributed leadership (Duignan, 2012; Harris, 2014; Lakomski et al., 2017; Starratt, 2011, Sergiovanni, 1992; Youngs, 2017), teacher leadership (Day, 2017; See also Bond, 2015; Hord & Tobia, 2012) and other forms of leadership that focus on connecting leadership and learning and improving teaching and learning conditions (Day, 2016; Leithwood, Sun & Pollock, 2017). Based on the work of Kemmis et al., (2014) this section concludes that pedagogical leadership is a form of praxis. Leadership literature supports the notion that school leadership and school culture are inextricably linked (Hallinger, 2007; May, Huff & Goldring, 2012; Mulford, 2007; Starratt, 2011). The extent to which trust is built by leadership in school culture is also explored as a symptom and a solution for school leadership practice during pedagogical change (Fink & McCulla, 2016; See also Day, 2016).

1. The Purpose of School Leadership

Pedagogy is leadership

School leadership can easily be reduced to the hierarchical terms of individuals such as principal, or the gendered terms Headmaster and Headmistress. The title ‘Headteacher’, as meaningfully termed in the U.K., emphasises their recognised teaching status as an educational leader (Thomson, 2009). Educational leadership is about more than the principal. Pedagogical leadership will be carefully defined in this research, reclaiming teachers as educational leaders, or teacher leadership. Principals also have additional administrative and bureaucratic responsibilities that inevitably prevent them from sole pedagogical leadership status. Researchers agree that expecting any principal to have all the capabilities required to perform the role is
neither desirable nor effective given the complex challenges of 21st Century schooling (Finnigan, 2010; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Harris, 2009; Hallinger, 2007; Pont, Nusche & Moorman, 2008; Scanlon, 2015; Spillane, 2006; Fullan, 2005; Hammersley-Fletcher & Brundrett, 2005). The opportunity to empower others in professional learning communities as pedagogical leaders is paramount. This is supported by pedagogical leadership (Day, 2011; Fullan, 1993; Hargreaves, 2007; Hallinger, 2007; Lingard et al., 2003; Sergiovanni, 1998), distributive or distributed leadership (Duignan, 2012; Harris, 2014; Lakomski et al., 2017; Starratt, 2011, Sergiovanni, 1992; Youngs, 2017), and teacher leadership literature (Day, 2017; See also Bond, 2015; Hord & Tobia, 2012). As administrators, principals are the democratic ‘gatekeepers’ between policy makers, teachers, students and parents. They influence the external and internal forces of school culture positively and negatively (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Thomson, 2009). Primary school leaders experience disempowerment due to current pressures of accountability in Australia (Heffernan, 2016). These are all reasons to distribute pedagogical leadership amongst teacher leaders.

Pedagogical leadership in this research incorporates principal, middle leadership and teacher leadership, acknowledging the work of Lingard, Hayes, Mills and Christie (2003) of leadership as pedagogy (Lingard et al., 2003; See also Hargreaves, 2007). This suggests a comparative approach where pedagogy is one form of leadership alongside other attributes such as administration. This research will justify, in Chapter 6 why, given the evolution of educational research away from ‘adjectival’ approaches, the acknowledgement that leadership is distributed and the increasing understanding of the importance of reclaiming pedagogy as praxis in schools I seek to justify the inverse, that pedagogy is leading. The focus of this research is on pedagogical leadership. Pedagogy and leadership do more than act upon each other, they unite each other. If pedagogy is leadership the two constructs are not just compared, but united in the core purpose of educational leadership, which is pedagogy. Pedagogical leadership may contain administrative and pastoral elements serving the core purpose of learning through data and relationships. Pedagogical leadership is defined as the people in a school who, in their capacity, lead pedagogically in their role (Day, 2011; Hargreaves, 2007; Hallinger, 2007; Lingard et al., 2003). This form of leadership is
not hierarchical and may involve teacher leadership, middle leadership and principal leadership concurrently. Teachers require the autonomy, agency and ability to be the pedagogical leader of their classroom, a ‘leader of learning’ (Hallinger, 2007). Different people may lead pedagogically at different times encompassing curriculum knowledge skills and philosophy, pedagogical knowledge based upon research, and praxis as part of their holistic approach (Alexander, 2008; Biesta, 2015; Schiro, 2013). The complexity of pedagogical leadership is shown in how it is practised, distributed and identified. If pedagogy is leadership then pedagogical leaders bring others within subcultures toward reform.

The purpose of pedagogical leadership within School Culture

My research positions pedagogical leadership as a practice that benefits or transforms student learning outcomes in a school learning culture (Leithwood, Sun & Pollock, 2017). Student learning outcomes are carefully defined in Section 3 of this chapter in order to make meaning from this potentially problematic claim in the current climate of accountability and attainment. In addition, this research assumes that pedagogical leadership practices benefit teacher professional learning. The role of pedagogical leadership is to build an organisational learning culture (Fullan, 1993). Leaders directly impact upon student outcomes through school-wide collaborative professional learning goals continuously monitored and reviewed through a pedagogical leader (Mulford, Silins & Leithwood, 2004; Robinson, et al., 2008). This is achieved through capacity building in both students and teachers through professional learning that translates into effective learning for students (Crowther et al., 2011; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1998). Transformational and instructional leadership also share some congruence with pedagogical leadership and they will be further discussed. The extent to which professional learning connects with student learning outcomes will be further explored by examining the internal and external forces upon school leadership and their interconnection with school culture and pedagogy in the literature.

Leadership may be the key to improving outcomes in schools, but school culture also has the potential to constrain leadership capacity (Lakomski et al., 2017; See also Hargreaves, 1994). Culture and leadership are like “two sides of the same coin,”
equally able to enable, or constrain practices (Schein, 2004, p. 10; See also Eacott, 2017), but the extent to which they are contingent is contested (Hallinger, 2007; Lakomski & Evers, 2017; May, Huff & Goldring, 2012). Starratt’s (2011) onion model of schools highlights the complex connections between cultural and pedagogical practices and the beliefs leaders and teachers have about the purposes of education, or their praxis, connecting school culture with leadership through practices. Sergiovanni (2007) and Caldwell (2006) agree that school culture creates powerful, interconnected learning networks for authentic learning where communities are defined by their centres, missed during compliance or contrived interpersonal connections. Hierarchical, ‘taylorist’ industrial approaches still apparent in school cultures constrain leadership capacity (Eacott, 2017) by promoting conformity over creativity where conflict influences and control teachers (Brooks, 2017). Some leaders use practices negatively to measure and control, allocate resources and status, recruit, react, promote, select, and excommunicate (Schein, 2004). This research demonstrates the need for new distributed leadership models for pedagogical change that build trust through positive practices.

Pedagogical leaders work with complex human relationships that nurture individual and collective trust and identity:

There are many variables that affect whether school culture changes endure, including the ability of the educational leader to build trust and commitment in staff… and the willingness of the district to make a transition to a new leader with a similar set of values and beliefs. Even with these issues adequately addressed, organisational culture may be intractable to certain changes, especially those conceived on a large scale that would attack the organisation’s collective identity.

Kelleher and Levenson, 2004, p. 108

Pedagogical leaders are faced with the challenge of building both individual and collective trust and commitment during curriculum and pedagogical change when they might face fear and resistance. It is assumed that pedagogical leaders will create change through relational leadership, distributed leadership, emotional leadership and cultural interpretation, and communication during change (Schein, 2004). Therefore, curriculum and intuition are required, or an acknowledgement that pedagogy is
leadership and if teachers are individually and collectively trusted and equipped with new pedagogies through teacher professional learning, they may lead themselves and each other.

Building school culture through effective pedagogy is the key influence school leaders have on student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2006), linking school culture and pedagogy with student learning outcomes, teacher professional learning and leading. Pedagogical leadership is dependent upon distributed leadership to enable change (Duignan, 2012; Fullan 1993; Starratt, 2011). This research examines how school culture determines the pedagogy, while at the same time pedagogy may transform the school culture. Day and Armstrong (2016) found that pedagogical leaders seek ways of improving teaching, learning and achievement by providing trusting environments for teachers to experiment with effective approaches in the classroom through staff professional learning. This builds teacher identity, motivation and commitment and in turn impacts teacher interactions with students and other teachers (Day & Armstrong, 2016; Mockler, 2013).

Learning: The purpose of Leadership

Learning is the core purpose of educational leadership, distinguishing educational leaders from leaders in other fields (Southworth, 2005). Research between 2000 and 2010 widely acknowledged that pedagogical leadership enables student learning by connecting with culture (Gurr et al., 2009; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Hargreaves, 2007; Robinson et al., 2008; Pettit, 2010; Silins & Mulford, 2002). Some researchers have termed pedagogical leadership Learning-centred leadership because of teachers’ indirect influence upon student learning outcomes (Duignan, 2012; Hattie, 2009; Jackson & Bezzina, 2010; Marzano et al., 2005; Printy, 2008; Robinson, 2009; Southworth, 2005). The findings of the OECD leadership project (2006), that overviewed Australian educational leadership research indicated that “Academic achievement, academic self-concept and engagement in learning are shaped by teacher and school practices that are influenced by school leadership” (McKenzie, Mulford & Anderson, 2007, p. 51). School leadership influences school culture and the practices of teachers that enable student learning, and therefore, leadership matters.
The core focus of educational leadership in Australia has shifted from principal administration to pedagogical leadership (Gurr & Drysdale, 2012; 2016). For example, “The Australian School Principal: A National Study” (Duignan, et al., 1985) presented a model of leadership qualities for improving teaching practice and student learning outcomes. Studies of successful principal leadership followed in the LOLSO (Leadership for Organisational Learning and Student Outcomes) project, a large survey of leadership and student outcomes (Dimmock & O’Donoghue, 1997; Mulford & Silins 2003; Mulford et al. 2004;). Watson (2014) concluded principals needed to shift from administration to pedagogy. This study focuses on leading teaching and learning and pedagogical leadership in Australia, fitting into the current research context and the need for more research into pedagogical leadership as Gurr and Drysdale (2016) suggest.

Effective leadership research has attempted to correlate pedagogical leadership with pedagogical practices and student learning outcomes through the measurement of evidence-based practices (Fullan, 2005; Hargreaves, 2007; Pettit, 2010). Duignan (2012) contests effective leadership research, suggesting that leadership influence is not necessarily linear, meaning that the correlation between leadership and student learning outcomes is indirect, and caused by multiple dimensions that influence student learning. The use of achievement tests as measures of achievement in leadership research has provided limited evidence about effective leadership. In the 1980s and 1990s researchers suggested that more qualitative data describing leadership was necessary to understand the extent to which leadership impacts teacher perceptions, morale and productivity, indirectly affecting students’ attitudes and learning outcomes (Blasé & Blase, 1998; Silins & Murray-Harvey, 2000). More recently, Brooks (2017) suggests that researching the specific practices that connect leadership with outcomes helps to understand the multiple, indirect factors that influence student outcomes.

Australian policy makers seek to make principals accountable for student learning through the AITSL standards for teachers and school leaders. This potentially model assumes that the principal is the proprietor of school culture even if aspects are distributed. Alternatively, principals who discuss pedagogy may ‘destablise’ their educational leadership by opening themselves up to critique (Lingard et al., 2003,
If every teacher is equipped to be a pedagogical classroom leader, through professional learning opportunities, distributed leadership and a culture of learning, then Lingard et al., (2003) suggest that school leadership in its current hierarchical form could cease to exist. This is not realistic when bureaucratic and administrative leadership is still required by school principals. The potential for devolved pedagogical leadership is crucial for student learning outcomes and teacher and leader agency, creating an interesting tension in schools. These conundrums demonstrate contested agreement about the purposes of pedagogical leadership due to the complexity of the role, the nature of hierarchy and the acknowledgement of differing school contexts (Ingvarson et al., 2006; Lingard et al., 2003). The indirect impact of the principal invites further qualitative research about pedagogical leadership in context. This research builds upon this premise.

Principals who influence positive school cultures provide professional learning time for teachers to share collaborative leadership (Duignan & Cannon, 2011; Fullan, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008; Roby, 2011). Research into distributed leadership and middle leadership, exercised by the leaders positioned between principals and teachers in a school, found that pedagogical leaders work carefully alongside others to make a collective difference to teaching and learning through the learning culture they co-create through modelling, mentoring and dialogue (Duignan, 2012; Fullan, 1993; Printy, 2008; Southworth, 2005). Leo (2015) surveyed 974 principals on the tasks principals as pedagogical leaders prioritise, concluding that principals need to invite teachers into pedagogical leadership practices. Further, leaders of school cultures supportive of school improvement collaborate, seek consensus, trust the knowledge and skills of teachers and encourage all teachers to assume leadership (Seashore Louis & Riley, 2000). Alternatively, Fullan (1993) suggests it is a myth that collaboration requires consensus because teachers also learn through disagreement. The need for diverse pedagogical approaches will be further explored in Section 3. This research explores the positive and negative impact disagreement had upon pedagogical leadership.

Meetings, observations, modeling and mentoring provide the potential for genuine opportunities for teacher collaboration. However, these practices can be misused as
opportunities for monitoring and appraisal rather than for learning and growth. Therefore, they are dependent upon trust. Scanlon’s (2015) longitudinal research in a disadvantaged setting observed that teachers feared surveillance where classroom observation caused suspicion of leadership and mentoring rather than support. Middle leaders face numerous tensions when focussed on pedagogy. Effective middle leaders navigate these tensions to balance collective and individual needs (Duignan, 2012). They encourage teacher ownership while dealing with poorly performing teachers. They acknowledge the wisdom and memory of older teachers while supporting new teachers and new ideas. Some teachers both learn and ‘unlearn’ during professional learning and during change, implying that schools are learning organisations and unlearning organisations (West, Jackson, Harris & Hopkins, 2000 p. 45). The challenges of unlearning practices are further explored in this research.

A key shift in practice in schools in the past decade has been in the collection and analysis of data. Pedagogical leaders collect evidence of effective teaching and student learning by utilising standardised test results, which may not measure effective teaching (Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008). Consequently, Pettit (2010) notes scant empirical research on the impact of pedagogical leadership on external testing data, observing few evidence-based changes to teaching as a result of NAPLAN testing. Rather, the principal’s perception of the efficacy of external testing more powerfully impacted student-learning outcomes and took a more influential role in the school. Leadership purpose is caught in a dichotomous ‘parallel development’ between testing and accountability alongside learning and pedagogy (Duignan, 2012, p. 23). Their coexistence creates tension and mistrust where standardised testing results in cynicism from teachers and stakeholders about leadership, standing in stark contrast with creative thinking, innovation and team work (Robinson, 2011). Hess (2008) critiques educational rationalism for translating achievement data simplistically and out of context, trivialising the goals of education. Pedagogy cannot necessarily be dissected into component parts for crude analysis (Hames, 2007; Senge, 1992; Wenger, 1998). If pedagogy is simply narrowed to achievement measured through data then there are challenges for educators seeking to promote genuine learning opportunities. Pedagogical leadership is about more than the
measurement of learning outcomes and this research explores the tensions teachers are experiencing in the current climate.

2. Style of leadership

If leaders are required to transform pedagogy and school culture, leadership research has sought to demonstrate whether certain types of leaders are more effective than others based on their measurable attributes (Davies, 2005). Extensive leadership research sought to explain the impact of leadership styles on student learning outcomes, linking effective leadership and student achievement to pedagogical leadership through attributes (Leithwood et al., 2006; Lingard et al, 2003; Robinson, 2008; Silins & Mulford, 2002; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008; Quinn, 2002). The International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) sought to identify the characteristics of successful leadership practices (Day & Leithwood, 2007). Researchers seeking to separate leadership practices from leaders have contested this view. Lingard et al. (2003) suggests that attribution theories provide useful, but incomplete or even heroic pictures of leadership (English & Ehrich, 2017). A one-size fits all approach to educational leadership is problematic because leadership changes with context as situational theories attest, making leadership style difficult to transfer (Brooks, 2017; Leithwood et al., 2006).

Two prominent leadership styles connected with student outcomes and pedagogy are instructional and transformational leadership. Both lean heavily on systems theory, otherwise known as organisational leadership theory or trait theory that assumes that leaders with particular attributes or styles within an organisation will take on leadership roles due to their personal characteristics or traits (Eacott, 2017; Bush, 2017). These traits may be played out differently due to the influence of school culture. The instructional leadership style gained prominence in a time of curriculum stability in the 1980s (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Boris-Schacter & Langer, 2006; Robinson, 2008; Quinn, 2002;) as a commanding form of pedagogical leadership similarly termed authoritative leadership (Dinham, 2007). Instructional leaders direct teachers instructively about their pedagogical practice. Instructional leadership has been criticised by Cuban (1988), Donaldson (2001) and Lambert (1998) for its unrealistic focus on the directive leader expert (Hallinger, 2007, p.2). The principal
potentially limits the pedagogical approaches by determining them in instructional leadership. Boris-Schacter & Langer (2006) and Quinn (2002) question whether instructional leadership can exist in a time of increasing accountability, complexity and competing demands in schools, placing too much pressure on the principal leader, and yet it seems to be the form of leadership promoted for effective teaching, despite being outdated (Gurr & Drysdale, 2016, 2009, 2007). Recent research is still exploring how instructional leaders foster successful learning conditions (Sanzo, Myran & Caggiano, 2015). Instructional leadership is potentially effective if the instruction is distributed amongst middle leaders and teachers, however, it promotes top-down modes of change that may not promote professional learning for teachers or consider the needs of individual students and school cultures.

Instructional leadership is diametrically opposed to teacher leadership in its top-down style. Therefore it does not connect well with distributed leadership (Harris, 2014). Teacher leadership and student ownership of learning have more influence than instructional leadership, but they require trust (MacNeill, Cavanagh & Silcox, 2003).

Transformational leadership gained prominence in the 1990s, prior to national curriculum and leadership policy change in Australia. Transformational leadership distributes leadership to build an environment for potential learning, making it seem like an effective pedagogical leadership trait. Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe (2008), Silins and Murray-Harvey (2000) and Hallinger (2007) suggest that transformational leadership focuses on a collective vision for high performance through distributed leadership and collaboration to create an organisational learning climate that indirectly impacts student-learning outcomes. More recent research explains how the collective vision occurs within transformational leadership through shared teacher ownership through reflexive inquiry and praxis (Kemmis et al., 2014; Mockler, 2013; Mockler & Sachs, 2012).

Pedagogical leadership reaches beyond instructional and transformational leadership models of practice. Research by Robinson, et al., (2008) concludes that a combination of instructional and transformational approaches is most productive. They conducted a meta-analysis examining the relative impact of leadership practices on students’ academic and non-academic outcomes. Results conclude the more leaders focus on
teaching and pedagogy the greater the influence on student learning outcomes. Therefore, leadership styles that focus teachers on student learning may increase the effectiveness of schools for learning. Robinson et al.’s (2008) research on the impact of leadership on students’ academic and non-academic outcomes from 1980 to 2007, concluded that instructional leadership was three to four times more effective than transformational leadership. Their survey sought to link principal behaviour and teaching and found instructional leadership gained higher student achievement scores in reading and mathematics. From these findings Robinson et al. (2008) critique inspiring visions, collegiality, loyalty and cohesion when they do not direct teachers to “specific pedagogical work” (Robinson et al., 2008, p. 665). However, leaders who instruct teachers in pedagogical practice do not provide them the agency to transfer learning into new contexts, nor transform school cultures into cultures of inquiry. Critiques of instructional leadership claim that education has become about efficiency rather than education where in learning the process is the product (Niesche, 2017; Brooks, 2017). Ukpokodu (2009) suggests that transformational leadership impacts upon pedagogical change alongside transformational professional learning. In addition, ‘Productive leadership’ also suggested that both instructional and transformational leadership practices were needed for ‘productive pedagogies’ (Hayes, Christie, Mills & Lingard, 2004). The Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (QSRLS) research built upon the instructional and transformational leadership debate. It focused upon student learning to support social and academic outcomes through continuous professional development and an increased understanding of pedagogy, combining instructional practice with transformational leadership reflecting teachers’ interests for pedagogical change (Hayes, et al., 2004).

Authentic leadership has the potential to foster trust and pedagogical change. Authentic leadership shifts the focus more closely toward the leader, underpinned by the core ethical values of the principal, whose responsibility is to build professional capacity and collective moral responsibility, influencing trust, power and praxis (Duignan, 2012; George, 2003; Kreber, 2010; Starratt, 2011; Mulford, 2007;). Sergiovanni (1992) suggests that authentic leadership may be an antidote to a culture of compliance. Building trust and valuing relationships during change may also be
dependent upon the authenticity of followers (Fink, 2016; Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Lakomski et al., (2017) question whether authentic leadership is a form of self-centred heroism that clashes with distributed leadership, questioning whose values, ethics or context are followed, promoting the concept of followership that distributed leadership celebrates. Duignan (2012) and Starratt (2011) however, suggest that authentic leadership can be distributed if a team is ethical, accepting, inquiring and reflective, in a culture of problem solving and adaption. Teachers expect authenticity from leaders (Fink & McCulla, 2016), but authentic leadership will not create pedagogical change without pedagogical understanding from all participants.

Distributed leadership seeks to ensure that all pedagogical experts contribute to leading pedagogical practice in a school. Distributed leadership is a process approach to leadership rather than an adjectival one because it describes the actions or practices of multiple leaders, taking the focus off the traits of a single leader (Youngs, 2017). Distributed leadership is therefore defined as the practices of pedagogical individuals exercising pedagogical leadership in their schools. Who these leaders are, what and how they lead requires careful examination. Rather than the ‘hero’ approach (Lakomski et al., 2017), Sergiovanni (1992) suggests that the principal is “leader of learners” in distributed leadership (p. 126) redesigning the primacy of the principal (Duignan & Cannon, 2011; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006). If primary school principals share pedagogical responsibilities amongst their team their leadership role becomes facilitative in a professional learning community (Wenger, 1998), rather than authoritative.

Recent research explores how distributed leadership is essential to school success (Crowther et al., 2009; Harris, 2004; Mulford, 2007; Timperley, 2005). The following research explores how distributed leadership influences teaching and learning outcomes (Andrews & Crowther 2002; Caldwell, 2006; Davies, 2006; Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2005; Harris, 2009; Hallinger, 2007; Spillane, 2006; McKenzie, Mulford & Anderson, 2007). Distributed leadership also links with trust (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008). However, Hall (2013) critically analysed distributed leadership practices in five schools and found varying understandings of distributed leadership. School leaders supported the notion of distributed leadership but saw the contradictions that implied greater teacher agency but clashed with traditional hierarchy. Distributed
leadership has a problematic fit with existing school structures (Harris, 2014). These organisational structures may limit its capacity to influence pedagogical change, or leaders may work creatively within hierarchies to enable pedagogical change. For example, Distributed leadership (Spillane, 2006) is gaining interest in Norway, but it is still based upon the principal’s personal capacities, (Moller, 2012). Distributed leadership does not necessarily mean a reduction in the principal’s role (Bush, 2017) and yet it can support broader pedagogical agency and aid decision-making (Gronn, 2017). It is the responsibility of principals to distribute leadership purposefully for teacher ownership and autonomy, which benefits student learning (Day & Armstrong, 2016). Therefore, it is important to evaluate to what extent distributed leadership is devolved leadership, or teacher leadership in order to understand its direct or indirect influence.

Leadership is often distributed to middle leaders (Youngs, 2016). Middle leadership is a form of distributed leadership that requires further research (Netolicky, 2016). It is often assumed that distributed leadership moves away from leader-centric perspectives, but research suggests that it returns to these bureaucratic structures derived from organisational theory (Brooks, 2017; English & Ehrich, 2017; Youngs, 2017). On the surface, distributed leadership appears democratic but it also determines who authorises certain people to influence school practices and school improvement goals (Youngs, 2017). Therefore, it is only distributed to the extent that leaders are able to act autonomously. This requires trust. As leadership in schools is redesigned away from principals and towards middle management, the leadership work of teachers becomes redistributed towards middle leaders. This ambiguous term may create role ambiguity and conflict resulting in anxiety and negatively impacting trust (Fullan, 1993; Hallinger, 2007). Middle leaders can become caught in the middle where maintaining respect requires ‘playing the game’ taking on role of team captain rather than coach (Grootenboer, 2016). This metaphor brings insight into the autonomous opportunities team captains have in middle leadership as game players that coaches may lack on the sidelines. Middle leaders enact new roles and actively connect policy and practice. They are the translators, interpreter and brokers of curriculum and policy (Goodwin, 2017). It is up to principals, middle leaders and team players the extent to which pedagogical leadership is distributed. School
teachers are well aware of this tension and this has been revealed in distributed leadership research in England (Day & Armstrong, 2016).

The theory of practice architectures suggests that conceptions of school leadership evolve from inherent philosophies of power, position and praxis within site ontologies, rather than in a person alone, distributing leadership. Leadership is co-experienced, interactive, dialogic and intersubjective (Ehrich, 2017). Ways of saying, doing and relating connect with leadership practices and assumptions. Wilkinson (2017) sees leading (the verb, rather than the noun, leadership) as a critical and socially just practice when seen through a practice lens because it enables participants and leading and teaching practices to be transformed so that praxis might be realized.

The theory of practice architectures analyses the impact of leadership evaluated through a conglomeration of actions and reactions, enabling researchers to analyse leaders in all parts of the school concurrently, as explored in my research.

Teacher leadership is gaining recent prominence in response to distributed leadership and pedagogical leadership. As Harris writes that (2014), teachers are the ‘best’ and ‘only resource’ for pedagogical leadership. The IDEAS (Innovative Designs for Enhancing Achievements in Schools) professional learning model, highlighted teacher leadership as essential for pedagogical change and improved student learning outcomes (Andrews, Conway, Dawson, Lewis, McMaster, Morgan & Starr, 2004; Chew & Andrews, 2010). Teacher leadership is not new (Lortie, 1975; Waller, 1932). Neither is teacher leadership about removing teachers from classroom practices as Williams, Lakin and Kensler (2015) and Valdez, Broin and Carroll (2015) suggest.

Teacher leadership is a form of autonomous distributed leadership. The alternative is ‘control’ decision making (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). Authentic teacher leadership is created and sustained by the principal who enables teachers to utilise their insider knowledge of the school to lead professional learning collaboratively and set collective goals (Bond, 2015; Sterrett, 2015), reform curriculum and act as transformational change agents (Boone, 2015; DeRosa & Brand, 2015).
3. Beyond the Person of Leadership to Leadership as Practice and Pedagogical Leadership as Praxis

Research into the attributes of leaders has demonstrated the inherent complexity of leading schools. Complexity leadership theory moves beyond the person of leadership, supporting the notion that leadership is a complex, multifaceted interaction of forces where school culture has greater influence and complex organisational behaviour is non-linear and unpredictable (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Uhl-Bien, Marion & McKelvey, 2007). Complexity leadership theory is limited to explanations rather than solutions in practice for pedagogical change. Further deconstruction of leadership includes Eacott (2017) who problematises the epistemology and empirical nature of leadership suggesting that leadership exists in “parallel monologues” (p. 186), while Brooks (2017) sees leadership as a “fractured field” and Niesche attempts to deconstruct it in order to expose its contradictions and assumptions (2017). Lakomski et al., (2017) question whether organisations have overemphasised the individual leader at the expense of structure, or school culture. These conceptualisations of leadership question its nature and existence, drawing toward solutions focussed upon collective practice rather than the attributes of individual people.

Further research in support of leadership as practice includes Bruner (1997) who states that leadership is where human values are enacted in practice. Wilkinson (2017) questions whether leadership and praxis are a contradiction, or if leadership is praxis, concluding that it is dependent on how leadership is defined and understood by participants, due to its intersubjective nature. Perhaps it is simply not a dichotomy. As Hodgkinson (1991) advocates,

The quality of leadership is functionally related to the moral climate of the organisation and this, in turn, to the moral complexity and skills of the leader… The differences cannot be explained by social science; they rest on the most profound of human subtleties. Yet all this complexity reduces in the end to a chemistry of morality or to an alchemy of values, to praxis (p. 129).

In contrast to leadership, managerialism is seen as ‘praxis in a strait jacket’ where teachers are denied their moral agency and ability to do the right thing (Ax, Ponte, Mattson and Ronnerman, 2008, p. 245). If teachers are able to lead pedagogy through
distributed pedagogical leadership, focussing on leadership as practice, then teacher leadership will be praxis. Analysing the practice architectures in their school may enable leaders to understand how praxis is tested during curriculum change, and learn how leadership can build trust during curriculum change by being pedagogical enactors and enablers (Kemmis et al., 2014).

Looking toward practice amongst the polyphony of contested leadership attributes, frameworks and forces, Ehrich (2017) suggests that leadership is framed by the institutional inter-relationships and practices of followers, rather than the leader. This provides insight into the nature of power (Lakomski, 2005). Eacott (2010) questions the strategic power of school leaders, suggesting that leadership practices may instead be in response to what leaders do, say and think, rather than ‘reculturing’ (Fullan, 2011). Gore (1992) critiques pedagogical leadership for professional empowerment questioning the assumption that there is an agent of authority to empower and critiquing the rhetoric of professionalism. If empowerment means to give authority or to enable and license, Gore (1992) questions whether students empower teachers and whether teachers are agents of empowerment exercising power unavailable to students. Similarly, Ellsworth (1989) queries the purpose of empowerment as productive, liberating or repressive. Empowering pedagogy acts upon ‘us’ and ‘them’ and does not necessarily dissolve authority or power of the instructor, but moves power from the instructor to more equal, creative movement in the classroom (Shrewsbury, 1987). Recent research continues to question what would happen in schools if leadership in schools ceased to exist (Eacott, 2017; Evers, 2017; Lakomski et al., 2017; Neische, 2017). Teacher leadership brings genuine empowerment where pedagogy is leadership.

**Trust**

This research examines how trust and mistrust, suspicion and deception, cooperation, coercion and compliance are heightened during curriculum and policy change (Sun & Leithwood, 2017; Day, 2011). Trust is reciprocal and valued by teachers and leaders in different ways (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996; Misztal, 2013) in accordance with social exchange theory (Elstad, Turmo & Guttesrud, 2011) and the extent to which trust in schools is organic, reciprocal, or utilitarian (Bryk &
Schneider, 2003; Darling-Hammond & Rothman, 2011). Trust is subjective and it is possible to mistrust people or ideas (Mishra & Mishra, 2013). The current global climate of transparency, accountability and competition in education has created the need for verification, which, if built on false premises, has the potential to build mistrust in schools (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Lingard, Thompson & Sellar, 2016; Hargreaves, 2015). Equally, being too trusting can also be problematic due to the need to verify (Fink, 2016). Trust can be built in hostile environments through genuinely distributed leadership, autonomy and through communication that seeks to minimise deception (Beveridge, 2015; Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Duignan, 2012, Fink & McCulla, 2016; Marks & McCulla, 2016; O’Neill, 2002; Whalan, 2014:). Transformational change through teacher professional learning is made possible with trust where the alternative is compliance (Browning, 2013; O’Neill, 2002). Recent research into trust and its impact upon student outcomes is also explored (Day & Armstrong, 2016).

Organisational trust was a focus in 1980s and 1990s research (Kramer & Tyler, 1996) derived from popular business (Covey, 2006). Trust and mistrust have recently emerged in educational leadership research as current changes to curriculum and policy in Australia have shifted the purposes of school leaders, the autonomy of teachers and the nature of school culture connected with organisational learning (Duignan, 2012; Day, 2011; Sun & Leithwood, 2017). Uncertainty about the future direction of education brought on by changes to structures and ideologies in schooling is creating a sense of mistrust (Fink & McCulla, 2016). Trust is both the problem and the solution for pedagogical change.

Trust is an intuitive trait necessary for learning and pedagogy, functional leadership, and school culture. Recent research into trust and school change include Robinson’s (2012) model school trust describing school culture, role trust referring to leadership and situated trust referring to curriculum change. Creed and Miles (1996) similarly identified process-based, characteristic-based and institutional-based trust, suggesting that trust underpins these three essential elements in a school.
Theories of social exchange, social agency and social capital assume that trust is social, rational and reciprocal (Elstad, 2011; Misztal, 2013; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996; Svedberg, 2016) or reactive (Cummings & Bromilley, 1996) and that the exchange of humanity and goodwill produces trust or vulnerability and mistrust (Fink, 2016; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Trust is rational (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996) and enables humans to cope with arbitrary social realities (Misztal, 2013), but it cannot necessarily be proven. Cooperation and compliance can be identified, but cooperation is not an indicator of trust (O’Neill, 2002). Cooperation is not necessarily a by-product of trust. Cooperation can mask coercion or compliance. People can cooperate with someone they do not trust. Cooperation can be driven by fear, resulting in artificial trust. Alternatively, lack of cooperation during change can produce creativity, spontaneity and innovation, and mistrust can benefit school culture. Utilitarianism suggests that trust is based upon voluntary or compulsory cooperation (Weber, 2006). Although trust is organic, or intuitive, the extent to which it is utilitarian in schools is questionable due to the need to comply with policy (Bryk & Schneider, 1996; Darling-Hammond et al., 2011) and the recognition of both trust and inequity that comes from expertise and credentials (Fink, 2016). Thompson (2009) suggests some contentious reasons for resistance can be complex such as rejection of policy, or cowardice, or teacher self-interest about salary and security. Mistrust is not necessarily the opposite of trust, but can build incrementally or decrease rapidly (Burt & Knez, 1996; Powell, 1996). To summarise the research above, in a climate of curriculum change teachers cooperate, comply, resist or recreate.

Organisational theory research notes that trust is built through shared experiences and mutual dependencies in groups, influencing school culture (Zucker, Darby, Brewer & Peng, 1996). Group identity can increase cooperation and trust for some group members. Other more trusting members will trust people regardless of the behaviour history and knowledge of other participants (Creed & Miles, 1996). Learning communities require teams with solidarity and trust (Weber, 2006). Mistrust comes if a group member’s identity is not tied to the core values of the group because solidarity comes from shared values and norms (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996). These issues
are evident in schools as learning organisations and issues of individual and group trust and mistrust will be explored in this research.

Research shows that trust is valued by teachers and school principals in different ways, due to their role influence. Survey research shows that teachers value trust more than leaders (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996; Marks & McCulla, 2016; Misztal, 2013). Similarly to organisational research, more recent research on trust in schools in seven countries showed that teachers trust leaders they perceive as pedagogically competent and caring (Marks & McCulla, 2016). Australian teachers did not see their principals as pedagogical, negatively impacting upon relational trust. Furthermore, 90% of teachers did not think principals admitted mistakes and only 30% felt that shared decision making occurred (Marks & McCulla, 2016). Ninety-nine per cent of Australian teachers felt that high relational trust had to exist to create conditions for school improvement, and yet only 42% of leaders deemed it necessary. Principals also value trust, and their trust in teachers is reciprocally influenced by teachers’ perceived competence in their ability as a principal (Fink, 2016). When principals felt trusted it gave them the confidence to take risks and initiate change (Marks & McCulla, 2016). Australian principals felt trusted by colleagues, parents and educational authorities but mistrusted by community groups, media and unions. Principals trusted teachers who were ethical, moral and who put students first (Fink, 2016). A Canadian school principal stated: “those I trust more, I do not verify their work as often. I ask for less proof of data and evidence of student learning” (Fink, 2016, p. 87). Fink’s (2016) research shows how verification can build trust and mistrust in schools.

Trust is subjectively reliant on people’s judgment that results in an action as they place or do not place trust in leadership or organisations. Therefore, trust is challenging to identify. Mishra (1996) explains:

> Trust operates on a fluid and potentially unattainable continuum where its absence is apparent, its presence is appreciated and the goal to strive for and maintain a community of trust may be potentially fleeting with changing circumstances, curriculum and staffing (p. 281).
The idea of pedagogical change can create mistrust within leadership, rather than the leaders themselves (Mishra, 1996). People and ideas are usually connected in people’s thinking. Rapid change causes people to question their judgements, increasing the potential risk of mistrust (Fink, 2013; O’Neill, 2002). Trust is essential for adaption during curriculum change, and trust is brought about by communication (Burt & Knez, 1996). However, during rapid curriculum change, power, influence and communication tend to become more centralised, increasing rigidity and tightening resources to increase efficiency, negatively impacting upon trust (Mishra, 1996). Repeated acts of integrity are needed to nurture trust (Day, 2013). Covey outlines such acts; straight talk, demonstrating respect, creating transparency, righting wrongs, showing loyalty, delivering results, and improving and confronting reality, to build trust (Covey, 2006).

The current global climate of transparency, accountability and competition in education has created the need for verification, which, if built on false premises, has the potential to build mistrust in schools (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Lingard, Thompson & Sellar, 2016; Hargreaves, 2015). In Australia mistrust has come from unionisation and the market good replacing the common good in education, where the traditional purposes of education, including inquiry, equity, and social justice are less recognised, and economics and competition have undermined trust (Fink & McCulla, 2016). Transparency is the result of trust, not the cause, and verification or unconscious checking is a counter balance to trust (Hargreaves, 2015). Principals are pivotal in developing high-trust relations in schools, and between schools and educational authorities, and this influences a teachers’ sense of professionalism (Fink & McCulla, 2016). The dilemma for leaders is how to combine checking and accountability with trust. Suggestions include verifying what kinds of activities should be checked, what the benefits of checking are and considering how checking affects those who are checked (Fink & McCulla, 2016). Verification seeks to discover if a school is delivering optimal learning experiences for students (Fink, 2016). Verification is ineffective if it names and shames, as teachers and leaders need to be trusted and need indicators of efficacy and support (Fink, 2016). The ways principals build trust and verification will be explored in my theory of pedagogical change.
Being too trusting without verification can also be problematic (Fink, 2016). There does not seem to be an optimal level of trust when too much trust can result in complacency and overconfidence in the collective (Kramer & Tyler, 1996). A collaborative school culture where teacher rewards go against team effort erodes trust (Fullan, 1993). Rewards may create competition that erodes collaboration. Collaboration is unsustainable without trust (Mishra, 1996). Too much trust leaves policy makers politically vulnerable and too much verification strips policy makers of creativity and autonomy (Fink, 2016). Verification and micromanaging, competition, favouritism and lack of voice can be viewed as mistrust. The current climate of teacher accreditation in Australia is creating contrived micromanagement that bears little resemblance to the constantly reconstructing thinking and learning of teachers (Talbot, 2015). Fitzgerald (2009) argues that performance management erodes professional trust. Rather, teachers who are professionals can be trusted to be moral and ethical. O’Neill (2002) proposes that appropriate governance is a solution to micromanagement.

However, research demonstrates that many principals and teachers attempt to build trust in a hostile environment through genuinely distributed leadership, autonomy and through communication that seeks to minimise deception (Beveridge, 2015; Bryk & Schneider, 2002; O’Neill, 2002; Duignan, 2012, Fink & McCulla, 2016; Marks & McCulla, 2016; Whalan, 2014). Some schools thrive despite the systems of education they do not trust (Fink & McCulla, 2016). Australian education exists in a crisis of identity and professional uncertainty in a free market world (Marks & McCulla, 2016). The funding of non-government schooling in Australia has created a low trust environment alongside the rise of neoliberalism and increased accountability and competition from the 1980s onwards and the evolution of a National Curriculum, with several failed attempts due to resistance from the states (Marks & McCulla, 2016). The introduction of ACARA for quality and standardised testing and NAPLAN and the MySchool website has eroded trust in education and institutions in Australia (Marks & McCulla, 2016). Teacher surveillance, which erodes trust, has been enabled by outcomes-based assessment, teaching standards and performance management schemes. Australian teachers feel a lack of collaboration time, and the cult of
competitiveness and individualism brought by neoliberalism has impacted negatively on team-work and mutual teacher support (Marks & McCulla, 2016).

O’Neill (2002) suggests that the opposite of trust is not mistrust, but deception that causes suspicion. When communication is unclear, deception may be perceived through misrepresentation. Fitzgerald (2009) suggests the continuing lack of trust in teachers has resulted in a climate of performance management in education where the mistrust of teachers has resulted in “teacher-proofed schools’’ that deny the professionalism of teachers (p. 45). Accountability through central bureaucratic control, teacher registration, standards, performance management and codes of conduct that adopt neoliberal reforms and ideological control are put in place to ensure trustworthy performance. A climate of mistrust fosters a compliance culture that minimises professionalism (O’Neill, 2002).

The principal plays a key role in developing and maintaining relational trust. Relational trust is formed in daily interactions that determine trust more significantly than professional learning (Bryk & Schneider, 2003) making trust “an active political accomplishment” (Misztal, 2013, p. 7). Relational leadership and trust is essential for influencing and collaborating with others (Eacott, 2017). Edwards-Groves (2016) identifies five dimensions of relational trust to understand intersubjective spaces in middle leading. The work of the middle leader takes time to sustain leadership culture. Distributed leadership tests trust. When hierarchies are replaced by flat organisational structures role blurring may occur, potentially leading to slower building of trust among more equal participants (Kramer et al., 1996; Meyerson, Weick & Kramer, 1996; Sheppard & Tuchinksy, 1996). This may be due to role confusion. Alternatively, According to Mishra (1996), trust itself engenders equal power relations in communities of practice. Therefore, unity will be a sign of a strong professional learning community.

Informal networks can build trust through positive and negative behaviours including gossip, social relationships, or even acts of revenge where mistrust pressures members into conformity (Kramer & Tyler, 1996). To build trust leaders need to be “intuitive
auditors” towards staff grumbles (Kramer et al., 1996, p. 218). Trust also depends on mutual understanding. As Kramer, Brewer and Hanna (1996) state:

Organisations cannot recognise and reward every cooperative act, nor can they detect and punish every failure to cooperate. Consequently, successful cooperation depends, at least in part, on the willingness of individuals to engage voluntarily in behaviours that further collective aims (p. 358).

Trust increases when teachers have a social bond with leaders demonstrating that trust is emotional and not always rational and its power breeds the potential for increased trust or abuse (Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Sheppard & Tuchinsky, 1996). Trust is integral to collaboration where interdependence and openness is valued so that teachers can speak freely and learn autonomously (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Informal communication is where professional learning often occurs and this area of school culture is as critical to building trust as formal meeting time.

Transformational change through teacher professional learning is made possible with trust (Browning, 2013; Fink & McCulla, 2016; O’Neill, 2002). The alternative is compliance. The tools or models we use to foster pedagogical change in schools can develop or erode collaboration and trust. Models for change in education, such as mentoring and coaching require trust and support from leadership to be effective (White, 2011). In performance based mentoring or coaching “rigid measurement schemes” can devalue trust (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996, p. 210). A climate of accountability may result in statements such as ‘just tell us what to do” demonstrating fear and lack of learning (Fink, 2016; Goldspink, 2007). Trust will influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school, by whom they are determined and what kind of school culture results from these interactions. Duignan (2012, p. 137) explains:

Teachers especially need to trust and support one another in a collegial learning environment in order to optimise learning opportunities and outcomes for all their students. However, many teachers may have to overcome a culture of individualism, privacy, professional isolationism and idiosyncratic institutional practices.

The level of trust evident amongst teachers may be influenced by the professional learning culture that is established in a school.
Recent research has explored trust and its impact upon student outcomes and school culture (Day & Armstrong, 2016; See also Bottery, 2004; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Kutsyruba, Walker & Noonan, 2016). Australian principals surveyed believed that high trust impacts student learning outcomes (Marks & McCulla, 2017). Research shows that school leaders contribute to student success through emotional paths where teacher trust in leaders influences student learning (Sun & Leithwood, 2017). These links are indirect. Principals cultivate trust through a culture that rewards academic press or expectations from students and teachers, collective teacher efficacy and teacher professionalism, which collectively influence student learning (Tschannen-Moran 2004). Further, the standout characteristic of student success is the degree to which a principal is respected and trusted by the school community and models integrity and fairness in their values, beliefs and actions, and involves others in decision making (Day, 2011). This suggests that a culture of distributed leadership fosters trust, which in turn brings student success. This is confirmed in further distributive and distributed leadership research showing that it sustains trust resulting in measures of high student achievement (Beveridge, 2015; Schneider & Bryk; 2013; Whalan, 2014). Reio & Lasky (2007) found that organisational learning occurs where teachers are trusted to take risks and school goals are monitored and reviewed, continuously impacting student outcomes.

A high trust environment is more effective and professional (Hattie, 2009; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Wallace Foundation, 2012). Conversely, performance cultures reduce risk-taking, thereby diminishing trust (Moller, 2012). Research by Moir, Hattie & Jansen (2014) discovered that teachers had high trust and commitment to school improvement if they felt valued and understood by their leaders, resulting in more positive classroom conditions. The building of trust is an integral part of improvement (Day & Armstrong, 2016). Fink’s (2016) research of institutional and relational trust of teachers and leaders in education systems in seven countries shows that principals and teachers are open to innovative approaches to verification and support rigorous evaluation of poorly performing teachers.

Trust in a working relationship takes time (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996) and yet schools are fast paced institutions with multiple demands. Meyersen, Weick and Kramer
(1996, p. 8) describe ‘‘swift trust’’ where temporary groups form for project based learning are actively produced and negotiated quickly. Alongside trust within the institution, teachers also are reliant on trust at system level, whereas Mockler (2005) suggests we have to trust in the capacity of others. Cognitive and interpersonal trust is required in schooling for collaboration.

Examining recent international research correlating trust and PISA in education, Fink (2016) researches forces that affect trust in seven education systems across the globe. He found a correlation between countries with higher trust and higher public expenditure on education. In Finland and Singapore principals trust the system and each other and the trust of teachers is not dependent upon teaching performance and results. However, there is mistrust between principals and superiors in Finland (Salo & Sanden, 2016). The irony of the low trust culture in England is that their consortia of schools are called ‘‘trusts’’ (Whittingham, 2016). In the United States, the country where ‘‘In God we trust’’ (Darling-Hammond, 2016) the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policy has created a fundamental shift to an accountability driven system. Ironically, high leader turnover and constant changeover of principals in America is eroding trust.

The impact of standardised testing has increased mistrust globally. (Sahlberg, 2015). National testing in schools in Australia published on the MySchool website has not only invited ‘‘conversation’’ into education as Gillard suggested (Gorur, 2016) but it has also displaced the trust of parents in schooling, as it promised data that could be trusted as unbiased and discouraged trust in parents’ personal knowledge of schools and instead is based on numbers and figures. Furthermore, it created distrust and suspicion between schools and the government (Lingard, Thompson & Sellar, 2016). Ultimately for educators, NAPLAN emphasises the bias of different schools with different students under different conditions (Wu, 2016; Darling-Hammond & Rothman, 2011).

As the institutional nature of schooling changes and yet remains static, and as curriculum and pedagogical change brought on by global educational trends of accountability, transparency and performance influence teaching and learning
outcomes, research has shown how trust between teachers and leaders remains somewhere in the balance. Reflecting upon the core purpose of education as praxis and the pedagogical beliefs of teachers and leaders will draw both conflict and consensus. Literature on pedagogy and curriculum ideology are further explored in the next section in order to explain a range of perspectives evident in the research and how they influence schooling during pedagogical change.

SECTION THREE: Pedagogy

This section examines the history and definition of pedagogy and its relevance to leadership and school culture. Pedagogy is a commonly used term in Australia in policy, curriculum documents and practice, focussed on the outcome of maximising student learning. Pedagogy has the potential to be reduced and misinterpreted by teachers based on its definition and usage. Curriculum ideology and theory will be introduced in relation to pedagogy, professional learning and the core purposes of education, in order to explore how deeply held curriculum ideologies may impact upon trust, effective pedagogical leadership and teachers’ understanding of praxis.

A definition of pedagogy

Definitions of pedagogy range from the holistic development of the child, encompassing all teaching techniques, to a specific teaching practice, or curriculum. The definition and meaning of pedagogy varies between contexts due to the history of the term and its usage and purpose either for understanding learning or for measuring attainment, affecting its validity or transference (Alexander, 2008). This section outlines its history in order to understand its context today and why education needs to return to the foundations of pedagogy to benefit learning.

Historically, pedagogy was defined as a holistic form of educating. It is derived from the Greek paidagogia, the guardian, protector and tutor of boys in ancient Greece. ‘Paidos’ means child and ‘ago’ is Greek for lead, so it translates: ‘lead the child’. Pedagogie is French for hospice, where students lived in community at The University of Paris for the purpose of intellectual, spiritual and character development (Smith, 2006). The origins of pedagogy were not simply teaching techniques, but the
development of the whole person with all its holistic complexity, wherein the learner is a dynamic participant, which links to the European notion of pedagogeik or the study of a child’s upbringing (Ax & Ponte, 2008). This notion is derived from an understanding of praxis from Aristotle and autonomous thinking developed during the age of enlightenment when Kant suggested that humans become creatures of reason through their ethical and moral outlook. Bruner sees “pedagogy as mutuality” in thinking or understanding between teacher and learner (Bruner, 1996, p. 167).

In contrast, in other Anglo-American literature, pedagogy is derived from the teaching strategies of Herbart’s (1806) theory of universal pedagogy, advocating formal steps in teaching and connecting these ideas to view pedagogy as a scientific construct where outcomes can be measured (Somr & Hruskova, 2014). It was not Herbart’s intention to dissect outcomes from values. The theory of universal pedagogy has moved on to seeing effective pedagogy as teaching formulas, techniques and educational fads. No singular philosophy can possibly achieve the varied objectives of teaching and therefore a repertoire of approaches is vital (Alexander, 2008). Pedagogies are not necessarily in conflict, but they serve different purposes derived from alternative ideological assumptions. Selecting from these according to purpose in relation to the learner, the content, and the opportunities and constraints of context becomes the art and science of teaching.

Mockler and Groundwater-Smith (2015) outline the numerous pedagogical frameworks that have been introduced to Australian schooling including Newmann’s authentic achievement in the 1990s, productive pedagogies in 2003, the NSW Department of Education Quality Teaching Framework (Ladwig 2007), Direct instruction (Adams & Engleman, 1996) and multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1985). In addition, visible thinking strategies and Marzano’s taxonomy of thinking skills (Marzano & Kendall, 2011) have also taken recent pedagogical prominence in schools.

Rather than defining pedagogy as teaching techniques or strategies, this research acknowledges a more encompassing definition of pedagogy as articulated by Alexander (2008, p. 210):
Pedagogy does not only refer to the act of teaching. It also includes all elements that inform, sustain and justify teacher’s actions, values, ideas, theories, beliefs, history and evidence as well as their relationship with the local and global context… making teaching an educative process rather than a merely technical one.

Pedagogy is inextricably connected with curriculum and school culture and its influences and elements become the responsibilities of educational leadership. If schools are learning communities, pedagogy is the professional act of discourse, skills and decision making that constitute teaching (Alexander 2004). Pedagogy is therefore a process rather than a product and cannot simply be narrowed to a way of describing learning (Hinchcliffe, 2001). If learning is construed as pedagogy the learning technique becomes extrinsic, instrumental and outcomes-based (Hinchliffe 2001).

Further, Biesta (2015) critiques the ‘learnification’ discourse that reduces education to facilitating, creating and delivering without careful consideration of purpose and teacher professional judgement. Rather than focusing on outcomes, Biesta (2015) focuses on the synergy or trade-offs between qualification, socialisation and subjectification through teacher pragmatic judgement to determine the character of pedagogy.

Pedagogy enables teachers and students autonomy over learning in the context of time, space and place. This definition is limited in that it is teacher focussed and does not acknowledge the freedom of learning in co-creation. Marsh’s (1997) definition that “pedagogy is a process of mutual creation that is multifaceted and co-constructed” incorporates this notion. Therefore, as pedagogy is co-dependent, classroom practices and pedagogical leadership practices have inherent complexity. Sellar (2009, p. 359) agrees:

Pedagogy describes and includes a dependent relationship between teacher and learner. It cannot easily become an object of knowledge prospectively or retrospectively… Producing a dependable and reproducible knowledge about pedagogy is important. However, the singular quality of pedagogical events, which conditions teachers’ ethical responsibility, is lost to the analytic lens through which knowledge is produced.
What Sellar (2009) is suggesting is that pedagogy can only be conceptualised in hindsight because pedagogy is an inherently relational, emergent, non-linear, unpredictable process. The Redesigning Pedagogies in the North (RPiN) project created professional learning communities in disadvantaged areas and questioned whether teachers could capture pedagogy from their day-to-day practice in discursive knowledge statements. The underlying assumption of the study was that once a pedagogical event has occurred, with time to reflect and describe what has happened, it should become knowable. However, teachers had difficulty describing pedagogy prospectively and retrospectively due to a lack of resources enabling them to explain theory, general principles or techniques. Therefore, teachers need opportunities for professional learning and reflection. Comber and Nixon’s (2009) research also discovered that teachers have difficulty articulating pedagogy and more easily discuss teacher-student relationships. Comber and Nixon (2009) state that if education is reduced to the measurement of pedagogical teaching techniques we risk missing the complex relational responsibility of teaching at the very core purpose of schooling.

This research explores and compares notions of pedagogy with curriculum. Curriculum is enacted through pedagogy (Ladwig, 2009). Curriculum can also be defined broadly as the ideology that constructs every element of pedagogical practice or narrowly as syllabus documentation (Alexander, 2004). Ideological and philosophical aspects of curriculum will be further explored in this section and the ways that they intersect with pedagogy. However, for the purposes of clarity in this research, curriculum will be referred to as syllabus documentation, enabling pedagogical practice to speak for itself.

Pedagogy is unintentional in human development, but highly intentional, or artificially created in schools (Hamilton, 2009). Therefore institutional learning has the potential to be synthetic in a school context. The decisions that teachers, leaders, students and stakeholders make about pedagogy, curriculum and the skills that are prioritised are going to differ in accordance with the nature of individual school cultures and their pedagogical leadership. How researchers and educators define pedagogy is dependent upon purpose. This research will acknowledge the intention of
pedagogy in schools as the enactment of curriculum creating learning opportunities for student outcomes, which can only be attained holistically.

**Pedagogy and Curriculum Ideology**

Curriculum is a highly contested concept. Marsh simplistically defines curriculum as planning what is taught: subjects, documentation, content, materials, objectives, experiences, indeed everything planned by a school (Marsh, 1997). However, planning is not always delivered and therefore a curriculum document represents the ideal rather than the actual (Stenhouse, 1975). Pinar (2000) sees curriculum as a verb or a process enacted by both teachers and students. Therefore, curriculum is never neutral in policy or practice (Apple, 2011) because it draws on philosophical, psychological and sociological principles (Schwab, 1969). Connell (1997) successfully provides a deeper description of the co-constructed process, describing curriculum as “the most difficult area of educational study where the theory of knowledge meets the practice of classrooms in complex, turbulent ways” (p. 211). Groundwater-Smith (1989) represents these curriculum complexities as a metaphor, conceptualising curriculum as a web of activities subject to tensions and pressures between responsibilities of the learner and teacher and the collaborative and individual. Smith and Lovat (2003) use the metaphor of a personalised and collective racetrack to describe curriculum. Thomson (2002) draws a metaphor of a virtual schoolbag. Habermas (1972) conceptualised curriculum as a process with multiple ways of knowing. Smith and Lovat (2003) build on these notions suggesting that curriculum has both conventional and technical aspects that involve interpretation, reflection and critique. All of these constructs demonstrate that the conceptualisation of curriculum is multifaceted and its implementation is a contextual process and not static or sequenced. The enactment of curriculum is dependent on the individuals and the collective within school culture. These philosophies and actions are tested during curriculum change.

Pedagogical approaches have influenced curriculum, syllabus documentation and classroom teaching. Ewing (2010) explains how Newmann’s authentic pedagogy and assessment and “‘new basics’” (Le Cornu, Peters & Collins, 2003) have influenced the Australian Quality Teaching Framework and productive pedagogies framework.
Australia has had a range of state models of curriculum and assessment and the latest NSW syllabus incorporates assessment for and of learning principles. The National Curriculum framework is seen as improving education through content-based outcomes. The outcomes-based approach to the Australian curriculum has been critiqued by Donnelly (2007) as lacking academic rigour in contrast with the more rigid and narrow standards approach adopted in the USA. Spady’s (1993), outcomes-based approach, however, differentiates between a traditional outcomes-based approach with a strong focus on year levels and a transitional outcomes-based approach with an emphasis on higher order competencies. Transformational outcomes-based education teaches real life skills outside the confines of year groups or time constraints. Berlach (2004) critiques the standards-based approach for constricting differentiation and being less connected with genuine learning opportunities from real life situations. However, outcomes must be well articulated so that genuine skills are learned. Berlach (2004) critiques Spady (1993) for ‘‘changing his mind’’ (p. 2) as his outcomes-based approaches have morph into three, relabeling Mastery Learning as Outcomes-based Education. Further, Berlach (2004) critiques the impact that numerous outcomes have on primary teachers with up to 500 outcomes to implement in the classroom in a year group, and assessment overload in order to produce evidence of learning by individual students (Towers, 1992). He suggests that an outcomes-based approach promotes complacency because nothing happens to students who do not meet an outcome. The most significant danger of the outcomes-based approach is summarised in Berlach’s (2004) concerns about hyperplanning over pedagogical imperatives, the suffocation of creativity and his final comment that “The death of knowledge occurs: when evidence of learning becomes more important than the learning itself” (p. 11). New curriculum can either attempt to incorporate all necessary skills and knowledge and assumptions and big ideas and be thick with critical thinking in its learning outcomes or, alternatively, curriculum can be thin, focussing on basic skills, conformity and prescription (Ditchburn, 2015; Luke, 2010; Geertz, 1973). Luke (2010) refers to this phenomenon as a “National overcorrection” (p. 7). Outcomes attempt to achieve equity across Australian education. This ideal may be unrealistic, but it attempts to provide a broad unity of purpose in curriculum across Australia.
Pedagogy is a form of curriculum ideology. Alexander (2008) analyses the benefits and dangers of each philosophical approach similar to Schiro’s (2013) curriculum ideologies about teaching and learning. Schiro (2013) considers the educational philosophies or ideologies that resonate with teachers in their everyday practice through four visions of curriculum ideology that reflect teachers’ dynamic and potentially evolving educational beliefs lived in context. They are: Scholar Academic Ideology, Social Efficiency Ideology, Learner Centred Ideology and Social Reconstruction Ideology. Teachers may strongly resonate with one preferred ideology, or their teaching may encompass aspects of all four. Educators go through shifts in their careers and curriculum beliefs due to changes in school, grade, communities, roles, research, life events in response to trends, global events and mentoring. Educators posture towards different ideologies in dualistic, relativistic, contextual and hierarchical ways (Schiro, 2013, p. 257). A Scholar Academic Ideology enacts the belief that the purpose of education is to help children learn the accumulated knowledge of our culture and its academic disciplines where the teacher is an academic. The Social Efficiency Ideology advocates that education is for its members to learn to be contributors to society by ascertaining what the needs of society are and creating curriculum objectives for future prosperity and skill mastery. The Learner Centred Ideology proposes that the goal of education is for the growth of individuals and their inherent capabilities. The Social Reconstruction Ideology assumes that the purpose of education is to facilitate and construct a new and more just society through the curriculum to teach people to understand society better from a social perspective, and that meaning is gathered through people’s experiences and knowledge is defined through cultural assumptions. These four views of pedagogy, based on their assumptions about the purposes of education, create new meanings for curriculum. Similar to Alexander’s (2008) realms of knowledge, and Schiro’s (2012) scholar academic ideology, White (2008) states that effective pedagogical practice makes intrinsic connections to produce new insights. Schiro (2013) concludes that teacher passion is the pedagogy that overrides curriculum philosophy enabling teachers to adapt to new approaches. Understanding ideological change can help facilitate the growth of others. What Schiro (2013) is suggesting is that building mutual understanding among teachers about their curriculum beliefs and ideologies bridges understanding about teacher identity and approaches to curriculum. This will
enable teachers to understand the beliefs and processes behind pedagogical change that Biesta (2015) seeks to uncover in a context where educational policy and research is creating a narrow view of what education is supposed to produce.

Pedagogy connects teaching with the wider culture where global influences impact upon classroom practices and influence the moral purpose of education (Alexander, 2008; Hogan, 2008; Schiro, 2013). Pedagogy can be descriptive, prescriptive, pragmatic and political (Alexander 2008). Pedagogy is culturally constructed in schools (Bernstein, 1990; Hamilton, 2009; Schiro, 2013). Teachers play an active role in pedagogical purpose. And yet, these purposes of pedagogy are in stark contrast with the measured and narrow teaching techniques teachers may be confined by today (Hinchcliffe, 2001; Schiro, 2013). According to Alexander, (2004), teachers risk becoming reduced to “technicians who implement the educational ideas and procedures of others, rather than professionals” Alexander (2004, p. 11). The philosophical purpose of curriculum is not to override the skill of teachers. Hamilton (2009) concurs and suggests that if pedagogy is seen more broadly as a holistic term, the outcomes are difficult to measure due to their inherent complexity in the same way that measuring creativity, imagination and critical awareness is challenging.

Curriculum, pedagogy and assessment are three message systems of schooling (Bernstein, 1971) that are currently shaped through neoliberal discourse (Lingard, 2012). Pedagogy now has a narrow focus on teacher quality (Mockler, 2013) and high stakes testing (Lingard, 2012), so the push-back is engagement with student voice in schools (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2015). The written curriculum is renegotiated in the classroom through pedagogy (Alexander, 2008; Marsh, 1997). New knowledge and skills that appear to be abstract concepts in a curriculum document come alive in classrooms through the pedagogical practice of teachers and students co-creating learning. Children are central to purpose and teachers are central to production (Thomson, Lingard & Wrigley, 2012). Pedagogy is described as the need for alignment between knowledge, curriculum, assessment, institutional and social context, and the aspirations and worth of human beings (Thomson, Lingard & Wrigley, 2012). As humans are individuals who learn in socially constructed settings, pedagogy that emphasises individualised education impacts positively upon student
learning outcomes (Jackson & Bezzina, 2010). School culture and curriculum will need to reflect change in context, structures and policies for students and for teacher professional learning if personalised learning is to be successful alongside the broader collective outcomes.

**Pedagogical Change**

Curriculum reform, change, or improvement (Ewing, 2010) is a process that may enable pedagogical reform. However, there are tensions and contradictions:

In many countries and throughout the modern era of educational change, curriculum innovation has been regarded as a strategy for educational reform. Over the longer term curriculum reform has generally failed to generate educational change of a fundamental kind… the structures and cultures of schooling have proven to be highly resilient to fundamental change (McCulloch, 2005 p. 169).

Teachers play an essential role in curriculum renewal and innovation while individual teachers cannot produce system wide change. McCulloch (2005) describes the “mismatch between curriculum orders and curriculum responsibilities” of teachers (p. 178). This means that teachers use innovative approaches even if they see the curriculum as narrow, or not meeting their ideological beliefs. Innovative and creative teachers who wanted to improve practices accepted improvement, were ready to be self-critical, recognized better practice and were willing to learn (Fullan, 1993). This may have come from their pedagogical ideological understanding. Some teachers may be resistant to transformative pedagogy based on the ideological understanding they were taught as pre-service teachers. Rodriguez and Kitchen (2005) suggest that resistance to change is as a result of reconciling constructionism with effective teaching. My research investigates how teachers adjust pedagogy during curriculum change.

School reform does not necessarily mean school change because reforms can be ignored, misinterpreted or reconstructed in alternative ways (Terhart, 2013). In order to foster pedagogical change, school reform involves three learning elements: social capital, group networks and trust where change comes from individuals collectively realising the need for change (Seashore Lewis, & Riley, 2000). Productive tension
between collegiality and individualism is heightened during change (Seashore Lewis, and Riley, 2000). Teachers need the capacity to bring their original contribution while they are also expected to conform and demonstrate loyalty to the vision and values of a school (Watson, 2014). Capacity for change comes from inquiry, creativity, mastery and collaboration. Fullan’s (1993) research suggests that the best feature of learning during change is generative learning when people struggle to accomplish something that matters deeply to them building group networks. Harris (2003) suggests that system wide reform is not possible but classrooms can build capacity for change to generate professional learning communities within schools. Change threatens the stability of culture creating anxiety and uncertainty (Deal, 1989; Fullan, 1993; Marsh, 1997) and the “dynamic complexity” of change means that getting everyone on board is unrealistic (Fullan, 1993, p. 30). Watson (2014) provides insight into the problems of professional learning organisations and communities of practice for reform. The word professional raises questions of inclusion and exclusion of members. A learning organisation may be an oxymoron as organisations do not learn, but the individuals in them do and the knowledge belongs to both the individual and the collective. Some members collaborate more, or less, based on their experience and their enthusiasm. The word community implies belonging based on identity and yet, this can be paradoxical if teachers feel like they do not belong to the reform. Mulford (2007) calls organisational learning the direct intervening variable between leadership, teachers’ work and student outcomes. The problematic variables in organisational learning have been outlined. Therefore, professional learning communities and communities of practice are dependent upon willingness and trust.

Fullan (1993) suggests that the problem with education is not resistance to change but rather to constant changes adopted critically and yet superficially. Learning organisations are impacted by “irregular waves of change, fragmented effort, and rushed projects” making teaching an uncertain profession of dynamic complexity, and teachers skeptical of reform (p. 42). McDonald (1996) suggests site-driven change can overemphasise individualistic opportunities where too much trust is placed on add-on programs and one-shot professional development. However, there is a “lack of mesh” between school improvement and school effectiveness (Dimmock & Walker, 2000, p. 186) or restructuring and improved teaching and learning. Watson (2014)
suggests that the assumption that because teachers are learning, students will also learn is potentially incommensurable and Biesta (2015) sees teachers as learning facilitators as a narrowing of the purposes of education.

There are genuine tensions between building a school culture based on a community of practice of inquiry (Wenger, 1998) where the process of learning is highly valued, while at the same time incorporating research-based approaches from the current effective teaching climate (Hattie, 2009; Petty, 2006). Day and Armstrong (2016, p. 254) explain how the two are both possible:

Heads focus on redesigning and enriching the curriculum as a way of deepening and extending engagement and improving achievement. Academic attainment is not in competition with personal and social development: the two complement one another. The heads adapt the curriculum to broaden learning opportunities and improve access for all pupils, with the emphasis on ‘stage not age’ learning. Many of these changes are in line with government initiatives. Building creativity and self-esteem features heavily in the curriculum, as does a focus on developing key skills for life. There is recognition that when pupils enjoy learning, they are more effective learners. Holistic pedagogies seem possible alongside academic attainment. Reform may be aided by teachers adapting and redesigning the curriculum, as improvement may not be responsive to the context, priorities or values of a school. Lack of leadership support may even undo efforts. *Capacity building* is a 21st century leadership term for sustainable improvement derived from the IDEAs project which included teacher leadership for a workshops-based professional learning model, including action learning, collaborating, reculturing, coaching and mentoring, cluster-based networking (Dinham & Crowther, 2011). However, the IDEAS project in Australia has had little impact upon school achievement (Levin, 2010). The adoption of these action learning practices takes time and commitment as demonstrated by Mockler and Groundwater-Smith in their work with practitioner inquiry as activist professionals (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2009) and the Coalition of Knowledge-Building Schools (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2009; Mockler & Sachs, 2012) and Laws (2016; 2013) with the ongoing DEPISA project, Developing Educational Professionals in Southeast Asia. These projects demonstrate how capacity to sustain
change comes from local school culture (Goldspink, 2007). It comes from a commitment from the individuals within their groups to desire collective improvement and action, which comes from praxis.

Professional development for teachers is full of change tasks (Chi Binh Bui, 2013). The purpose of Goldspink’s (2007) learning-to-learn project was to foster change and ameliorate patchy take up of pedagogy by teachers, and to connect teachers to their own learning, to value emergence as learning leads to new thinking, and to seek congruence of values, principles and practices in whole school design. Teachers were intrinsically motivated to improve student learning outcomes and take up diverse pedagogies, with a project leader. It was fundamental that this middle-distributed leader was loyal to the project. However, Goldspink (2007) and Sarason (1990) also discovered that teachers were suspicious and cynical of change and left feeling hopeless and disappointed. School change harms teachers’ sense of self as their professional development and desired working conditions are changed, threatened and lost (Kelchtermans, 1993). Teacher emotions are displayed in micropolitics during professional development interactions that connect with the professional self. The complex power relations of micropolitics between teachers of differing age and experience has the potential to constrain collegiality (Flessa, 2009). Micropolitics is inseparable from leadership (Chi Binh Bui, 2013). The project manager was pivotal in managing emotions during the change process. Emotions and micropolitics will be inevitable during change. As Schein (2004, p. 329) suggests, professional learning needs to create psychological safety for transformational success or resistance may occur. Mistrust comes from “survival anxiety versus learning anxiety.” Schein, (2004) explains: “if a learner is in denial or defensive they will fear incompetence, punishment, or loss of personal identity or group membership. Authentic support processes during curriculum and pedagogical change may ameliorate such emotions.”

School culture and pedagogical practices connect with the beliefs leaders and teachers have about the purposes of education. Bruner’s (1959) suggestion that improving school curriculum is not about changing technique but asking: “what do we conceive to be the end product of our educational effort?” still stands today in reflecting on curriculum ideology and pedagogical change (p. 29). The purpose of pedagogical
leadership is to create a learning culture achieved through a deep mutual understanding of curriculum and curriculum ideology and pedagogy, underpinned by a shared core purpose of education. Change and reform are seen as good due to their economic gain but they need to be acknowledged in terms of a social justice, intellectual demand and broad holistic outcomes that reach beyond the high stakes testing driving curriculum and pedagogy today (Thomson, Lingard & Wrigley, 2012).

**Professional learning**

Leaders shape opportunities for teachers to learn in communities of practice through professional development, monitoring and dialogue (Printy, 2008; Duignan, 2012; Fullan, 1993). Ideally teachers have the opportunity to shape learning in a community of practice. Communities of practice look different in new contexts. Therefore formulaic professional learning does not provide the depth required to apply curriculum in context. Pedagogical Leadership enables academic transformation as schools implement curriculum through professional learning (Gurr et al., 2005; Caldwell, 1997; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008). However, there is a limited understanding of distributed leadership from a pedagogical perspective. Research by Sales, Miliner and Amat (2016) showed that when management teams relinquished pedagogical leadership it didn’t promote a collaborative culture and shared reflection.

The notion of relinquishing pedagogical leadership reinforces the idea that teacher professional development is grounded in a deficit theory of compensatory education programs (Brodin & Lindstrad, 2007). The success of educational change is dependent upon teachers’ critical capacity for self-esteem, autonomy, innovation and creativity. Obstacles to innovation included prevailing individualism and compliance. Networking may support change (Sales, Miliner & Amat, 2016). Professional learning for managing school change requires space for collaboration and reflection and distributed leadership, to work through tensions between theory and practice, and attitudes towards innovation and school culture (Sales, Miliner & Amat, 2016). This takes time and staff meetings may not have enough time. Teacher professional learning needs to infuse all aspects of school culture and not be reduced to formal staff meeting time and activities labelled ‘teacher professional learning’ where minimal learning is offered.
Pedagogical leadership invests in professional development with the intention of fostering superior teaching focussed on subject matter and standards, which translates into increased learning and higher achievement (Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005; Printy, 2008; Robinson et al., 2008). A school’s ability to adapt to change depends on its capacity to engage in continuous learning between teachers and students (Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005). As Bruner (1959, p. 25) notes, “The proper reward of learning is that we can now use what we have learned; can cross the barrier from learning into thinking.” Conditions in schools promote and inhibit the barrier from learning to thinking (Bruner, 1959). Professional learning involves being stirred into practices and reframing thinking (Kemmis et. al., 2014).

Some researchers (Davies, 2005; Hallinger, 2007; Macneill, Cavanagh & Silcox (2003) suggest that despite the complexity of school leadership, the outcomes of successful school leadership are identifiable by the quality of pedagogy provided by teachers and the engagement of students in learning. However, you can have schools with excellent teachers and substandard leaders, or excellent leaders and poor teaching practices. Leaders are only able to equip teachers to reflect on pedagogical practice if they have formed a complete understanding of pedagogy through critical reflection upon their own pedagogical principles and practice (White, 2008). Leaders need to be immersed in pedagogical theory and integrate it into the process of school improvement. Without critical reflection teachers replicate the pedagogical culture from their own student experiences (Macneill, Cavanagh & Silcox (2003). Therefore, opportunities for pedagogical dialogue need to be connected with teachers’ everyday experiences through teacher professional learning where teachers can participate in curriculum implementation as scholars and researchers, between and among students (Alexander, 2008; Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2013).

Signature pedagogies are key teaching and learning skills that connect professional knowledge with core values to help professionals understand what is required for effective practice (Schulman, 2005). Sappington, Paul, Gardner & Pacha (2010) suggest that action research should be a signature pedagogy for principal preparation programs. The Coalition of Knowledge Building Schools focussed on signature
pedagogies with educators, enabling diversity, flexibility, academic support, tackling sustainability, capacity building and the need to remain “critical” (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2012). The metaphor of a spider web for teacher professional learning focuses on identity formation, professional knowledge, practitioner inquiry and a culture of continual improvement with an awareness of environment, a recognition of expert teacher knowledge, a flat structure with flexible planning, diverse opinions, experimentation and reflection, dialogue and inquiry and reciprocal learning. This learning is the opposite from deficit discourse. It demonstrates how praxis, or morally informed committed action oriented tradition responds to the needs of a practice situation. Practitioner inquiry should be undertaken by teachers as responsible, activist professionals where they are critical of the conditions of education and schooling and where their professional learning seeks to solve problems of practice for themselves (Mockler & Groundwater-Smith, 2009; Sachs, 2003; Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2009).

Education is a social process based on relationships and lived experiences where participants co-construct meaning (Ewing, 2005). Teachers flourish as they construct and develop their own pedagogy (Kreber, 2010). Interactions between teachers ranging in experience impacts pedagogy and school culture (Schiro, 2013). Therefore, the way that staff meetings are conducted impacts teacher professional learning. Research using the theory of practice architectures in Sweden found that material economic conditions also enabled learning through staff meetings, stirring participants into practices. Langelotz (2016) used the lens of practice architectures and discovered that there was little examination of collegial professional learning and this became a project of practice, similar to this research.

Teacher professional learning itself is under pressure in an era of transparency and accountability where both the individual and the collective are important and where theories of curriculum and pedagogy are in conflict impacting collegiality. Professional learning is being enabled or constrained by learning practices in schools through transmissive or inquiry approaches to professional learning. All learning is personal including teacher professional development (Couros, 2015). Understanding the complexity of learning communities, the constraints upon teachers and the
practices that enable individual and collective learning may help teachers to apply new curriculum and pedagogy for continuous learning. Research enabling teachers to use research-based approaches to lead their own professional learning through action research provides empirically based solutions to teacher professional learning issues in schools. Part of understanding pedagogy is reflecting upon how professional learning can promote transformational teaching and transformative learning practices. Transformative pedagogy is an activist pedagogy that involves reflection and constructivist and critical thinking for sustainable development (Ukpokodu, 2009). Transformational practices consider traditional and progressive approaches (Miller, 2016; Ackerman, 2003). Miller describes three types of pedagogy: transmission, transaction and transformation (1996). Traditional practitioners are evidence-based problem solvers who focus on the problem with the belief that the subject knowledge is the foundation from which all pedagogy flows. They transmit and transact pedagogy. Progressives are intuition-based problem solvers who focus on the solution with a belief that learners construct their own foundation from which all then flows, known as transformational pedagogy (Miller, 1996). Recognising that teacher professional learning occurs throughout all interactions and aspects of schooling, rather than just during staff meetings and activities labelled professional learning, provides both opportunities to think about learning in new ways in schools to emancipate teachers as ongoing learners and pedagogical leaders.

Conclusion

The literature review was conducted within the scope of a constructivist grounded theory approach with initial preliminary reading and in depth reading following data analysis. The literature was categorised into key overlapping themes of school culture, leadership and pedagogy. The literature review is further utilised in Chapter Six to enable the researcher to build towards a theory of pedagogical change intended to transform professional learning practices, and pedagogical leadership practices, by building curriculum and pedagogical understanding in schools for the benefit of students.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORY, METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Grounded theory methods consist of systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analysing qualitative data to construct theories from the data themselves. Thus researchers construct a theory ‘grounded’ in their data. Grounded theory begins with inductive data, invokes iterative strategies of going back and forth between data and analysis, uses comparative methods, and keeps you interacting and involved with your data and emerging analysis.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 1

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the theoretical framework, research methodology and research methods used in this study. The research purpose forms the basis of the qualitative design, method and implementation. The chapter outlines the research questions and their theoretical basis, and explains how the data sought to answer those questions through a constructivist grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2014). A rigorous description of the research process and its strengths and limitations is outlined and how the research analysis enabled me to further refine my theoretical perspective and its inextricable connection with the methodology. The use of extant literature in the literature review is justified in reference to the methodology. The process of data gathering and analysis is explained. Following extensive analysis, new theory was built, grounded in the data. The reliability, dependability or trustworthiness of the research is carefully considered and connected to the research design and process. Both internal and external validity are carefully examined through a qualitative lens of credibility, confirmability, and transferability (Guba, 1981).
Constructivist grounded theory is constructed through interactions with people, perspectives and research practices (Charmaz, 2014; Shenton, 2004). The methodology is encapsulated in the quote at the beginning of Chapter 3. Charmaz moved grounded theory closer toward interpretive inquiry and away from its positivist roots, while preserving its pragmatist heritage. Constructivist grounded theory recognises the mutuality between the researcher and participant and through shared reality, their multiple realities and standpoints. Constructivist grounded theory builds on Vygotsky (1962) and Charmaz (2000; 2003; 2006; 2014). The diagram overleaf models the roots of constructivist grounded theory, developed from a model by Gardner, McCutcheon & Fedoruk (2012). It is derived from a constructionist epistemology (Holstein and Gubrium, 2011) and its theoretical perspective from symbolic interactionism (Ward, 2003).

Interpretive constructionism was the epistemological paradigm for this research. It assumes that knowledge is shaped by the researcher’s values and preconceptions as opposed to the positivist or objectivist roots of grounded theory (Stake, 2010; Tolhurst, 2015). Rather, it finds an alternative approach to knowing reality through a systematic process. Tolhurst (2015) and Plummer (2001) argue that Constructivist Grounded Theory seeks to explain simplistic concepts with complex terminology, but I argue that qualitative research, although based in natural human interaction, requires clear interpretive guidelines and parameters that move beyond the argument for legitimation that Tolhurst (2015) suggests. Constructivist grounded theory is more than an expression of an ‘uneasy orthodoxy’ (Bryant, 2009) and requires the constructivist grounded theorist to be deeply immersed in the methodology literature to grasp its subtlety and sophistication within the boundaries of sociology as Tolhurst (2015) suggests, prior to his critique of constructivist grounded theory as an inadequate research method. Chapter 3 seeks to outline carefully my stance.
Constructivist grounded theory was utilised because it was congruent with my subjectivist epistemological assumptions about the nature of reality, ontology, and the social construction of truth with multiple perspectives. Initially I sought to use a phenomenological approach to understand the meaning, structure and essence of curriculum change for participants (Patton, 2015). I wanted to understand teachers’ and leaders’ perceptions of pedagogy, leadership and school culture. I wanted to use a systematic comparative analysis to explain my empirical observations (Patton, 2015). The acknowledged relationship between researcher and participant and the concurrent reconstruction of experience and meaning were also key in my choice. Phenomenology would be inadequate because I could see that bracketing past knowledge and withholding a position about reality would not be possible (Patton, 2015). I knew that I would need to be cautious about the narrative frame I imposed on the analysis of participant viewpoints (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Therefore, it was necessary to take into consideration social constructionism in order to ask how people constructed their reality, or how they perceived what is real and what the
consequences of those perceptions were for them (Patton, 2015). This is known as dialogic meaning making. This meant that taking a positivist approach to grounded theory would be ineffective because acknowledging the multiple perspectives of participant experiences meant that reality was in accordance with the multiple perceptions of participants and therefore appreciating that what is knowable or real cannot be operationally measured or logically deduced, but can be discovered (Patton, 2015). Constructivist grounded theory enables the researcher to locate herself in these realities (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Charmaz (2000) describes the epistemological process as “the discovered reality from the interactive process and its temporal, cultural and structural contexts” (p. 524). I had few preconceived ideas about the pedagogy. The research questions were created from the unknown, where constructivist grounded theory was able to answer the research questions through knowledge development, fitting the goals of seeking gaps in the research and a lack of theory development in leadership and pedagogy. Extending the range of theoretical concepts has enabled a more reflective construction of theory about pedagogical change. Grounded theory is also problematic with a “dearth of expertise” in constructivist approaches and fundamental historic tensions between positivism and constructivism bringing a lack of agreement over measures and procedures (Nagel, Burns, Tilley & Aubin, 2015). Imposing reductionist or deduction oriented influences on the data risks compromising the trustworthiness of findings. Whereas, constructivist grounded theory is rather an iterative process of seeking out resources and a carefully considered paradigm and philosophy. Nagel, Burns, Tilley & Aubin (2015) suggest in preparation to “fortify yourself” for “bumps along the road” (p. 379). The iterative nature of this research provided opportunities for checking and rechecking the constructivist grounded theory approach.

**Research Purpose**

The purpose of the research was to investigate pedagogy and pedagogical leadership in the context of curriculum change in two Australian (NSW) schools. Two NSW primary schools based in the Sydney metropolitan area formed the cases for this research. The study sought to discover more about the professional development practices and specific learning cultures in two schools during the implementation of the NSW English syllabus for the Australian Curriculum. The data informed the
analysis and enabled an empirical inquiry into how teachers and pedagogical leaders were responding to the implementation of the English syllabus. Curriculum change provided a timely opportunity to examine pedagogical leadership frameworks in practice.

This research sought to ask:

1. How are the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school determined and who and what determines them?
2. To what extent do internal and external forces influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school?
3. What are the links between school culture and the pedagogy adopted in the school?

Answers were sought from voluntary participants in two schools. The participants interviewed are outlined in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1. Participants and their pseudonym names and titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crownwood</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Coach Key Stage One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Coach Key Stage Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The outcome of this research was to build theory about pedagogical change. My theoretical perspective, ontology, epistemology and the methodology, methods, purpose and nature of the case are further outlined below. The following diagram outlines how this research was conceptualised:

Figure 3.2: Diagram. Research Conceptualisation

**Ontology and Theoretical Perspective**

Symbolic interactionism holds key beliefs about the subjectivity of humans in their social environment. A constructivist epistemology and constructivist grounded theory methodology is derived from symbolic interactionism. It assumes that people form meaning from actions and reactions within their environment over time and as circumstances change. There is no separation between the social environment and meaning making. People’s perceptions adjust with new social information as individuals gain new meaning continuously from perspectives and actions (Charmaz, 2014; Ward, 2003). Ontological subjectivism formed the theoretical basis of my research (Holstein & Gubrium, 2011). This meant appreciating that participant understandings would not be permanently fixed, even if they were fixed in time.
Symbolic interactionism analyses the interrelationships between participant and researcher, acknowledging the complex nature of human interaction, mutuality, reciprocity and power. Constructivist grounded theory analyses the interpretive interactions between participants. This meant choosing a range of participants in a setting in order to explore these interactions. The link between symbolic interactionism and constructivism attracted me to constructivist grounded theory methodology in order to deeply interpret participant responses to the research questions being proposed. Denzin (2001) defines interactionists as “interpreters of problematic, lived experiences involving symbolic interaction between two or more persons” in order to “confer meaning” (p. 32) and interpret data “grounded in the worlds of lived experience” (p. 42). Each research question acknowledged the complex nature of social interaction, learning and pedagogy in a school. In determining the pedagogical approaches being used in a school it must be acknowledged that pedagogical approaches may be determined and re-determined by individuals or groups. The second research question acknowledged how internal and external forces determine pedagogy. This question sought to determine how these forces influence adopted pedagogical approaches. Asking respondents about the links between school culture and adopted pedagogy acknowledged the context specific nature of this research and its connection with a constructionist epistemology.

**Epistemology**

Qualitative researchers are interested in interpreting meaning making based upon how people interpret and construct their experiences and worlds (Merriam, 2009). This qualitative social research sought to discover meaning from people’s complex experiences, decisions and viewpoints (Johnson, 1994). The 1990s brought more interpretive, postmodern and critical approaches to social research. Constructivist grounded theory moves beyond the positivist thinking of mid-century positivists who previously rejected interpretive research methods as unsystematic and biased (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Charmaz, 2014). More recently researchers such as Lincoln, Lynham & Guba (2011) have challenged the interpretive reality of all research, acknowledging potential limitations with reliability and validity. This is particularly pertinent in educational research where there can be potentially multiple, contested
variables that are difficult to isolate. The purpose of constructivist grounded theory is to form new theory from discovered meaning using a methodological process where meaning is shaped by the researcher and the researched. Inductive processes are used to build theory from the dialogic meaning making to explain a new phenomenon.

Interpretive research often assumes that reality is socially constructed and that there is no single observable reality, but rather multiple realities or interpretations of an event. Therefore researchers construct knowledge rather than find it (Merriam, 2009). Constructivism and interpretivism are closely related terms based on the subjective nature of social interaction where meaning is formed through social negotiation and historical and cultural norms (Cresswell, 2007). Interpretive constructionism is the epistemology underpinning this research. The process of constructing meaning is how people make sense of their experiences individually and collectively and dialogically (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Interpretive constructionism acknowledges that reality is subjectively perceived, interpreted and constructed by researcher and participant rather than discovered (Charmaz, 2014; Holstein & Gubrium, 2011; Simons, 2009). Interpretive constructionism seeks to understand how and why participants construct meanings and actions in specific contexts. Part of the subjective construction is the acknowledgement that the researcher’s values and preconceptions shape the subjective constructivist analysis (Charmaz, 2014). As Charmaz (2000) writes:

Constructing constructivism means seeking both respondent’s meanings and researchers’ meanings. To seek respondents’ meanings we must go beyond surface meanings and presumed meanings. We must look for views and values as well as acts and facts. We need to look for beliefs and ideologies as well as situations and structures. By studying tacit meanings we clarify, rather than challenge respondents’ views about reality (p. 525).

Qualitative research about lived experiences, behaviours, emotions and organisational cultures involves deep and detailed interpretive analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). These lived experiences occurred in two specific school contexts. Stake (2010) acknowledges that these contexts are constantly shifting in response to change as people’s ways of knowing change and develop. Their responses become fixed in time
in their semi-structured interview responses while the researcher’s viewpoint is changed and challenged to form new theory from the data.

**Methodology**

Constructivist grounded theory is derived from the grounded theory approach created originally by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Strauss and Corbin (1998). Grounded theory combines two contrasting and competing paradigms. Its origin was Columbia University positivism and Chicago school pragmatism and field research. In the 1990s scholars moved grounded theory away from the positivism embedded in Glaser and Strauss and Corbin’s earlier versions of the method (Charmaz, 2014). Postmodern critics saw the positivist epistemology of objectivist grounded theory as “modernist” and overly rule-based where theory building became a mismatched “grand metanarrative about science, truth, universality, human nature and world-views” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 13). Exposing the beliefs and the research context in constructivist grounded theory serves to avoid making overarching claims and to openly address the limitations of both researcher and research beyond the specific context. Constructivist grounded theory was formed from this renewed perspective about the role of researcher and participant from a symbolic interactionist epistemology. Participants share experiences during interview narratives in order to create meaning alongside literature review and theory building (Charmaz, 2003). Constructivist grounded theory has inductive creativity, and meaning is created through interactions, giving voice to participants and challenging the objectivity of truth. Its findings are about behaviour patterns in social engagement.

Researchers such as Breckenridge (2012) and Glaser (2002) critique constructivist grounded theorists for remodelling grounded theory beyond recognition. The purpose of positivist grounded theory is to enable a conceptual perspective on social behaviour whereas constructivist grounded theory provides a descriptive or interpretive analysis of participant’s meanings (Breckenridge, 2012). Its relativism and subjectivism is at odds with the classic approach (Mills, Bonner, and Francis, 2006). Charmaz (2014) defends its relativist position by stating that the researcher clearly reports on their own bias within the research, thereby acting as one extra voice in the creation of shared
reality to inform the theory development. Grounded theory does not claim authoritative truth but rather builds theory captured from multiple perspectives in context where concepts can be used and modified. Breckenridge (2012, p. 6) also critiques the “preoccupation with ontological and epistemological issues” but grappling with these viewpoints are at the heart of seeking deep meaning and understanding for constructivist grounded theorists.

Symbolic interactionism and grounded theory connect in purpose as theory is built from people’s descriptions of their reactions and meanings (Wildy, 2003). As Charmaz writes (2014): “Grounded theory provides the methodological momentum for realising the potential of symbolic interactionism in empirical inquiry” (p. 278). Acknowledging the place of the researcher and the researched with a symbolic interactionist theoretical perspective while building theory gives grounded theory its epistemological strength. Being able to build theory from the data enabled me to make meaning from participants’ responses and connect their experiences with ideas about pedagogy, leadership, school culture, curriculum implementation, trust and change.

Charmaz (2014) believes that the original conceptualisation of grounded theory contained elements of interpretive constructivism where “Glaser and Strauss (1967) invited their readers to use grounded theory strategies flexibly” (p. 16). Glaser introduced the rigorous qualitative coding and Strauss the human agency, emergent processes, social and subjective meanings, problem solving practices and the open-ended study of action to grounded theory ... Pragmatism informed symbolic interactionism and addresses how people create, enact and change meanings and actions (Charmaz, 2014, p8-9).

However, Glaser (2007) refutes that grounded theory is constructivist, stating that the data are abstracted from time and place. As Charmaz (2014) writes “The constructivist approach treats research as a construction but acknowledges that it occurs under specific conditions of which we may not be aware and which may not be of our choosing” (p. 13). This does not alter the methodological principle behind constructivist grounded theory where data collection methods flow from a research question and its subsequent direction rather than an analytical strategy directing the
research question (Charmaz, 2014). The research questions drive the analysis in Chapter 4 and 5 and the discussion in Chapter 6. The research questions are answered through the building of theory in Chapter 7.

**Research context and the concept of case**

Constructivist grounded theory and case studies are closely associated research approaches. Punch (1998), Simons (2009) and Denzin (2001) agree that grounded theory is the approach that generates theory in qualitative case study research. The concept of *case* was important for the development of this research. As Flyvbjerg states, “if you choose to do a case study, you are therefore not so much making a methodological choice as a choice of what is to be studied” (2011, p. 301). This is in direct contrast to Yin (2012) who sees a case as a research process or Wollcott (1992) who sees the case as the end product of research in the field. In using a constructivist grounded theory approach the case is carefully outlined, taking into account the epistemology and theoretical perspective.

Merriam defines the object of study as the case (2009) and this research takes on that definition. Similarly, Stake, (2006) tries to pinpoint the unit of study in a case, seeing a case as “a bounded system, a specific, complex, functioning thing” (Stake, 1995, p. 2). Merriam (2009) and Miles and Huberman (1994) also think of a case as a bounded phenomenon, delineating what will and will not be studied from the core of the phenomenon to the extraneous elements. In this research the two cases were two primary schools implementing the NSW K-6 English Curriculum for the Australian Curriculum. Each case is bounded by curriculum implementation as it seeks to find out about pedagogical influences and influencers. The two schools are only examined within the context of curriculum change. This makes the cases particularistic each focuses on a particular event or program, the NSW K-6 English syllabus implementation (Merriam, 2009). This enabled the researcher to design good questions for interview about the curriculum to provide *thick description*. The descriptions are also heuristic in nature as they illuminate the reader’s understanding and insights into the phenomenon and the research brings new meaning about
curriculum implementation and pedagogical change from concrete, contextual, interpretive experiences (Stake, 1981).

In qualitative case studies the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis using inductive investigation and producing rich descriptions of the case. Therefore the sensitivity and integrity of the researcher is paramount, where an unethical case writer could be overly selective with the data, creating intentional bias (Merriam, 2009). The benefits of case study research include context dependent knowledge, even though generalisation is not its purpose, for generating and testing hypotheses, for confirming preconceived notions as in other research and to create theory, despite the complexity of the reality studied (Flybjerg, 2006).

Interviews were conducted at two school sites and therefore it could be argued that the research was a multisite case study offering comparisons in curriculum implementation and pedagogical change. The cases are bound together by the phenomenon of curriculum change (Merriam, 2009). Constructivist grounded theory recognises that data are set in a specific place by individuals within a specific time frame. The NSW English syllabus as a case resonates with Merriam’s approach where programs can be examined to understand and improve practice (Merriam, 2009). Different school contexts, leaders and schools have preferred pedagogical approaches worthy of comparison in the context of the case for the English curriculum. An in-depth study of curriculum change in two school cultures makes it possible to draw comparisons of pedagogical approaches during curriculum change. The research questions intentionally allowed this leadership research to be centred within two specific school cultures so that their approaches to curriculum change, pedagogy and student outcomes could be explored in detail. However, the research is not an ethnographic case study of two schools because it did not explore numerous aspects of the schools in depth but rather specifically the adoption of the NSW K-6 English Curriculum in two school contexts.

The overall intention of this research was to build theory, rather than a hypothesis from deep exploration and analysis of the participant responses about their pedagogical approaches as they emerged. Merriam explains that this is possible with a
bounded type of case study with constructivist grounded theory (2009). As Merriam (2009, p. 43) writes,

By concentrating on a single phenomenon or entity (the case), the researcher aims to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon. The case study focuses on holistic description and explanation. As Yin (2008) observes, case study is a design particularly suited to situations in which it is impossible to separate the phenomenon’s variables from their context.

I searched for major themes to organise the data by going back and forth during the analysis. The themes will be explored further in the methods section. After saturation in the data, theory was built (Johnson, 1994, p. 23). In building theory about leadership, pedagogy and curriculum the overall purposes of the research were met by providing detailed explanations about how pedagogical approaches were determined by leaders to discover who leads pedagogy in a school. The study sought to find out what pedagogy is used and whether changes to curriculum altered pedagogy. The study also sought to ascertain how pedagogy is seen by teachers and leaders to connect to student outcomes.

**Constructivist Grounded Theory methodology and Literature Review**

The research commenced with a literature review in preparation for a research proposal and university ethics approval. The initial purpose of the literature review was to outline the empirical research into pedagogy, leadership, curriculum and school culture and how these complex paradigms are inextricably linked with student learning outcomes. In accordance with constructivist grounded theory research, initial reading was based on these themes to contextualise the research. The early stages of the literature review enabled me to link the project to prior research and stimulate new ideas in order to formulate the research questions (Davies, 2006; Neuman, 2006).

After a year of interviewing and transcribing, and during the coding, categorising and theming of data, no reference to the literature was made, in order to discover theory fresh from the data and “avoid [the] contamination”, assumed by positivist grounded theorists (Thornberg, 2012). However, a constructivist grounded theory stance
suggests that research is inevitably influenced by literature and data analysis. Heath (2006) accuses constructivist grounded theorists for not being emergent. However, the risk of building new theory without mapping the literature in the field is that findings and theory could be potentially limited in depth and scope (Silverman, 2000). “Theoretical virginity” as termed by Clark, (2005) is perhaps not possible, and risks being perceived as ignorance or missed opportunity. The challenge is the acknowledgement that in research there is no neutral position (Thayer-Bacon, 2003).

The constructivist grounded theory researcher has the freedom to discover themes in the data by separating data analysis and literature review and then joining them, building new theory by examining current theory (Thornberg, 2012). The constructivist grounded theory researcher takes a critical stance to “emergent” concepts and links “extant theories”, as they are known in constructivist grounded theory without imposing them on the data. Extant theories are stand-out theories from the literature. Data are not forced into pre-existing theories that replace constant comparison. Constructivist grounded theory draws upon prior theoretical knowledge through a process of pragmatic abduction during literature review, following the analysis in order to formulate the discussion. Abduction is a form of co-construction between the extant literature and data (Thomas & James, 2006). Rich new theory emerges from extant theory using abductive reasoning as a “source of scientific creativity” dependent upon the researcher’s previous knowledge (Thornberg, 2012). Theoretical perceptions are declared in the research and subject the research to rigorous scrutiny (Charmaz, 2008). These are declared in Chapter 6. Constructivist grounded theory rejects pure induction, delays the literature and uses abduction to explore specific phenomenon drawn from the data, recognising the value of the researcher’s perspective and prior knowledge.

After internal and external influences were analysed in the data, I returned to the literature, connecting the prior themes of school culture, leadership and pedagogy with professional learning, change and trust, redefining the research by staying grounded in the findings from the data. As Lempert 2007, suggests, “Careful analysis of relevant extant literature after developing one’s grounded theory can provide cues for raising its theoretical level” (p. 19). The theory of practice architectures (Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edwards-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer & Bristol, 2014) informed by the
work of Schatzki (1996, 2005), Wittgenstein (1958) and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) communities of practice were later explored in the literature. The theory of practice architectures connects key themes and provides an overarching framework for understanding school culture, leadership and professional learning in order to build new theory grounded in the data about pedagogical leadership and change. Following the analysis, Schiro’s (2013) curriculum ideologies were also explored alongside other pedagogical theory in order to understand pedagogical change more deeply and to write abductively.

The use of extant literature through abductive reasoning is termed “informed grounded theory” by Thornberg (2012), and it is a form of constructivist grounded theory. Informed grounded theory uses literature as a source of inspiration using multiple lenses in line with the logic of abduction where findings are heuristic tools. Thornberg (2012) suggests that researchers need skills in theoretical pluralism, a highly iterative process that uses the literature for comparison with emerging codes and concepts. Competing theoretical concepts provide flexible extant choices and ideas without confining or blinding a viewpoint in a co-constructed stance. Henwood and Pidgeon (2003) refer to the critical analysis or doubt of theory from the literature as theoretical agnosticism. The main focus in grounded theory is staying grounded in the data rather than the literature through continuous memo writing and creating substantive codes and concepts. Following the analysis theoretical playfulness can enable critical and creative thinking and reflexivity rather than mechanical construction inviting extant theories and concepts (Charmaz, 2014).

**Method and Research Design**

The method employed for data collection was semi-structured interviews in accordance with constructivist grounded theory methodology capturing the reflexive experiences of participants and acknowledging the voice of the researcher (Charmaz, 2014; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011; Clarke, 2012; Morse, 2009; Denzin, 2011; van Manen, 1997). Semi-structured interview questions were prepared and piloted prior to seeking ethics approval and interviewing participants. A sample of participant schools was gathered using qualitative sampling from leadership groups in
independent schools. Permission was sought by writing letters inviting principals to participate in the project. Two schools in the Sydney metropolitan area accepted. This created a small purposive sample that included principals and teacher leaders diverse in age, gender, personality and experience in two different school locations (Marton & Booth 1997). The researcher was subsequently invited to give a presentation to teachers about the background and aims of the project at staff meetings in both schools in order to invite these potential participants to voluntarily participate in the project in order to avoid any perceived coercion. Each participant signed an individual consent form and was instructed that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the project at any time.

Fieldwork was done one site at a time in order to avoid confusion (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Data were obtained in the two school settings over a year, spending six months in each school with several visits for each interview and staff meeting or professional learning visit. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eleven participants including primary principals and teacher leaders aged 21-65. Interviews were approximately one hour in length. One teacher transcript was removed from the data in order to balance the number of interviews in the two schools. In constructivist grounded theory respondents tell stories on their own terms, within an intended framework set by the semi-structured questions. During the interviews and the ongoing analysis the researcher sought meaning from participants while self-reflecting concurrently. Any unexpected lines of reasoning were reflected upon (Charmaz, 2003). Interviews were recorded for transcription and analysis.

Following each semi-structured interview transcription occurred. Transcripts were sent to participants for verification of accuracy. No changes were required. Data were coded and categorised using a grounded theory approach. The first stage is known as initial coding where data are analysed line by line to inform initial categories and memos. This occurred manually by underlining hard copies of the transcripts, highlighting key themes and writing in the margins of each transcript. Initial memos outlining themes were kept and added to. This manual process was followed by more focused coding where large amounts of data were synthesised and categorised and then analysed. This was done using a code-and-retrieve software program known as
N-Vivo. N-Vivo helped with categorising and interpretive analysis. Axial coding is when categories are further categorised. This occurred using N-Vivo during the analysis writing process and afterwards where further themes were discovered. Checking and rechecking transcripts ensured reliability. Examining multiple variations in perceptions and meaning through the collective analysis of individual experiences created themes and subsequently built theory to ground the research.

During coding, Glaser’s (2007) key questions that govern coding were adhered to: 1. What is the data a study of? 2. What category does this incident indicate? 3. What is actually happening in the data? 4. What accounts for the basic problem and process? Constant comparison, grouping and categorising data enabled further abstraction. Additional memoing and diagramming enabled the focus of the study to shift from description to analysis, elaborating and refining theory. Hallberg (2006) explains that making constant comparison is the most important process in grounded theory. This process is demonstrated in figure 3.3 and table 3.2 overleaf.
This diagram highlights how grounded theory is a process of constant comparative analysis appropriate to a case study. In the data analysis everything is a concept and the purpose of the analysis is to describe how concepts relate to the research question (Birks & Mills, 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). However, conceptualising is more than re-describing. It is finding emerging concepts, setting them in the context of the
The researcher was actively involved in generating data using the interpretive voice of the participant through quotes (Strauss and Corbin 1998). An example of how coding, categorising and theme building occurred after transcription is outlined in the following Table 3.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Quote What accounts for the basic problem and process?</th>
<th>Code word/phrase What is actually happening in the data?</th>
<th>Category What category does this incident indicate?</th>
<th>Theme What is the data a study of?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I just sort of—I needed to take people out of their comfort zones; And there will be some ongoing little pockets of resistance and it might actually come to the point where a couple of those people start to feel this is actually not feeling comfortable with who I am as an educator.”</td>
<td>I needed to take people…comfort zones</td>
<td>Pedagogical Leadership</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing pockets of resistance</td>
<td>Pedagogical Change</td>
<td>Trust and suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who I am as an educator</td>
<td>Pedagogical ideology and identity</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exploration and interpretation of data occurred through the transcription and analysis of semi-structured interviews as outlined in the methodology (Stake, 2010). As each interview was transcribed and analysed, themes that arose from previous interviews were reflected upon. Discrepancies were noted. The initial guiding questions remained the same, but clarifying questions in the interview guide were modified as the concepts developed during the analysis. I was able to query with future interviewees themes that had emerged. They responded in agreement or disagreement and justified their response from their own perspective and experience. From the themes, emerging concepts arose to build theory. Thematic analysis occurred by discovery and categorisation of themes (Ezzy, 2002). The constructivist process is structured, but not mechanical. As Charmaz (2014) writes:

Constructivist grounded theory adopts the inductive, comparative, emergent and open-ended approach of Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) original statement. It includes the iterative logic… as well as the dual emphasis on action and meaning inherent in the pragmatist tradition… Constructivist grounded theory
highlights the flexibility of the method and resists mechanical applications of it (p. 13).

Saturation was reached when theoretical coding occurred from rich categorisation, integrating the analysis in a theoretical framework (Charmaz, 2014). During this stage of analysis, preparation of the final report commenced where leadership experiences, perceptions and theories of curriculum were defined, described and conceptualised to build a theory of pedagogical change.

**Rigour and trustworthiness**

Rigour is an essential component of any research project. The purpose of rigour is to persuade the reader and follow procedures faithfully and to portray the process with attention to the perspectives of those studied. A study is trustworthy if it does well what it is designed to do (Merriam, 1995). Agar (1986) and Guba (1981) suggest using a different nomenclature to reliability and validity, grounded in the purpose of the research. My research uses Guba and Lincoln’s (1989) notions of “credibility, dependability, transferability and confirmability” to address issues of reliability and trustworthiness. Credibility attempts to show that a true picture of the detailed phenomenon is represented in the research. Transferability means that contextual detail about the fieldwork is provided in this chapter such that the reader could decide if another environment is similar and whether the findings could potentially be applied to the other setting. Dependability represents the possibility that if the study could be repeated, fieldwork notes from the methodology could be followed. Confirmability ensures that findings come from the data rather than the researcher’s presuppositions, as explained in this section (Shenton, 2004).

Qualitative research holds philosophical assumptions about trustworthiness based on its inherent purpose. Assumptions about observations are based on the relative truth inherent in the study that comes from normative assumptions that there is truth in an observation, as an interpretation of reality (Merriam 1995). The philosophical assumptions that underpin a researcher’s worldview are demonstrated in their responses to these questions. Merriam (1995) poses:
How can you generalise from a small, non-random sample? If someone else did the study, would they get the same results? How do you know the researcher isn’t biased and just finding what he or she expects to find… If the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis, how can we be sure the researcher is a valid and reliable instrument? (p. 51-52).

This chapter describes the method in detail in order to respond to these questions and validate its rigour. The retrospective nature of qualitative research is built from assumptions that the participants and researchers co-create when finding out how roles or tasks are perceived. Trustworthiness in qualitative research requires frameworks in seeking to address criteria (Shenton, 2004). Rigorous adherence to the guidelines of constructivist grounded theory and explicit instructions about the research process in this chapter have maintained trustworthiness in this research.

**Credibility and Validity**

Credibility is a form of internal validity. Research is credible if it can demonstrate that the views represented are backed up through processes of sampling, accuracy and triangulation. Merriam (1995) puts it simply: “Are we observing and measuring what we think we are observing or measuring?” (p. 53). The purpose of this research was to find out how pedagogical approaches were adopted in a school during curriculum change in two schools and by whom and with what forces? Random sampling is one method of ensuring credibility and the schools were randomly chosen from letters sent to principals, but my study required voluntary participation from specific participant groups in each school in order to attempt to build a clear picture about syllabus change across two schools. Individual written consent was given following a voluntary invitation in each school.

Accuracy comes from consistent lines of questioning and accurate transcription during data gathering and analysis (Yin 2012). Validity is how the data are captured to address the research question. The same semi-structured interview questions were asked, each transcript was verified by each participant and the same analysis procedures were followed during transcription (Shenton, 2004). Triangulation is “the use of multiple investigators, multiple sources of data, or multiple methods to confirm
the emerging findings” (Merriam, 1995, p. 54). Triangulation also comes from “a wide range of informants” (Shenton, 2004, p. 66). In addition to individual interviews with a range of participants chosen spanning a cross-section of the staff room from new teachers through to members of the executive, I was able to observe teachers during staff meetings and review their curriculum documentation. This enabled multiple perspectives and cross checking of information across informants. Triangulation is using data from different sources to contrast and verify other data. It strengthens social research by gathering multiple viewpoints in the data, increasing validity (Stake, 2010). This occurred by my contrasting interview findings with memos from the staff meetings and professional learning sessions I was invited to attend in both schools, and also by reviewing the English curriculum documents provided in each school, noting that the human construction of documents that does not necessarily make them a higher source of knowledge than interviews (Charmaz, 2014; Chen, 2011).

Honesty is also a form of credibility (Shenton, 2004). Tactics I employed to ensure honesty in the study included voluntary participation and the right to withdraw, establishing a rapport with participants by attending several staff meetings, informal conversations and placing participants at ease during interviews by being an external participant and validating their responses. The opportunity to probe and rephrase questions also enabled me to detect suspicious data which was further confirmed in writing by drawing attention to “discrepancies and offering possible explanations” (Shenton, 2004, p. 67).

Stating the researcher’s experiences, assumptions and biases also increases the credibility of the research (Merriam, 1995). I declared my professional background and interest in the topic at the commencement of each interview to inform the interviewee of any potential bias. Their stance was also clearly outlined in the analysis section, which also served to increase reliability and validity of the research. This connects with Lomborg and Kirkevold’s (2003) stance that truth and validity in grounded theory comes from a reconsidered realist interpretation. Frequent debriefing with my supervisors and peer scrutiny of the research project through annual conference presentations also occurred throughout the project, testing its credibility.
Examining previous research to assess whether the project’s strengths were congruent with past studies through extensive ongoing literature review also occurred (Shenton, 2004).

The role of the researcher during data analysis is to be an interpreter of “ordinary people who speak” (Denzin, 2001, p. 82). Therefore, van Manen (1997) argues for the importance of confronting our assumptions during the interpreting stage to expose our own bias about the data to be interpreted. Stake describes how humans are researchers and the researched, the instruments, the writers and the readers, and therefore all research requires human investigators to define meaning in accordance with assumptions that come from values and experiences (2010). The method of constructivist grounded theory aims to see the inside world of the research participants, and have the privilege of entering their setting and obtain their views without claiming to be able to replicate or reproduce their experiences (Charmaz, 2014). The questions were designed appropriately so that participants responded to the key questions of the research through the semi-structured interview questions thus increasing internal validity. However, interviews are also limited in their validity. Charmaz (2014, p. 32) describes potential difficulties in how the interview process is conducted and perceived, stating:

Tensions between data collection strategies and what constitutes ‘forcing’ are unresolved in grounded theory. What might stand as a viable means of gathering data to one grounded theorist might be defined as forcing the data into a preconceived framework by another.

This was nullified by participant checking and cross-checking meaning with participants for accuracy which made me confident of meanings or differences in thinking (Stake, 2010). Interviewing principals, curriculum coordinators and teachers enabled a range of viewpoints to be heard and transcripts were sent to participants for verification.

**Reliability, Dependability and Confirmability**

Dependability and consistency are more practical measures for qualitative researchers than reliability (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011). “Qualitative researchers seek to
understand the world from the perspectives of those in it” (Merriam, 1985, p. 56). Reliability asks to what extent findings will be found again if replicated. However, qualitative research is subjective rather than objective because:

> Human behaviour is not the same as studying inanimate matter. Human behaviour is never static. Classroom interaction is not the same, day after day, for example. Nor are people’s understanding of the world around them.

Merriam, 1985, p. 55

Scriven (1972) also argues that a number of people experiencing the same thing does not necessarily make it more reliable than one person’s true account. This suggests that replication could potentially create “two interpretations of the phenomenon” rather than yield the same results (Merriam, 1995, p. 56). In constructivist grounded theory reliability is instead determined by saturation of data. Data are credible through their depth and quality and their ability to answer the empirical questions to give a complete picture. Unreliable data are “skimpy” and “nuanced” so that definitive statements cannot be made (Charmaz 2014, p32-33). However, the value of a single example should not be underestimated and is not considered “skimpy” (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

Transferability ensures a certain reliability or dependability in the research. Merriam’s (1995) solution to transferability in qualitative research is to suggest that:

> The extent to which findings from an investigation can be applied to other situations is determined by the people in those situations. It is not up to the researcher to speculate how his or her findings can be applied to other settings: it is up to the consumer of the research (p. 58).

In qualitative work “public descriptions are static and frozen in the ethnographic present” (Florio-Ruane, 1991, p. 234). Replication is problematic and yet the findings in context and time may be reliable. Readers are able to determine to what extent they are confident to transfer the findings to new situations if the research provides a full and thick description of the research context. This would include the number of organisations in the study and their location, restrictions on people who contributed to the data, the number of participants involved in the fieldwork, data collection methods employed, number and length of data collection sessions and the period of time the data were collected (Guba, 1981; Shenton, 2004). These have been outlined in this
chapter. A future researcher might see the prototype as a dependable prototype model with detailed coverage of the research design and its implementation with an operational level of detail and reflective appraisal of the project (Shenton, 2004). Dependency and consistency were achieved through triangulation, peer examination and through providing evidence of an audit trail by describing in detail how data were gathered, how categories were derived and how decisions were made during the inquiry in the methods section (Merriam, 1995). The detail of the audit trail is a form of possible replication, which creates a form of “internal reliability” (Merriam, 1995, p. 57). An audit trail is represented in the method section to show how the data were gathered and led to recommendations (Shenton, 2004). Data consistency was supported by the use of N-Vivo software. As Strauss and Corbin (1998, pp. 172-173) explain, by systematically seeking multiple perspectives and building theory through the process of coding, analysis and constant comparison, the researcher questions their own ideas and participant perspectives. The process of explicit questioning from the researcher serves to increase reliability.

Intrusion and researcher bias is inevitable with human design (Shenton, 2004). “Confirmability is the qualitative investigators, comparable concern to objectivity” (Shenton, 2004, p. 72). The researcher is required to admit their own predispositions and the reasons for favouring one approach when another technique could have been employed in the form of “reflective commentary” (Shenton, 2004, p. 72). The subjective nature of the researcher’s viewpoint can influence the final product and therefore researcher bias needs to be declared explicitly. Lack of rigour in data gathering, construction and analysis is critiqued in case study research. However, by following the steps of the grounded theory method cross-checking should occur.

Saturation in qualitative research is reached from the amount of data collected rather than the number of participants used (Neuman, 2006, p. 457).

Some grounded theorists (Glaser, 1998; Stern, 1994) argue against attending to the amount of data. Numerous other researchers have embraced a similar stance to legitimize small studies with skimpy data. For both Glaser and Stern, small samples and limited data do not pose problems because grounded theory methods aim to develop conceptual categories and thus data collection
is directed to illuminate properties of a category and relations between categories. Their reason can help you streamline data collection. It can also lead to superficial analysis.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 33

In response to this criticism regarding data size, I found the following checklist from Charmaz labelled Figure 3.4 was helpful in determining whether data saturation was reached during the interview process for analysis and writing:

- Have I collected enough background data about persons, processes and settings to have ready recall and to understand and portray the full range of contexts of the study?
- Have I gained detailed descriptions of a range of participants’ views and actions?
- Does the data reveal what lies beneath the surface?
- Is the data sufficient to reveal changes over time?
- Have I gained multiple views of the participant’s range of actions?
- Have I gathered data that enable me to develop analytic categories?
- What kind of comparisons can I make between data? How do these comparisons generate and inform my ideas?

Figure 3.4: Checklist for Data Saturation (Charmaz, 2014)

The confirmability of the research comes from the original contribution that the theory of pedagogical change makes to educational research. This is the ideal for constructivist grounded theory. Charmaz (2014, p. 15) warns:

Few researchers show evidence of having conducted theoretical sampling and of constructing theory, despite their claims of having done both. To me, engaging in iterative research is not equivalent to theory construction per se. Theories rest on explicated abstract concepts. If so, then connections to theory may remain loose in many studies but the analytic precision of numerous other studies distinguishes them as original contributions.

Confirmability comes from precision with constructivist grounded theory, which enables it to make a valid contribution to research as the representation of a case. My research followed the precepts of grounded theory and created new theory about pedagogical change during curriculum implementation.
Building Theory

In grounded theory the researcher avoids applying an external theory until after the theory has been developed during theoretical coding. This is known as theoretical sampling where variation is discovered in a category (Charmaz, 2014), which may account for what has happened or why. As Birks and Mills (2011) explain: “Theoretical coding is employed in the later stages of grounded theory analysis for the purpose of moving your analytic story in a theoretical direction” (p. 123). Theoretical coding helps substantive codes to become concepts that support theory, as outlined back in Table 3.2: “Coding and Category Identification”, and these are made explicit in the analysis. The process of coding informed my decision to explore unexpected theories of trust.

The strength of case studies is that they outline complex issues that cannot be simplified or discounted (Merriam, 2009). As Flyvbjerg (2006) explains, the nature of reality may make it difficult to summarise data into a general theory. However, constructivist grounded theory seeks to build theory from specific realities. It is the responsibility of researchers to interpret and make theory in constructivist grounded theory and build categories through theoretical sensitivity (Denzin 2001; Strauss & Corbin 1998; Neuman, 2006; Ezzy, 2002).

Birks and Mills (2011) explain the process of forming new theory as inductive and abductive reasoning. Inductive thought finds patterns in concepts, and abduction scrutinises data and entertains all possible explanations and forms hypotheses until the most plausible interpretation is found (Birks & Mills, 2011). Both inductive and abductive thought is required at the same time. During this research induction was achieved by looking at quotes for emotions, interactions and consequences such as trust and mistrust. Abduction was achieved using diagrams to map and connect codes and find gaps in the theory. Both of these processes are demonstrated in the analysis where the data moves toward a theory of pedagogical change. I checked and rechecked as categories were chosen and built upon. Multiple variations in perceptions and meaning were jointly analysed and discrepancies noted. For example, pedagogy and trust are two concepts that may have different meanings for participants. This was resolved by confirming meaning with participants during
interviews and through the process of constant comparison and by using the processes of theoretical coding.

Theory production increases reliability in the research through “conceptually dense” theory through thick description (Corbin & Strauss, 1998, p. 169; Charmaz, 2014). Birks and Mills (2011) suggest theoretical integration is achieved by acknowledging the diversity of answers to the research question through careful explanations situated in theory. This can be referred to in Chapter 6. Reflecting critically on the actions and decisions made throughout the research process using reflexivity enables others to see how conclusions were reached thus increasing reliability and validity (Simons 2009).

**Practice Architectures**

According to Charmaz (2014) building theory may mean analysis of a new area, providing a “treatise” in an established area or extending current ideas (p. 201). The process of developing a theory of pedagogical change came from data analysis as participant narratives unfolded from the dialogic meaning making. Following the analysis, the theory of practice architectures (Kemmis, et al, 2014) derived from symbolic interactionism, helped me to reflect upon specific site practices grounded in the data, which enabled and constrained pedagogical change in the discussion chapter. I was able to evaluate the extent the participants in each case were in communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). Following the analysis of practices, the research moved toward a theory of pedagogical change rooted in the data. Following the discussion, I built a grounded theory of pedagogical change presented in Chapter Six.

However, some would suggest that the use of theory in constructivist grounded theory could be categorised as using extant literature, which still causes debate (Dunne, 2011). Extant literature would not be used in positivist grounded theory. Dunne suggests in order for constructivist grounded theory to retain its methodological integrity, it is agreed that the use of extant literature is avoided until towards the end point of the analysis, in order to allow codes and categories to “emerge naturally from the empirical data during analysis, uninhibited by extant theoretical frameworks and associated hypotheses” (Birks & Mills, 2011; Dunne, 2011, p. 114). As Charmaz puts it, delaying a review of literature “avoids importing preconceived ideas and imposing
them on your work...[and] encourages you to articulate your ideas" (p165). Rather, extant theories should “earn their way into your narrative” (Charmaz, 2006, p126) or be woven in during the write-up stage (Glaser, 1998). My research remains true to these notions. The process of building theory through further analysis continued during writing and revision. I found during interpretive research that theorising cannot be separated from writing, reflection and language processes that access our biographical experiences (Denzin, 2001; Van manen, 1997). Van Manen (1997, p15) writes, “Theory enlightens practice and practice always comes first (opposite to positivist) and is the result of reflection.” In this way the epistemology and theoretical perspective of the research connect with the methodology and the methods employed.

Education is in permanent renovation, exacerbated by curriculum change. The theory of practice architectures (Kemmis, et al., 2014) encapsulates the notion of dynamic practice in specific contexts known as site ontologies (Schatzki, 2002). The theory of practice and practice architectures is in part derived from Lave and Wenger’s (1991) communities of practice theory. Both practice architectures and communities of practice are social, collaborative practices. Communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) model the action and intention, whereas the theory of practice architectures enables deep analysis of educational praxis through three interconnected lenses of “sayings, doings and relatings” (Kemmis, et al., 2014). The theory of practice architectures provided a framework to investigate the internal and external forces that influence school culture during times of change in this research.

Practices are cooperative human arrangements shaped by meaning or intention that can be described by their product. The purpose of the description is to analyse and either recreate current practice or create change. Educational praxis is an active, dynamic and substantive form of practice formed by action not intention (Kemmis, et al., 2014). Praxis can be interpreted from a psychological, epistemological or a rational perspective. Aristotle sees the moral purpose of praxis from a psychological viewpoint. Kant takes an epistemological stance on praxis, seeing it as intentional and rational action by which normative judgments should be validated through pure reasoning. Habermas sees praxis as deliberately rational communicative action. These perspectives each add to the analysis of practice (Kemmis, et al., 2014). Practice
architectures enable or constrain conduct though cultural discourse in the form of sayings, material economic doings or social political relatings influenced by Wittgenstein (1958) (Kemmis, et al., 2014). These sayings, doings and relatings enabled me to reflect upon data in the analysis and explore the themes from the data in greater detail in the context of each case.

Practices are formed in contextual intersubjective spaces and connect with school culture. They occur in practice landscapes, arrangements or ecologies of practice found in specific sites. They are prefigured in practice memory, attempting to make praxis objective rather than subjective. This can only occur with a timescale approach. Practices question what is already predetermined and shaped. By transferring arrangements in intersubjective spaces that support practices we can transform practice. This provides opportunities to individually or collectively expose and be rid of imposed harmful, inefficient and unsustainable practices. Unlike, Lave and Wenger’s (1991) communities of practice, communal action cannot be imposed (Kemmis, et al., 2014). This research deeply examines the internal and external forces enabling leadership and school culture within two specific contexts applied to the implementation of the NSW English syllabus for the Australian Curriculum.

Ethical Considerations

I sought approval to conduct the research from the Human Research Ethics Committee at The University of Sydney. This process ensures that research is planned, conducted and evaluated ethically and within the guidelines and procedures for the protection of human participants’ health and wellbeing, confidentiality and non-identification. Consent to conduct the research was given prior to the gathering of data. Potential participants were given written information about the study in a letter (see Appendix A). Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions in order to be fully informed and to understand the nature of the study. Participation in the research was voluntary. Participants completed a consent form (see Appendix B). Semi-structured interview questions are found in Appendix C. At the commencement of each interview participants were notified that they could stop the interview at any
time. At no time during interviews or in the report were the actual names of schools, teachers or principals used.

**Dissemination of Results**

An executive summary of the research was distributed to the two participant schools. I have published peer reviewed journal articles from the research findings, with further intended publications. The research has been presented at two conferences. Access to the thesis is also available to interested parties.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I have outlined the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of constructivist grounded theory. I have mapped the history of grounded theory and its relevance to interpretive constructivism. I have described in detail the methods by which the research was conducted and its inherent limitations, acknowledging that rigour and rich description increase the validity, trustworthiness or credibility, and reliability, transferability and dependability of the study. The process of grounded theory enabled a theory of pedagogical change to be built from the tension between conflicting and resonating participant responses to leadership, pedagogy and school culture, trust and change and relevant literature and theory.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS: GREENVILLE

PRACTICES THAT INFLUENCE PEDAGOGICAL CHANGE

Through writing you can bring out implicit arguments, provide their context, make links with extant literatures, critically examine your categories, present your analysis, and provide data that support your analytic arguments.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 289

Introduction to Greenville and Crownwood

Chapters 4 and 5 present the cultural and pedagogical leadership practices in two primary school settings within K-12 schools with the pseudonyms, ‘Crownwood’ and ‘Greenville’. They present an overview of the research conducted at each school through participant interviews. Participant quotes build themes grounded in the data using a constructivist grounded theory perspective. The practices within school culture are examined in each school from the perspectives of participants as a frame for understanding the context for leadership and pedagogical change. This includes the pupil learning culture and the professional learning culture for teachers. Curriculum and pedagogy are explored next in each school. The mandatory
implementation of the NSW English syllabus was the catalyst for curriculum change and pedagogical change. There was a strong sense in both schools for a need to change pedagogical practice. This came from new knowledge of transformative pedagogical practices based upon teacher professional learning and syllabus documentation making teachers question traditional and progressive learning approaches. A sense of pedagogical change also came from external pressures of transparency and accountability driving more instructional and evidenced based pedagogies. Finally, an analysis of school leadership and its connection with pedagogy and pedagogical leadership, school culture and professional learning and trust during change in these two settings concludes the interpretation and analysis.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine practices that influence pedagogical change found in participant words, actions, and interactions. The narrative interprets the sayings, doings and relatings of participants. Both chapters examine how these practices are enmeshed in the practices within learning cultures, leadership practice and pedagogical practices in particular school sites. The tensions that exist within and between them in “intersubjective spaces” are explored as practices remain, or evolve and change and emesh or destruct the practice architectures of a site (Edwards-Groves & Grootenboer, 2016; Green, 2009; Kemmis et al., 2014; Lave & Wenger, 1991). The two chapters are structured in accordance with the key themes that emerged from both schools during data coding and categorising. These include learning culture, school effectiveness and student outcomes, pedagogical change, curriculum implementation and reform, pedagogical leadership and teacher professional learning, trust and change.

The context of curriculum reform and pedagogical change was such that both Heads of School were required to mandate curriculum change in accordance with NESA requirements for the NSW English syllabus. However, both Heads of School were also seeking to implement pedagogical change based upon curriculum change for the benefit of student learning outcomes. Pedagogical change became a source of both tension and opportunity at both schools. At Crownwood the Head of School was

---

4 In 2017 the name of BOSTES NSW (Board of Studies Teaching and Educational Standards New South Wales) was changed to NESA (New South Wales Education Standards Authority) in NSW.
explicitly seeking to transform the learning community using transformative inquiry pedagogy and a form of distributed pedagogical leadership with both teachers and students in accordance with the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program. At Greenville the Head of School sought both curriculum and pedagogical change, but the specific pedagogical direction and the specific leadership direction of Greenville was less clear and more fluid.

The following diagram outlines how the themes are structured for Chapter 4 and 5 and the ways in which practices influence pedagogical change:

![Diagram showing the relationship between pedagogical leadership, school learning culture, curriculum implementation, and their influence on pedagogical change]

Figure 4.1: Practices that Influence Pedagogical Change
This chapter also presents the findings. It outlines what participants say, what they do and how they relate in the intersubjective spaces. Teacher professional learning practices, pedagogical change practices and school effectiveness practices that influence student learning outcomes enable and constrain pedagogical change. The figure above demonstrates where practices are enabled and constrained in the intersubjective spaces between school learning culture, pedagogical leadership and curriculum implementation and reform where the teacher professional learning practices, pedagogical leadership practices and practices for pedagogical change within leadership, curriculum reform and school culture also influence change. Internal and external forces also enable and constrain practice. Chapters 4 and 5 use practice architectures as a way of understanding practice as an epistemological approach rather than a theoretical tool for analysis (Kemmis, Wilkinson & Edwards-Groves, 2016). The nature of participant interviews means that practices can only be analysed and thought about through the ways that participants explain the sayings, doings and relatings of practices. In classroom based research, practice architectures is used as an analytical tool to analyse directly observed practices. Chapter 6 explores the intersubjective spaces in more detail and analyses the ways practices evolve and change.

In constructivist grounded theory, the building of theory is constructed from the interpretation and analysis, formed through interactions with people, perspectives and research practices (Shenton, 2004). Each section of the analysis commences with a description of the participants interviewed because school culture, school leadership and pedagogical practices will be described from their perspectives. Constructivist grounded theory also recognises the mutuality between the researcher and participant through shared perspectives and standpoints and the limitations of these perspectives. Therefore, it is important to introduce the participants and provide a brief background into their context and to acknowledge my narrative place in the formation and construction of the analysis from their quotes. I have attempted to represent the subjective and intersubjective realities of the participants through their voices, even if at times their voices are contradictory. The interpretation of their experiences will be further critiqued with the literature in Chapter 6. The data in Chapters 4 and 5 address the research questions in Chapter 7.
GREENVILLE

Participants

At Greenville the following participants were interviewed: Head of School, Deputy Head, K-6 Learning Innovator, English Coordinator, and Class Teacher. At the time of interviews, the school was in the midst of some significant staffing changes. The Head of School, Andrea\(^5\), was in her first year of her first Head of School role. The Deputy Head, Lisa, had been in her role for one year. She was an experienced teacher who had worked in a number of primary schools. The K-6 Learning Innovator, Cathy, was also an experienced teacher who had worked in several schools. She explained during her interview that she had been asked to step down from her role and return to the classroom the week before her interview. The English coordinator, Elizabeth, was similarly experienced. The class teacher, Renee, had been at the school for three years and this was her second school appointment. Leadership and staffing changes are noted as they formed an important part of the context within which the interviews were conducted. Table 4.1 below outlines participants and their pseudonyms for easy reference:

Table 4.1: Participants at Greenville and their pseudonyms and titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenville</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-6 Learning Innovator</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Coordinator</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Renee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Learning Culture

School Learning Culture is an aspect of school culture that encompasses both pupil learning culture and teacher professional learning culture. Learning cultures

\(^5\) All names are pseudonyms
contextualise leadership and pedagogical change. Participants described Greenville School as “big”, “vibrant”, “strict”, “busy”, “high achieving” yet “non-selective”. It has a large school population and sizable grounds. Greenville seeks to invite “every” kind of student with the opportunity to be a “Greenville student”. The large population size was seen by teachers to constrain their ability to know students and how they learn. Renee admitted, “I know my class really well but I don’t know all the kids in [my year group]”. Renee disliked not knowing all the students in her year group for pastoral care, cohesion and for any cross-year projects or interactions. However, in contrast Elizabeth described the school culture in terms of the students: “It’s a very positive ethos. It’s a very supportive ethos in the school, a very caring ethos” that enabled learning. The teachers strived to work closely with students and parents. At the same time it was a school learning culture where parents were interested in achievement. Lisa shared:

_Some of the kids here are very pressured already and that worries me. Some of them are very young and we push them to grow up too quickly. We want them to just be a mini secondary school… Sometimes there’s a lot of comments that the senior school does this so we should do this, and we need to acknowledge that children come here because it’s a primary school. Sometimes we’re too serious. Primary school should be fun._

The material economic arrangements within the school leadership and hierarchy were such that the senior school drove the school learning culture at Greenville. For example, “There’s a lot of pressure for us to fall in line with the Senior School. Even the way we’re reporting, the way we’re assessing and the way we’re prize giving” (Lisa). The Junior school was expected to comply, and although it had some freedom, it did not have complete autonomy as a separate school.

Due to its popularity, the size of the school tended to result in teachers “teaching in silos” (Andrea). With up to six classes in each year group teachers only interacted with their year groups, rather than across a key stage, impacting upon curriculum progression and cohesion within the school learning culture. Elizabeth explained:

_There’s not too much cross phase discussion, say between Year 5 and 6. There probably needs to be more, but I think given the volume of people unless they are given an official meeting time that’s actually quite difficult to get all_
those people together. So we’re not necessarily working as a stage. It’s quite grade-based and often it’s quite teacher-based because you have all got different personalities.

The size of the school also brought “a substantial leadership team” (Andrea) and increased “administrative necessities” in each year group (Elizabeth).

The school had developed a strategic plan, or a mission statement and goals that sought to influence the school learning culture significantly over the next decade. Pedagogical and administrative change came from a genuine desire and effort to know each student and their learning outcomes in a large school. This aim was “clearly outlined in the school strategic plan” as Andrea explained. Renee also explained the plan:

Andrea works with [School] Council and they have come up with this plan, and we get that hammered into us at meetings and so now we’re about personalised education and whatever else we are, so that is the school element coming from that very top level. And because our Head of School says, well I spoke to [the Principal] and we need to do this.

Elizabeth showed me how the “strategic intents” or the school’s mission statements were printed as objectives on “posters on display in each classroom” and each staffroom to remind the teachers that they needed to show evidence in their planning of how they were demonstrating them.

Comments about the school teaching culture ranged from “really lovely hard working teachers” (Lisa) and “a fantastic environment” (Elizabeth) to a “tall poppy culture” (Cathy). Both Renee and Andrea reported teachers feeling a “sense of survival” due to the amount of staffing changes and the busy pace.

The school learning culture was described by Lisa and other teachers as traditional and there was a desire for change among some teachers:

Coming in new to this school I would say there have been a lot of people who have been here for a long time. They seem like they are open to ideas, but after a while they just start chipping away with a bit of negativity. We used to
do it this way, or this way was better – it’s moving people out of their comfort zone.

Renee and Cathy also noted that a few former students were now teachers at Greenville, resulting in reproduction and cloning of the traditional culture.

Cathy, the K-6 Learning Innovator at Greenville outlined some concerns about the school learning culture for students:

The Junior School is somewhere where the perception would be that we’re quite a high achieving entity… but… a lot of what we do is aimed at keeping parents happy. And a lot of the time it’s not about what actually goes on in a classroom.

There were other pressures on teachers and conflicting demands that competed with teaching and learning culture such as school performances. Renee, a class teacher also shared:

I wonder about the depth - sometimes we do these great things, but [parents] want the best education for their kids and how we are structured - I just often wonder are we providing the opportunities for the best English and Maths education?

Positive changes to the school learning culture included “new continuity between infants and primary.” For example as Elizabeth explained:

Through the recent English curriculum implementation we have worked very closely with [both schools]. The Heads are quite keen to keep our own identity as schools but sort of keep that transition K-6, so that there is continuity in some of the methods we are actually using and the way we have actually attacked the implementation.

Continuity and transition between the learning cultures of both schools was evident in recruitment processes, curriculum continuity and shared staff meetings. The Head of School announced that teachers were invited to apply for roles from K-6 for the first time where before infants and primary had always run as separate large schools. Teachers were meeting to discuss curriculum for professional learning for the first time across the two schools and particularly between Stages One and Two. Other teachers critiqued these changes as contrived. They felt “working together K-12” was
something the executive wanted to see but an aspect of school culture the teachers never intended to build as it lacked genuine purpose and seemed fake. Renee shared:

*I think of MySchool as only 3-6, even though we are a K-12, but any interaction we have with those other parts it’s just in good faith or it’s not real interaction. We don’t do it to help the kids. We do it because the other people want to see us working with other schools.*

**Pedagogical Change**

Pedagogical change was a focus at Greenville where 21st century learning and personalised pedagogies were key aspects of building the current and future direction of the school culture to prepare the school outlined in its strategic vision. Critics of the strategic intents felt that they potentially lacked “*actual theory or philosophy*” (Cathy). Some teachers did not trust the depth of pedagogical thinking of the leadership at primary level because as Cathy commented, the Head of School was “*not K-6 trained*” and neither was the K-12 Director of Teaching and Learning. However, the strategic intents did provide a clear vision, form of communication and cultural direction for Greenville. As the Head of School noted:

*It is great we are in a school that has a clear direction and a clear [K-12] vision. Does it fit one of the strategic intents? If it doesn’t, we don’t do it…We need fewer voices, clear accountability, expectations and a clear goal for the year and I think we’ll be successful.*

However, the translation of the strategic intents into practice was problematic because teachers were not consulted during the creation of the strategic intents. The English coordinator shared that if teachers were “*not on board with things, or don’t feel they are part of that decision, they will dig their heels in and say no*”. Teachers sought opportunities for consultation and autonomy. This was in contrast with the Head of School, who shared how compliance was a perceived strength in the teachers: “*That is one great thing about the teachers: they just do whatever they have to do – they really are fabulous at it*”. The culture of compliance permeated through Greenville. Lisa explained:

*It’s very directed from the top and not much comes up the other way, and I think that that’s a shame. I think that it isn’t a two-way street. So there are certain agendas we have to satisfy and so registration, for example, or things*
that have to do with compliance that require the Head to dictate what has to happen from a compliance point of view. Then I follow that up. The year coordinators and the curriculum coordinators also work with their teams to ensure that those sorts of things happen. So ticking off the boxes.

The Head of School, Andrea, was in her first year as Principal, having been promoted internally from a leadership position in the Senior School. Greenville was the only school in which Andrea had taught, for only a few years, so she had no former experience leading pedagogical change in a primary setting. Her former business career explained her corporate leadership style seeking clear direction and purpose. Andrea was able to identify a perceived difference in school sub-cultures between the Senior and Junior School. Lisa described the Junior School as “a fantastic environment to work in” with great teachers. When asked if she had seen much change in the past two years, her response was: “Yep, which is good.” Lisa welcomed and supported change.

Pedagogy was another aspect of the teaching repertoire disconnected with curriculum. Rather, separate professional development on specific pedagogical approaches occurred at other times such as through “differentiation and visible thinking” routines as Cathy explained. Curriculum change was the urgent agenda connected closely with NESA registration. Lisa noted that pedagogical approaches were not modelled or communicated with teachers during staff meetings.

Meetings are held for administrative purposes, not discussion of pedagogy… It’s a perfect vehicle for modelling what we expect in the classroom. Let’s model it with the teachers. So you can see when staff meetings are run in such a way, that is the way the classes are run.

The focus of meetings was still on administration and curriculum change rather than pedagogical change.

There were multiple conceptions of pedagogy articulated at Greenville. Renee described pedagogy as traditional, but changing:

The school is on a journey with pedagogy. When I first came here it was like stepping back into the dark ages. It was textbook driven and it is now outcomes driven.
The Deputy Head, Lisa, showed how she understands pedagogy and she applied this to differentiation practices.

*Pedagogy is the art and science of teaching. It’s what you do and how you do it and why you do it. So, the philosophy and the theory behind why you would have different opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding, is just an example…. I think we all influence pedagogy.*

The Head of School, Andrea, applied pedagogy to every day practices:

*It’s all about the practice of education, the practice of teaching. When we talk about good pedagogy we talk about good practices.*

The English coordinator, Elizabeth, reflected upon her desire for more opportunities to discuss pedagogy at school following her attempt to define pedagogy:

*Pedagogy: I struggle with that word. We have it in staff meetings. It’s the way you deliver your methodologies. I don’t think there is enough discussion about that in our school.*

Cathy differentiated between her own pedagogy and school pedagogy, pointing to its complexity:

*Pedagogy is intuitive reasoning; why I choose to teach it this way or choose to do it this way. There is a huge personal element in it. There are two types of pedagogy: personal and school.*

Teachers understood the importance of pedagogy and were insightful about the difference between their own pedagogy and the development of collective pedagogy within the school. Different depths of pedagogical understanding were apparent. ‘Good’ pedagogical practice was left undefined by the Principal, but Andrea suggested it is an active teaching process.

*Pedagogy is really all about informing practice and recognising that we are learning all the time and need to keep on top of our game and read and discuss and understand, professional development and collaborative practice and conversation.*

Their definitions of pedagogy showed how teachers utilised a range of pedagogical approaches at Greenville. Teachers expressed a freedom in their classroom to implement their own pedagogy. Cathy said: “I think a lot of that comes down to an individual classroom and what structures particular teachers have set”. Renee explained:
My personal pedagogy is not affected by that. It’s affected by myself, and the input of others through those professional conversations, which aren’t happening for me.

However, several participants noted that the pedagogical culture was being transformed where “the school works really hard in trying to sort of push student learning to the front in making sure teachers are current in their learning” (English Coordinator). Another participant suggested that the pedagogy was “top-down and imposed” without teacher reflection. Other teachers shared that they discussed pedagogical practices informally.

**Curriculum Implementation and Reform**

The English Coordinator at Greenville had been at the school for three years and had seen enormous change during this time. Elizabeth felt “very supported by the Head of School” in her role leading the English team, a group of primary teachers selected to work on the implementation of the NSW English syllabus during curriculum change. Andrea shared:

*It has been led brilliantly by Elizabeth. She has really unpacked it and in very interesting ways has got them to unpack it as well. She has done a great job at building that skill up and it has been a very progressive step-by-step approach.*

Teacher professional learning for curriculum implementation for the NSW K-6 English syllabus was directed from the English coordinator who described her position as a middle leader. Cathy shared that “no disagreement” was to take place and inquiry was not encouraged. Lisa explained: “They have done a huge amount of work but it’s not distributed. One person owns the whole thing.” Therefore, a community of practice was challenging to build in the silence of compliance.

Renee shared problems with meeting structures: “Subject specialists are out of the loop about cross-curricular literacy expectations because they miss the English Curriculum meeting if they do not teach English.” Lisa expressed concerns about the way that professional learning on the English Curriculum was being conducted:
It costs more for a guest speaker to come and give professional development rather than actually working on something together. You know the AIS\textsuperscript{6} runs the courses, but it’s expensive. So [Elizabeth] is doing the PD [professional development] instead of sending someone from the AIS for a day, and anyway at the moment the PD in the Junior School is just all over the shop.

The English Coordinator in the Junior school was attempting to use a consistent programming approach across each Stage that everyone could use: “We are going for uniformity in terms of our programming format” (Elizabeth). However, Renee noted that in the English implementation “the focus isn’t on the pedagogy, it’s on the building of scope and sequence.” Cathy expressed concern about how scope and sequences were static programs, rather than active changing learning plans, which created a lack of connection between the curriculum and pedagogy in the classroom: “I think they’re just looking at a piece of paper and going yeah I’m going to do that, what thinking has gone into what teaching and learning is taking place?” At Greenville curriculum change made teachers feel a lack of confidence in their own new curriculum knowledge and a fear about whether they would be able to apply the new curriculum: “I’m flying blind” (Cathy). “I don’t know if we’ve really explored the English curriculum.” (Lisa). Staff needed the opportunity to be more heavily involved in planning and to receive teacher professional learning in differentiation and outcomes planning for the new syllabus.

The implementation of the English Curriculum was perceived to be a sole priority not developed in conjunction with other key learning areas or projects. The English Coordinator stated: “We can’t have an English focus and a maths focus at the same time” despite the general capabilities and cross-curricular priorities that require multiple curricular focuses at primary level. When Elizabeth was asked if she could complete cross-curricular planning she was told “We are part of the bigger school so we can’t. We have been told we are not allowed to integrate English into other subject areas.”

School registration impacted upon curriculum change as curriculum coordinators sought to “embed good practice” (Elizabeth) by “reviewing all programs and

\textsuperscript{6} AIS Association of Independent Schools
checklists” (Andrea) as forms of accountability through data and evidence of student learning outcomes. However, there was a general agreement that compliance had taken over. Lisa explained: “We are constrained by compliance ‘tick off’ as opposed to a ‘great lesson’.” Compliance was constraining teachers’ ability to improve upon pedagogy or to have the time to engage critically with the NSW English Syllabus during curriculum change. The implementation of the NSW English Syllabus came alongside a school inspection and reaccreditation. The pressure from government and accrediting bodies was driving the school executive to ensure that contemporary pedagogical practices were being used and curriculum implemented within a limited time frame. The Head of School explained how this pressure resulted in evidence collecting student outcomes for registration and accreditation rather than fostering creativity in learning experiences for students that could result in more deeply engaged learning, which were seen as separate constructs:

Whilst we want to really engage these students with some amazing learning experiences… we need to prove that we are teaching to outcomes and assessing accurately and keeping samples and annotating our programs and we have evidence.

The external pressure of accreditation had a powerful impact on teaching practices, and the teachers’ view of compliance was limiting their capacity to think about creative, innovative experiences and think in terms of monitoring the cohort.

Curriculum change was being utilised as a perfect opportunity to demonstrate compliance through the proper and thorough implementation of the NSW English Syllabus as well as a catalyst for pedagogical change. The English coordinator explained how the new curriculum for English was such a significant change:

I think we’re sort of in the crux [of change] at the moment, because the new curriculum in English has actually taken away pretty much all of what we know about how we are currently teaching English.

The new English syllabus was so different from the former one with the introduction of digital technology, new writing techniques, functional grammar and new outcomes,

7 The NSW Education Standards Authority (‘NESA’) is responsible for the registration and accreditation of non-government schools to present candidates for the Record of School Achievement and Higher School Certificate. Registered and accredited non-government schools must abide by the Education Act 1990.
teachers were not only learning new syllabus content, but also ways of conceptualising the teaching of English and literacy.

For Cathy, the mandated curriculum change seemed like “change for change’s sake”. The English Coordinator reflected on how frustrating it was that assessment processes in the school had gone in and out of favour depending on leadership, showing how pedagogical leadership remained “top-down” at Greenville. Rubrics and assessment for learning had been used two years ago, and were then dropped as an assessment approach by the executive, but were now in use again. Currently assessing directly to outcomes was in favour with moderation through work samples, bringing together the outcome and the student. These would be checked during school registration. Elizabeth thought moderation across the school was excessive:

As coordinators we are cross-referencing the work samples to the daily planner, to the termly planner, to the scope and sequence, which is also a big job. We have got a very big registration hat on at the moment, so I think [the principal] wants to embed good practice, but at the same time - it needs to be manageable good practice, because the number of work samples that they were talking about were not manageable.

It was apparent that this whole school approach to moderating work samples for assessment was occurring in every subject. Preparation for registration became the tool for embedding universal assessment practices at Greenville to show how student outcomes were being met.

Strategies for Student Learning Outcomes

Participants at Greenville were asked to describe their understanding of pedagogy and student learning outcomes. The responses of Greenville participants suggest that teachers took into account the whole child when it considered the learning outcomes of its students. The Head of School described the specific holistic values attached to student learning outcomes: “Teachers place an importance on knowing the students and reaching the outcomes set for them. Curriculum is both student outcomes and a values approach.” When Renee was asked about student learning outcomes she drew upon a range of outcomes to discuss including “curriculum outcomes”, “Board of
Studies outcomes” “and the KLAs”. She described teacher approaches to student learning outcomes and their lack of connection with assessment and personalised learning at Greenville as “being in the dark ages I think”. Further, Lisa admitted: “we don’t have great feedback mechanisms for students” (Deputy Head). Cathy described outcomes as “non-descriptive statements”. Elizabeth commented that she had been annotating the board with learning intentions for the lesson: “We’ve been using the outcomes, but not really unpacking them and actually working out exactly what they meant” in order for pedagogy to be driven by the needs of children. Renee explained that she was able to guide teacher understanding of student learning outcomes and their connection with syllabus documents, but as a relatively new teacher she struggled with how to improve outcomes in her own classroom: “As a leader in Science I don’t know how I get student outcomes, but as a classroom teacher with my group of kids I know how I can push them or support them in Science.” This demonstrated a clear distinction in her thinking between curriculum knowledge with student outcomes without connecting pedagogical knowledge to the classroom.

Greenville’s ten year plan for school improvement included pedagogical change. In order to address the perceived need to improve “student potential” a member of staff had been appointed K-12 Director of Improvement Strategy, to improve student outcomes across the school. Cathy outlined her cynical perspective: “Her job is about NAPLAN results and student outcomes. It is unclear what her role is apart from ruffle feathers.” This signified mistrust in the measurement and attainment processes as part of the culture of improvement and a perceived lack of collegiality from Cathy. Renee noted with cynicism the effectiveness of what she perceived as an excessive compliance: “The pushing, probing and assessment work won’t change much with new curriculum” This expectation of compliance from executive management and the school strategic plan was strong.

Student learning outcomes were seen more holistically than curriculum outcomes. Renee explained: “The students have opportunities to do well in a lot of things and I think so they can show and demonstrate their learning in a lot of different areas and that might be music, sport, leadership, citizenship.” Renee thought that these opportunities were “a huge positive of the school. It does mean that the students are
very busy, but it also means that everybody need to understand that just because this student can’t read very well they have other skills to offer.” Student learning outcomes were said to be not connected with measured academic outcomes. Lisa, the Deputy Head also shared her view of student learning outcomes for students at Greenville:

Student outcomes. I mean they vary all the time, so it can change on a daily basis. You know their outcome today is not to call mum during the day because they are having friendship issues. Or it can be an academic outcome that occurs at the end of an assessment. Or at the end of a unit of work they demonstrate achievement. Or it’s that they’re happy - that they feel that they know where they are going. Or they are working to their potential.

These teachers at Greenville connected the holistic individual potential of students to their learning outcomes.

Curriculum change had made it challenging for teachers and curriculum coordinators to understand how to map learning outcomes. Armed with this complication, Elizabeth, the English coordinator, attempted to describe her experiences:

I had to learn the whole new terminology of everything when I came, and so student outcomes now to me link directly back to the curriculum, in terms of what they are actually being asked to do, in terms of those nice long often nondescript statements that are quite difficult to unpack and work out... 3, 4, 5, 6 years ago, we’d been using the outcomes, but not really unpacking them and actually working out exactly what that meant.

Elizabeth also understood that student learning outcomes became active measures of student productivity:

But also student outcomes to me are what we are producing at the end of a lesson. What the purpose of the lesson is and what we are trying to necessarily do. So, the curriculum outcome can actually have lots of different ways of actually achieving it, but your lesson outcome is different. It is just specific to your lesson.

Elizabeth explained how the English team were creating a scope and sequence for the implementation of the NSW English syllabus by referencing the content descriptions as outcomes from the National curriculum content descriptions. Elizabeth explained the process by which the staff decided to reference each “dot point” as a learning
outcome using program builder, a NESA tool that enables schools to create electronic programs and access outcomes, upon the instruction of the Director of Learning in the Senior School:

*What we are doing next is we actually use the ACARA references as a big help to be honest. So, then we are actually ticking off which ones we have covered... So we are having a whole school Australian curriculum meeting. The big discussion is, are we referencing the outcome or have we got to reference these dot points? The Director of Studies wants us to reference the dot points which is what is making it challenging for us because in our integrated unit we have dot points for English, of which one lesson might have 14 different dot points in it. And our question was have we got to show evidence that those dot points are being taught in that lesson or can we just reference them?*

Multiple curriculum documents were adding complexity and detail to planning documentation at Greenville and the expectation from executive of implementing both the NESA curriculum and the Australian curriculum cross-curricular priorities, which came from the time where Australia had the Australian Curriculum, but NSW had not yet updated its English syllabus, and teachers were caught between the two. Greenville was devising an alternative strategy to create a new proforma that the teachers could use to map their outcomes and ensure that the curriculum was being implemented across the school.

When participants at Greenville were asked about student learning outcomes and pedagogical approaches, they also volunteered information about assessment approaches and reporting procedures and how they connect to student learning outcomes and pedagogical approaches. Greenville is a K-12 school and the junior school fitted in with the rest of the school’s assessment and reporting procedures. Renee shared: “*We don’t use the same language [as the Senior School]. Well, we might, but it’s not clear. We don’t use the same assessments. Well we might but we don’t coordinate with the Year 7 teachers*. This demonstrated a lack of clarity and communication between Year 6 and Year 7 teachers about assessment. Sharing the same school location and facilities did not aid communication. As Renee explained, “*Even though we’re on the same campus it’s quite a separate thing.*” The Junior and the Senior school were not discussing assessment procedures and approaches. Current
school assessments were not showing what some students were able to do. Renee explained:

*I hate assessment. I hate how we assess. I don’t think it helps any kids and we’re working on it, and that’s where the formal pedagogy change is helping to change that, but I think our assessments currently don’t allow the lower kids to show what they can do, even if they can do nothing currently.*

Renee was describing an approach to assessment that did not meet the needs of students, teachers or parents.

The English Coordinator at Greenville explained how the collection of work samples was being used as an assessment tool to determine student knowledge of text types in English. The new English syllabus has narrowed text types into three areas. Traditional modes of assessment had changed alongside the new curriculum that sought a different style of work from students. One difficulty with the new NSW syllabus is that there were no assessment models yet in place. Modelling the new types of writing was essential for evaluating the progress of student writing. Elizabeth commented:

*Well because this is a question of being asked how are we going to assess this new curriculum because it’s not mentioned anything about assessment at the moment. There are no models for assessment that I am aware of at the moment about how we are going to be assessing the text types.*

It appeared from participant responses that there was a lot of testing occurring with the students at Greenville. The pervading response from participants was that the students were doing “*a lot of tests. Let’s be frank. More tests than I have ever done in my life*” (Cathy). Assessment and accountability formed the necessary components of data collection of students. Connections between teaching, learning and assessment were not being made as well. Cathy explained:

*I think some of the teachers have that attitude here I taught them so they learned: Which is different to actually student learning. I think it’s a bit of lack in experience in being able to assess students and what they can know.*

Drawing the connections between these constructs was challenging. Static programming at the start of term did not hold the flexibility for making changes to teaching and learning. As Lisa shared: “*They all do pre-tests and then they’re*
teaching the kids everything, so you know they don’t use any of it.” Teachers were making the first step, but then they were uncertain what to do next once they discovered who could and could not achieve the outcome.

There were inconsistencies in the philosophy behind assessment tasks and reporting activities at Greenville. Renee shared: “Assessment has changed this year to be assessment for learning and assessment of learning, but having said that we’re still putting marks on things to go towards prizes for speech day, which goes against it all.” The teachers were frustrated that they were unable to voice these inconsistencies in the school culture.

The moderation of work samples was a form of assessment being used at Greenville in preparation for the upcoming NESA school inspection. It was an extensive project across all key learning areas. Elizabeth explained the difference between work samples and portfolios and why this was important for assessing students exactly at their level of ability:

> You should be able to take any piece of work for a work sample. Not just a specifically designed piece that’s presented nicely, and they have been asked to use rulers for, because then it is turning into more of a sort of portfolio. So they are doing work samples and the idea is that as coordinators we are cross-referencing the work samples to the daily planner, to the termly planner, to the scope and sequence, which is also a big job and I know that is sort of important. And that is that happening in every subject all at once.

The overall purpose of assessment was to know and understand the learning of students either as a summative assessment, at the end of learning about something or formatively, to inform learning about student progress. This had not always been the case. Syllabus outcomes had not been driving the teaching and learning at Greenville. Assessment driven by a didactic teaching approach may have originated from “textbook” teaching at Greenville, which drove a one-size approach to teaching and assessment. Cathy shared:

> Because things were textbook driven, it was: Do the textbook. Set the assessment paper. Get a mark. The assessment was driven by what had been
completed in the textbook. So it had nothing to do with whether it was linked to outcomes.

Lisa, The Deputy Head, added in a further dimension – the element of student potential:

I don’t think we do maximise student potential. I really don’t. I think we pay lip service to it, but I don’t think we have. I don’t think our assessments are good enough. I don’t think that they... we don’t have great feedback mechanisms for students, so we’re never going to maximise student potential if you don’t have that in place. If you don’t have regular feedback that’s appropriate and constructive - if the students achieve the outcome, then that’s it. You know there’s no, I don’t think that they recognise. I mean intellectually they understand this, but I don’t think they think ‘well they’ve got it where to from here? Where do I take them next?’

Utilising the assessment for learning principles as pedagogy set out in the NSW English syllabus enabled teachers to reflect upon constructive feedback to inform the next steps for teaching and learning. At Greenville the gaps were in feedback and the use of that feedback to inform future teaching.

Personalised learning was a key strategic intent of the school at Greenville. Some participants at Greenville discussed personalised learning when they talked about pedagogical approaches, student outcomes and assessment. The complexity of understanding of student learning outcomes in terms of personalised learning was captured in Renee’s comment: that “student outcomes should be personal outcomes.” This suggests that curriculum outcomes were inadequate for meeting the needs of each student in the classroom. The Deputy Head at Greenville explained how differentiation was a recent pedagogical approach in the Junior School: “Differentiation? Well the Junior School has come a long way with that. When I first came the plan had no differentiation statement. Nowhere in the program was there differentiation – none.” Lisa looked closely at how to make this change within the learning support arena: “I was shocked, so I lead the gifted team, so we looked at differentiation. So they now have differentiation in their program. It is still a one-size-fits all. So extension is this, core is this.” The division of differentiation into three groups was meeting the needs of some students more closely, but it was missing the point of personalised learning, which was a key pillar of Greenville in the strategic
Differentiation is a pedagogy encouraged in the NSW English syllabus. Renee explained how differentiation happened in classrooms at Greenville for mathematics and its limitations: “Our Maths program - we’re doing the same thing at the same time, but perhaps at a different level and that’s expected and then we’ll all do the same assessment at the same time on the same day and that is so different to how I operate.” The reason behind the sameness came from “a fear of parents and that’s huge and it’s not - I’ve never seen evidence of it being a legitimate fear like I’ve never had a parent come into me and say well my students didn’t do the test on the same day as that student. It’s not fair. But apparently in the past and over the like 15 years that some of my colleagues have been working at this school that has happened.” Therefore, perceived pressure from parents seemed to be driving the lack of differentiation in testing in the school as teachers sought to demonstrate that no children were missing out on learning at a certain level evidenced in testing.

Accountability drove the formal pedagogical structures within the school. Renee explained: “I think formally there is change. They’re definitely, they are doing things I think in a better way because of the formal pedagogy around assessment and planning and feedback to kids. And that’s all come from the top down and it’s formal and we’re making good change from it, but the informal change I would say it’s slow.” Changes in assessment, planning and feedback were yet to be embedded in teacher practice.

The curriculum had not been the vehicle at Greenville to create changes to teachers’ understanding of assessment pre-testing, differentiation and the use of student learning outcomes, despite the pedagogical change of assessment for learning in the new syllabus. This had resulted in multiple meetings with different and sometimes conflicting agendas, leaving teachers in the middle, confused. Lisa explained that in addition to the time constraints placed on teachers: “Well, it is very, very difficult, because we’ve got competing agendas. So, we’ve got the English curriculum... and I think those curriculum areas are the vehicle for addressing [pedagogy].”
Some teachers had not coped well with the high leadership turnover at Greenville. Renee explained: “It’s my third year working here and we have had three different heads of Junior School for each of the three years that I have worked here.” Leadership change had caused unrest and Cathy describes some of the subcultures:

You have got polar opposites. People who have been here for 20 years - and then you’ve got a good group of people who have been here less than five who are willing to change things, but you’ve got the stick-in-the-muds who want to just keep recycling what we have done for the last 10 years.

Cathy has explained some of the confusion and division amongst the teachers about which pedagogical approaches were prioritised and the kind of learning culture being built in the Junior School.

Leadership practices at Greenville were intentionally hierarchical. Pedagogical leadership was the core responsibility of the K-12 Director of Teaching and Learning at Greenville. She worked closely with Cathy, the former K-6 Curriculum Innovator in the Junior School. Curriculum coordinators in the Junior School were also responsible for each Key Learning Area. The Deputy Head, Lisa, envisioned curriculum coordinators should have increased autonomy and focus in the school. Andrea also wanted to create pedagogical change, but the management of this change was made more complex with the current staffing arrangements. The Head of School shared that it would shortly be announced that curriculum coordinator roles would be replaced with year coordinators, who would instead have the prominent role as pedagogical leaders alongside a literacy and numeracy coordinator. Currently, in order to foster a consistent K-12 approach across Greenville any pedagogical change initiative was imposed from the whole school Director of Teaching and Learning, in accordance with the hierarchy, which was top-down.

The pedagogical leadership of the school was supportive of change. Elizabeth explained: “The school works really hard in trying to sort of push student learning to the front in making sure teachers are current in their learning.” Teachers were
encouraged to apply the pedagogical “toolbox” thinking to curriculum in their classroom. Some teachers embraced the change and others ignored it.

Teachers were given allocated staff meeting time to adopt the new English curriculum separately from subject coordinators who were left to deal with syllabus change separately without the support of other pedagogical leaders, disconnecting pedagogy and curriculum. It left Elizabeth, the English Coordinator, feeling vulnerable. She found her pedagogical leadership role was substantial:

*The English implementation is quite huge, plus integrating the units… I need to put my hand up and go, I am not the only one who can make these decisions. Some of these decisions need to be higher up than me.*

Elizabeth sought approval for the pedagogical changes being made to teaching reading, writing and grammar as the result of a new English syllabus and seemed afraid of the repercussions of making the wrong decision where “there is a lot being put on me.” Elizabeth created a glossary of terms and rewrote the English curriculum in the Junior School. Leading pedagogical change alone was stressful for Elizabeth.

Lisa reflected upon the different leadership styles of school executive and the extent to which they prioritise pedagogical leadership:

*I think in terms of leading the pedagogy it really depends on the leader. If that’s your passion then you will make time for that. You will give that a priority in the professional learning, but if you’re more administrative and signing off on things then you won’t. You’ll be more about compliance.*

The Deputy Head took a personalised approach to pedagogy according to the needs of individual teachers. She supported teachers through formal and informal conversations through teacher accreditation meetings and mentoring.

The Head of School explained how learning a new role had limited her ability to be the pedagogical leader she sought to be:

*It’s been a struggle to do that as yet because I have spent six months getting to know the school…. But moving forward everything I do must be focused on that: on improving student outcomes and being that leader of learning and driving learning and being facilitative of staff to increase their own knowledge*
about learning and pedagogy. So I’m not there. So I wouldn’t say I was a very good pedagogical leader as yet, but I will be.

It was apparent that the school leaders juggled numerous priorities at different times. And so, in recognition of the challenges upon executive staff performing in a pedagogical capacity, the former Head of School had appointed a K-6 Learning Innovator in the Junior School, to support the subject coordinators and prioritise pedagogical reform from a primary perspective. However, in a recent staffing restructure Cathy’s role as K-6 Learning Innovator in the Junior School was made redundant. Cathy returned to full time class teaching when a teaching vacancy unexpectedly needed filling the week of her interview. She stated: “They’ve basically, in my mind, said that the teaching and learning aspect of what we’re doing is not important, because that was my role.” Cathy questioned the priority of pedagogical leadership in the Junior School. Although this teacher held no pedagogical leadership title she continued to invite others into her room to observe and trial new pedagogical approaches and participated in informal discussion promoting change. She hoped to infuse pedagogical change from within the teacher team, recognising the fragmented change.

Andrea explained how “observation triads” as an arrangement for observing peer teaching were in place, with highly structured feedback. The opportunity to give feedback had not yet been scheduled. Negativity about the triads was unanimous amongst all participants and their reports of other teachers. The Head of School concluded that teachers “don’t like to be observed” and that it’s “not going away” but also that “they don’t know why they are doing it” or perhaps whether it is teachers or children being observed, but they had been told “it’s not about planning a great lesson”. These confusing statements provided insight into how conflicting pedagogical leadership may be constraining practices. There was tension between subject coordinators and their principal, or lack of communication and support within the K-12 structure. Elizabeth explained the problem:

I think the time between the feedback and the actual observation is too delayed. I went and saw four different classes last term I have not fed back on. So it’s interesting and I make notes, but I almost make notes on what I want to see as opposed to the questioning.
Teachers wanted the opportunity to say what they thought and share pedagogical approaches with others, but not using the formal structures that they have been given where the feedback was too delayed. The observation schedule had been over managed.

Andrea remarked that the executive did “learning walks” to informally observe classroom practice. Learning walks were times that senior management staff and Heads of Department would walk around and between classrooms to view classroom practice to assess the implementation of pedagogy in practice in the school. It was found that learning outcomes were not being displayed on the board at that front of the classroom. This is a practice teachers were expected to adhere to.

At Greenville, conflicts in pedagogical leadership practices appeared to be frustrating to teachers. The curriculum had not been conceptualised as a holistic tool for teaching writing: functional grammar and the teaching of genre or text writing were being separated, which does not reflect the pedagogical approaches required in the NSW syllabus. Renee talked about how pedagogical leadership was in “freak out mode” with accreditation, and “had been told” that all documentation was to be “perfect”: evidence of practice without room for error. Mistakes were discouraged. Pedagogical leadership continued to masquerade as compliance.

The pedagogical leadership structure of the school was in a state of constant flux with disagreement about who should be leading pedagogy. Andrea decided: “I’m removing curriculum coordinators and giving that responsibility to year coordinators to reduce a layer of complexity and coordination” (Head of School, Greenville). Andrea was attempting to apply a secondary model of pedagogical leadership to a primary school without understanding how primary school teachers understand curriculum. In Primary schools all teachers are expected to have strong syllabus knowledge for each key learning area and expertise in this syllabus outcome knowledge for their particular year group. There is a tendency to structure a primary school one of two ways: either with grade or year coordinators who divide the syllabus knowledge amongst their year group, or with subject coordinators who become syllabus expert consultants to oversee each year group. The advantage of the year group model is that
the work is divided amongst the year group and they become experts in that age group. The distinct disadvantage is that the NSW NESA syllabus is written in key stages, making year groups redundant from a curriculum perspective. The advantage of a subject coordinator is that they gain a progressive picture of the development of their subject and the syllabus across the school. Without a subject coordinator each year group is required to map the progression, which can cause conflicts of interest over topics and activities and lack of ownership. The disadvantage is that they only teach in a particular key stage, so it is more practically difficult for them to observe certain outcomes in practice. Andrea prioritised a year structure over a subject coordinator structure in order to give more ownership of the syllabus to year coordinators, thereby simplifying management structures that do not match the NSW curriculum stage model. This structure also conflicted with those who understood the need for deep understanding of curriculum and pedagogy in the Junior School that may only be gained from subject specialists, as the Deputy Head’s structure suggested.

**Distributed Leadership**

It was apparent that opportunities for distributed leadership in pedagogy were being diminished while opportunities to lead administration in this large Junior School were growing. Andrea shared:

*There’s myself and [the Deputy] and we form the main leadership team. And then we have our Year Coordinators and they are responsible for their year group… As well as that we have Curriculum Coordinators for each of the KLAs [Key Learning Areas].*

Andrea thought that dense middle management did not work particularly well and sought to change the leadership structure. The Head of School talked about how difficult it is for year groups to be accountable for pedagogy and curriculum and “for those teachers to be accountable for their own areas of leadership.” The most effective way the Head of School could improve communication and accountability was to diminish distributed leadership:

*I am flattening the structure out… I am reducing the positions of added responsibility. I really need a small team of key drivers who will help me drive...*
change within the Junior School and at the moment I have too many… We will start next year with fewer voices, clear accountability, expectations and a clear goal for the year and I think we will be successful if we do that.

Subject Coordinators would no longer hold positions of responsibility, except in numeracy and literacy, reducing the middle leadership team. Therefore, it seemed pedagogical leadership was not being distributed amongst all teachers, due to a perceived lack of trust from Andrea who did not want to hear from all the teachers, but a small select few.

Lisa described the top-down leadership structures in place: “It’s very directed from the top and not much comes up the other way and I think that’s a shame” (Deputy Head). Lisa did not share the hierarchical vision of leadership of the Head of School which caused tension in their relationship, calling Andrea a “fluffy spokesperson” who when you “ask questions in meetings doesn’t know the answers” and a “speed hump”, meaning someone who slows down teachers who seek to make pedagogical change. Lisa’s vision for pedagogical leadership was more distributed where Curriculum Coordinators are pedagogical leaders who drive the pedagogical approaches. She recognised that this “ideal” middle leadership structure was not occurring at Greenville and at the time she was unaware of the change about to take place to leadership in the opposite direction. The size of the staff body made dissemination, understanding and consensus in any project a potential hurdle.

Delegation and distribution of responsibilities was part of the pedagogical leadership structure. Cathy explained: “You know it has got to be distributed, especially when you’re relying on 20 class teachers to be delivering [the new curriculum]… A lot of delegation goes on. And I think that occurs because of that not knowing what the answer is. I’ll pass it off to somebody else.” The Head of School at Greenville appropriately delegated the leadership of the implementation of the NSW English syllabus to the English Coordinator. The English Coordinator described the positive distributed leadership experience she had with the Head of School:

Once [the Head of School] realised that she has staff members in her leadership team that can actually deliver for her, once she has talked it through and stepped it out and she is still in the driving seat that way.
The English Coordinator had autonomy once trust was formed with the Head of School. Elizabeth subsequently created her own hierarchy in the implementation team at a “lower level” to the team she is working with to implement the curriculum, suggesting an acceptance of hierarchy. Lisa was concerned that the implementation of the NSW English syllabus had not been properly distributed amongst the teachers from the leadership of the English Coordinator during staff meetings:

*It’s not distributed. There is an English committee… I think the person leading it is easily threatened so it is not collaboration. They’ve got this – this is how we are going to do it and that’s how they cope with it.*

The Deputy Head recognised the enormity of the curriculum change, but also expressed concern that the hard work of the English Coordinator has not resulted in deep learning from teachers despite the meeting time spent on disseminating and understanding the new syllabus outcomes.

Renee suggested that management appeared not to listen to teachers or value their ability to trial pedagogical approaches:

*I feel that we are free to teach how it works for our [students] and how it works for us… but then for a class teacher to try and make bigger change to perhaps help the students – there may be less avenues for it just because of the leadership structure… I don’t think we’ve got the culture yet of that didn’t work – here’s what we want to do – try this – can we?*

Even when teachers knew something might not work, they struggled to speak up in meetings. Hierarchical thinking was evident in comments from numerous participants. Renee shared:

*Subject coordinators have never had a voice. We don’t have those staff conversations. I just don’t feel that they are perhaps on the same standing as the subject coordinators for core subjects.*

Not all teachers were happy about change being: “a top-down sort of model. It’s very directed from the top and not much comes up the other way and I think that’s a shame” (Deputy Head). Renee also commented that it was “top-down for making changes.” Elizabeth was not completely comfortable with the hierarchy: “I don’t want to be pushing my agenda or thoughts: it needs to be collective.” These statements suggest that the staff seemed aware of the problems and issues with
distributed leadership at Greenville. Their solution was to discuss matters of pedagogy amongst themselves.

**Relational Leadership**

A variety of interviewees shared their insights and difficulties as relational and pedagogical leaders. Relationships were an essential element of leading change as Cathy explained:

> I learned some hard lessons in terms of how to manage people here, and if you wanted them to do something there is a particular way of going about that… I’m probably lucky in that I have forged a lot of friendships, so people are less reluctant to say no because they think, oh we can’t let her down.

Trust and autonomy in leadership fostered with genuine relationships fostered success for this learning leader.

Annual changes to the leadership structure of the Junior School led to teachers feeling that they needed to “assert themselves with the new management structure” (Elizabeth) in order to be known as pedagogical leaders. Conflicts were intentionally diminished in an attempt to diffuse disagreement during constant leadership change. The Deputy Head was disciplined for disagreeing publicly with the English Coordinator during the meeting because it was seen as undermining. “[Disagreement is] not allowed” (Deputy Head). The consequence was resentment building. Relational leadership skills were required in order to effect positive pedagogical change that solves problems by inviting conflicts to be resolved and genuine learning to take place, which happens with trust. Instead meetings are “formal, contrived with no trust” (Deputy Head) and “morale is impacted by lack of efficiency and clear directions in meetings” (Renee) demonstrating that relational leadership in formal setting was equally as important to informal settings. Others looked to the Senior School for relational pedagogical leadership: “I have forged good relationships with the Director of Teaching and Learning in the Senior School” (Cathy). The principal was working toward building positive relationships with parents, students and teachers but this would take time and trust.
Trust between some teachers grew using informal communication as they worked together to find out what was happened in meetings. Cathy explained:

*I’m lucky, because [X] and I are quite close, so we talk a lot. In the Friday meeting she will tell me, so we will go and have chats and she will say, was this one discussed at yours? And I will say no.*

Teachers wanted to trust the new principal, but they needed time. Renee shared:

*If we could justify why we wanted to do it differently I’m pretty sure she’d support us, but because we have had a lot of change of leadership, I think people will revert to what they know as safe. I just don’t think we’ve had enough time to know and to build that trust.*

Renee was also longing for a pedagogical leader who will mentor her. “*I would love a mentor. I would love someone who, that I trust*” (Renee). Teachers did not necessarily trust each other and Renee explained how the observation process felt artificial:

*There’s we’ve got these triads in place where you go and observe other people which I think is great in theory, and I do enjoy going in and seeing other people teach, and I will have it planned, but I have worked in schools where you can say to someone, oh no my kids are just not getting division. Do you mind if I pop in on your lesson? Sure!*

Cathy had been demoted as part of a change to the whole management structure in the Junior school which caused a loss of trust:

*A couple of people in the high school have said, what the hell is going on down there? And I have said, don’t even go there. Yeah I don’t have that innovator role anymore. They decided that that wasn’t working, and so I think that was what I was told, but [The Director of Teaching and Learning in the Senior School] didn’t have any input into that… So that sort of went kaput last term. I went from cruising along thinking that I was good to being pulled into the office being told I don’t think that this is working. I was supposed to be the [Director of Teaching and Learning] down here.*
Teacher Professional Learning

Renee was seeking to conduct staff led professional learning based on the needs of teachers in the Junior School and there was minimal time. Renee felt that there was also minimal trust or collegial decisions:

[The Head of School] doesn’t attend leadership professional development and that’s actually a forum where we feel more able to discuss things because we’ll discuss things in our coordinators meeting but there’s still a decision made by [The Head of School] and I’ll walk away and think ok ah we discussed it, but [Andrea] did what she wanted to do anyway.

There were formal structures at Greenville for communicating about curriculum and pedagogy through weekly grade meetings, coordinator meetings and whole staff. As Cathy stated:

The school is definitely trying to work on a sort of combined pedagogy, I think. For the Junior School in terms of sharing those ideas I think just more collaborative planning I think is useful.

More opportunities to plan specific curriculum would benefit teachers in the Junior School if more agency were given to teachers. Lisa concurred, that there was:

No formal opportunity to share good practice. Staff meetings and professional learning is all about: ‘I’ve got the knowledge and this is how you are going to do it’.

Teachers were rarely asked to present learning from their own classroom or experiences, or if they were it was less celebrated than the academic experts, but both Cathy and Lisa shared that they wanted opportunities to create their own professional learning opportunities at Greenville. Formal communication processes reflected the hierarchies in place within the Junior School. Elizabeth suggested that hierarchies might be a function of the size of the school and the structures required. Andrea recognised that the school needed to focus less on organisational matters and more on pedagogy: “Curriculum is both student outcomes and a values approach. We should be more visionary, not just the day to day business. We’re leaders of learning.”

Andrea recognised that amongst some teachers there was positive sharing:
There is always a sense of sharing - collaboration. The doors are always open between their classrooms and they are always popping from one to the other.

When Lisa was asked if teachers participated in informal conversation about curriculum she said: “I’m sure they do because that’s just the nature of teachers”, and yet they were shut down in staff meetings. Formal and informal communication practices enabled pedagogical change to occur with varying degrees of effectiveness. It was apparent that pedagogy and student learning outcomes mirrored the leadership practices of the school.

The Head of School described the fear staff had of losing their jobs, which connected with their need to comply in professional learning:

So I think because I’m new and they have had three heads in quick succession there is a sense of fear, some people said to me, ‘well I won’t say anything because then I might get sacked’ – what?!

However, there was a tendency for staff turnover with the recent changes to leadership, syllabus change and pedagogical change. Elizabeth described the reaction to the change: “I think there are a few people that are thinking ‘I should retire’ – a few people are thinking ‘I don’t know whether I want to do this… too much of a change’”.

Teachers revealed the tension and mistrust amongst themselves. Cathy shared:

Last year the Head thought I walked on water, and people noticed that very quickly. So I started to be called ‘golden girl’ but then, it sort of eased up a bit, because people could see: she does actually know what she’s talking about. To start off with, it was quite nasty from some of the people it was coming from and they would sort of say they’re joking, but I was thinking you are not joking. You’re jealous and threatened. And I was like whatever, and I learned not to care.

Despite the turmoil that had occurred this member of staff was focused on sharing pedagogy regardless of how she was perceived or whether or not she held an executive title.
Conclusion

This chapter has shown how the Greenville intended to have a clear whole school strategic direction as its teaching and learning culture. A culture of pedagogical and administrative compliance was apparent due to the pressures of NESA (BOSTES) registration and syllabus change was causing tension and suspicion. Some teachers embraced pedagogical change, where other teachers preferred traditional pedagogical approaches. A culture of transparency and accountability with learning walks and observation triads had the potential to open up possibilities for pedagogical dialogue and pedagogical change during a time of curriculum change, but suspicion of leadership due to constant leadership turnover, a lack of understanding of curriculum, registration requirements and limited professional learning opportunities were constraining pedagogical change at Greenville. Chapter 5 will explore these themes at Crownwood and Chapter 6 will compare and contrast the two schools alongside extant literature.
CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS: CROWNWOOD

PRACTICES THAT INFLUENCE PEDAGOGICAL CHANGE

Introduction

This chapter presents the cultural and pedagogical leadership practices observed at ‘Crownwood’. The chapter is structured using the same themes and headings as Chapter 4 in accordance with the key themes that emerged from both schools during data coding and categorising. The diagram (Figure 4.1) in Chapter 4 illustrates the ways in which practices that influence pedagogical change outlined the structure of both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. The table below names participants from Crownwood and their pseudonyms for easy reference:

Table 5.1: Participants and their pseudonyms and titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crownwood</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Learning</td>
<td>Vicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Coach Key Stage One</td>
<td>Alison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Coach Key Stage Two</td>
<td>Jane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants

Interview participants at Crownwood included the Head of School, Director of Learning, Pedagogical Coach (Stage) One, Pedagogical Coach (Stage) Two and Class Teacher. The NSW syllabus works in stages rather than year groups. In NSW Stage One and Early Stage One is K-2, and Stage Two is Year 3-4. Stage Three is Year 5-6. The Head of School, David, was in his first year as principal. The Director of Learning, Vicki, had been appointed two years prior to lead the implementation of the International Baccaelaureate Primary Years Programme (PYP), which was new to Crownwood. Crownwood was responsible for accreditation in both curriculum spheres as a NSW IB PYP school. The PYP transdisciplinary curriculum focuses on the development of the whole child as an inquirer in order to develop active, caring, life-long learners with skills, attitudes, action and ownership of learning. She came to Crownwood with international school experience. The Pedagogical Coaches, Alison and Jane, were both promoted into these roles just prior to their interviews as a result of the staff inquiry work they had done on the English curriculum. Alison had been at the school for a long time and Jane was a newly appointed member of staff and an experienced teacher. The class teacher, Andrew, had been at the school for ten years and Crownwood was the second school in which he had worked. Pedagogical Coaches were newly assigned middle leadership roles for classroom teachers to coach and support others to try new transformative pedagogical approaches relevant to their key stage based on the inquiry learning of the PYP syllabus.

School Learning Culture

Participants described Crownwood as “steeped in tradition and a little bit too steeped” (David) and “parochial” with a “cultural memory of [100] odd years” (Vicki). Tradition was “honoured” (Jane) through “uniform” and “history.” (Alison). Such “huge” (Vicki) cultural memory resulted in teachers being “institutionalised” (David, Vicki and Jane) where one teacher joked of the school colours, “if you cut them they would bleed” (Jane). Although participants spoke fondly about the traditions of the school the participants interviewed agreed that institutionalised
thinking was a barrier to change. In contrast, Crownwood was also described as a “busy”, “fantastic”, “Christian” and “multicultural” place where “with a new head comes new ideas and new excitement” (Alison). The character of students is emphasised alongside academic achievement, connecting the school’s traditional roots with contemporary notions of education of the whole child. They were “trying to be a forward thinking school” (Andrew) pedagogically and in their leadership structure. The expected pedagogical practice was inquiry learning, based on student questioning and structured research, which forms the basis of the PYP. However, many teachers were using more traditional teaching approaches in their classrooms, despite this pedagogical shift. These short quotes from participants start to highlight the challenges of change in a traditional school.

At Crownwood the Head of School, David, saw himself as shaping school culture, “setting up a climate for sharing good practice [where] the full potential is not yet realised” where his vision was to create a professional learning community. Two class teachers, Alison and Jane, shared the leadership of the staff inquiry group into the English curriculum. Their purpose was to “step up” as classroom based curriculum leaders and enable new, creative practice in the English curriculum that incorporated the NESA curriculum and the Primary Years Program (PYP) International Baccalaureate (IB) program. The school executive selected and trusted these newly appointed teacher leaders. Members of the executive team reported that the majority of teachers were ready for curriculum and pedagogical change. Andrew felt supported pedagogically by “willing”, “innovative” and “genuine” leadership during both formal meetings and informal conversation. However, interviews also revealed that the leadership team perceived some teachers as obstructive “pockets of resistance” to pedagogical change.

The Head of School and middle leaders described attempts from their perspective to seek to support resistance by exposing their “myths” (David) about “academic rigour” (Vicki) and “falling standards” (Jane).

A lot of people don’t see the rigour in what we do because it’s different to the way we were taught or the way they’re used to teaching. Good assessment is the key because you have to know, so here it’s easy because you know what
your outcome is, so and I guess that the outcome, the nitty gritty of the content of it, your outcome is really where you are aiming for (Vicki).

Jane explained: “I think what they are forgetting is that we actually need a blend of everything.” The Head of School sought to “take them out of their comfort zones and it might actually come to the point where a couple of those people start to feel this is actually not feeling comfortable with who I am as an educator. I would hate to lose them, but I suppose that’s part of what happens in school too you know despite their suspicions.” As Alison explained:

There are some teachers in the school who still have very old-fashioned practice in their classroom. Some like to teach their children and talk to their children and their children will work. I think that’s really sad. You can’t just sit and teach in, like, an old fashioned teacher anymore. Those days are gone. So they’ve got to move with the times. So I think it’s got people’s thinking happening. I think people are a little bit keen to research more current trends, which is good.

They described how teachers felt constrained by the “shock value” (Alison) of the new curriculum with the NSW English syllabus substantially changing the practices of English teaching through new outcomes, a new genre writing approach, functional grammar and multimodal literacies and communicative texts in addition to books.

At Crownwood, staff inquiry groups were established for teacher professional learning using Sagor’s (2005) action research approach. The intention was for teachers to implement new curriculum while focussing and connecting particular aspects of their professional learning with inquiry pedagogy based on the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme (PYP) employed at the school. I observed how the new curriculum created tensions between teachers during staff inquiry group meetings as they grappled with curriculum change in a context of pedagogical and cultural change. Jane shared that there was “resistance” initially to the idea of staff inquiry groups because “people just needed a break” from curriculum change work with so much change occurring with the implementation of new syllabus documents across all KLAs. When inquiry commenced Alison explained that teachers felt “the thought of the extra work was not appealing to them”, particularly when “not one person in the group” had done the meeting preparation work. Alison sent an
email to the group stating: “we’re happy to guide you but the ownership is yours” and when people started to “engage in some research it set the ball rolling”.

David described the school learning culture:

*It’s an evolving school… Coming back as a Head I feel that there have been some things where we have moved on. We’ve actually got a really good understanding of what inquiry pedagogy is like, but I do feel that there are still some very traditional approaches to teaching and learning.*

The traditional approaches David was referring to included transactional “chalk and talk” teaching. David’s previous experience enabled him to understand and contextualise the school and its emphasis on transformational, inquiry pedagogy with an internal and external perspective of the Crownwood school culture having left and returned as Head of School in order to lead pedagogical change.

The school learning culture at Crownwood reflects its International Baccalaureate (IB) transformational inquiry pedagogy. Having received IB accreditation the previous year, David reported that inquiry learning was promoting a change in the students in some classrooms. In preparation for his new role, the Head of School identified areas of inquiry pedagogy and other areas in conflict with inquiry PYP practice from the IB accreditation report, received following their recent accreditation. Through the use of staff inquiry groups David sought to develop a professional learning culture of inquiry amongst teachers, so that they could directly experience the inquiry learning practices of their students, have reflection time and thereby aim to model an inquiry learning culture in their classrooms.

The Director of Learning, Vicki, played a pivotal role in the promotion of pedagogical culture in the school with her international school background. She was appointed to implement PYP at Crownwood:

*The reason why I came is because it’s a PYP school... I love working here because it so different to an international school. The challenge is a lot of people are Australian and have only had Australian experience so bringing the world to them is very different. And not just that: People have worked here for years.*
Vicki’s role as Director of Learning was to support all teachers in their professional learning and understanding of the PYP by facilitating weekly meetings with teachers to encourage dialogue about curriculum planning, student outcomes and pedagogy. Her role was also to support the Pedagogical Coaches, who would further enable the distributed pedagogical leadership she felt necessary to achieve the PYP objectives.

The purpose of Alison and Jane’s role as Pedagogical Coaches was to remain in the classroom and receive release time to support teachers with inquiry-based practice connected with curriculum in each Stage. Structuring pedagogical leadership in Stages matches the structure of the curriculum in NSW. Alison’s enthusiasm and excitement about the “fantastic” changes to pedagogy through curriculum infused her interview. A school culture of pedagogical dialogue was growing. Jane explained, “[What] struck me the most is how much [pedagogical] dialogue went on” between teachers in comparison to her former school.

**Pedagogical Change**

Teachers and leaders at Crownwood were asked to describe pedagogy. Andrew’s quotation describes the transformative pedagogy that the PYP embraces: “Pedagogy is teaching approaches: the way you teach. What we’re really aiming for here is inquiry-based learning.” Alison connected the idea of co-created pedagogies and the role of teacher and student in mutual inquiry: “Pedagogy is how a teacher teaches and how a child learns… [At Crownwood] everyone influences pedagogy.” Jane referred to pedagogy as a form of transformative practice:

*I think pedagogy is what we understand about teaching practice so it’s all the kind of hidden and overt ideas about what happens in a classroom: how children learn and how we should teach. I think the main umbrella term we would use here is inquiry learning – that’s our pedagogical practice.*

Vicki approached pedagogy in terms of outcomes and meaningful inquiry:

*[Pedagogy is] all about knowing the end. And teachers don’t know that, because teachers don’t think like that. They think of activities. What can I do that I did last year?*
David saw that the abstract nature of “pedagogy” as a principle was still causing confusion amongst teachers:

*Pedagogy: It’s exactly what we are and if people have difficulty spelling it or saying it or whatever - I think it encapsulates what we are wanting to say… We’ve actually got a really good understanding of what inquiry pedagogy is… but I do feel that there are still some very traditional approaches to teaching and learning [here].*

David described pedagogy as practice. Each of the interview participants connected pedagogy with inquiry. However, David is suggesting that not all teachers had made the connection between pedagogy and practice, or potentially transformative pedagogy. Inquiry was not simply another teaching technique, but rather a way of conceptualising the connection between learners, whether teachers or pupils. Vicki’s comment alluded to an understanding of outcomes-based inquiry “knowing the end”. Andrew saw his teaching role as inquiry-based and more than meeting syllabus outcomes. Alison and Jane saw their classroom-based leadership as pedagogical. The Head of K-6 used the term “pedagogy” freely in meetings and role titles. The staff inquiry group experience enabled Andrew to see a clear connection between inquiry pedagogy and the implementation of the English curriculum:

*This school has inquiry pedagogy that it then had to match to this curriculum… so therefore the pedagogy sort of impacted the curriculum and the curriculum sort of impacted the pedagogy.*

The transdisciplinary approach that the PYP uses meant that transformative pedagogies would become the framework that syllabus documentation approached. Crownwood would need to establish how the NESA (BOSTES) outcomes would fit within the transdisciplinary themes. At Crownwood using action research through staff inquiry groups as a platform for understanding the English Curriculum gave teacher researchers a practical experience of inquiry pedagogy. Teachers were invited to share examples from their classroom where they had trialled inquiry pedagogy with the new curriculum. Vicki described an initially reluctant teacher who had returned “confused” and “hostile” after taking long service leave half way through the implementation of staff inquiry groups. She shared a classroom lesson idea that was “amazing” and Vicki asked her to “write it up for an article” in the “PYP newsletter
because I just felt I needed to value what she was doing”. This motivated the teacher to continue to contribute more to the group.

The necessary adoption of the PYP pedagogy in order to fulfil IB requirements altered the thinking of teachers that were interviewed, but the principal reported that there were still traditional teaching practices such as the prolific use of direct instruction and the overuse of textbooks and worksheets, identified as “academic rigour” by some teachers, standing in direct contradiction to the idea of inquiry learning and transformative pedagogy. This was the reason the principal set up the inquiry groups. Inquiry was the most significant pedagogical change brought about by the PYP. A small group of teachers were rethinking their lesson formats and structures to become more inquiry-based. Some teachers who had taught at Crownwood for several decades were immune to changes occurring in education around them. Jane elaborated on their specific protection of pedagogy:

I have found that there are a couple of shields that people are standing behind. One of them is the cry that we are ‘academic rigour’ and we are losing our academic rigour with our focus being on inquiry and PYP… Rows, independent work, practice, practice, practice, I teach – you practice - that’s academic rigour.

Alison explained the problem:

In our first PC meeting we were discussing what are we going to do with those people… who aren’t going to shift their thinking… or think about the classroom practice that they have and how it’s impacting their students. And I think what it comes down to, is that people either have to go with change or leave, but if they leave I think they are going to find it very hard to find a school that’s not going in this direction.

Some teachers had shifted their pedagogy in accordance with inquiry learning for PYP. Andrew explained how his own pedagogical approach had changed:

I guess my role is to lead [the students] in the right direction, not say this is what we have to learn and this is how we’re going to learn it…. That’s a change from when I started teaching ten years ago.

Inquiry approaches have changed the nature of teaching and learning bringing a need for teacher professional learning.
At Crownwood it appeared that connecting teaching and student learning still needed further development. Alison understood how teachers’ pedagogical approaches reflected their talents, identity and experiences and that quality pedagogy meets the potential and personal needs of the students. She described the diversity of pedagogy at Crownwood:

*Everyone’s got a different pedagogical approach I think. I don’t think any teacher is going to have the same work practice. They are all going to draw on their strengths and… a good pedagogical teacher or leader is someone who will really examine best practice within their classroom, because you have got to look at your [students].*

Alison explained how pedagogy is nuanced. An intuitive teacher will choose the approach that best suits the learning needs of their students. This may look different in two classrooms due to the needs of the students and the skills of the teacher and their mutual interests.

Pedagogical Coaches were realising this complexity as they conceptualised their new coaching role. The complexity of teacher professional learning and experimenting with and developing new pedagogical approaches in teachers was explained well by Vicki:

*[Pedagogy is] learning and knowing about how to teach and how to get the best out of who you have got in your class which changes every year which is why you cannot go back to the old, ‘this is what I did last year’ because it might not work… So for me it is about… how it looks when you walk into a classroom… and how you are actually going to get those students learning.*

The pedagogical leaders described their appointment to their new roles as Pedagogical Coaches to encourage teachers to make the connections between curriculum and pedagogy in their planning and in the classroom supported by Vicki, the Director of Learning. They envisaged that their role was to make a difference to classroom practice.
Curriculum Implementation and Reform

It was apparent that Crownwood’s drive for Pedagogical change was driven by Australian curriculum change as well as the introduction of the PYP. The Head of School, David, explained: “It’s about where education is going and it’s what our government is going to be asking of us.” Vicki reported: “It’s not just [our] school changing. It’s education as a whole. The Australian Curriculum has changed” (Director of Learning). Vicki also acknowledged that a philosophy of curriculum and her role as Director of Learning is wider than a NSW syllabus change: “People think it’s about the subjects, but the curriculum, it’s the whole thing: staffroom, playground, even in the way we deal with each other and the conversations we have” (Director of Learning). Vicki’s pedagogy connected with transformative pedagogy.

Vicki explained that Crownwood’s implementation of the NSW BOSTES requirements was initially considered separately: “Now, when we first set out we said right we’ll do English next year and then we’ll do the Maths and then we’ll do the Science.” However, when the leaders realised how the transdisciplinary skills in PYP would impact upon syllabus change the approach changed. Alison pointed out how the change occurred as a result of transdisciplinary thinking.

What we learned straight away was we cannot just be implementing English. We have got be implementing English and Science and Maths and History to understand…In order to come up with your transdisciplinary theme we had to know what was the Science curriculum saying we had to implement? What was History saying? Then of course Geography…we realised we needed to log into ACARA and see what Geography was looking like and then of course where does Maths fit into all of this because it has to be an integrated approach. That’s what other PYP schools were doing.

Transdisciplinary skills in the PYP are categorised as thinking, social, communication, self-management and research skills. These approaches to learning connected with literacy skills throughout an entire primary PYP school curriculum. Jane reflected: “We started with the writing section and then realised if we were going to overlay the curriculum with PYP we needed to go back to the curriculum concepts” (Pedagogical Coach Stage Two). They realised writing was going to
involve skills in thinking, communication, social skills, self-management and research in the classroom. Connecting the NSW English syllabus with the PYP enabled the leaders to give a closer examination of inquiry-based approaches derived from transdisciplinary thinking, which enabled PYP teachers to integrate curriculum with pedagogy.

At Crownwood new syllabus implementation was teacher led. The principal invited all teachers to apply to lead staff inquiry groups, and one group designed the implementation of the English Curriculum, working out how it would be programmed with the PYP and with other subjects and would provide opportunities for involvement from all teachers. Two teachers realised a mutual interest and co-led the group. David suggested that they make a realistic start by researching reading. Alison recalled: “It started with looking at just one component of the English syllabus” to develop a scope and sequence (Pedagogical Coach One). As Alison stated, as soon as they started connecting PYP with the NSW English syllabus the staff inquiry group leaders realised that to implement transdisciplinary skills from the PYP alongside the English curriculum they would have to reconceptualise not just reading, but the whole curriculum from an integrated perspective. At Crownwood the English syllabus implementation process was not as simple as breaking up content “into the sub-strands… because everything is very interwoven and integrated and because we’re a PYP school everything needed to come underneath a transdisciplinary theme” (Alison).

The process of working out how the transdisciplinary themes from the PYP connected with the English syllabus involved Crownwood teachers co-creating curriculum knowledge in the staff inquiry groups. This resulted in teacher professional learning as David explained below. Curriculum change was further brought to life for teachers as they individually and collectively thought about practical ways that they could implement the new syllabus using PYP principles in their classrooms. David explained:

In this staff inquiry group you are empowering people to think about their pedagogical approach and then that is driving the way that the curriculum can be implemented versus, ‘let’s just dump this in the English part of the
timetable’… taking this ‘SIG’ [Staff Inquiry Group] approach has completely revolutionised the way that you would make that change.

Two teachers shared practical ideas for syllabus implementation in the classroom, giving one Pedagogical Coach “goose pimples” from the excitement of this learning opportunity (Alison). This process of staff professional learning connecting PYP pedagogy with the syllabus aimed to enable gradual classroom change over the year.

It appeared that using an inquiry process to implement curriculum change was not conflict free. Alison stated: “It [was] shock value to start with. We had to go back and really think through why are we doing it this way?” She explained, teachers were used to the English syllabus fitting neatly into its timetabled slot without considering how literacy connected with the transdisciplinary themes and that perhaps teachers were comfortable with the previous familiar NSW English syllabus that had been in place for two decades.

At Crownwood coping with curriculum and pedagogical change concurrently was unsettling for teachers. Vicki attributed this to the minimal change in this traditional school setting for so long: “As much as they think that they may cope with change, they don’t”. David understood that change can be an awkward process, but also a part of learning: “We are still in the uncomfortable phase because there is still so much work that needs to be done… I need to take people out of their comfort zones.” Other teachers who were “reluctant” to embrace inquiry were frustrating for the new pedagogical leaders. Jane summarised the message echoed in each staff meeting: “We are going to change, change, change.” Jane was critical of teachers who did not fully embrace inquiry pedagogy: “Inquiry was seen by some as a flighty bit on the side.” Vicki perceived her role as supporting teachers to “embrace the change.” Her intention was to “make everything more transdisciplinary” by incorporating specialist teaching into inquiry topics and opening up the timetable. Crownwood was attempting to support teachers with pedagogical change. Teachers also had a role in trialling, challenging, refusing or accepting pedagogical change based upon their own curriculum ideologies and knowledge of research and practice.
**Strategies for Student Learning Outcomes**

Differentiation was an important aspect of transformative pedagogy at Crownwood as Vicki explained:

“We want our students to reach every outcome that we put in place from the curriculum, or from IB... Even go beyond that. Some students are just not going to get there. And that’s when we’ve got to differentiate... Make those outcomes a little bit more visible for the students so I actually like the words ‘learning intentions.’

Jane recognised how outcomes help “kids really engage with their learning. If they’re not deeply engaged then I don’t think we’re getting the outcomes.” At Crownwood NSW syllabus outcomes were connected to PYP learning intentions, to meet the broader needs of students beyond the NSW syllabus and provide necessary accountability and evidence. Personalised learning and inquiry afforded differentiated outcomes. Andrew explained: “We’re not doing something the one way for everyone.” Vicki connected differentiation with student outcomes: “In talking about maximising student potential you’ve got to be talking about their own potential. So again coming back to that - not one yardstick.” However, assessment was an area requiring further work at Crownwood. Jane had noticed the lack of accountability for results at Crownwood: “Where are you accountable for your marks and to whom?” The Head K-6 reported that assessment and pedagogy were less well connected at Crownwood. A separate staff inquiry group was set up to address assessment in the school.

Participants at Crownwood were asked to define student learning outcomes and the extent to which they maximise student potential. This provided insight into whether teachers understood the difference between outcomes and potential in students and how these could be addressed in the school. The Head of School, David, explained his understanding of student outcomes with reference initially to the NSW Board of Studies outcomes:

*Ok, my understanding of student outcomes. Our focus is really on the NSW Board of Studies outcomes... Are we wanting to talk about the defined set of outcomes or are we talking about student outcomes as in a big umbrella*
statement about what are the outcomes for your students in terms of reaching their potential?

Educators were differentiating between two sets of outcomes: curriculum and syllabus outcomes and what they really intended student learning to be. David, the Head of School proceeded to describe his own philosophy of education and what he really meant by outcomes.

Well, I suppose we’ve got our outcomes that are sort of broader outcomes for us as a school about what we believe about kids and about the way we’re trying to empower their lives. And so if I start there I would probably say about them that the Board of Studies outcomes work inside the academic realm of what we hope for - for our students. And yes they provide a really good guide for us and we program according to it, but we also we need to align that with the IB outcome statements as well that are there. And so we are pretty aware of all those sorts of statement because we’re also answering to both so we’re aware in our paperwork and I think we’re aware generally in our practice. I think we can do some things better. I think we need to make those outcomes a little bit more visible for the students so I actually like the words ‘learning intentions’. I really feel that as a school we can do a better job.

David explained how you could intend an outcome in a lesson that does not necessarily eventuate, and yet his response suggested that he would have liked teachers to be even more specific in their setting of learning intentions:

So I really like it when teachers are very specific about what their learning intentions are and that will be something I am wanting to grow in the staff as well particularly for [students]. I think [students] respond so well when they understand the purpose for learning.

David explained how students need a directional approach to learning even within inquiry so that they know the purpose of their inquiry.

David talked further about the difference between academic outcomes and other ones.

So there’s that sort of alignment with the outcomes, they’re the academic ones, but I think they’re a whole range of other outcomes that operate within a school that’s about helping a whole child reach their potential because I think for our school it is really very much about broadening horizons here. I think
kids come to our school and there’s so many possibilities here. And yes we organise those possibilities for them through compulsion like our music program. You know its compulsory for Year Two that you are playing a musical instrument, but what incredible outcomes that we have kids that love music. We’ve got 70 % of our student body that learn a musical instrument.

The Head of School was keen to foster a school culture of participation and opportunity for students.

*We had two leading Australian artists who spent time with the kids. That for me is something that this school can offer that not a lot of other schools can offer. And it’s a big part of our ultimate outcomes for kids and that is to expose them to all sorts of opportunities and push them into things that might be a little uncomfortable that’s going to open some opportunities for them in the long run.*

David also talked about the restrictions that external agencies placed upon student learning outcomes in the form of standardised testing and how this influenced parental pressure and where accountability lay.

*We’ve got certain restrictions that we have to work within, within our school – given that you know you’ve got your NAPLAN, the kids do the ICAS test because these are all parental expectations as well. And I think for us as educators we need to make sure we have got the right tracking mechanisms that are happening within our school and that has been part of one of the groups – the SIG groups looking at assessment because assessment was one of the issues that was raised in the IB feedback, so that was raised that we needed to have a look at. I still think we have a fair bit of work to do there.*

The international background of the Director of Teaching and Learning shaped her views on student learning outcomes. She explained her view on the use of syllabus outcomes and how she felt student learning was constrained by the Australian syllabus outcomes:

*Coming from a school where you could actually use any curriculum, so we had the PYP as a framework, we actually made up our own outcomes, we decided we’d take a little bit of the UK, a little bit of this, so coming here I found it really restrictive because it was suddenly all about outcomes, so [in*
Austral] I think with student outcomes I immediately think of curriculum, as
in Board of Studies.
Outcomes to her were more “global and holistic” when they could be separated from
curriculum. Vicki objected to checklists. She explained:
I don’t think [teachers] would have been ticking off boxes [overseas]. It
would definitely have been more holistic and about the big ideas, rather than
the little bits and pieces, you know?
Vicki explained that when teachers got bogged down in ticking boxes they seem more
focussed on activity-based learning or skills than the scope of possibilities for what
students could do or achieve, beyond a finite skill, to extend them or differentiate.
Vicki explained a scenario at Crownwood where this occurred:
In one of the meetings that we had, we had to look at the Science curriculum
as well, which is how the English SIG just grew and grew. There was
something about heat and we just got stuck on heat [as a concept or outcome]
and I was [saying] just forget about heat! You know, you can do it. You can
do it in one lesson. Just get it done and tick that box. It’s not about that. It’s
about much bigger understanding of that. Don’t get bogged down in that.

New curriculum documentation invited conversation at Crownwood about assessment
procedures. The effective use of assessment tools was an important area for further
development with the implementation of new curriculum. David explained:
Assessment is one that we really haven’t tapped into and it’s something that I
feel strongly we need to is the whole diagnostic side of the assessment area. I
don’t feel that we are using our assessment tools as effectively as we should.
We do pretesting well. You know, we set up our learning well from a student-
centred point of view, but I don’t feel like sometimes then when we’ve got
some formative and summative assessment tasks that we are then analysing
what they are showing us to then mould the next bit of the learning you know?
We need to do that better.
Andrew, an experienced class teacher, reflected upon how outcomes related to his
class teaching connected with syllabus documents:
So, outcomes I guess – you know what the students are getting out of lessons
and what you are seeing them producing. So I guess for me I look at syllabus
documents. You know, just to refresh my memory on where we’re going and
what we’re trying to get to and hopefully - with good assessment you can keep track of whose reaching outcomes.

Andrew connected assessment, the syllabus and learning outcomes with his students and who may and who may not meet them seamlessly in his thinking.

A Pedagogical Coach reflected upon how the school maximised potential through differentiation. Alison shared:

*I think the school does maximise student potential. We are doing a lot of differentiated teaching now, and we’ve got a fantastic learning support program, which we are so fortunate to have.*

When Jane was asked about how the school maximised student potential through the use of student learning outcomes her response was “I don’t think we do it very well. It is one of the things that is being investigated.” The area that Jane thought that Crownwood was doing well is with “academic outcomes... because we have a reasonably intelligent student base. So our kids – we have a reasonably high student base although some teachers who have been here for a while don’t feel that. They go ten kilometres west they’ll realise that we actually have quite a good academic student base here.”

Formative assessment and assessment for learning practices were part of the inquiry approach used at Crownwood. These matched the NSW syllabus requirements for assessment for learning pedagogy that Andrew referred to as “good assessment.” Rather than thinking summatively, Andrew described how he used assessment in the classroom:

*I guess we see assessment as like its ongoing through the unit we are teaching. So you’re always checking, seeing how they are going in different tasks. So there is always that sort of constant seeing where the students are up to but we also like to do an end of unit test or reflections, so it might be like a maths test or for a unit inquiry it might be a reflection.*

The main area that Jane was seeking to address was the connection between student learning outcomes and assessment.

*I don’t think there is a lot of correlation between our teaching and our assessment and I think that is something that really needs to be addressed. So
for example, teachers will be running reading groups in Year One and they will have a completely different structure in Year Two. Different methods of assessing: different expectations. So a child could be on a level ten in Year One might go up to Year Two and the teacher will be thrilled to bits because they’ve sort of skipped up to level 14, buts it’s actually a difference in standards and assessment that’s put them up those levels rather than real student growth. Different teachers have a real focus on analysing numbers, so gathering as much data as they can and then working out patterns...

Jane explained how testing was still quite summative at Crownwood. Work samples were an area for further progression and this was being addressed through an alternative staff inquiry group.

It’s process based testing still and I think we haven’t got to open ended testing, we haven’t quite got to comparing work samples.

Jane was frustrated by the lack of focus on assessment at Crownwood and its impact upon teaching and learning for students. She explained:

I came from a fairly innovative school last year and parts of it annoyed me. I used to think, how do we actually assess whether a student can do a thing? A skills-based thing say in Maths or English? But here we do it completely the other way we go right to the pen and paper – black and white results. Lots of multiple choice reading. Lots of cloze testing. Lots of maths - testing is pen and paper - straight forward answers, often multiple choice so you know, well to me that’s kind of not in line with anyone’s teaching. For example in our NAPLAN grades – NAPLAN is a huge focus for probably eight weeks leading up to NAPLAN because we are compared to other schools on MySchools website we really need to keep our NAPLAN results up. That counts for enrolments at this school. So there’s a huge pressure on those year teachers to get NAPLAN results up which means that we are actually teaching to the test, which goes against every philosophical idea of the school. We do the same thing for ICAS.

Andrew shared how teachers at Crownwood communicated about assessment:

I guess with looking at assessment and the data to try and challenge students and support the students who are struggling so there is a learning support
team. Yeah, [they follow up on that data] so I mean its usually up to the teacher to identify issues and write a referral so after we do that we'll get some learning support and then to extend students who need that support there is a member of staff who again has a few withdrawal groups but also works in the classroom as well.

The support that teachers received for these students through learning support staff made them feel enabled to meet the learning outcomes for all students. This was in stark contrast to Jane’s comments as a recently appointed teacher at Crownwood:

*In my thinking assessment hasn’t really quite hit the mark and I don’t feel as if we have follow through. There’s a lot of handover of behaviour and a lot of handover of children’s learning needs and so on, but there’s not a lot of handover of children’s assessment data which means you know, when I start the year teaching I really have to dig through to find out where a student is at.*

Jane wished for more specific, connected data on student learning for handover and follow through each year, based on her previous experiences.

The way outcomes were perceived impacted the extent to which report writing was personalised at Crownwood and potentially in Australia. Vicki explained her frustration with impersonal outcomes that explain rank over personal best and summative assessment over formative goals being reached.

*So yeah, I mean here you have to map it against those outcomes and that was interesting, as well the reports because we didn’t have that sort of - we had the overall sort of stage sort of thing. You didn’t have the nitty gritty, so you were able to talk about how the student had improved. And you know we would talk about personal best and that sort of thing and you could actually do that and you could explain a lot more easily to parents that it is not about [rank].*

Vicki explained how personalised learning was connected with assessment that links with outcomes that are about the central idea and specific constructs.

*Yeah, good assessment is the key because you have to know, so here it’s easy because you know what your outcome is, so and I guess that the outcome, the nitty gritty of the content of it, your outcome is really where you are aiming for and that’s why I always say to the teachers when we are doing our PYP*
units, you know we are assessing this huge central idea, what is it in there that you want them to know about? You know, it’s not all the fluff and you’re not asking them to name plants. You’re actually talking about sustainability or whatever you might be and coming up with that concept that’s there. So I think it’s identifying that in order to maximise it, but also, and in talking about maximising student potential, you’ve got to be talking about their own potential. So again coming back to that - not one yardstick, but personalised learning.

The personalised learning that Vicki described came from more than one outcome and different outcomes, acknowledging how each student inquires in a different way, bringing with it the concept differentiation as a focus.

Differentiation is a huge focus for us as well. We’ve got another SIG that’s looking at that. And that will continue to be a focus I think forever.

The current problem was that differentiation did not match the types of assessment teachers at Crownwood were expected to do with inquiry learning. Vicki gave the example of NAPLAN restricting types of writing where students were assessed on the same thing:

NAPLAN. You know, so we’re going to give you the type of writing you’ve got to do and everybody’s going to be assessed on the same thing? That doesn’t work. That isn’t what we’re looking at so how do we look at the assessment?

Vicki proposed the solution to such narrow teaching based on outcomes was a different form of rigour than the teachers were proposing:

You’ve got to get good at assessing and differentiating your assessment and saying there are multiple ways in order to do this and knowing your students. At the end of the day you have got to know your students and you have got to be able to know, right, this child, not everybody can do this writing... it’s based on the student, it’s not based on the teachers – what I am teaching

Vicki struggled to have the teachers understand that the focus was not on them or what was being taught or a learning activity, but rather a focus on what was being learned or inquired.

Vicki describes how IB approaches summative assessment with inquiry. She noted the following:
It goes back to that whole thing of what is the student doing, and you know PYP they actually talked to [Howard] Gardner back in the day when they actually developed the program and there is room on the planner that says about the assessment – summative assessment - what are the possible ways? Not ‘way’. There is not one way. So, the child that cannot write four pages of masses of writing? Yes, he’s going to have to get to that point at some point but if he can verbally tell you, how’s it any different? He’s still understood the outcome. It doesn’t say you have to understand the outcome by writing about it. If it is a writing outcome fair enough, but if you are talking Science, if you understand sustainability and you can show me you can get up on the stage and show me, I’m happy. Well, whatever. So it is all about knowing the end. And teachers don’t know that, because teachers don’t think like that. They think of activities. What can I do that I did last year?

The Director of Learning was trying to help the teachers to understand that inquiry drives their curriculum writing and their outcomes, and not the other way around.

Jane explained that there was no one in the school responsible for encouraging consistency in assessment:

*This is the first school I have ever worked at where there is no consistency in the way we allocate grades… We just do it ourselves based on what we see in our class. Which means really that a student in my class is getting an A might be getting a C in someone else’s class. We don’t seem to compare our grades, our marks, our raw marks – we don’t compare them. We haven’t moderated them, which might mean that a test that was particularly hard for a very small strand is worth as much as a test that was very easy for a very big strand.*

Jane described the problem with specific focuses in school professional learning where other parts get ignored:

*And I think what happens is, you have these huge focuses. So for us at the moment its been all about implementing the new curriculum and making sure we have got our heads around it and implementing PYP has been a huge focus for the past five years and that has come at the cost of focussing on assessment [for example].*
Pedagogical Leadership

The new management structure at Crownwood prioritised pedagogical leadership. Pedagogical coaches in each key stage supported teaching and learning and replaced administrative grade coordinators on each year to support teaching and learning. It appeared that administrative grade coordinator roles seemed to be an irrelevant form of middle leadership when the curriculum emphasised key stages. David saw pedagogical leadership as an effective tool for transforming teacher inquiry pedagogy through distributed middle leadership so that PYP implementation might be “school wide”. He expressed his vision that he hoped would become collective with teachers and middle leaders: “we have invited people into more of a stakeholder position than we had before.” David reflected that a change in pedagogical leadership style from a new K-6 Head and the emphasis on a professional learning culture at Crownwood made some teachers “suspicious” of the “new agey” flat hierarchical structure in contrast with the former hierarchy of a traditional school.

David saw distributed leadership practices as integral to pedagogical leadership: “There have got to be some people steering the agenda a little bit. And I feel that’s my role, but I don’t see it just solely me. I do see it as the school executive.” Pedagogical leadership was distributed amongst the Director of Learning and the middle leaders in the classroom entitled “Pedagogical Coach”. Prior to the appointment of Pedagogical Coaches, The Head of K-6 intended to distribute pedagogical leadership amongst all teachers through staff inquiry groups in order to create a learning community fostering genuine pedagogical change. Distributed pedagogical leadership has created such a cultural shift in school culture at Crownwood that some teachers expressed concern that the leadership team were not actually leading them, because they had only experienced authoritative, administrative leadership, so they saw it as a sign of weakness. David described the response of some teachers: “Are you guys not going to lead us? No I think we’ve got experts within our community here. We’ll be participants and supporters…” (Head K-6). All teachers had the opportunity to volunteer, inquire and research autonomously. David: “feel[s] this has empowered some people incredibly” with staff inquiry groups as the vehicle… “I had no idea it would be as expansive as it has been which is a lovely
outcome.” Jane saw staff inquiry groups as “a great team partnership.” Staff inquiry groups enabled opportunities for teacher voice, reflection, research and practical application about inquiry pedagogy embedded within the core purpose of curriculum implementation. However, critiquing inquiry pedagogy in a PYP school was problematic as the recent PYP accreditation meant that inquiry pedagogy was the Crownwood philosophy. Teachers who did not embrace transformative pedagogies would be supported in exploring these approaches, and this is further explained below.

David’s intention as a pedagogical leader was to model inquiry learning with teachers so that they could understand their own students and connect inquiry with outcomes:

Learning is not the conveying of one person’s understanding to another, and that’s truly what I believe as a learner… I’m trying to model this with my colleagues… I am really placing them into a situation that the children are placed into… we are encouraging the children to inquire… daily and this is putting the teachers into that kind of experience… We’re seeing a better understanding for the kids about what is really important for their outcomes.

Vicki agreed that when leaders modelled dialogue and pedagogical thinking it was helpful to teachers: “I hope that the way that we deal with each other as an executive helps with the pedagogy of the rest of the school.” Vicki described her role as a side-by-side teacher of teachers where pedagogical change is driven by the needs of children and the individual needs of teachers. “The teachers are like our ‘students’ and we want to show them collaboration between us and we’re all learners.” Vicki saw the opportunity for teacher leadership and learning as similar to student learning and ownership: dynamic and involved: “Those who want to improve will have those conversations.” However, it is difficult to know from the interviews the extent to which the teachers at Crownwood felt like ‘students’ or ‘side-by-side’ colleagues and how this impacted upon their reactions to pedagogical change.

The leaders at Crownwood wanted the inquiry approach with the teachers to positively impact student learning and transform school culture. Some teachers at Crownwood were motivated by new opportunities for pedagogical leadership within
the teachers that came from the distributed approach in the staff inquiry groups. Alison stated:

*When the Pedagogical Coach role came up, I remember thinking I have just got to apply for that because I have had so much fun and I have got so much out of running a SIG group… I just want to keep going.*

Alison had been affirmed by mentoring others to use inquiry practice and she applied for a promotion following the staff inquiry group project on the implementation of the English curriculum. In contrast with Alison’s enthusiasm, Jane described the pedagogical challenges some teachers are facing in this traditional school in a time of rapid curriculum and leadership change:

*Some teachers* are finding it very challenging because the new leadership has come in and has just taken a broom to lots of accepted practices… And some people… are just too entrenched in a deep love for the traditions of this school that I suspect they don’t often question their own practice.

According to the pedagogical leaders, some teachers who have taught at Crownwood for many years have not embraced inquiry pedagogy despite the introduction of the PYP. Traditional modes of direct instruction provide them with the security of discipline, authority and structure in their classrooms. Alison explained their fears in an attempt to empathise and explain their perspective: “*They like that control in their class in a certain way and they don’t want to let go of their own pedagogical practice.*” In addition, Alison explained how “*people were exhausted*” as Crownwood had just gone through PYP authorisation and NESA registration and accreditation.

The interviewees shared their interpretations of the teachers’ reactions to the Pedagogical Coach role. Jane explained, “*People are lost with pedagogical leadership. It’s not about pastoral or administration or discipline.*” David decided

---
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that some teachers were confused about the meaning of pedagogy. “People are not understanding their role, because they do not understand what pedagogy is.” This lack of understanding and acceptance of the role impacted upon the ability of Pedagogical Coaches to support teachers in their professional practice and goal setting because they were not trusted. Alison stated: “They feel like we are coming to spy on them and we’re not.” A lack of acceptance for the Pedagogical Coach role, demonstrated in the title: “[David’s] Spies”, used by teachers at Crownwood and reported by each of the interviewees, displays how the emphasis for teachers is on their teaching practice being watched rather than student learning being observed. Alison explained:

I don’t want it to be people thinking I am there to judge them and you know I think that that’s probably been the hardest thing about this implementation of this project. It’s that some staff are very uncomfortable with the fact that there will be someone coming in. They feel that we are coming in to spy on them and we’re not.... And I don’t think that there has been that accountability.

The emphasis on administration and discipline in leadership was valued highly in the school culture and enabling pedagogical leadership was misunderstood and had not been experienced at Crownwood. Vicki used a metaphor to attempt to explain what makes a good spy, and attempts to make accountability heroic in support of the empire of education: “But not in a nasty spy thing, you know. In a good James Bond way [laugh].” James Bond, however, is only loyal to himself, ‘M’, and the Queen. There was tension and insecurity amongst teachers about the perceived role of distributed leadership in the school. Consequently, Pedagogical Coaches were being asked to “sort fights in the locker room”, “book excursions” and “write everyone’s programs now”. This was in part due to their frustration that schooling was about more than teaching and learning and also a misunderstanding of the Pedagogical Coach role. The teachers wanted Pedagogical Coaches to write their program for them, as they did not feel enabled as leaders of their own classroom pedagogy.

The autonomous professional learning culture only empowered teachers at Crownwood to a certain extent. When Andrew was asked about his own pedagogical leadership he puts up a classroom boundary: “I wouldn’t say teachers are leaders, but
I guess you know when you’re with your class you are certainly a leader.” He had recently modelled inquiry practice with the whole staff through a professional learning meeting after presenting inquiry ideas on the English Curriculum in his staff inquiry group. However, teacher observation by the executive was seen as more threatening to the teachers than supportive. Andrew explained:

We’re going to have teachers, or executive, or teachers in leadership coming in and watching us teach and seeing if we’re meeting certain goals that we have set… that will be a big cultural shift. In the past there hasn’t been a lot of executive coming.

At Crownwood the fear of observation was new. The perceived emphasis is not on observing student learning in the classroom, but on the “executive coming” checking that teachers are “meeting goals”. There was a mismatch between the way teachers were experiencing observation and the intentions of the leadership team.

It appeared leadership change moved slowly alongside tradition at Crownwood. The Head of School describes different phases in the changing of staff culture to a learning culture including “the great unveiling”, “the uncomfortable phase” and the time when teachers “come to terms with it” acknowledging how teacher reactions and practice became part of the process of pedagogical change. Vicki described how she saw the change in teaching practices during meetings from:

Ok tell us what you’ve got to do. What are your minutes and your agenda? Where as now, people say, we’d like to talk today about… And that’s been a big shift.

David was forming a clearly defined culture of inquiry pedagogy and everyone was invited to choose to embrace it. However, “a couple of those people start to feel this is actually not feeling comfortable with who I am as an educator.” If there is pedagogical dissonance then “those staff members are welcome to choose to leave”. Dialogue has been pivotal as “the conversations that have gone on since have unpacked the misunderstanding... I do feel that at the end of all of this that we will have a different culture within the school. And that is – was- probably one of my biggest goals.” The excitement and the tension caused by change were well described. However, the intention was to involve all staff in staff inquiry groups and give everyone the opportunity to research curriculum in practice in their PYP school.
Jane reflected on the negative reaction to the pedagogical leader role and suggests that perhaps this was influenced by the way it was presented to teachers, illustrating that communication practices influenced pedagogical change both positively and negatively:

Perhaps it’s also come from the way it was sold as well? Because it was explained at a staff meeting: this is our new leadership style. Our new focus for [the year] will be: first of all we are going to remove the role of grade coordinator, so there will not be a grade coordinator. That is going to be horizontally looked after, and next we are going to install a Pedagogical Coach.

The pedagogical leader role at Crownwood was presented as a comparison and a replacement for two grade coordinators to have one stage pedagogical leader. Part of the problem with the Pedagogical Coach role came from an original decision about its definition. The principal wanted to title “Coach”, so that teachers would see them as a side-by-side teacher, but the executive thought the title should state “Leader”. When disempowerment of the year coordinators in the change in structure caused some people to be “embittered” the role title was changed to “coach.” The perception through prior communication had already been set. However, the intention of the Head of School was to create a new mindset that leadership “is not about administration: it is now about teaching and learning”. Several teachers enjoyed the opportunity to have release for administrative responsibilities, and although they still had release time, they were still expected to spread administrative tasks across the year group in their own time. Further, the interest in leadership on teaching and learning meant that the practice of certain teachers would always be observed and potentially critiqued. The title of coach or leader was irrelevant. That person was now the spokesperson for the Head of School.

The Director of Learning gave two classroom teachers the opportunity to facilitate external professional development. Alison commented:

[We] got invited by [the] Director of Curriculum to a PYP private school group who get together every now and then on their curriculum issues - and
this one happened to be about the English syllabus… And she said you have to come because this is all part of your leadership and your learning.

These teachers were inspired to lead from this opportunity. The Head of School trusted in the capacity of teachers with the Staff Inquiry Group model to share his vision as described by Jane:

His vision is to develop leadership in all his staff. So he specifically instigated learning groups for us where we can take on leadership ourselves and try and exhibit maybe, I think maybe, how we see the school developing. He has given us room to try and shape our little corner of things, which has been really empowering.

Two teacher leaders of the staff inquiry group gave the pedagogical leadership opportunities to their team, building trust and providing opportunities for teachers to share classroom practice. Andrew explained:

I had a chat in our staff inquiry group, things I was doing with the new curriculum and the leaders of that group said, you’ve got to show the staff. So I said ok. I'll do that. I was encouraged to do it. We really need to do more of it.

Teachers like Andrew were enabled by pedagogical change in a culture of trust and encouragement.

Trust in pedagogical leadership can be damaged by ineffective communication. The Pedagogical Coaches admitted when the leadership of the implementation of the English syllabus was shared between them: “Yes and I don’t know that we sold it to them too well. It might have been a bit of a shock.” Syllabus implementation is compulsory, but in order to effect it rapidly the Pedagogical Coaches felt the need to promote it as a positive change. This learning experience helped Alison to realise how trust has the potential to create genuine learning beyond compliance, from complaint to excitement about change that seemed impossible.

Jane stated:

There was a line in the [Pedagogical Coach] role description that really disturbed a lot of people and it said basically that we would be answerable to executive… No, I don’t think we are spying at all.
The role description stated that Pedagogical Coaches would report to the principal any pedagogical issues not in line with current practice. She indicated that teachers had a fear of consequences and this possibly created mistrust during professional learning. David noted: “People are worried that this person is going to be coming in and checking on them and probably reporting back.” He explained that teachers feared Pedagogical Coaches entering their classroom. There was a lack of genuine collegiality felt by these teachers and confusion about the purpose of classroom observations. Previously teachers had had complete autonomy in their classrooms and this change was being met with a feeling of loss of control.

David’s comment suggested that mistrust is connected with a perceived loss of power:

I think a few people that have lost the leadership of the Year Coordinator, that’s where they’re not dealing with it, because they feel like, oh that’s been taken away, and somebody’s been given power, you know, over two year levels instead.

Suspicion and insecurity were understandably slowing the process of change at Crownwood. Teachers needed time to reflect upon the structural and pedagogical changes. Vicki mistrusted teachers when they did not follow through after meetings.

I think the hardest ones for me are the ones that just sit in the meeting and say we’ll do it, we’ll do it and then when you see it in practice, it’s just not happening… The ones that you turn, that are the most against, that can sometimes be the best voice for it.

Vicki found that as teachers share good practice through the staff inquiry groups they become more empowered as teacher leaders of pedagogy:

Trying to get our teachers to stand up and tell us about a great lesson and the outcome… That’s been really empowering especially for some of our teachers who see themselves as being old school… if we walk into their classroom and see something fantastic… And when you drill down and find out what they have done to try and achieve it, it’s excellent practice, but they don’t see it that way.

This description encapsulates the tension between teachers at Crownwood and how they are attempting to affirm teachers’ pedagogical practices in order to influence their pedagogical practice.
Distributed Leadership for pedagogy

Leadership was distributed at Crownwood through the development of pedagogical middle management and genuine attempts to diminish hierarchy through staff inquiry groups. Staff inquiry groups “set the ball rolling” for distributed leadership as Alison explained and elaborated that “there had not been much scope for teacher leadership at Crownwood until recently”. With staff inquiry groups and a new leadership structure, Pedagogical Coaches worked together with the Director of Teaching and Learning.

Alison described how professional learning structures, including the staff inquiry groups that distribute pedagogical leadership, have changed pedagogical leadership at Crownwood:

_I think the Principal influences pedagogy, but now that we’ve got these staff inquiry groups, staff inquiry group leaders are also influencing pedagogy, because we’re really influencing the fact that people have to be active and current in their research._

Alison’s role was to encourage teachers to actively contribute to the inquiry group. Distributed leadership supported teachers to be active participants in the implementation of the NSW English syllabus at Crownwood. Alison found that initially teachers were not accustomed to such an opportunity to share in pedagogical leadership and she said to teachers in the staff inquiry group: “This is a group task. Yes we’re happy to lead you. We are happy to guide you, but actually the ownership is yours. It’s not just ours”. Alison thought the response was positive: “We’ve had some such fantastic results from enthusiastic members.” Teachers had been previously passive recipients of curriculum instruction.

Active involvement in the evolution of distributed leadership at Crownwood was an emotional process for staff inquiry group leaders. Alison described the emotional challenges of modelling distributed leadership and professional expectations:
[Jane] and I were just almost in tears, because we had done so much extra work… we asked them to look something over and bring it back to the table and not one person in the group had done that. And so then I sent out a very abrupt email… people had to realise this is… something that is actually required of them not even by our SIG group, but by the Head of School.

The initial lack of ownership and potential inactivity from teachers resulted in disappointment from the leaders who realised that the teachers felt minimal accountability for their work. Teachers were accustomed to traditional hierarchical thinking and teacher passivity. An invitation for learning leadership from all teachers was lacking in the traditional hierarchical model at Crownwood. They had never been asked to be active, inquiring participants in their own curriculum learning and building this would require time and trust, even with a Head K-6 whose vision was for a collaborative professional learning community. David stated:

_I didn’t want to come in and make a lot of decisions about change until I had invited them to explore with me and with other colleagues possibilities for change and development._

At the end of the English syllabus implementation project Alison agreed: “they own it now” celebrating shared ownership of syllabus knowledge and taking a step closer to mutual trust in the development of pedagogical practice at Crownwood.

Leadership had become more distributed, but also potentially less clear for some teachers. The Director of Teaching and Learning’s distributed view was that every staff member is a leader and Vicki could not effectively perform in her role without everyone’s support:

_Whoever you are, you’re leading the [students]… a lot of people have great ideas, regardless of title and pay. Distributed leadership supports me because I don’t have enough time in a week to get into 16 classrooms._

Distributed leadership changes gave some teachers opportunities to lead pedagogy. However, the abolition of Year Coordinators and the creation of Pedagogical Coaches in each Stage had also created confusion, disempowerment and mistrust among other teachers who value pastoral and administrative leadership. Jane empathised: “I think some people feel like they have had that leadership taken away from them. Perhaps other people see that they have had the opportunity to step up a little bit as well.”
Relational Leadership during pedagogical change and curriculum reform

Relationship building was a key aspect of the Pedagogical Coach role during curriculum and pedagogical change. Jane and Alison described themselves as “side by side leaders” with a “great team partnership.” Participants described the need to understand teachers’ fears about change and negative emotions about accountability and the flattening of hierarchies with where teacher’s perceptions about hierarchies remain fixed. Relational leadership skills were needed to know what to “do” with resistant teachers. I asked respondents whether they saw the inherent value of these often experienced teachers and how they could be utilised when the solution for these teachers was “go elsewhere” or “retire” as Alison suggested. Jane learned about relational leadership from the staff inquiry groups when she was surprised how “empowering” the staff inquiry groups eventually were for some teachers “who saw themselves as being old school and left behind…To watch them now.”

Distributing pedagogical leadership among the staff through relational leadership brought out hidden talents within teachers. David shared:

[Alison] said to me, I always thought my gift as an educator was as a pastoral carer… All of a sudden, I am finding at this stage of my career, actually no, I am quite good at curriculum, and I love it.

This illustrates the importance of relational leadership when talented teachers may show initial reluctance, but discover their potential. Vicki explained how a formerly resistant staff member changed when her written contribution to a PYP newsletter was intentionally valued: “I just felt I needed to value what she was doing.”

Relational leadership also accounts for imperfection. David reflected on his own poor communication and error of judgement when he chose to stick to the clock instead of allowing the necessary time to discuss the new Pedagogical Coach role and answer questions:

We had allowed 20 minutes before for a staff inquiry group session; we weren’t able to stay and chat – and it would have been perfect to chat for the
next 45 minutes to an hour… and just get all the problems and the questions out on the floor there and then.

David regretted not allowing more communication time for an open forum. This caused subsequent problems in the acceptance of Pedagogical Coaches. The collaborative work of the Pedagogical Coach functions optimally with relational leadership, trust and respect. Jane described the attributes of her new role:

*I will work with staff on their professional learning goals and try and give them some guidance on where they can go to meet those goals, some professional learning ideas, some time to watch others teaching and learning and learn to adjust their own.*

Jane candidly and confidentially described teachers as “young, laid-back and casual” and “uptight old-school.” Illustrating the importance of leaders to have growth, rather than deficit views of the teachers they were supporting as relational leaders.

Vicki expressed the inadequate emotions felt by teachers not in labelled leadership positions as part of her relational leadership: “I’m just a classroom teacher. What do you mean you are just a classroom teacher? If we didn’t have classroom teachers we wouldn’t have a school.” It appeared at Crownwood that hierarchies made teachers feel undervalued. Vicki valued teacher leaders, because teachers value them: “I’m glad that I teach, but it’s not the same as having teachers in that position where they come in and help because they get a bit more respect.” To Vicki, shared ownership makes learning relationships genuine. The impact of teacher leadership can be significant. As Vicki shared: “The ones that you turn that are the most against that can sometimes be the best voice for it.” Voice, teacher identity and professional learning are connected.

**Teacher Professional Learning**

The purpose of teacher professional learning at Crownwood was to develop pedagogical change away from traditional learning approaches toward inquiry learning in order to model learning for the benefit of student learning outcomes. The Head of School understood this when he described his vision, the Director of Learning when she described her role and the new Pedagogical Coaches when they
took on their role as classroom teacher models and mentors. Vicki concluded: “There is a mirror between the way that staff work together and how then staff interact with children. That modelling carries over… It’s really important to come back to how does that impact the student learning?” She indicated that focussing on student outcomes in curriculum and teacher professional learning results in teachers modelling learning practices for students.

Formal meeting time at Crownwood enabled a structure for professional learning. Whole staff and staff inquiry group meetings occurred on a weekly basis. Vicki met weekly with teachers and was “surprised” the teachers didn’t meet more often to discuss teaching and learning. Andrew noted “Leaders have the most interaction with us during staff meetings.” David agreed: “Staff meetings have been very much curriculum in the last couple of years and I think they will continue to be.” Curriculum is taking priority with extensive changes to the NSW syllabus for the Australian curriculum. Formal meetings gave opportunities for people to understand and communicate reactions to change. Alison commented: “It was really interesting to watch the staff reaction in that staff meeting.”

Teachers were given opportunities to lead the change in meetings. For example, Jane explained: “[Andrew] shared with the whole staff when we had an English afternoon.” Sharing this with the staff gave him agency, which excited other teachers. Alison explained:

He did a stack of research and then came into one of our staff inquiry group meetings absolutely abuzz and he said ‘I have just got to share with you what I have been doing in my class’.

Small staff inquiry groups provided “accountability for what was going on in the classroom” through teacher dialogue as Alison shared:

One of the teachers… had implemented some classroom changes and… she shared one of her lessons with our group… and everyone was just suddenly thinking and sharing and brainstorming and there was excitement… now we understand what the English syllabus is about. This is what it’s going to look like in the classroom.
David indicated that informal conversation about pedagogy among staff was effective for pedagogical change:

I want to be able to sit around and be able to have conversations with colleagues about our practice and about learning. And I am finding that is happening you know.

He found informal teacher talk fosters inquiry in the teachers, where conversations can be contrived in formal settings and may not result in change. David wanted to see teachers willing to share in meetings not because they are on a roster but because it comes naturally from their own desire to learn. Jane shared:

We have fairly anecdotal casual conversations over morning tea and lunch. It’s not gossiping about the [students] although obviously we swap stories… but it is genuinely responsible learning conversation... It’s great.

Informal conversations supported teachers in their learning and created a positive atmosphere at Crownwood. Vicki agreed: “There are some excellent teacher leader conversations.”

Crownwood was a traditional school embracing 21st century learning practices and transformative pedagogies through inquiry learning approaches and the International Baccalaureate PYP program. These examples have provided insight into how school culture and leadership practices worked together to enable or constrain professional learning about pedagogy at Crownwood during curriculum change. Participant statements demonstrate the contrast between old and new pedagogical and leadership thinking in the school and the challenges and opportunities of change in a school culture where tradition is embraced.

**Conclusion**

Chapter 4 and 5 presented the findings, or ‘sayings, doings and relatings’ of participants in order to build a picture of the practices that enable and constrain pedagogical change during the implementation of new curriculum. Changes to pedagogical leadership through the new Pedagogical Coach role and the abolishment of administrative leadership created tension and suspicion. Rapid curriculum and pedagogical change with the implementation of the PYP alongside the NSW syllabus
created tension and confusion in some participants who believed in traditional approaches to learning, and excitement in others who embraced inquiry as a transformational pedagogy. The next chapter interprets the findings with research and theory around these themes. Trust and mistrust fill the intersubjective spaces and enable and disable teacher professional learning through formal and informal opportunities. Transformative practices that influence pedagogical change in both schools are examined within each of the theme headings in Chapter 6.
Constructivist grounded theory moves back and forth between theoretical interpretations and empirical evidence.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 287

Begin locating your work within the relevant literatures, which no doubt have changed since you began your study. You may have travelled to new substantive terrain and scaled unforeseen theoretical heights… outline your path, but first attend to writing your grounded theory.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 307

Introduction

This chapter is primarily about practice. It explores the transformative and transformational school cultural, leadership and pedagogical practices that influence pedagogical change. It introduces the nuanced differences between reform and change. Chapter 6 utilises the themes built from participant quotes grounded in the data to interpret the practice architectures found within the intersubjective spaces between pedagogical leadership, pedagogy and school learning culture in more detail following their outline in Chapters 4 and 5. The chapter is divided into these themes. Each section explores the tensions that exist within the intersubjective spaces that enable and constrain pedagogical change. As participants are ‘stirred’ into practices,
ecologies of practice are built in the practice architectures that create the conditions for practices to remain, evolve or change based upon the complex interactions between participants. Changing practices requires transforming intersubjective spaces. The chapter explores how teacher identity and praxis are enabled or constrained by opportunities for reflection and empowerment. It explores how learning may also be enabled or constrained within the intersubjective spaces through personalised and collective outcomes. The chapter explains how pedagogy and leadership connect. It describes how pedagogy is enacted through curriculum. Chapter 6 uses extant literature and empirical evidence to build towards a theory of pedagogical change in Chapter 7 where the central influence upon pedagogical change is trust.

Figure 6.1 Practices that enable and constrain pedagogical change
Figure 6.1 illustrates the relationship between transformative and transformational practices that influence pedagogical change. This diagram builds on the findings and key themes found in the Figure 4.1: Practices that Influence Pedagogical Change from Chapter 4. The diagram highlights how the themes have developed from leadership, pedagogy and school culture into more specific areas that explain how pedagogical change occurs through a deeper understanding of pedagogical leadership, cultures and subcultures and genuine connections between curriculum and pedagogy resulting in personalised learning, empowerment and praxis.

Figure 6.2 below illustrates how the ‘sayings, doings and relatings’ in a project are found in cultural discursive arrangements that shape language and communication; bundled in social-political arrangements found in social space, action and power; and shaped in material economic arrangements found in physical space-time during activities. School learning cultures and practice traditions come from the collective memory and experiences of participants, forming practice architectures. This chapter examines the intersubjective spaces within these arrangements to describe the practices enmeshed in school culture and those factors that enabled and constrained practices (Grootenboer, Edwards-Groves & Choy, 2016; Kemmis et al., 2014). It links key themes from the data with the cultural discursive, material economic, and social-political arrangements that shape interactions between people and their own praxis (Edwards-Groves & Grootenboer, 2016; Kemmis et al., 2014). The purpose of practice architectures is not to tear apart and reassemble practices. Practices alter, become habitual and end within the intersubjective spaces, depending on the contiguity between participants and their arrangements within the ecologies of practice.
Teachers in both schools experienced pedagogical conflict between the use of instructional and transformative practice, and between traditional and progressive pedagogical approaches. There was tension in both sites as a result of changes to pedagogical leadership practices creating trust and affirmation and teamwork, or tension, mistrust and division between teachers in the intersubjective spaces of both sites. The two schools enacted professional learning practices and pedagogical leadership practices within professional learning time in entirely different ways highlighting that professional learning practices can encourage or inhibit change as the practice architectures create subcultures of learning both formally and underground. The impact of professional learning practices upon school culture either enabled or constrained pedagogical change and the enactment of curriculum change in the classroom. Practices within the intersubjective spaces inhibited or built trust.

---

“It’s a school that’s steeped in tradition and a little too steeped at times…
I’m setting up a climate for sharing good practice where the full potential is not yet realised.”

Head of School, Crownwood

“It is great we are in a school that has a clear direction and a clear vision. Does it fit one of the strategic intents? If it doesn’t we don’t do it…
We need fewer voices, clear accountability, expectations and a clear goal for the year and I think we’ll be successful.”

Head of School, Greenville

This section reviews the extent to which teacher professional learning and student learning practices are connected. It also examines professional learning as a practice that depends upon reflection. Transformative learning cultures and transformational professional learning are key aspects of school learning culture that influence student learning outcomes. Practice architectures enable us to understand school culture through the ‘artefacts’, or ‘intersubjective spaces’ of participants. By understanding the sum of their parts and the inherent contiguity between them, or their connections between what people say, do and how they relate, educators are able to build a picture of the practices of school cultures and how change is enabled or constrained (Coleman, 2016; Kemmis et al., 2014).

The intersubjective spaces within school learning cultures are composed of student learning and teacher professional learning cultures and subcultures (Roby, 2011). Pedagogical practices such as curriculum and assessment are influenced by internal and external forces found within intersubjective spaces. School culture does not exist in a vacuum (Prosser, 1999). Rather, national and global forces influence pedagogical change. Australian curriculum and policy change caused a ‘cultural shift’ in the practice landscape of both schools and the ‘material-economic arrangements’ that come from syllabus and policy change that bring changes to resources, knowledge,
skills and structures. Firstly, implementing the new mandatory English curriculum alongside syllabus change in every primary curriculum area created a culture of instability in curriculum approaches where Alison from Crownwood shared, “there really has been so much change”. The key constraint in the practice landscape was the perceived “shock value” from curriculum change in NSW as teachers were “initiated” into new teaching and learning practices (Alison). The new English syllabus was changing the way English and literacy were taught at both schools as they were preparing for NESA (BOSTES) registration that year. According to Jane, teachers at Crownwood were “exhausted” by these new ‘material-economic arrangements’ as a result of curriculum reform.

External accountability in NSW primary schools driven by a government policy of transparency through standardised testing and the ‘MySchool’ website was changing the learning culture within both sites. These ‘material-economic arrangements’ also resulted in the use of evidence-based practice for 21st century learning and student learning outcomes in both schools (Hattie, 2009; Petty, 2006; Prosser, 1999). The Head of School at Crownwood explained how external forces were driving change: “it’s about where education is going and what our government is going to be asking of us, so let’s get on the ride”. This is the cultural-discursive language of reproduction, translation and reculturing where schools respond to global policy at a local level (Fullan, 2011; Maehr & Midgley, 1996; Wilkinson, Bristol & Ponte, 2016). However, the way that schools respond to curriculum and pedagogical change differs. Crownwood was utilising this opportunity for change to revitalise the pedagogical approaches used by teachers for the benefit of student learning outcomes. The pedagogical emphasis at Crownwood was inquiry for both students and teachers. Their purpose was to change the material-economic arrangements of their pedagogical approaches in the practice landscape and “step up” (Alison) to enable new, progressive inquiry practice and to constrain traditional practice by building a new scope and sequence for the English syllabus that incorporated the inquiry approach integral to the Primary Years Program (PYP) International Baccalaureate (IB) program and to integrate the new Australian Curriculum and the NESA (BOSTES) curriculum. This was in conflict with traditional pedagogies in place. Greenville was also striving to create a progressive school learning culture through
teacher professional learning about “differentiation and visible thinking” (Cathy), and a strategic plan for teaching and learning change brought about by the school goals and a ten year plan. Greenville had “a clear direction and a clear vision. Does it fit one of the strategic intents? If it doesn’t we don’t do it”(Andrea). This cultural-discursive language of progressive pedagogical change found in the intersubjective spaces, driven by student learning outcomes was not integrated with syllabus change at Greenville.

Practice traditions are consistent practices identified within a school from the sayings, doings and relatings of participants that define their school learning culture. The practice traditions in both schools enabled and constrained the learning culture for teachers and students concurrently during curriculum change. Participants described Crownwood’s practice as both traditional and progressive: “steeped in tradition” (David), where teachers were “institutionalised” (Alison) and the school culture is “formal” with “a pretty strong vertical pattern of leadership” (Jane) that constrained change. As the Director of Learning shared: “the cultural memory of place: it’s huge. You’re talking [100+] odd years”. Cultural memory also constrained change. In contrast, more recently, Crownwood was trying to be a progressive, “forward thinking school” (Andrew) with “new traditions”, “new accountability”, “a new head… new ideas and new excitement” (Alison) where through renewed material-economic arrangements a more transformative learning culture of “inquiry” (Andrew) was being established. During this period of rapid change old and new practice architectures clashed, forming divisions between teachers and creating unintended subcultures in the social-political arrangements of the school. The practice traditions at Greenville were similarly “old school” (Cathy) using a “top-down imposed pedagogy” with “reluctance to change” (Lisa) traditional pedagogical approaches, in order to protect Greenville’s reputation as a “high achieving, competitive performance driven school” (Cathy). A shift to progressive approaches would require substantial large scale influence or “stirring” into new material-economic practice traditions through pedagogical change (Dimmock & Walker, 2000; Johnson, 2010).

Institutionalisation, or the repetition of over familiar school cultural practices within the social-political arrangements, filled the practice landscape of both schools.
Teachers had taught in both schools for a long time, disrupting or decelerating pedagogical change. This supports the notion that school cultures are reproduced or translated in context (Wilkinson, Bristol & Ponte, 2016; See also Maehr & Midgley, 1996). Changes to leadership, curriculum and pedagogical approaches disrupted the ‘social-political’, ‘material-economic’ and ‘cultural-discursive’ arrangements in the practice landscape of Crownwood and Greenville and the ways people act, speak and relate. The sayings teachers used to describe the social-political arrangements of the school teaching culture at Greenville were conflicting. The Deputy described the teachers as “really lovely, hard working” where Cathy described a “tall poppy culture” and Renee a “sense of survival” among teachers with “three heads in three years”, suggesting a practice landscape of significant disruption and uncertainty. The ‘sayings’ at Greenville silenced the participants. They included: “we have been told” and “there are a lot of voices and I think we need to reduce those voices down” and “subject coordinators never have a voice” demonstrated how the cultural-discursive arrangements in school culture created power and disempowerment during change.

The Deputy Head at Greenville chose to stop speaking in meetings when told to: “I just had to shut up”. Similarly at Crownwood certain teachers remained silent in staff inquiry group meetings. These silent tensions found in the intersubjective spaces have the potential to create subcultures within learning cultures. Lack of teacher voice is rooted in individualistic notions of leadership (Brooks, 2017) rather than collegiality, constraining praxis. Sayings used amongst several participants at Crownwood describing the change from traditional pedagogical approaches to a progressive culture of inquiry included “let’s just get on board” (Vicki) and “go with the change or leave” (Alison). These ‘sayings’ suggest intolerance and conflict within the intersubjective spaces of the social political arrangements at Crownwood for teachers who may struggle to shift from traditional to progressive pedagogy (Barber, 2011; Maehr & Midgely, 1996).

Subcultures are smaller subsets of school learning cultures within the social-political arrangements of a school. They have the potential to shift the material-economic arrangements, create positive learning opportunities and counter institutionalism (Roby, 2011). They may enable or disable transformative pedagogical change based upon the pedagogical beliefs of teachers enacted in their classrooms. The Head of
School at Crownwood described subcultures as “pockets of resistance” to inquiry pedagogy. These teachers saw repetition, drill and “practice” as essential parts of “academic rigour” (Vicki). David surmised that “Fear from new accountability” in the form of Pedagogical Coaches and classroom observations, filled the intersubjective spaces, disrupting praxis. At Greenville the teachers would “dig their heels in and say no” (Elizabeth). Saying no was a viable cultural-discursive response to the perceived “contrived collegiality” (Hargreaves, 1996) where teachers remain silent and comply. These teachers chose to share their understanding of praxis through informed dialogue to defend their pedagogical approaches (Alexander, 2008). Teachers at Greenville felt “constrained by compliance ‘tick off’ as opposed to ‘a great lesson’” (Lisa). Both schools were seeking to develop learning and achievement in their students and they attempted to manage pedagogical change in their teachers through the monitoring of work samples, classroom observations and through opportunities for professional learning. The strengths and inadequacies of these strategies as transformative pedagogical approaches within the material-economic arrangements will be further explored in the ‘Pedagogy and Curriculum Change’ section of this chapter.

School learning culture is only transformational if it deeply connects with the central myths, beliefs and assumptions of the school. Greenville sought to build transformative school culture through 21st century pedagogy, personalised learning, NESA (BOSTES) compliance and whole school regulation. Greenville was at the start of the process of transformational change. Pedagogical change came from a genuine desire and effort to know each student and their learning outcomes in a large school. Attempts to create pedagogical change were driven by the material-economic arrangements of Senior School leaders delivering training to teachers. The Deputy Head described the cultural-discursive arrangements of the pedagogical compliance landscape for teachers as “I’ve got the knowledge and this is how you’re going to do it”. This top-down approach was represented in artefacts such as the “strategic intents” that were placed in staffrooms. They represented a “clear direction and a clear vision” for Greenville. Teachers’ planning documents had to demonstrate how they met the strategic intents providing clear, shared direction about learning essential for sustaining pedagogy (Maehr & Midgley, 1996; Prosser, 1999). Conversely, certain
teachers criticized the strategic planning as contrived and the pedagogy from the strategic intents lacking “actual theory or philosophy” (Renee), in conflict with their praxis. Teachers were consulted during the creation of the intents as part of the cultural-discursive arrangements, but large staff numbers precluded feelings of involvement and resulted in limited discussion time. Starratt’s ‘onion model’ demonstrates how these may be represented in the outer layers of policies, goals and practices that influence the material-economic arrangements, where neoliberal pressure from a culture of school effectiveness may mean that myths do not permeate beyond programs, policies and products (Maehr & Midgely, 1996; Schein, 2004; Starratt, 2011). Starratt (2011) explores how deeply held values, shared understanding of curriculum and commonalities build collegial relationships that produce trust to enable change whereas misunderstandings can create mistrust within the intersubjective spaces and constrain pedagogical change. Staff inquiry groups at Crownwood created the social-political arrangements to build collegiality between some teachers through “pedagogical dialogue” (David) during formal meetings. At Greenville trust and relationships were fostered through informal cultural-discursive interactions between teachers “always popping from one room to another”, (Andrea) fostering collegiality. With minimal opportunities to discuss pedagogy during meetings, Greenville teachers created these opportunities themselves. There were attempts to build transformative learning cultures, but sometimes transformative practice was restricted to the subcultures and was yet to permeate through the material-economic arrangements of the wider school learning culture.

Communities of practice and professional learning communities foster school learning cultures, enabling pedagogical change through the exchange of pedagogical knowledge, solving problems of practice and supporting reform (Eaker & Keating, 2008; Harris, 2015; Mockler, 2013; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Printy, 2008). They are dependent upon focussed innovation, collaboration, belonging and trust (Stoll & Seashore Louis, 2007). Therefore the extent to which a school is a professional learning community or a community of practice is dependent upon the perceptions and involvement of participants. The theory of practice architectures suggests that communities of practice are limited by the concept of collective knowledge where individuals also think and create their own niches within the ecology. Both schools
designed and tailored curriculum to their own pedagogical context. The Head of School at Crownwood used the social-political arrangements to “set up a climate for sharing good practice”. David’s core purpose was to build a professional learning community through “reflective” practice where teachers chose the focus of action inquiry and the membership of the group. David explained how he “spread the leadership” and gave teachers and middle leaders “room to try and shape [their] little corner of things” in the social-political arrangements thus building a professional learning community. Leadership was distributed, each member was accountable and it generated new practice by sharing outcomes with others, building collective capacity (Harris, 2015). David’s attempts to foster a community of practice model or professional learning community were highly intentional. However, establishing and maintaining a climate of sharing good practice was dependent upon the teachers’ response to the climate and there was acceptance and resistance. In communities of practice teachers are “stirred” into practices (Kemmis, Wilkinson & Edwards-Groves, 2016). This metaphor implies that they start separately in the same space without being intermingled and that stirring takes time, action and ongoing movement in the same direction. Coleman’s (2016) metaphor of the tea cup explains intersubjectivity as contiguity, where the cultural-discursive, material-economic and social-political arrangements within the practice architectures meet and stir like a cup of tea.

Building a community of practice or professional learning community at Greenville was less intentional in the staff meeting structure for curriculum reform. A culture of compliance drove administrative leadership responsibilities rather than pedagogical leadership. The Head of School aspired to be a pedagogical leader and admitted that as a new leader, “[pedagogical leadership] has been a struggle”. The material economic arrangements of directive staff meetings with the purpose of rapid change meant that teachers at Greenville were being ‘initiated’ or whizzed into new curriculum rather than ‘stirred’. As a consequence, teachers lacked confidence in their knowledge of curriculum from the “spray-on” (Mockler, 2005) professional learning they were receiving. Examples from Greenville include the English Coordinator explaining how teachers were not being stirred into new practices of using outcomes properly: “we’ve been using the outcomes, but not really unpacking them and actually working out exactly what they mean”. The purpose of classroom observations was to
promote pedagogical change, but Andrea shared: “they do not know why they are doing it.” Observation triads seemed not to be changing pedagogical practices at Greenville.

School culture and leadership are both influential during reform (May, Huff & Goldring, 2012), meaning that transformative school learning culture is dependent upon transformational leadership practice. Hierarchical practices, middle leadership practices, pedagogical leadership practices and teacher leadership practices formed part of the material-economic arrangements in both schools. David invited teachers to be “self-leading” at Crownwood where staff inquiry groups were a potential niche for professional learning and goal setting. This was dependent upon the extent to which teachers chose to be involved in the social-political arrangements, which came from their sense of teacher leadership, identity and praxis. Teachers were not accustomed to leading at Crownwood. The Head of School intended to “take people out of their comfort zones”, while leadership was being distributed, testing trust and inviting pedagogical change within the intersubjective spaces through teacher leadership, which some teachers rejected. The hierarchical leadership culture at Greenville connected to the school learning culture through compliance. Lisa’s perception was that the “hard working” English Coordinator was responsible for curriculum change, “but the work was not distributed. One person owned the whole thing”. Elizabeth didn’t want to own the whole thing and shared, “I do feel like at the moment I am working in isolation”, but she was following the hierarchical structure in place. The social-political arrangements at Greenville that enabled rapid curriculum reform through formal staff meeting structures were potentially constraining the practices required for genuine pedagogical change.

Attempts to transform school learning cultures, ‘reculturing’ or ‘realigning’ teacher’s pedagogical ideas brought uncertainty in both schools (Fullan, 2011; Harris, 2015; Williamson & Blackburn, 2009). The staff inquiry groups at Crownwood sought to create a teacher-led professional learning culture of inquiry while the Director of Learning influenced pedagogy mentoring teachers and middle leaders in regular weekly meetings with teachers, diffusing leadership with the Pedagogical Coaches and sharing her vision of the overall curriculum picture with teachers (Duignan, 2012;
Alongside these structured material-economic arrangements, uncertainty at Crownwood was expressed through the intersubjective spaces in the cultural-discursive arrangements where accusations that middle leaders were “spies” (Jane, Alison, David and Vicki) and that leadership was a “new broom” (Jane). Mistrust was constraining change to the learning culture at Crownwood while others embraced the change. At Greenville, uncertainty in the social-political arrangements was seen in rapid curriculum change and leadership turnover with “three different heads of Junior School for each of the three years” (Renee). Rapid leadership change caused confusion about which pedagogical approaches were a priority in the school learning culture to the leadership team, creating subcultures and constraining pedagogical change. If a transformative learning culture is created through learning opportunities, disruption by the leadership practices, compliance practices and the conflicting pedagogical identities of teachers within the practice architectures constrained pedagogical change. As a result some teachers created their own subcultures of learning for change.
Leadership

“People are lost with pedagogical leadership. It’s not about pastoral, or administration, or discipline.”

Pedagogical Coach Stage Two, Crownwood

“Leading the pedagogy really depends on the leader. If that’s your passion then you will make time for that. You will give that a priority in the professional learning, but if you’re more administrative and signing off on things then you won’t. You’ll be more about compliance: we’ve got to do this; we have got to do that.”

Deputy Head, Greenville

This section explores to what extent leadership practices can have transformational influences upon student learning outcomes, curriculum reform and pedagogical change. Examining the literature on the attributes of leadership within organisational theory this section concludes that if leadership is practice or a set of practices then pedagogy is leadership. Leadership and pedagogy connect with notions of teacher leadership and praxis. Next, it explores the problematic premise that distributed leadership empowers. Pedagogical leadership is critiqued and administrative hierarchies are examined.

Pedagogy and Leadership

This research sought to explore whether the type of leadership employed by pedagogical change agents made a difference to teachers’ work and praxis. The purpose of leadership influenced the leadership structures that were in place in both schools and their material-economic and social-political arrangements. If administrative leadership was the priority, then hierarchy was in place. If pedagogical leadership was the priority with the current shift towards data-driven evidence-based pedagogies, then distributed leadership was prioritised.
Research into leading learning in schools utilises the simile “leadership as pedagogy and pedagogy as leadership” (Lingard, et al., 2003, p. 19). The revolutionary premise is that pedagogical leadership is promoted amongst principals where a culture of administrative leadership practice pervades schooling. The concept is supported by ‘productive pedagogies’, ‘productive leadership’ and ‘productive assessment’, which were ways of understanding leadership and pedagogy during the adjectival leadership debates of the early 2000s and moving beyond them. If the primary purpose of schooling is learning, then the leadership, whether from leaders or teachers, needs to be pedagogical where “the productive leadership habitus is about the ‘we’ of the school”, based upon Bourdieu’s habitus and field, drawing further towards leadership as practice” (Lingard, et al., 2003, p74). Leadership is practice moves the responsibility for pedagogical change. Within Crownwood and Greenville this responsibility rested upon certain individuals and groups. Traditional models of administrative leadership in the practice architectures of both schools meant that teachers had little prior experience of pedagogical leadership practices and this was reflected in their sayings promoting administrative leadership. For example, the Head of School at Crownwood expressed concern that “teachers do not understand pedagogy” when they suggested Pedagogical Coaches “sort the locker room”, meaning resolve the fight going on in there. A tradition of pastoral and administrative leadership led to teachers misunderstanding the role of Pedagogical Coaches, thinking of them not as supporters of teaching and learning, but disciplinarians or administrators, similar to how the pedagogical leaders were perceived at Greenville.

Crownwood and Greenville were both seeking to create new pedagogical leadership space in their schools. These new practice architectures brought more professional capital and agency for teachers at Crownwood who involved themselves in the “staff inquiry group discussions and action research” (David), but less for others. Pedagogical leadership (Day, 2011, Hargreaves, 2007; Lingard et al., 2003; Sergiovanni, 1998) changed the material-economic arrangements of the practice landscape where formerly leadership had been the role of the Head of School and the Deputy Head. Pedagogical leadership was intended by the Head of School to be disseminated amongst all teachers as “leaders of learning” (Hallinger, 2007) using
staff inquiry groups, but teacher leadership was enabled and constrained by complex group dynamics within the intersubjective spaces based on levels of expertise and pedagogical knowledge. At Greenville the pedagogical leadership was hierarchical, led by the Head of School and the Deputy Head. It was the responsibility of the K-12 Director of Teaching and Learning and the English Coordinator as middle manager to initiate and ‘stir’ teachers into new curriculum and pedagogical practices. At Greenville certain teachers met “informally” (Cathy) bringing social and professional capital within pedagogical subcultures for teachers to develop the praxis they felt unable to attain in staff meetings.

There was increasing dialogue in both schools about data-driven practice as a result of the material-economic arrangements of accountability and outcomes-based curriculum practices. This is a contested area in educational research where Duignan (2012) suggests that improvement is non-linear and measurement is challenging (Fullan, 2005; Hargreaves, 2007; Hess, 2009; Pettit, 2010). The material-economic practices in both schools included bringing evidence-based practice into focus in their school so that teachers would be “current in their learning” (Elizabeth) and improve outcomes for students. There is extensive research linking pedagogical leadership indirectly with student learning outcomes (Duignan, 2012; Hattie, 2009; Jackson & Bezzina, 2010; Leithwood, Sun & Pollock, 2017; Marzano, et al., 2005; Printy, 2010; Robinson, 2009;). Learning intentions were written on the board at both sites. Both schools collected evidence of practice through “teacher observation” (Andrea). The “collection of work samples” (Elizabeth) was discussed at Greenville as common practice for the upcoming BOSTES accreditation. Both schools wanted to make stronger connections between assessment and outcomes as part of their pedagogical practice. Greenville did this through “learning walks” (Andrea) where the overarching purpose was to check for compliance. However, both schools were at the very start of connecting data and assessment with learning processes, where traditional versus progressive approaches were still under debate, constraining change. These improvement practices potentially constrained pedagogical change because the teachers within both schools either complied, acquiesced, enthused, or refused, depending on their pedagogical teacher identity. This will be further discussed in the section on pedagogy and in Chapter 7.
The extent to which pedagogical leadership enables pedagogical change is dependent upon the practice architectures that enable and constrain pedagogical change (Hargreaves, 2007; Kelleher & Levenson, 2004; Pettit, 2010; Robinson et al., 2008; Southworth, 2005). The Head of School at Crownwood had a strong vision for pedagogical leadership by distributing pedagogical leadership amongst the Director of Learning and the Pedagogical Coaches and collaborative leadership among the teachers through the staff inquiry groups. This model of distributed leadership supports the notion that pedagogical leadership increases human capital through the creation of community (Duignan & Cannon, 2011; Fullan, 2011; Roby, 2011). Two teachers shared the middle leadership of the English curriculum staff inquiry group at Crownwood. The English curriculum was the responsibility of the English Coordinator at Greenville who described herself as “at middle leadership level” within the hierarchical leadership structure of the school, connecting the leadership of curriculum change with learning culture. The Deputy Head of Greenville reflected upon the leadership styles she had seen in principals throughout her career in education and how it was represented in their practices: “Leading the pedagogy really depends on the leader. If that’s your passion then you will… give that priority in the professional learning; but if you’re more administrative then… you’ll be more about compliance.” Macneill, Kavanagh and Silcox’s (2003) research found that the outcomes of quality leadership are measured through pedagogy, but as White (2008) notes, many leaders do not critically reflect on pedagogical theory. The Deputy Head took a personalised approach to her pedagogical leadership practice, meeting the needs of individual teachers through mentoring, conversations and teacher accreditation meetings.

The Head of School at Crownwood saw his principal role as a pedagogue to reform the practice landscape for pedagogical change. He shared: “Leadership is not about administration. It is now about teaching and learning” (David). The extent to which the pedagogical leadership was instructional or transformational was in question. In instructional leadership the leader determines the pedagogical approaches, which was the case for both schools (Hallinger, 2007). However, during curriculum and pedagogical change instructional leadership is challenging to enact, particularly by a
pedagogical leader alone in fulfilling the requirements of 21st century leadership (Boris-Schacter, 2007; Quinn, 2002) and therefore instructional leadership is only effective with distributed leadership (Sanzo, Myran & Caggiano, 2015) and yet it seems diametrically opposed to distributed leadership (Harris, 2014). Transformational leadership enables genuine distributed leadership and motivates teachers when they can reflect upon and own their learning, connecting it with praxis (Kemmis et al., 2014; Mockler, 2013; Mockler & Sachs, 2012). The Head of School of Crownwood was hoping that teachers would “buy in” to new pedagogical approaches to make the vision collective, as did the Head of School at Greenville. Both schools took instructional approaches to achieve their pedagogical vision within the time constraints with the intention of altering the pedagogical practice architectures. The compliance culture at Greenville paid lip service to transformational leadership, instructing staff in their pedagogical approaches and in curriculum reform.

Distributed, collaborative leadership facilitates learning (Duignan, 2012; Duignan & Cannon, 2011; Fullan, 2011; Roby, 2011). “The school works really hard in trying to sort of push student learning to the front in making sure teachers are current in their learning”. “Push[ing]” represents a perception of certain pressure of being initiated rather than ‘stirred’ into practices. The practice architectures of leadership at Greenville were more hierarchical in order to cope with the size of a large school and the management structures in place; these may be less apparent in a smaller school. Hierarchies constrain pedagogical leadership and reform (Day & Armstrong, 2016). The English coordinator at Greenville was finding her “middle management” pedagogical leadership role substantial: “My job is to unpack the English Curriculum” and “there is a lot being put on me” and she was afraid of being singularly accountable where collaboration enables trust (Hallinger, 2007). Pedagogical leadership had been distributed solely to her, with minimal support from the Head of School with a hierarchical structure that impeded teacher leadership. It cannot be assumed that pedagogical leadership benefits teacher professional learning (Leithwood, Sun & Pollock, 2017) as it is dependent upon the form of pedagogical leadership and the type of teacher professional learning being offered and the opportunities for teachers to take learning risks whether perceived or actual within the
intersubjective spaces (Day & Armstrong, 2016; Roby, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008).

**Distributed leadership and false empowerment**

Examining the practice architectures of leadership at Crownwood and Greenville provided a way of understanding distributed leadership in both settings. Distributed leadership may bring false empowerment. Rather, empowerment comes from teacher identity, teacher leadership, pedagogy and praxis. Distributed leadership is connected with practice leading and is limited by hierarchy. Genuinely distributed leadership is interactive, co-experienced, dialogic and intersubjective (Ehrich, 2017). The problematic term “genuinely distributed leadership” suggests the inverse, that leadership can be falsely distributed.

If leadership is a practice, ‘leading’ makes more sense than leadership (Wilkinson, 2017). There were instances in both schools where teachers remained focused on the person of leadership, their ability and their authenticity. The Head of Greenville was described as a “fluffy spokesperson” (Cathy), lacking in pedagogy. The Head of Crownwood was critiqued, along with the leadership team, for his lack of up front, instructional leadership: “aren’t you going to lead us?” (David), lacking in authority. Teacher’s perceptions of leadership found these sayings constrained their trust in leadership.

From a systems perspective, the traditional mode of educational leadership is the hero principal leader (Davies, 2005; Lingard et al., 2003). Current research acknowledges the impossible task of a school principal in fulfilling these requirements, particularly during reform (Boris-Schacter, 2007; Quinn, 2002). Even authentic leadership, though a valuable trait (Duignan, 2012; Mulford, 2007; Starratt, 2011), may be at odds with distributed leadership if it is heroic or dependent upon the values of the leader without consultation (Lakomski, 2017; Lingard et al., 2003). Therefore role-based structures based on organisational theory are out dated, and distributed, parallel and dispersed leadership requires further research (Netolicky, 2016; Lingard et al., 2003; Youngs, 2017). The Head of School at Crownwood sought to change the social-political
arrangements by distributing leadership and inviting teacher leadership, reforming a traditionally hierarchical structure. “We have invited people into more of a stakeholder position than we had before” (David). The teachers, however, viewed school leadership as administrative and so when administrative leadership was “taken away from them” (Jane) with the change in role from year coordinator to Pedagogical Coach, mistrust developed. The opposite was set to occur at Greenville where the Head of School changed the social-political arrangements and diminished distributed leadership. Andrea planned for distributed leadership opportunities to be a “removed component” in order to “flatten structure out” and “reduce the positions of added responsibility” to “a small team of key drivers” where curriculum coordinators would cease to exist and “responsibility” would be added to the year coordinators, in order to avoid “a layer of complexity” and “lack of communication” (Andrea). This represented a return to instrumental leadership (Brooks, 2017). However, this decision was in stark contrast with the collaborative leadership dispositions of the Deputy Head and the former Director of Learning at Greenville and this was set to cause tension. The Deputy Head at Greenville sought more middle leadership opportunities for subject coordinators because “subject coordinators have never had a voice” (Renee) in order to model and distribute leadership for student learning outcomes, perhaps considering “leading” rather than “leadership” (Wilkinson, 2017). Modelling distributed leadership was made more challenging due to the hierarchical social-political nature of leadership at Greenville. As the Deputy Head shared: “the head dictates and I follow up” (Lisa). Staff inquiry groups attempted to reduce hierarchies at Crownwood. Teacher leader opportunities were created to motivate participants to utilise their curriculum skills. Hierarchies remained at Greenville in order to deliver compliance.

When hierarchy exists as a material-economic arrangement alongside distributed leadership, distributed leadership has the potential to become confused with delegation, or dispersal, particularly during reform (Lingard, et. al, 2003). The Director of Learning at Crownwood shared that “distributed leadership supports [her]” in her own role because it was impossible for her to be in all of the classrooms all of the time, so she had distributed or delegated these responsibilities to the Pedagogical Coaches. Leadership actions at Greenville were delegated rather than
distributed. The English coordinator was “delegated” the responsibility for the English curriculum and she felt that “there was a lot being put on [her]”. This may have been because of the Head of School’s lack of time and experience in primary education.

Teacher leadership had been a constrained practice at both schools. The key change at Crownwood was that the Head of School recognised teacher expertise: “We’ve got experts within our community here” (David). This was not the case at Greenville. At Greenville, leaders “hoped” teachers would “own” (Vicki) curriculum and wanted to empower them, but they struggled to understand the intersubjective spaces preventing teacher ownership including hierarchical leadership, top-down cultures, the calling in of external experts, and new pedagogy with inadequate training. Both schools needed to develop teacher self-empowerment through autonomous participation, reflection and praxis, personalised and collective learning, with learning for the child and the teacher at the centre of purpose.

At Crownwood two middle leaders had the opportunity for “a great team partnership” (Jane) as pedagogical leaders. The practice of middle leadership is problematic if the middle leaders coach from the side. Grootenboer’s (2017) analogy of middle leader as team captain, rather than coach demonstrates how practising the pedagogical skills is an essential part of the social-political arrangements for enabling pedagogical change. Distributed, authentic leadership is dependent upon a high performing team and teachers expect it from leaders and trust leaders who demonstrate these traits (Fink & McCulla, 2016).

When principals lead pedagogy in a school it can cause unintended problems for distributed middle leaders seeking to serve and please the principal, as appropriate for the hierarchy. At Crownwood “leadership had taken a broom to old practices” (Jane) altering the material-economic arrangements. Middle leaders can be pressured to sweep teacher’s traditional pedagogical practices away when connecting the school culture and new pedagogical approaches (Robinson, Lloyd & Rowe, 2008). At Crownwood this unintentionally constrained pedagogical change as Pedagogical Coaches were being perceived by the teachers as “spies, in a good James Bond sort of
way” (Vicki) checking on their practice and reporting back to authorities, rather than being collaborative supporters. The Head of School admitted that because there had been inadequate time in a staff meeting for discussion and questions, mistrust had developed. However, the leaders seemed to be unable to see the intersubjective spaces that were constraining the teachers’ ability to trust these new coaches even though the leaders could see that the teachers felt “uncomfortable” and “feared loss of control” (Alison) of their pedagogy within the new structure. At Greenville middle management owned “the whole thing” (Lisa) without teacher leadership. And yet Elizabeth shared: “I don’t want to be pushing my agenda or thoughts: it needs to be collective.” Teachers at Greenville saw how the intersubjective spaces of hierarchical leadership were limiting their capacity for unity, contiguity, and pedagogical change. Genuinely distributed middle leaders position themselves among equals with teachers. The staff inquiry groups at Crownwood, led by teachers, supported equality. Teachers were surprised by the suggestion that the senior leadership team at Crownwood would “be participants and supporters” rather than leaders. This opened leadership and followership to all participants, including the leaders themselves (Lakomski, 2017; Ehrich, 2016). Ehrich (2016) suggests that in the polyphony of contested leadership attributes and frameworks, leadership is dialogic and framed by followers, matching the Head of School of Crownwood’s vision.

Positive professional relationships within the social-political arrangements empower within the intersubjective spaces to make a difference to practices, opening opportunities for teacher professional learning both formally and informally. Cathy at Greenville shared how relational leadership meant that the staff would follow through on practices: “They think oh we can’t let her down”(Cathy). Other teachers at Greenville longed for more relational leadership. Renee would “love a mentor [they] trust.” This desire was further heightened during curriculum change. A mentoring structure of professional learning was in place at Crownwood. The Head of School at Crownwood saw teacher professional learning practice “as a form of empathy” toward children so that teachers could understand how students inquire, and that modelling and emulating practice within the practice architectures may improve student outcomes (Duignan, 2012; Printy, 2010). Vicki agreed that modelling inquiry is a form of relational leadership that may help both teachers and students: “I hope
that the way that we deal with each other as an executive, helps with the pedagogy of the rest of the school”. The Pedagogical Coaches were designed to be “side by side leaders” (Jane). David saw this for all the teachers: “I didn’t want to come in and make a lot of decisions about change until I had invited them to explore with me and with other colleagues possibilities for change and development” (David). Distributed pedagogical leadership requires relational leadership, particularly during curriculum change where authenticity builds trust (Duignan, 2012; Eacott, 2017; Kreber, 2010; Mulford, 2007; Starratt, 2011).

**Trust and Change**

Trust is found within the intersubjective spaces between pedagogical leadership, teacher professional learning culture and curriculum implementation. Trust and mistrust, suspicion and deception, cooperation, coercion, and compliance are heightened and tested by external forces during curriculum reform and policy change (Day, 2011; Sun & Leithwood, 2017;). Transparency, accountability and competition in schools have created the need for verification, which can also build mistrust (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Hargreaves, 2015; Lingard, Thompson & Sellar, 2016).

Rapid change causes people to question their judgments, increasing the potential risk of mistrust, even when teachers show compliance (Fink, 2013; O’Neill, 2002; Webb, 1996). The social-political arrangements at both schools constrained trust. At Crownwood teachers feared Pedagogical Coaches entering classrooms as “spies” (Vicki). At Greenville there was “[not] enough sharing of what works well” (Renee). The cultural-discursive arrangements were such that teachers were “told we are not allowed to integrate new curriculum” (Elizabeth) and “not allowed to disagree” (Renee) in “formal, contrived” meetings with “no trust” and getting “busted” and having to “shut up” (Lisa). Fink’s (2016) research on trust found that the statement “just tell us what to do” shuts down communication and symbolises lack of trust.

Mistrust is not the symmetrical opposite of trust, but deception that causes suspicion that may be brought about by poor communication, potentially resulting in misrepresentation (O’Neill, 2002; Powell, Burt & Knez, 1996). At Crownwood the
Pedagogical Coach role was poorly explained engendering mistrust. Similarly, at Greenville observation triads were poorly explained and were not well followed up and this miscommunication developed mistrust. Lack of ownership from lack of teacher leadership breeds lack of trust. Lack of leadership knowledge can also create mistrust in teachers. At Greenville if teachers “ask questions in meetings exec don’t know the answers” (Cathy). Suspicion was created amongst staff about the competency of leadership. At Greenville the English Coordinator was trusted as a middle leader with the implementation of the English Curriculum and subsequently created her own “tall poppy” (Cathy) hierarchy in the implementation team, generating mistrust amongst other teachers, revealing how the intersubjective spaces in school culture can enable and constrain pedagogical change.

Lack of cooperation can also reap pedagogical benefits including creativity, spontaneity and innovation with teachers who are trusted with pedagogical autonomy. The teachers at Greenville conducted their own creative pedagogical work in the social-political arrangements outside of formal meeting time where compliance was expected. Andrea shared: “that’s one great thing about the teachers: they just do whatever they have to do – they really are fabulous at it” (Andrea). It cannot be assumed that cooperation means trust, but it is easier to see cooperation and compliance than trust (Kramer & Tyler, 1984). At Crownwood, teachers could voluntarily choose the topic for their inquiry group, fostering the potential for personal creativity in the material-economic arrangements, within the compliance of inquiry. It was the teachers’ understanding of their ‘relatings’ within the intersubjective spaces of the groups that determined whether learning was enabled or constrained.

According to Vicki, teachers at Crownwood were “suspicious” of her overseas experience. David perceived that teacher reacted to the “uncomfortable phase” of pedagogical change with mistrust and “suspicion”. Social capital research assumes that trust is social, rational, reciprocal and reactive (Cummings & Bromilley, 1996; Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996; Mitszal, 2013). However, trust is subjective, reliant on people’s judgements and this enables them to cope with arbitrary social-political arrangements (Mishra, 1996; Misztal, 2013).
Trust is also dependent on the judgment of leaders and followers and this is expressed in sayings, doings and relatings. The Director of Teaching and learning at Crownwood shared her frustration when teachers didn’t follow through: “I think the hardest ones for me are the ones that just sit in the meeting and say we’ll do it…and when you see it in practice, it’s just not happening” (Vicki). Trust is reciprocal and valued by teachers and leaders in different ways (Fink & McCulla, 2016; Kramer, Brewer & Hanna, 1996; Misztal, 2013).

Trust is an active political accomplishment (Misztal, 2013; Weber, 2007). The principal plays a key role in developing and sustaining relational trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2003) and teachers are also responsible. Distributed leadership and middle leadership have the potential to blur who tasks responsibilities, which can lead to slower building of trust (Edwards-Groves, 2016; Meyerson, Weick & Kramer, 1996; Sheppard & Tuchinsky, 1996; Kramer, 1993). In contrast, trust has the potential to engender equality of power in relationships within the social-political arrangements (Mishra, 1996). At Greenville the Head of K-6 trusted the English coordinator to “deliver [curriculum change] for her” (Elizabeth). Collaboration is unsustainable without trust, and trust is eroded by competition and reward (Mishra, 1996; Fullan, 1993). For example, Cathy was named “golden girl” by her colleagues because the former Head of School appreciated her pedagogical work and this created competition within the intersubjective spaces. Being too trusting of teachers can also be a problem for leaders due to the need to verify that work is being done well (Fink, 2016). Teachers and leaders are mutually responsible with students in creating purposeful work.

Therefore, trust within the practice architectures can be both the problem and the solution for pedagogical change. Pedagogical change that requires transformation only comes when trust fills the intersubjective spaces rather than the lesser alternative, compliance (Browning, 2013; O’Neill, 2002). High trust impacts student learning outcomes (Day & Armstrong, 2016; Marks & McCulla, 2017). When Pedagogical Coaches were introduced at Crownwood, trust was eroded for some teachers because they felt like they were being measured where performance measurement and
transparency devalues trust (Fitzgerald, 2009; Sitkin & Stickel, 1996). Teachers were reclaiming their praxis at Greenville, by meeting informally, and defending praxis at Crownwood, by refusing to change. Jane shared: “most people are on board… the concerns are with some people who aren’t on the journey and what we are going to do with them” (Jane). Compliance filled the intersubjective spaces within the learning culture at Crownwood and Greenville. Reform implies improvement where change suggests adjustment or alteration. Educators assume that curriculum change is reform because it is an improvement. Pedagogical change can be seen as reform or improvement, but this makes assumptions about change that cannot be verified.
**Pedagogy and Curriculum Change**

| “The pedagogy sort of impacted the curriculum and the curriculum sort of impacted the pedagogy.” | Class teacher, Crownwood |
| “It started with looking at just one component of the English syllabus…” | Pedagogical Coach Stage One, Crownwood |
| “Pedagogy is intuitive reasoning: why I choose to teach it this way or choose to do it this way. There is a huge personal element in it. There are two types of pedagogy: personal and school… In terms of the new curriculum changing pedagogy, I don’t think we’re changing it yet.” | Class teacher, Greenville |

This research sought to ascertain to what extent internal and external forces influence pedagogical approaches during curriculum change and the tensions that exist within and between ‘intersubjective spaces’ through the sayings, doings and relatings described by participants (Kemmis, et al, 2014). Tensions included: establishing communities of professional learning practice during rapid curriculum and policy change alongside teacher identity, personalised learning versus collective learning and student learning outcomes, notions of empowerment and trust in an era of school measurement and school effectiveness. This research found that educators do not all have the same language of pedagogy. This is enabled and constrained by dialogue and pedagogical practices. Secondly, curriculum does not change pedagogy, but it can. Rather, pedagogy is enacted through curriculum. Pedagogical change is constrained by fear and enabled through trust in the intersubjective spaces. Pedagogy, learning and achievement have different meanings. This section builds a case toward a theory of pedagogical change presented in Chapter Seven.

Dialogue about pedagogy was analysed in each school. Participants understood it to be either an enactment of curriculum (Alexander, 2008; Ewing, 2005; Hamilton,
2009; Marsh, 2007), a scientific construct (Herbart 1804) or a holistic act depending on the dispositions of individuals and practice traditions of the culture (Sergiovanni, 2009). Participant responses at both schools demonstrated that educators did not have the same universal language of pedagogy when asked to define ‘pedagogy’. At Crownwood, sayings about pedagogy included “encapsulating what we are wanting to say”: “teaching approaches”, “inquiry-based learning” and “knowing the end” rather than “activities from last year”. The participants interviewed understood pedagogy as a mutual process of teaching and learning for student learning outcomes connected to their specific classroom practice, which for some included inquiry learning practice, another, outcomes, and another, evidence-based practice (Marsh, 1997). The Head of School connected pedagogy strongly with the collective teacher identity of the school: “It's exactly who we are”, and he used the term freely in meetings and role titles. However, participants reported how teachers misunderstood the term and this caused additional tension and confusion (Alexander, 2008).

At Greenville, a universal language of pedagogy was lacking in the cultural-discursive arrangements. Sayings about pedagogy ranged from: “the school [was] on a journey with pedagogy from the text book driven dark ages” to “outcomes driven” approaches (Renee) as they explored “the art and science of teaching” (Lisa), “good practices” (Andrea) and “intuitive reasoning” (Cathy). One teacher admitted: “I struggle with that word. We have it in staff meetings” (Elizabeth). This quotation explains how the uncertainty filled the intersubjective spaces. The definition of ‘good’ pedagogical practice is left undefined by the Head of School at Greenville, but she did understand how professional learning for teachers through formal and informal opportunities aided their pedagogical praxis (Kemmis et al., 2014). “Pedagogy is really all about… professional development and collaborative practice and conversation all of the time” (Andrea).

The implementation of pedagogy was difficult at Greenville and Crownwood. Teachers in both settings felt unable to express their personal pedagogy in staff meetings, when compliance and mistrust filled the intersubjective spaces. Learning is always personalised, but it also requires collective consensus when a school adopts a particular pedagogical approach for universal practice, such as inquiry at Crownwood.
The conflict between traditional and progressive approaches was paramount within the practice architectures of both schools (Ackerman, 2003; Miller, 2016; Miller, 1996; Ukpokodu, 2009).

The pedagogical leadership practices intended to develop curriculum reform and pedagogical change seemed to be unintentionally constraining change within the teachers. Leaders struggled to understand how trust and mistrust was caused by specific practices that were part of the material economic arrangements of both schools such as learning walks, classroom observation and work samples. The purpose of these practices were to learn progressive and unlearn traditional modes of teaching and learning held in both schools, such as teacher-directed learning and worksheet and textbook driven approaches (West, Jackson, Harris & Hopkins, 2000). At Greenville “teachers don’t like to be observed” (Andrew) and at Crownwood it was also a new, “uncomfortable” (Vicki) practice “not going away” (David) even though teachers in both schools “don’t know why they are doing it” (Andrea). The teachers at Greenville were receiving mixed messages about the purpose of observations. Teachers were told “it’s not about planning a great lesson”. These confusing statements provided insight into how conflicting pedagogical leadership was constraining practices. Perfection was also constraining practice within the intersubjective spaces where pedagogical leaders at Greenville were in “freak out mode” over accreditation, seeking that all documentation was “perfect” evidence of compliance (Fullan, 2005; Hargreaves, 2007, Pettit, 2010). Practices that may have led to the success of this arrangement include clear communication, peer mentoring, instant flexible feedback, and opportunities for taking risks, and the opportunity for teachers to be trusted to organise the arrangement.

Pedagogical discourse (Alexander, 2008) creates professional learning opportunities for teachers to understand pedagogy (Lingard et al., 2003; Marsh, 1997; Sellar, 2009).

One Crownwood participant acknowledged “everyone influences pedagogy” (Alison). The approaches teachers utilise are individually and collectively translated into practice. Pedagogy and teacher identity are personally related. When the material-economic and social-political arrangements changed at Crownwood the emphasis was on inquiry pedagogy and transformational practice. This enabled
teachers who embraced inquiry pedagogy and left those with traditional approaches in tension in the intersubjective spaces. At Greenville one class teacher shared the distinction between her “personal” and “school” pedagogy based on “intuitive reasoning” and “personal choice” (Renee). This teacher’s pedagogical identity was expressed in a form of freedom of separation from the school’s developing pedagogical identity. Making such a distinction between personal and school gave Renee the potential freedom to choose which aspects of pedagogical change she embraced at Greenville exercising a form of self-empowerment that came from her professional identity (Gore, 1992).

The extent to which curriculum does or does not alter pedagogy became a pivotal theme in this research exploring pedagogical change during curriculum reform. McCulloch (2005) warns that when curriculum reform is used as a platform for educational change resistance can be heightened. Schools have been highly resistant to fundamental change during curriculum reform. Teachers cope with a limited curriculum with personalised pedagogy. Curriculum does not necessarily change pedagogy, but it has the potential to, given the right conditions in the intersubjective spaces of a school. Ladwig (2009) suggested that curriculum is enacted through pedagogy, as the syllabus is taught through the ways in which teachers facilitate teaching and learning. I suggest that it is more helpful in this research to proposed that pedagogy is enacted through curriculum. Both schools used the opportunity for curriculum reform as a niche for creating the conditions within the practice architectures for pedagogical change in their school. As Vicki explained: “It’s not just [our] school changing. It’s education as a whole. The Australian Curriculum has changed”. The external force of curriculum was changing the pedagogical approaches used at Crownwood and Greenville. For example, “Whilst we want to really engage these students with some amazing learning experiences… we need to prove that we are teaching to outcomes and assessing accurately and keeping samples and annotating our programs and we have evidence” (Andrea). Curriculum change was the rationale for pedagogical change. The external pressures of accountability were changing the pedagogical practices through curriculum change so that schools were ready for accreditation. The driver of pedagogical change was accountability and monitoring, rather than teaching and learning and this impacted upon trust and
mistrust. At the same time notions of empowerment or disempowerment through teacher professional learning about curriculum reform and pedagogical change or lack thereof were filling the intersubjective spaces (Gore, 1992; Ellsworth, 1989; Shrewsbury, 1987).

The interpretation and implementation of the NSW English syllabus and upcoming NESA (BOSTES) accreditation in both schools was creating a climate in the physical time space caught between compliance and learning. As an IB School, Crownwood needed to meet the requirements of both the NSW NESA syllabus and the IB pedagogical framework. Using both curriculum documents enabled Crownwood to create cross-curricular links and fostered inquiry approaches in literacy. In contrast new curriculum at Greenville created more administration in preparation for NESA accreditation. Concurrently, teachers at Greenville were offered opportunities to meet with Harvard in-residence professors of education to develop their pedagogical approaches. American educators were unfamiliar with the Australian curriculum and the opportunity to connect the two opportunities was limited. At Greenville curriculum reform was not recognised as an opportunity for pedagogical change. “[The English syllabus] is not meant to be changing the way we are teaching in the Junior School as such. That’s got to come from a wider base than just me”. Pedagogical change was compartmentalised away from curriculum implementation. At Greenville curriculum seemed to be understood as entirely separate from pedagogical approaches, which either brought teachers the freedom to teach as they wished, or a lack of cohesion within and between classrooms. Curriculum was one part of pedagogy and the written curriculum was renegotiated in the classroom to become the enacted curriculum from the intended syllabus (Alexander, 2008; Luke, 2010; Marsh, 1997).

At Crownwood, both curriculum and pedagogy were expected and interpreted concurrently. “The pedagogy sort of impacted the curriculum and the curriculum sort of impacted the pedagogy” (Andrew) suggesting how this research meets Ladwig’s (2009) findings and builds upon them. A syllabus is a product, while a curriculum is a process. The responsibility of pedagogical leadership is to interpret the syllabus in context and apply appropriate pedagogical practices for the specific context based on
the needs of students and their learning outcomes. For curriculum to transform pedagogy it needs to be practically applied by teachers and their programming as it forms and changes the practice architecture. Conceptions of curriculum are connected with the ‘sayings, doings and relatings’ of the school and its material-economic arrangements through professional learning, staff meetings, strategic planning documents and articulated pedagogical philosophies that connect with children in a school (Kemmis, et al., 2014). Curriculum change at Crownwood was prompting teachers and leaders to think holistically about their roles:

That’s my job, you know, the curriculum. People think it’s about the subjects, but the curriculum, it’s the whole thing: staffroom, playground, even in the way we deal with each other (Vicki)

Her definition of curriculum concurs with Bruner’s (1959) ideals of conceiving the end product, but he also further develops his conceptions of pedagogy as a valued process (1996). Schiro’s (2013) ideologies and the intended versus the actual curriculum also point to a holistic approach. If curriculum is the entire act of teaching and learning then it is much more than a syllabus document. It is the overarching philosophy for teachers’ pedagogical philosophy or praxis.

Pedagogical change was constrained by fear and lack of knowledge, found in the intersubjective spaces in the ways teachers interacted, spoke and acted. The Deputy Head described how pedagogy was not discussed during meetings and how this affected their teaching:

Meetings are held for administrative purposes, not discussion of pedagogy… It’s a perfect vehicle for modelling what we expect in the classroom. Let’s model it with the teachers. So you can see when staff meetings are run in such a way, that is the way the classes are run (Lisa).

Professional learning opportunities become like a mirror for modelling pedagogical practice whether effective and congruent or ineffective and in conflict. The way pedagogy was perceived impacted how the curriculum was enacted. However, both schools appeared to have different practice landscapes for changing pedagogy, formed by the intersubjective spaces between staff professional learning and teacher praxis. They moved in different directions in their modelling of pedagogical practice and in staff development practices to change practice traditions. One school enabled staff
professional learning through staff inquiry groups, while the other arranged curriculum meetings during staff meeting time with minimal discussion. This modelling connected directly with the pedagogical leadership of a school. Empowerment enables knowledge and replaces fear with trust. Leaders were seeking to empower teachers at Crownwood and Greenville through teacher professional learning, but the practices establishing pedagogical change were not creating agents of empowerment in teachers by connecting the rhetoric of empowerment with the practice of pedagogy (Gore, 1992). At Crownwood, the notion of “spies” created fear and at Greenville discussions about being “fired” revealed teachers fears. When pedagogical change was constrained leaders mistrusted teachers and teachers mistrusted leaders.

The material-economic arrangements that connect teacher professional learning with the classroom become “how you actually get students learning” (Vicki). This statement connects with the notion of empowerment between teacher and student. These are not equal power relations but Shrewsbury (1987) suggests that for learning they need to move in that direction in creative learning spaces. I think that the extent to which teachers empower students is dependent upon their capacity to make learning purposeful. Therefore staff professional learning indirectly connects with student learning outcomes. Capacity for change comes from local school culture practitioner inquiry (Goldspink, 2007; Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2009). A culture of practitioner inquiry as attempted by Crownwood built a niche for pedagogical change within ecologies of practice including personalised learning (Kemmis et al, 2014). Based upon this understanding professional learning can be personalised to build upon their pedagogical knowledge and values. From there pedagogical understanding can be shared so that teachers can build a mutual understanding of their pedagogical approaches and these can be reflected upon for the benefit of student learning and student outcomes.

**Student Learning and Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment and Reporting**

Learning is the core purpose of school. Curriculum reform and pedagogical change are only of value if they serve to create the practice architectures for purposeful
learning. Achievement is about human capital, while learning is about the child, and therefore student learning outcomes may be an inadequate representation of learning (Fullan, 1993; Mulford, Silins & Leithwood, 2004; Robinson et al. 2008). Rather, academic attainment and broad learning opportunities may be complementary outcomes (Day & Armstrong, 2016). Participants at Crownwood and Greenville were asked to describe their understanding of student learning outcomes, in order to gain a more detailed understanding of the pedagogical approaches that were utilised in both settings and how the school was maximising student potential. Participants at Crownwood and Greenville acknowledged the holistic and personal nature of the child and the “opportunities” (David and Andrea) that this presented to students within their definition of student learning outcomes in both schools where pedagogy aligns knowledge, curriculum, assessment, institutions, context and individuals within the material economic arrangements (Thomson, Lingard and Wrigley, 2012). Meeting the needs of individual students was a priority. Student learning outcomes were not just connected with measured academic outcomes and data driven learning at Crownwood and Greenville. David talked further about the difference between academic outcomes and other ones.

There are a wide range of other outcomes that operate within a school that’s about helping a whole child reach their potential, because I think for our school it is really very much about broadening horizons.

The Head of School was keen to foster a school culture of participation and opportunity for students at Crownwood. The tensions between an outcomes-based approach and an emphasis on holistic skills are well represented by Berlach’s (2004) dilemmas and Spady’s (1993) multifaceted outcomes-based approach to learning.

The outcomes driven approach was assisting both schools in reflecting upon what they hoped to achieve with students. Both schools also referred specifically to syllabus documents when they were explaining student learning outcomes including “curriculum outcomes”, “Board of Studies outcomes” “and the KLAs.” The way that outcomes connected with assessment and personalised learning at both schools was contested. One teacher at Greenville expressed the difficulty she found connecting knowledge of curriculum outcomes with classroom practice: “As a leader in Science I don’t know how I get student outcomes, but as a classroom teacher with my group of
kids I know how I can push them or support them in Science.” (Renee). Teachers at Crownwood had difficulty understanding the outcomes in the PYP and the NSW syllabus and connecting these with inquiry approaches rather than classroom activities. There was confusion in the cultural-discursive arrangements constraining understanding. Therefore the applied knowledge of curriculum outcomes was problematic in both settings. Both schools saw student outcomes as more than academic, connecting the holistic individual potential of students to their learning outcomes rather than curriculum dot points. However, teachers were also expected to use outcomes in planning, assessment and reporting, demonstrating how new curriculum presented pedagogical and administrative change for teachers. David was concerned by “traditional approaches to teaching and learning” that did not represent inquiry or a connection with student learning outcomes. Similarly at Greenville, Andrea stated “we need to prove that we are teaching to outcomes and assessing accurately and keeping samples and annotating our programs and we have evidence” of student learning as part of their management of teaching and learning. Accountability for learning was a new priority within the material-economic arrangements at both schools. Towers (1992) and Luke (2010) warn educators about outcomes overload and national overcorrection. This was problematic in both schools, but they were still striving to educate holistically, as well as incorporating national, state and IB outcomes.

When it came to achievement, both schools considered academic and non-academic student learning outcomes that placed the needs of the child in the centre of the learning and practice. Educators were differentiating between two sets of outcomes: curriculum and syllabus outcomes and what they really intended student learning to be. David, the Head of School described his own philosophy of education and what he meant by outcomes:

Well, I suppose we’ve got our outcomes about what we believe about kids and about the way we’re trying to empower their lives…. The Board of Studies outcomes work inside the academic realm of what we hope for our students… but we also we need to align that with the IB outcome statements…. I think we need to make those outcomes a little bit more visible for the students so I actually like the words ‘learning intentions.’
The cultural-discursive arrangements were such that the challenges of curriculum change included defining and using outcomes when mapping to the NSW syllabus and the Australian Curriculum. The English Coordinator at Greenville described outcomes as “long, often nondescript statements that are quite difficult to unpack and work out.” Elizabeth returned to the curriculum outcomes in order to describe how Greenville was maximising student potential, suggesting room for “really unpacking them and actually working out exactly what that meant” as active measures of student pedagogy.

Assessment practice appeared to have a different agenda from curriculum at Greenville and Crownwood as teachers responded to the assessment requirements of curriculum reform. External testing formed part of the material-economic arrangements that also added pressure on student learning outcomes at Greenville and Crownwood and influenced parental pressure for accountability. David shared: “You’ve got your NAPLAN, the kids do the ICAS test because these are all parental expectations as well. And I think for us as educators we need to make sure we have got the right tracking mechanisms that are happening within our school.” At Greenville the perception of one teacher was that it involved “pushing and probing” students and teachers “questioning assessment” (Renee) and whether it enabled or constrained purposeful learning.

Curriculum was changing pedagogy at Crownwood as new curriculum documentation invited conversation into assessment practices. The effective use of assessment tools was an important area for further development with the implementation of new curriculum. Bernstein (1971) describes curriculum, pedagogy and assessment as the three message systems of schooling and these were the three priorities at Crownwood and Greenville. New syllabus documents were changing assessment requirements as part of the material-economic arrangements in both schools. Both schools were developing their own writing rubrics to determine student knowledge of writing and enabling teachers to measure “consistency” (Elizabeth). Formative assessment and assessment for learning practices were part of the inquiry approach used at Crownwood. These matched the NSW syllabus requirements for assessment for learning pedagogy that Andrew referred to as “good assessment.” Rather than
thinking summatively, Andrew described how he used assessment in the classroom as “ongoing through the unit we are teaching.” The main area that Jane was seeking to address was the connection between student learning outcomes and assessment: “I don’t think there is a lot of correlation between our teaching and our assessment and I think that is something that really needs to be addressed”. Testing was a frequent practice at Greenville. Assessment and accountability formed the necessary components of data collection from students. Connections between teaching, learning and assessment were also not being made in the intersubjective spaces at Crownwood and Greenville: “A bit of lack in experience in being able to assess students and what they can know” (Cathy) that meant that teachers programming was not changing. Some teachers were adopting “pre-testing” in order to assist them with assessment for learning practices, a new compulsory pedagogy in the NSW English K-6 syllabus, but Renee shared that they needed to be more “differentiated.” Teachers were making the first step, but then they were uncertain what to do next once they discovered who could and could not achieve the outcome.

Jane was frustrated by the lack of focus on assessment practice at Crownwood and its impact upon teaching and learning for students. Jane explained that there wasn’t a person in the school responsible for encouraging consistency in assessment:

*We don’t seem to compare our grades, our marks, our raw marks... We don’t standardise them which means when we add a child’s marks up... we haven’t moderated them.*

There were inconsistencies in the philosophy behind assessment tasks and reporting activities at Greenville. Renee shared:

*Assessment has changed this year to be assessment for learning and assessment of learning, but having said that we’re still putting marks on things to go towards prizes for speech day, which goes against it all.*

The intersubjective spaces within school culture demonstrated how assessment practices were not purposefully infiltrating reporting and student awards, similar to the production model of assessment and reporting critiqued by Thomson, Lingard & Wrigley, (2012). The teachers were frustrated that they were unable to voice these inconsistencies within the cultural-discursive arrangements and felt constrained by assessment practices.
In order for curriculum reform to enable pedagogical reform and impact upon student learning outcomes then how Crownwood and Greenville maximised student potential required careful consideration. The Deputy Head of Greenville considered the dimension of student potential.

*I don’t think we do maximise student potential. I really don’t. I think we pay lip service to it... I don’t think our assessments are good enough... We don’t have great feedback mechanisms for students... If you don’t have regular feedback that’s appropriate and constructive - if the students achieve the outcome, then that’s it… Intellectually they understand this, but I don’t think they think well they’ve got it where to from here? Where do I take them next?* (Lisa)

Utilising the assessment for learning principles as pedagogy set out in the NSW English syllabus as a material-economic arrangement potentially enabled teachers to reflect upon constructive feedback to inform the next steps for teaching and learning. At Greenville the gaps were in feedback and the use of that feedback to inform future teaching, suggesting that this was constraining practices and that the outcomes that were not informing the teaching and learning at Greenville.

Teachers were attempting to meet the learning needs or student outcomes of students in their classrooms through a differentiated curriculum. At Crownwood “*Differentiation is a huge focus for us as well. We’ve got another SIG that’s looking at that. And that will continue to be a focus I think forever*” (David). Renee explained how differentiation happens in classrooms at Greenville for mathematics and its limitations based upon a fear of parents: “*Our Maths program - we’re doing the same thing at the same time, but perhaps at a different level*” where perceived pressure from parents seemed to be driving the lack of differentiation in testing in the school: “*And that sameness, because we need to be accountable - a huge fear within us*” (Renee). The Deputy Head at Greenville explained how differentiation was a recent pedagogical approach in the Junior School. Lisa looked closely at how to make this change within the learning support arena. It has become a part of the curriculum in the NSW syllabus. Lisa explained her surprise: “*They now do have differentiation in their program. It is still a one-size-fits all. So extension is this, core is this.*” This division
by three has met the needs of some students, but missed the point of personalised learning, which was a key pillar of Greenville. A Pedagogical Coach at Crownwood reflected upon how the school maximised potential through differentiation. Alison shared: “We are doing a lot of differentiated teaching now”. When another Pedagogical Coach was asked about how the school maximised student potential through the use of student learning outcomes her response was “I don’t think we do it very well. It is one of the things that is being investigated.” This inconsistency of responses at Crownwood demonstrated how there was still room for development in differentiation, echoing the importance of individuals collectively realising the need for pedagogical change (Seashore Lewis & Riley, 2000). Pedagogical change was being delivered through differentiation, connecting pedagogical change with curriculum reform as differentiation is a pedagogical practice expected in the NSW English syllabus.

If students are at the heart of purposeful pedagogy as this research suggests, then personalised learning as well as collective outcomes are important for the child at the centre of learning and pedagogical change (Jackson & Bezzina, 2010). Personalised learning connects with assessment and links with outcomes. Personalised learning is about specific constructs: “not one yardstick, but personalised learning” (Vicki). The personalised learning practice that Vicki described at Crownwood came from more than one outcome and different outcomes, acknowledging how each student inquires in a different way. Personalised learning was a key strategic intent of the school at Greenville. Some participants at Greenville discussed personalised learning as a material economic arrangement when they talked about pedagogical approaches, student outcomes and assessment. Renee stated: “student outcomes should be personal outcomes.” This suggests that curriculum outcomes were inadequate for meeting the needs of each student in the classroom. Curriculum reform starts with the cohort and ends with the individual.

Personalised learning was needed to address the significant needs of a large non-selective cohort at Greenville as a key reform. Teachers were frustrated by the narrow focus on NAPLAN data that was constraining them from supporting some challenging students. An attempt to connect personalised learning with student
learning outcomes was being utilised at Greenville through an informal project between a class teacher and the Director of Teaching and Learning. The formal learning channels had been constrained as this teacher no longer held the innovation role, but the pedagogical relationship between these teachers remained as they attempted to infuse pedagogy for the benefit of students. These teachers were taking pedagogical projects informally without waiting upon formal structures for learning, despite the perceived constraints on their learning. Cathy shared:

*We are looking at learning objectives and setting objectives for kids. They know exactly what the objective is and all the feedback I give is related back to the objective… we’re also going to start this week getting students to do a learning journal each week.*

The Director of Learning was trying to help the teachers to understand that inquiry drives curriculum.

Accountability drove the formal pedagogical reporting structures within Greenville, but it was not connecting well with teacher professional learning practices and personalised teacher learning, suggesting that accountability was inhibiting teachers’ ability to be stirred into practices (Couros, 2015; Kemmis, 2014; Langelotz, 2016). Renee explained: “*Formally there is change. They are doing things I think in a better way because of the formal pedagogy around assessment and planning, and feedback to kids. And that’s all come from the top down and it’s formal and we’re making good change from it, but the informal change I would say it’s slow.*” Staff had not fully developed their thinking and praxis within the ecologies of practice at Greenville. There had been professional learning opportunities for teachers about assessment, planning and feedback and whole school meetings exploring these pedagogical approaches. However, the changes in teacher thinking about assessment, planning and feedback were yet to be embedded in practice. Vicki struggled to have the teachers at Crownwood understand that the focus was not on them as teachers or what was being taught or a learning activity, but rather a focus on what was being learned or inquired. Jane described the problem with specific focuses on school professional learning where other parts get ignored:

*And I think what happens is, you have these huge focuses. So for us at the moment it’s been all about implementing the new curriculum and making sure*
we have got our heads around it and implementing PYP has been a huge focus for the past five years and that has come at the cost of focusing on assessment [for example].

At both schools professional learning was coming from curriculum reform. The extent to which there was clear, shared direction about the specific learning needs of participants in a school community, came from how the school’s vision, mission and values lived in the intersubjective spaces in their specific context, enacted by all participants (Starratt, 2011). This is integral to reform where the capacity to sustain change comes from the school’s learning culture (Goldspink, 2007). Teachers were weary and cynical of curriculum reform in both schools (Goldspink, 2007; Sarason, 1990) and this was constraining the pace of reform and the adoption of new practices.

**Teacher Professional Learning**

The two schools conducted professional learning and utilised pedagogical leadership in entirely differently ways for the same purpose of curriculum implementation. The practice architectures at Crownwood supported action research as inquiry to enable curriculum reform and but leadership practices with Pedagogical Coaches constrained pedagogical change. As explained in Chapter 4 and 5, at Crownwood the Head of School established staff inquiry groups for teachers to focus particular aspects of their professional learning and inquiry pedagogy based on the PYP and the curriculum. At Greenville the practice architectures of formal meetings such as English curriculum committee meetings constrained professional learning. At the same time professional learning sessions about pedagogy such as visible thinking routines enabled pedagogical practice. Separating the two approaches constraining pedagogical change. The two professional learning approaches were quite dissimilar in altering the practice landscape back in the classroom. Teacher praxis, dispositions and responses to changes in practice traditions enabled and constrained pedagogical change.

Leaders shape genuine, non-formulaic opportunities for teachers to learn in communities of practice through professional development, monitoring and dialogue (Duignan, 2012; Fullan, 1993; Printy, 2013). These professional learning practices have the potential to make a difference to curriculum implementation (Meiers & Ingvarson, 2005). Potential is dependent upon the often turbulent opportunities
teachers have to connect teacher professional learning with practice dependent on where each child’s curriculum racetrack connects with the teacher (Smith & Lovat, 2003) or the metaphorical virtual school bag where both the child and the teacher carry their learning histories, backgrounds and practice preferences (Thomson, 2002; Connell, 1997). The Head of School at Crownwood gave an open invitation to all teachers to take on a leadership opportunity to lead a staff inquiry group on the implementation of the English Curriculum to “overlay curriculum with PYP”. Two teachers from Crownwood realised that in order to implement PYP transdisciplinary thinking alongside the English curriculum they would have to reconceptualise the whole curriculum design from an integrated perspective during staff inquiry groups, overlaying PYP with the syllabus. “We started with the writing section and then realised if we were going to overlay the curriculum with PYP we needed to go back to the curriculum concepts” (Pedagogical Coach Stage Two). It was not the original intention to have so much change at this initial stage. As the Head of School stated, “I had no idea [professional learning] would be as expansive as it has been, which is lovely”. Their shock came from the realisation that the new English curriculum would transform their teaching in other curriculum areas and enable an inquiry approach in the classroom.

Professional Learning is full of change tasks (Chi Binh Bui, 2013) and these doings at Greenville included activities such as “unpack[ing] the English curriculum”, “mentoring for teacher accreditation” and staff meetings. Leaders were frustrated that they didn’t run the professional learning in their school: “I haven’t done a single piece of professional learning for the staff in all the time I have been here… It’s just not the forum, it’s not encouraged” (Lisa). This lack of staff empowerment is “not as effective. It loses traction. We always feel like we are being told how to do things” (Lisa), potentially damaging teachers’ professional sense of self (Kelchtermans, 1993) in the micropolitics of power (Flema, 2009). Teachers wanted opportunities to lead and reflect, rather than be passive participants, in professional learning. They sought to be active in the reform process. Empowerment from teacher professional learning practices can be productive and liberating, or repressive, potentially creating an us and them knowledge culture (Gore, 2012). If teachers enable students to learn it facilitates empowerment (Gore, 2012). Teachers engaging in personal, purposeful,
individual learning are not dependent on empowerment. Engaging in collective learning is dependent upon opportunity.

Staff Inquiry Groups at Crownwood provided the opportunity to transform curriculum change by “empowering” (David) teachers to think about the way curriculum could be incorporated with the PYP through action learning practices (Laws, 2016; 2013; Mockler & Sachs, 2012; Sachs, Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2009;). “Taking this ‘SIG’ approach has completely revolutionised the way that you would make that change” (David), while at the same time change amongst some teachers was slow. The Director of Teaching and Learning suggested that “the teachers are like our students”, a statement that gives less autonomy to teachers than “we have invited people into more of a stakeholder position than we had before” (David). This lack of empowerment for teachers in the practice landscape explains why teachers craved opportunities for autonomy and praxis. This example of the difference in pedagogical leadership highlighted differences in the relational leadership styles within Crownwood in the intersubjective spaces that affected trust during curriculum change. It is the practice of teacher professional learning that enables community change. If teacher professional learning is an ecology of practice then teacher identity and praxis, or morally informed action, are enabled and constrained by teacher professional learning practices within these ecologies (Kemmis, et al, 2014).

Curriculum reform “in its teething stages” (Jane) was far from seamless at Crownwood with tensions between individualism and collegiality (Fullan, 1993). Teachers at Crownwood reticent about curriculum change frustrated other teachers excited by change. This is evidenced in sayings such as: “Go with the change or leave” (Alison). “We are going to change, change, change” has been the message (Jane). “Embrace the change” (Vicki) that filled the intersubjective spaces. They felt that academic rigour was being compromised by inquiry. They were only prepared to do inquiry in some parts of their lessons “as a flighty bit on the side” (Jane). Change was an issue for teachers at Crownwood who “as much as they think that they may cope with change, they don’t” (Vicki). The Director of Teaching and Learning was resigned to the thought that some teachers may not change, even though she hoped that they would. “There are still people that don’t want to move and they will not
change and it doesn’t matter how much training or how much help… maybe this isn’t the right place for you anymore” (Vicki). This statement indicates a ‘my way or the highway’ approach, but ultimately if a school curriculum is changing, teachers need to explore the curriculum and the subsequent pedagogy connected with the curriculum to go with the change. Teachers not in the niche of inquiry pedagogy felt constrained by the pressure to change, but those who did were enabled by the ecology of practice and some described their experiences as being transformed. The sayings, doings and relatings in the intersubjective spaces were enabling and constraining thinking and action about curriculum change.

Professional learning dialogue existed in the intersubjective spaces in both schools. The K-6 Learning Innovator suggested that more opportunities to share best practice would benefit teachers at Greenville. Formal practices were constraining these arrangements. Elizabeth shard: “The school is definitely trying to, you know, work on a sort of combined pedagogy, I think. For the Junior School in terms of sharing those ideas I think just more collaborative planning I think is useful.” The Deputy Head concurred, stating that there is: “No formal opportunity to share good practice. Staff meetings and professional learning is all about: ‘I’ve got the knowledge and this is how you are going to do it.’” Teachers did not have the opportunity to question or own their ideas and their learning. When a teacher was asked if she had the opportunity to share thinking about literacy the response was: “Yeah absolutely, but… they make changes I feel because they’ve been told to make changes”. The K-6 Head of Crownwood was now able to “have conversations with colleagues about our practice and about learning”. Pedagogical Coach Stage Two concurred. “The thing that struck me the most is how much dialogue went on… It is genuinely responsible learning conversation a lot of the time. It’s great.” Dialogic learning enabled professional learning and the development of praxis in teachers (Alexander, 2008; Lingard et al., 2003). At the same time change was threatening the predictability and comfort of the culture (Deal, 1987).

Figure 6.3 below highlights how the theory of pedagogical change has further developed in the analysis. It draws upon the models diagrammed in previous chapters
and extends themes from the data into the following theoretical findings. The theory of pedagogical change is presented in Chapter 7.

Figure 6.3 Toward a Theory of Pedagogical Change

The four participants: school, community, educators and the child, work for each other and from each other to be an enabling and inclusive voice for school communities, educators and the child and to transform learning. This research proposes that an ideal contiguity (Coleman, 2016) could exist in the intersubjective spaces between these groups in a purposeful school culture. Each segment of the diagram builds toward a theory of pedagogical change and will be defined and explained in relation to the data and the extant literature below. The practices that
enable and constrain pedagogical change are placed at the centre of the diagram. Trust is at the core.

**Pedagogy is Leading**

Leading is a practice, not a person (Kemmis et al., 2014; Lingard, Hayes, Mills & Christie, 2003; Wilkinson, 2017). My research has explored the prolific adjectival descriptions of leadership still apparent in leadership research. Pedagogical leadership is an inadequate term. It assumes that pedagogy is known and modelled by an experienced and competent leader, or leaders supporting teachers with pedagogical change. Research suggests that distributed leadership makes pedagogical leadership an effective practice (Crowther et al, 2009; Hallinger, 2007; McKenzie, Mulford & Anderson, 2007; Youngs, 2017). Distributed leadership practices do not necessarily successfully distribute pedagogy in the ways it is intended and may disperse or delegate leadership instead (Grootenboer, 2017; Lingard, Hayes, Mills & Christie, 2003; Netolicky, 2016) There was a lack of contiguity in pedagogical leadership in both schools in my research. For a school to operate as a pedagogical ‘coalition’ in a form of equitable teacher leadership as Lingard, Hayes, Mills and Christie (2003, p. 74) promote, the intersubjective spaces in the practice architectures need to be carefully explored in order to understand why some groups of teachers are able to create coalitions and other groups are constrained. Relational leadership is purposefully contingent on the collective with pedagogical leadership, creating contiguity and building trust, dispersing power and enabling the conditions for teacher leadership or coalitions (Day, 2017).

Lingard, Hayes, Mills and Christie’s (2003) statement “leadership as pedagogy and pedagogy as leadership” (p. 19) suggests that leadership and pedagogy are symbiotic. Without leaders, pedagogical change may be inhibited. However, not all educational leaders are pedagogical, and their understanding of pedagogy and purpose vary. My research found that some teachers exercising exemplary pedagogical practice may not be seen as leaders due to constraints of visibility and opportunity in the intersubjective spaces. The simile forms part of their work on productive leadership. The notion of
pedagogy or leadership being productive may lead educators to measure productivity in an era of school effectiveness and value learning as a product rather than a process (Niesche, 2017; Brooks, 2017). I suggest that leading with a “purposeful” stance (Day and Armstrong, 2016) may connect learning in meaningful and compassionate ways that respond to current needs in education that respond to a neoliberal focus on productivity. If excellent teaching connects pedagogy through praxis then pedagogy cannot be simplistically reduced to the application of teaching techniques for subsequent measurement (Alexander, 2008). Students and teachers are dynamic, dialogic, reflexive participants in pedagogy, able to conceive, critique, believe, act, and problem solve in purposeful ways. Pedagogical leading needs to enable these holistic actions and values. “Pedagogy is leading” could be seen in this research when the pedagogical knowledge, skills and praxis of teachers led the change formally and informally within subcultures concluding that pedagogy is praxis where teacher leadership is praxis (Kemmis et al., 2014).

Learning cultures and subcultures enable reform

Teachers, leaders and students are mutually responsible for purposeful work and contiguity within and between school cultures and subcultures. Curriculum reform and pedagogical change are made possible by the cultures and subcultures within a school learning cohesively, building trust, or working on conflict resolution of problems, thereby building increased trust (Fink, 2016; Mulford, Silins & Leithwood, 2004; Roby, 2011). This contiguity, or stirring of practices, creates the practice architectures for change. The ideal is that professional learning communities participate in professional learning about pedagogy with formal and informal structures of meetings and communication where dialogue is enabled and differences of opinion are made welcome, building trust. My research in both schools showed how difficult professional learning communities or communities of practice are to establish (Lave & Wenger, 2008). The sayings, doings and relatings in the intersubjective spaces showed how not everyone experiences cultures and subcultures in the same way in a school. The intersubjective spaces described and explained the tensions evident between practices. Cultures of compliance were in tension with a
desire for innovation. Pedagogical change was embraced by working within the subcultures making curriculum reform possible.

**Pedagogy is enabled through curriculum reform**

According to Ladwig (2009) curriculum enables pedagogy as it is enacted through curriculum. Building upon the notion that pedagogy is enabled through curriculum reform, inherent within syllabus documents are philosophies of pedagogy. Therefore, curriculum reform has the potential to enable pedagogical change. Both schools in this study attempted to change pedagogy during curriculum reform with varying success. Pedagogical change can be made without reference to curriculum outcomes, but my research showed how teachers experiencing a disconnection between pedagogical change and curriculum reform were slowed down from connecting changes with outcomes. How teachers successfully apply their pedagogical approaches to curriculum is dependent upon their philosophy of teaching and praxis and the philosophical approaches adopted in their school. There were conflicts between traditional and progressive pedagogical approaches in the intersubjective spaces in both schools (Miller, 1996). My research showed that when these matched, teachers felt a deep sense of connection and trust with the learning in their school. When pedagogical approaches clashed, the intersubjective spaces were filled with tension and mistrust.

**Dialogic pedagogy enables praxis**

Pedagogy is dialogical and the language of pedagogy enables praxis through teachers talking about what they value, what their pedagogical approaches are and how they connect to their moral decision making so that they may be transformed and develop praxis. Leadership and pedagogy are dialogic and framed by followers (Alexander, 2008; Ehrich, 2017; Lingard, Hayes, Mills & Christie, 2003). Teachers learn through discussion and relational interactions, building trust. This enables learning opportunities, and leading and teaching relationships to function in the intersubjective spaces. Silence constrains learning and can create tension in relationships and mistrust. Discourses are framed by power, which can constrain productive discourse
Discourse has the potential to bring self-empowerment. Empowerment assumes that there is an agent of authority to empower (Gore, 1992). The promise of empowerment did not necessarily enable the professionalism of teachers. Tensions in leadership, trust and professional learning constrained opportunities for empowerment.

**Transformative and transformational practices and enable and constrain change**

Examining the practices evident during curriculum change in two school settings has highlighted how change and trust requires building, establishing and maintaining pedagogical development processes and relationships concurrently in school settings. The capacity to create a dynamic learning organisation comes from understanding the intersubjective spaces that enable and constrain teacher professional learning practices. The material-economic conditions of professional learning during curriculum reform must be deeply contextual and inquiry-based in order for teachers to see the relevance and commit to learning new pedagogies.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented the transformative and transformational cultural and leadership practices that influence pedagogical change found in two schools and the nuanced differences between reform and change. It utilised themes grounded in the data to interpret the practice architectures found within the intersubjectives spaces between school learning cultures in more detail. Defining leading as practice and critiquing distributed leadership and its influence and impact upon trust and reform, the chapter utilised literature and data to explore the extent to which leadership practices transform student learning outcomes, curriculum reform and pedagogical change. Defining and understanding pedagogy was problematic in the literature and participant discourse. The ways that accountability, personalised learning and teacher professional learning were practiced within the intersubjective spaces within and between participants in these settings enabled and constrained transformational learning within cultures and subcultures. The chapter concludes that learning cultures and subcultures have the capacity to enable reform and that pedagogy has the potential to be enabled through curriculum reform when pedagogy is leading.
CHAPTER SEVEN

TOWARD A THEORY OF PEDAGOGICAL CHANGE

Grounded theory involves taking comparisons from the data and reaching up to construct abstractions and simultaneously reaching down to tie these abstractions to data. It means learning about the specific and the general – and seeing what is new in them – then exploring their links to larger issues or creating larger unrecognised issues in entirety. An imaginative interpretation sparks new views and leads other scholars to new vistas. Grounded theory methods can provide a route to see beyond the obvious and a path to reach imaginative interpretations.

Charmaz, 2014, p. 323

The purpose of Chapter Seven is to build toward a theory of pedagogical change. Constructivist grounded theory emerges from the findings in the data. This chapter attempts to provide possible responses to the following research questions posed in Chapter One.

1. How are the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school determined and who and what determines them?
2. To what extent do internal and external forces influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school?
3. What are the links between school culture and the pedagogy adopted in a school?
The theory of pedagogical change is a response to each of the research questions, as its component parts encapsulate the practices that enable and constrain pedagogical change. My theory contributes to knowledge in the field about school leadership and pedagogical change during curriculum reform. The theory of pedagogical change refines current ideas about how the language of pedagogy enables praxis. The social and theoretical significance of my research includes possible insights into understanding pedagogy, leading transformative and purposeful pedagogical change in a school and challenging and extending notions of distributed leadership and pedagogical leadership. My research explains how the learning cultures and subcultures enacted within the practice architectures of two schools enabled and constrained curriculum reform and pedagogical change, by identifying certain drivers of pedagogical change that have the potential to transform the practice architectures of a learning culture and its leadership and pedagogy. These provide insight into potential future actions and reflective opportunities for educators. This chapter also outlines the potential limitations of the study and suggests directions for further research.

Chapter 6 introduced the drivers of pedagogical change within the practice architectures of two schools. Of central importance are the transformative and transformational practices that enable and constrain change in the intersubjective spaces where the consequence is trust or mistrust.

**Where a grounded theory of pedagogical change meets practice**

The table below identifies and represents the possibilities for transformative and transformational drivers of pedagogical change, contingent upon the practice architectures that enable and constrain these drivers. The theory is not a toolbox for pedagogical change. Rather, the structure of the table represents the complex tensions between practices when they enable or constrain pedagogical change. The enabling and constraining practices found in the practice architectures are not to be considered as alternative forces, because practices can both enable or constrain the drivers of pedagogical change to a certain extent. There may be elements or practice on both sides of such a continuum.
Table 7.1 WHERE A GROUNDED THEORY OF PEDAGOGICAL CHANGE MEETS PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Change Constraints</th>
<th>Drivers of Pedagogical Change</th>
<th>Pedagogical Change Enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • One off training by experts unfamiliar with school context  
• Inadequate reflection time in meetings  
• Pedagogical ignorance/fixed mindset of teachers/leaders | Identifying pedagogical issues of practice for pedagogical change | • Action research through inquiry as ongoing/teacher professional learning, reflection and unlearning  
• Understanding pedagogy toward consensus |
| • Silence, unresolved dialogue about pedagogy | Sharing pedagogical issues of practice for pedagogical change | • Open, constructive dialogue about pedagogy |
| • Agents of imposed, hierarchical pedagogical middle leadership  
• Contrived collegiality | Leading pedagogical change collectively | • Collaborative/collective group inquiry where teachers are autonomous pedagogical leaders/authentic collegiality |
| • Pedagogical compliance/monitoring.  
• Perfectionism/accountability/suspicion  
• Narrow thinking/quick fix/toolbox/disconnected with purpose and context | Building a philosophy of pedagogical practice in context for pedagogical change | • Using creativity/innovation/trialing new pedagogy.  
• Mistakes as learning opportunities  
• Practical/deep thinking about pedagogical purpose in context |
| • Cohort learning opportunities for teachers with mandatory monitoring/lesson observation/spot checks/learning walks. | Learning focussed improvement for pedagogical change through a deep understanding of the individual and collective learning needs of children and teachers | • Personalised learning opportunities about pedagogy with learning choice, voluntary elements. Autonomous self- and peer-assessment practices rather than monitoring practices. |
| • Accountability through data and evidence of student learning outcomes. Hierarchical structure.  
• Observation/evidence about the teacher. | A desire to see evidence of learning progress through pedagogical change. | • Accountability through data and evidence of student learning outcomes. Mentoring.  
• Observation/evidence about the learner and the teacher learner. |
| • Change for change’s sake.  
• System compliance  
• Disconnect between curriculum and pedagogy. | Pedagogical change is justified, connecting curriculum and its relationship with individuals in context | • Pedagogy driven by the needs of children.  
• Specific site based reflexivity by understanding contiguity and intersubjectivity.  
• Deep connection between curriculum and pedagogy. |

Consequences

| Mistrust of leaders in their teachers and mistrust of teachers in their leadership | Resultant permeating action from pedagogical change | Trust of teachers in leadership and trust of leadership in their teachers |
The statements arranged in the centre of Table 7.1 articulate the key drivers in the theory of pedagogical change. These statements form the practical action from the theory. Findings grounded in the data are represented on the left and right hand side of the table. The enablers of pedagogical change are on the right and the elements on the left that constrain pedagogical change are directly derived from the semi-structured interview data outlined in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Trust was an unexpected consequence of the practices that enabled and constrained pedagogical derived from the data.

**Driver 1: Identifying pedagogical issues of practice for pedagogical change**

Pedagogical change is enabled and constrained by pedagogical dialogue and practice. The extent to which both schools were able to identify pedagogical issues of practice for pedagogical change was enabled and constrained by the individual participants within each school and the formal and informal opportunities for dialogue within each school, which was also dependent upon the individual teachers and the professional learning practice architectures. When teachers understand the meaning of pedagogy they are able to participate in dialogue that may lead toward a mutual consensus of pedagogy appropriate to their specific school context. Opportunities to understand pedagogical differences could be enabled during collaborative learning time in a culture of trust, where trust may be dependent upon individuals. At Crownwood teachers defined pedagogy with relative consensus in terms of holistic inquiry and outcomes, as their ongoing action research experience was a practice architecture that reinforced their understanding and fostered praxis through reflection. The action research inquiry also intended to foster unlearning of traditional approaches to pedagogy. At Greenville definitions of pedagogy were more mixed amongst individual participants. Consensus was constrained by one off training meetings by experts unfamiliar with the school context, inadequate reflection time, and pedagogical ignorance caused by a fixed pedagogical mind set in some teachers and leaders, while others embraced a progressive pedagogy, causing tension in the intersubjective spaces amongst teachers.
**Driver 2: Sharing pedagogical issues of practice for pedagogical change**

Sharing pedagogical issues of practice drives pedagogical change. When teachers participate in open, constructive dialogue about pedagogy, praxis is enabled. Silence or unresolved dialogue about pedagogy constrains the mutual sharing of praxis and potentially the development of individual teachers’ praxis. Silence and dialogue filled the intersubjective spaces in both schools, enabling and constraining pedagogical change. At Greenville pedagogy was shared during informal conversation between teachers, but was actively constrained due to the top-down social-political arrangements of staff meetings, causing tension. At Crownwood there were opportunities for teachers to share pedagogical issues of practice as part of the professional learning practice architecture both formally during staff meetings and during informal staff room conversations. Participants at Crownwood reported tension due to teachers’ reluctance to share if they held conflicting philosophies of pedagogy from the inquiry approach of the school.

**Driver 3: Leading pedagogical change collectively**

Leading genuine pedagogical change takes collective effort. This research found that pedagogical leadership practice is rarely genuinely distributed due to the complex tensions between power and empowerment, loyalty and trust within the intersubjective spaces. Practice architectures that embody collaborative practice and collective group inquiry, where teachers become autonomous pedagogical leaders with authentic collegiality and trust may enable pedagogical change. Collaborative inquiry was attempted at Crownwood, but when suspicion filled the intersubjective spaces, acceptance of this professional learning approach was slow. Agents of imposed, hierarchical pedagogical middle leadership, disguised as distributed leaders, with artificial collegiality and really acting as decentralised leaders or spies, constrained pedagogical change in both schools. In both schools these practices were problematic. At Crownwood, participants reported that teachers feared the influence of the Pedagogical Coaches on their reputation with the Head of School and this mistrust constrained their effectiveness. At Greenville decisions about pedagogy were
mainly made by the executive and executed by middle leaders, which was the opposite model to Crownwood. Neither worked. Participants described how this constrained teachers from being enable to lead change. One of the most significant findings from the data in both schools was that middle leadership had the capacity to significantly constrain pedagogical change, despite its positive intentions to lead pedagogical change.

**Driver 4: Building a philosophy of pedagogical practice in context for pedagogical change.**

My research showed how building a philosophy of pedagogical practice that applies to the specific context drives pedagogical change. Crownwood had an inquiry philosophy of pedagogical practice based upon the International Baccalaureate. Some participants supported inquiry pedagogy, but it was met with resistance from some teachers with a tendency toward more traditional teaching approaches. Tension between pedagogy created a subculture that constrained the inquiry philosophy of pedagogical practice. Greenville’s pedagogical practice was less fluid or defined, but compliance to pedagogical change was required despite teachers’ pedagogical independence. Creativity and innovation was welcomed and trialled by teachers and students, mistakes were seen as learning opportunities because participants were committed to working out the pedagogical practices that enable learning in their context. At Greenville, pedagogical change was constrained by accountability, monitoring and compliance practices, feeding perfectionism and suspicion. These traits were evident in both schools. Philosophies of pedagogical practice that apply to specific school cultures cannot be driven by narrow thinking or quick fix toolbox pedagogies disconnected with purpose and context. At Greenville curriculum was disconnected with the school’s philosophy of pedagogy. The professional learning inquiry philosophy at Crownwood provided the potential for teachers to connect pedagogy with curriculum. Although they were slow to commence, they provided continuous practice architectures for teacher professional learning.
Driver 5: Learning focussed improvement for pedagogical change through a deep understanding of the individual and collective learning needs of children and teachers.

A deep understanding of the individual and the collective learning needs of children and teachers are enabled by inquiry and personalised learning opportunities about pedagogy. This may include learning choice and voluntary elements in practice. Crownwood adopted an inquiry approach for students, and personalised pedagogies formed the strategic plan at Greenville. Staff professional learning at Crownwood also adopted inquiry in order to provide learning choice and voluntary elements. Personalised learning about curriculum was not available for teachers at Greenville. Participants in both schools wanted to build the practice architectures in order to gain a deep understanding of the individual and collective needs of students through focussed outcomes-based planning, assessment practices, lesson observations and work sample monitoring in order to enable praxis. Participants in both schools articulated the limitations of their data analysis and the lack of connection between assessment, outcomes and differentiation. Monitoring was part of the practice architectures at Crownwood and Greenville as a form of accountability. Mandatory monitoring, lesson observations, spot checks and learning walks constrained pedagogical change in both schools because these practices were not done autonomously and the way the practices were conducted did not promote self-assessment. Participants in both schools reported negativity, resistance to change, fear, inconsistent approaches, lack of feedback and lack of ownership. Therefore, autonomous self- and peer-assessment practices enable praxis. Teachers need to be accountable for what they do, but primarily as collaborative and self-developing professionals. Monitoring without the opportunity for reflection and ownership constrains pedagogical change.

Driver 6: A desire to see evidence of learning progress through pedagogical change

The use of data and evidence of student learning outcomes is driven by a desire to see evidence of learning progress through pedagogical change. Although student data were being utilised in both schools, Crownwood and Greenville both identified assessment data as an area for further professional learning and whole school
development. Therefore a positive attitude towards data was enabling a gradual change in emphasis toward data in both schools. At Crownwood a staff inquiry group was investigating assessment practices and the use of data for assessment for learning. At Greenville work samples were being collected in every subject area for moderation. Hierarchical structures constrained the gathering of lesson observation data on student outcomes in both schools. At Greenville complicated procedures were adopted and were not followed through. At Crownwood participants reported a lack of trust in the Pedagogical Coaches coming to ‘spy’ on their lessons. Both schools intended lesson observation to be positive for teachers, and neither Head of School had anticipated that it would become a learning constraint.

**Driver 7: Pedagogical change is justified, connecting curriculum and its relationship with individuals in context**

Pedagogical change needs to be driven by justified intentions as it connects curriculum with individuals in context. Pedagogy driven by the needs of children is the paramount philosophical reason for change. Mandatory curriculum reform justifies change, but change becomes meaningful when teachers connect changes with practice. This is enabled by specific site-based reflexivity where teachers draw deep connections between curriculum and pedagogy. This occurs through teacher professional learning. There were opportunities at both schools to learn about curriculum reform and pedagogical change through staff meetings at Greenville and staff inquiry groups at Crownwood. Pedagogical change is constrained if teachers cannot make connections between curriculum and pedagogy, or if the two are in conflict. Teachers are not moved to alter pedagogical practices for the sake of compliance. Teachers at Crownwood and Greenville who had adopted traditional pedagogical approaches were struggling to make these connections. Pedagogical change is constrained by change for change’s sake.

The theory of pedagogical change is not a toolbox for change. It is made more complex by the tensions in the drivers of change. Constraints in certain contexts may be enablers in another. For example, accountability is not wrong. The practices architectures that constrain the drivers of pedagogical change are not necessarily based upon inherently poor practice. The theory of pedagogical change exposes the
complexity of creating change in leadership, pedagogy and school culture. Rapid change alongside systems of transparency and accountability, and the traditional leadership structures inherent in our school systems may unintentionally result in pedagogical change constraints and mistrust at individual, school and system level. Practices that enable teacher professional learning and foster deep collaborative learning are themed with requiring time, dialogue and autonomous relationships, deep analysis of learning needs, knowledge of context and individuals, and trust. Contiguity is achieved when trust is developed. The resultant permeating action from pedagogical change is twofold: When pedagogical change is enabled the consequence is that teachers trust in leadership and leadership trusts their teachers. When pedagogical change is constrained in a school, leaders mistrust their teachers and teachers mistrust leaders. Leadership enables and constrains pedagogical change. Leader is singular where leadership is plural, implying shared leadership fosters pedagogical change.

The next section seeks to respond to the research questions, based on the data.

Research Question 1:

How are the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school determined and who and what determines them?

In both schools pedagogical approaches were partially determined by external authorities, translated into teachers’ knowledge of the Australian Curriculum and the NSW NESA (BOSTES) syllabus. Pedagogical approaches were determined by compliance to curriculum and policy change and NESA (BOSTES) accreditation ensured their implementation. The PYP program was adopted in one setting. This pedagogical inquiry approach was determined by the IB accreditation board. Pedagogical change was justified through system compliance and connected to the specific needs of children.

Additional pedagogical approaches such as the use of inquiry, visible learning techniques, assessment for learning approaches, questioning strategies and learning intentions were determined by forces within each school through the leadership team.
in consultation with external academics in order to provide professional learning for teachers. Concurrently, teachers practised their own pedagogy and encouraged others to try new pedagogical strategies, demonstrating that teachers also determined pedagogical strategies as the enactors of curriculum and pedagogy when this was entrusted to them. Some teachers in both schools sought to identify and share pedagogical issues of practice for pedagogical change, from a desire to see evidence of learning progress through pedagogical change.

The extent to which leadership had autonomy within a K-12 school also determined the pedagogical approaches used in the schools and who determined them. At Greenville the K-12 Principal and K-12 Director of Teaching and Learning strongly influenced the pedagogical approaches that were delivered by the Junior school leadership team. In contrast, the Head of School at Crownwood was given complete autonomy to determine the pedagogical approaches in the school. The level of autonomy and trust the Head of (Junior) School was allowed differed in each school. Building a philosophy of pedagogical practice in context was directly connected with the strategic plans of both schools, and accountability for delivery to school boards and the K-12 Principal was also a requirement.

Monitoring the adoption of pedagogical approaches during pedagogical change occurred in both schools in accordance with pedagogical leadership and school cultural practices including observations, learning walks, book monitoring and sampling, and checking planning documents. This did not necessarily determine adoption of new pedagogy or curriculum and was influenced by trust. Formal meetings were either an effective or ineffective platform for discussing and adopting new pedagogical approaches. Meetings became the responsibility of middle leaders in both schools who were agents of imposed change. In one school Pedagogical Coaches also supported pedagogical change in support of the adoption of new pedagogical practices. Informal conversations were an effective means of influencing pedagogical change in both schools, building trust. Teachers determined what pedagogical approaches they used in the classroom based on their pedagogical identity, except where inquiry pedagogy drove pedagogical change and became a teaching requirement at Crownwood. There were teachers at both schools passionate about
learning and focussed improvement for pedagogical change through a deep understanding of individual and collective learning needs.

The pedagogical approaches were adopted at Crownwood through the use of staff inquiry groups for teacher professional learning. This was highly intentional so that staff professional learning would model the inquiry learning culture that the Head of School wanted mirrored in classrooms. If the staff were trusted to take ownership of their learning through action research inquiry then they would be empowered to learn and change. This enabled a genuine learning community where all participants were welcome to contribute, minimising hierarchy. This distributed leadership empowered some teachers. However, the abolition of year coordinators and the creation of Pedagogical Coaches in each key stage during pedagogical change also created confusion, disempowerment and mistrust among other teachers who valued pastoral and administrative leadership. Pedagogical ignorance and a fixed pedagogical mindset in some teachers may have constrained pedagogical change.

The pedagogical approaches at Greenville were determined by the senior school leadership team and disseminated to the junior school. Teachers were told what to do, with minimal distributed leadership and the teachers themselves suggested that they were not trusted with change. At the same time, several participants reported that they longed for a voice within the school culture to work together and build trust. The voice they spoke about was both their own and that of pedagogical leadership lacking in the junior school. The English coordinator was given the role of leading pedagogical change alone. She found this both empowering and stressful. It appears that control and policy determination by an individual can create fear where collaboration builds trust.

The size of the staff body had an impact upon pedagogical change, making dissemination, understanding and consensus in any project significant. Disagreement was also not allowed, which built resentment and led to the isolation of leaders. When academics in residence were brought in as experts to empower teachers in their learning, the teachers themselves felt disempowered as autonomous learners, leading to a loss of confidence in their ability to connect curriculum with pedagogy during
pedagogical change. These academics were pedagogical experts. They did not understand the Australian curriculum context and that the role of teachers was to make valuable connections between curriculum and pedagogy. Autonomy in the practice architectures may have enabled pedagogical leadership, fostering authentic pedagogical relationships with the external academics.

Research Question 2: To what extent do internal and external forces influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school?

The second research question sought to find out to what extent internal and external forces influence the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school. The key external force driving pedagogical change was curriculum change. The extent to which curriculum changed pedagogy was dependent upon whether or not it was intended to be used as a conduit for pedagogical change. Curriculum change influenced the created legitimate opportunity for pedagogical change. An emphasis on student outcomes from external pressures of accountability and compliance from NAPLAN, MySchool, PISA and teacher accreditation as well as research-based practice trends currently being practised in schools influenced the outcomes-based practice adopted as a pedagogical approach in both schools. Cultural pressures on teachers from external compliance created conflicting demands that competed with teaching and learning at both schools, resulting in suspicion and teacher mistrust and teaching. Compliance did not imbue trust and was not supporting teachers to improve upon pedagogy or connect it with the NSW English syllabus during curriculum change. The external force of the curriculum did not necessarily change pedagogy at Greenville where there was a complete disconnect between curriculum change and pedagogical practice. This gave certain freedom to teachers in their pedagogical practice. However, literacy was less explicitly prioritised as a cross-curricular priority. Curriculum seemed like a disruption to pedagogical transformation. At Crownwood the IB curriculum, combined with the NSW English syllabus drove curriculum and pedagogical change and curriculum sought to alter pedagogical practice to inquiry throughout the curriculum.

The internal forces that influenced pedagogical approaches came from the curriculum and pedagogical ideologies of teachers and leaders. Pedagogical leadership is an
internal force that influences the pedagogical approaches adopted in a school. There was minimal understanding in both schools about the pedagogies that drove their practices, and there was no acceptance of the value of difference, and this created conflict and pedagogical mistrust within the schools. The way pedagogy was perceived impacted upon how the curriculum was delivered. Misunderstandings about pedagogical ideology not only constrained pedagogical change, but also created mistrust in leadership and mistrust in pedagogical change itself.

Formal and informal communication can enable or constrain pedagogical change. The effective use of time during formal professional learning meetings impacted upon teachers in both schools. Using staff meetings to enable teachers to inquire, communicate concerns and solve problems rather than seeing meetings as opportunities for formal messaging enabled pedagogical change and built trust. Conversely, telling teachers how to think, or pedagogical silence, constrained pedagogical change and built suspicion and fear, creating complexity and delaying and constraining pedagogical change.

**Research Question 3: What are the links between school culture and the pedagogy adopted in the school?**

The third question sought to understand the links between school culture and the pedagogy adopted in the school. Staff professional learning practices provided a clear picture about the connection between school culture and pedagogy in practice. At Crownwood formal inquiry practices enabled pedagogical change through the use of staff inquiry groups as a platform for understanding the English curriculum, making discovering pedagogy a research-based process. Shared ownership made learning relationships genuine, building trust. At Greenville there were constraints in formal communication practices and staff meetings, but informal conversation, separate from leadership, was rich in pedagogical dialogue, transforming teaching and learning from within. Pedagogical learning became meaningful to teachers and their colleagues when it was applied practically in their school context in both schools, enabling change and building trust.
A school culture inviting pedagogical leadership and inquiry learning sought to create pedagogical change in teachers. This was caused by enthusiasm or perhaps as the result of peer pressure in a formal learning structure, or staff inquiry groups enabling teachers to build a community of practice. Personalised learning through inquiry, enabled the curriculum to be received by teachers. Informal networks between teachers at Greenville enabled some pedagogical change, but it was disconnected with curriculum change and the formal pedagogical learning culture.

Conflicts in pedagogical leadership, as new leaders were appointed and they changed their approach, were frustrating to teachers. New principal leadership in both schools and changes to middle leadership structures in both settings caused confusion amongst the teachers as to what pedagogical approaches should be prioritised and what kind of school culture was being built. At Crownwood a culture of inquiry was being fostered by staff inquiry groups and by the Pedagogical Coaches. The hierarchical middle leadership mentoring role created mistrust and almost unintentionally undermined the work of the professional learning groups. At Greenville teachers were able to choose their own pedagogical approach, but were also monitored through observation, learning walks and book checks, creating fear and mistrust. Fostering collaborative group inquiry at Crownwood enabled pedagogical change. The distributed leadership of the English coordinator at Greenville also promoted imposed curriculum reform, separate from pedagogical change. Pedagogical change was conducted in separate K-12 professional learning sessions at Crownwood, disconnected with curriculum change.

Collaborative and collective learning is a lived pedagogy of sharing and empathy, where modelling and emulating practice has a powerful connection with improving student outcomes, which occur in practice individually and collectively. Therefore, a theory of pedagogical change enables trust for personalised professional learning in a community of practice. Recognising vulnerabilities was an essential element of relational leadership for pedagogical change and distributed pedagogical leadership brought out hidden talents within teachers. Trust during pedagogical change enables relational and genuinely distributed leadership. The process of staff professional learning connecting PYP pedagogy with the syllabus enabled gradual classroom
change at Crownwood, creating sustainable pedagogical change. Similarly at Greenville, pedagogical change occurred through teacher leadership. Pedagogical trust was needed at Greenville for sustainable change and clarity about pedagogy and curriculum.

Pedagogical change theory, grounded in the data, acknowledges the essential element of trust in enabling and constraining pedagogical leadership practices during curriculum change. Pedagogical change requires genuinely distributed leadership and the building of trust amongst participants, reducing hierarchies and prioritising learning. Pedagogical change theory creates the essential link between school culture and the pedagogy adopted in the school. The pedagogical approaches adopted in a school are determined through mutual learning, consent, shared growth and trust.

Research Limitations, Contribution and Possibilities for further research

This constructivist grounded theory research provides insight into pedagogical change during curriculum reform. It highlights the pedagogical leadership practices of principals, middle managers and teachers and their perceptions of each other, within these two contexts, providing a layered understanding of the two school cases. The case studies analyse the implementation practices of the NSW K-6 English syllabus for the Australian curriculum in two schools, building theory about pedagogical change in this specific context. At Crownwood there seemed to be a more collective voice than at Greenville where perceptions of pedagogy and leadership varied. The complex nature of social interaction in the two sites means that this research is one possible interpretation of the practices that occurred in the two specific sites. The contexts are constantly shifting in response to learning and embracing curriculum reform and pedagogical change. The research sought to be credible and valid as it evaluated the research questions in accordance with the subjective perceptions of interview participants. There are a range of participants making the collective perceptions a more reliable source of investigation. The building of theory from the data enables meaning to be potentially transferable in new contexts.
Naming the theory toward a theory of pedagogical change, leans on the title of Bruner’s (1997) seminal work. Toward in the title also acknowledges the limitations of the findings. There are multiple complex reasons why pedagogical change is enabled or constrained. Trust is one element of the theory that emerged in the findings of this research. There are other elements that contribute to a theory of pedagogical change. For example, researching the impact of time constraints upon pedagogical change would be valuable future research. Each of the drivers of pedagogical change could form separate research topics in the future to further build the theory of pedagogical change.

The findings within my theory of pedagogical change could also be further explored. Transformative and transformational practices in schools is an area of further research. Whether teacher leadership makes a difference to the methods that constrain compliance is another area. Further examination of dialogic pedagogy and subcultures in schools are also areas of interest, including research into student voice and pedagogy.

The opportunity to research pedagogical change in an IB PYP school provided comparative insights between a school adopting the NSW syllabus alone and the PYP. This also makes an important contribution when a number of Australian schools are choosing to be IB schools. Future research could examine how other IB schools, other NSW schools or other alternative schools implement pedagogical change during curriculum change. Future research into middle leadership as collaborative or as agents of imposed change could provide insight into pedagogical change. Research using the theory of practice architectures as an analytical framework for classroom observation could also provide further insight into pedagogical change during curriculum change. The opportunity to build a theory of pedagogical change gives leaders, middle leaders and teachers new ways of conceptualising pedagogy, leadership practices, and teacher professional learning cultures during pedagogical change.

The importance of this thesis is the way it highlights that practices intended for positive pedagogical change can unintentionally hinder trust and progress during
curriculum reform. It left me with an overwhelming sense that leadership is about trusting and enabling teachers to lead and self-manage in order to create a productive and purposeful pedagogical culture, particularly during curriculum change. Therefore, collective learning that fosters collegiality and trust is the key to pedagogical change, alongside personalised learning for teachers who each have a different pedagogical philosophy. This will look different in every context. I conducted this research in order to become a better pedagogical leader. This research has shown me that the role of pedagogical leadership is about distributing professional learning through genuine relationships with teacher leaders that support dialogue about pedagogy and connect teachers with action research. New curriculum can be a catalyst for pedagogical change. Building a theory of pedagogical change from a practice architecture perspective has enabled me to see the complexity of leadership and teachers’ individual and collective involvement in building pedagogical practice during curriculum reform.

**Conclusion**

This chapter sought to provide answers to the research questions posed in Chapter 1 by building a theory of pedagogical change in accordance with constructivist grounded theory. Seven drivers of pedagogical change outlined in Chapter 6 were built from the literature and data analysis. Trust emerged as an unexpected explanation for how practices enabled and constrained pedagogical change. The theory of pedagogical change presented in this final chapter further develops the seven key drivers of pedagogical change within the complex tensions of the practice architectures of two schools, outlining how practices enabled and constrained the seven drivers. The theory of pedagogical change built in this research provides a useful understanding of the ways the drivers of pedagogical change function within the inherent complexity of school contexts. If school reformers take a reflexive approach during curriculum and pedagogical change, they may be actively mindful of the practices within their own contexts that enable and constrain reform, in order to most effectively lead pedagogical change.
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APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

(1) What is the study about?
You are invited to participate in a study about pedagogical leadership and the ways in which it impacts upon student outcomes. The Australian Charter for the Professional Learning of Teachers and School leaders implemented in August 2012 has placed student outcomes at the forefront of primary education in Australia. It is for this reason I wish to gather information about pedagogical practices in your school and the internal and external influences that determine pedagogical approaches. A particular emphasis will be placed on pedagogical leadership. The study will specifically examine the impact of the implementation of the Australian National Curriculum in English, Mathematics and Science in 2013 upon pedagogical leadership in independent schools.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Christine Grice (BA DipEd MEd) and will form the basis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Kevin Laws.

(3) What does the study involve?
The study involves the following:
Participants will be interviewed about their current experience and their insights about pedagogy, leadership, and the implementation and incorporation of the National Curriculum in English, Mathematics and Science in Key Stages 2 and 3 in their school and the outcomes for students.
• Participants will include the Head, Director of Studies of equivalent and Subject Coordinators for English, Mathematics and Science. Separate consent is required from all participants.
• Interviews will require approximately one hour of your time and will be conducted at your school site. The interviews will be undertaken between January and June 2013 and a schedule drawn up in consultation with participants.
• The interviews will be semi-structured and the indicative interview questions are attached.
• Each interview will be recorded on an audiotape for analysis and coding of content.
• Access to data from past and present curriculum documents during interview would be beneficial to the study.
• The research will not adversely affect the participants or cause any physical or psychological distress in the participants.
• In reporting the results of the study at no time will your true identity be revealed, not will the real name of the school be used.

(4) How much time will the study take?
The study will involve approximately one hour of each participants time in the form of a semi-structured interview. Please see the attached potential interview questions. Interviews will be
(5) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants. A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(6) Will the study benefit me?

There are no financial benefits for participating in the study and no additional costs will be incurred by participating in the project. I hope that this research will benefit participants by offering school leaders and staff an opportunity for reflection on current pedagogical practice in the context of your school in an open, professional exchange in a pertinent area of research as recommended by the Australian Charter (2012). However, we cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from the study.

(7) Can I tell other people about the study?

You are able to discuss any aspects of the study with anyone at any time.

(8) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?

When you have read this information, Dr Kevin Laws will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Dr Kevin Laws, Faculty of Education and Social Work on +61 2 9351 6396 (Telephone); or kevin.laws@uni.sydney.edu.au.

(9) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ..................................................[PRINT NAME], in the role of ..................................[PRINT JOB TITLE], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND STUDENT OUTCOMES

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher(s).

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) or the University of Sydney now or in the future.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

5. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent.

6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
RESEARCH TITLE: PEDAGOGICAL LEADERSHIP AND STUDENT OUTCOMES

INDICATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Please tell me about your school? What is it like? How would you describe the ways in which teachers and leaders interact in relation to student learning?

How is leadership distributed in your school? How is your school organised in terms of stages and subjects? How do different key stages and subject areas talk to each other?

What is your understanding of student outcomes? How does your school maximise student potential?

What do you understand by the term pedagogy? Describe the pedagogical approaches used in your school.

Are there opportunities for teachers to share good practice in your school?

What, and who, influences pedagogy in your school?

How is the implementation of the new Australian National Curriculum in English, Mathematics and Science impacting pedagogy in your school?

How does your pedagogical leadership contribute to student learning outcomes?

Do you have any comments about the Australian Charter for the professional learning of teachers and school leaders by AITSL (Australian Institute for teaching and school leadership) 2012?

Do you have any other comments, observations or information about pedagogical leadership and student outcomes?
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