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SECONDARY ENGLISH IN THE AUSTRALIAN CURRICULUM: TASMANIAN TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION – A CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW

Australian school curricula are currently being reformed with the nation-wide introduction of the Australian Curriculum, designed to bring national subject content and assessment standard conformity through the detailing of the “core knowledge, understanding, skills and general capabilities [that are deemed] important for all Australian students” (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2008). The reform and implementation of any curriculum requires well-structured planning, and at the school level, curriculum implementation requires the input of teachers – the frontline stakeholders.

Research suggests that the implementation of a new curriculum requires concentrated support to ensure that teachers are able to work and progress through professional learning effectively (Mulford, 2008; Australian Curriculum Coalition, 2010). This chapter is presented in two parts: a discussion about the incoming Australian Curriculum: English, and an outline of a proposed qualitative case study that will examine English teachers’ perceptions of the implementation of the Australian Curriculum: English in Tasmania.

WHAT IS MEANT BY ‘SCHOOL CURRICULUM’?

The definition of curriculum is constantly changing. A school curriculum can be described as a set of learning outcomes for school subjects, but also as a description of and rationale for the skills, content knowledge and assessment standards of achievement for each of these learning outcomes (ACARA, 2008; Kridel, 2010; Squires, 2008). A curriculum is cited as a course of study which guides the direction of classroom instruction; a set of objectives with methods to achieve them (Hirst, 1975; Kliebard, 1986). Therefore, elements of the curriculum need to be sequential, clear, effective and achievable for both students and teachers (Squires, 2005). Although a curriculum does not prescribe pedagogy, it is important that teachers understand how to teach the content, what the required standards are, and why the outcomes are important. Darling-Hammond (2010) notes,

In addition to standards of learning for students, which focus the system’s efforts on meaningful goals, …[curriculum] will require standards of practice.

N. Fitzallen et al., (Eds.), The Future of Educational Research, 53–66.
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that can guide professional training, development, teaching, and management at the classroom, school, and system levels, and opportunity to learn standards that ensure appropriate resources to achieve the desired outcomes. (p. 103)

Darling-Hammond argues that, in order to comply with curriculum guidelines and to facilitate the essential skills that students require to achieve the set standards, the teacher must be knowledgeable about the content and language within the curriculum document. Moreover, the curriculum document must be clear and understood by teachers in order to be delivered effectively. Darling-Hammond posits further that Australian curriculum reform, like other international curriculum reform, needs to be supported by effective and collaborative professional development amongst teachers. Mulford (2008) and Darling-Hammond (2011) suggest that this is done by incorporating policy strategies that encourage building strong professional standards and support structures such as teacher professional development, briefings about and evaluation of classroom activities; and through the empowerment of teacher learning for successful curriculum implementation via collegial collaboration. In the context of the current discussion, it is essential that educators are provided with clear and explicit information about the new Australian Curriculum in order for them to contribute meaningfully to its implementation.

Recent literature iterates the need for teachers to understand and be heard during curriculum reform (Chaudary & Imran, 2012; Dixie, 2011; Gardner & Williamson, 2004; Noack, 2011). In the Australian context, Masters (2010) notes that “the implementation of the new curriculum will require teachers with expert knowledge about effective teaching practices and high levels of skill in interpreting the new curriculum for particular groups of students”, and that the Australian Curriculum “will enhance the quality of teaching and learning in our schools to the extent that it is accompanied by systematic efforts to identify and promote highly effective teaching practices” (p.11). This tells us that teachers should be included and listened to (Gardner & Williamson, 2004) in order to understand what kinds of supports teachers need during the implementation of the Australian Curriculum, to ensure they work successfully under the new requirements. The focus of this nascent study is English teachers’ perceptions of the implementation of the Australian Curriculum: English.

THE AUSTRALIAN CURRICULUM: ENGLISH

ACARA released Version Three of The Shape of the Australian Curriculum in October, 2011. Version 3 outlines the Foundation to Year 10 curriculum for English. The curriculum is to:

Provide a clear, shared understanding of what young people should be taught and the quality of learning expected of them, regardless of their circumstances, the type of school that they attend or the location of their school. (ACARA, 2011, p. 5)
Furthermore, ACARA identifies teachers as key stakeholders in education processes:

The primary audience for the Australian Curriculum is teachers. The curriculum is concise and expressed in plain language while preserving a complexity appropriate for professional practitioners. Consistency in terms of language and broad structure supports teachers in planning within and across learning areas (ACARA, 2011, p. 11).

Here, ACARA asserts that the Australian Curriculum documents will be easy to follow with language that teachers will be able to easily understand, plan, prepare and work with. This quotation also suggests that teachers will be able to collaborate more effectively since the language is considered to be plain. However, there is a limited amount of time for teachers to develop shared understanding of the new ‘plain’ terminology of the Australian Curriculum, particularly given the extent of the changes to terminology from that used in previous curriculum documents. The latter is exemplified in the Foundation to Year 10 English curriculum glossary. The use of terms and phrases associated with the language strand of the new curriculum indicates a distinct shift from the previously-used methods and metalanguage of traditional grammar methods to those of functional grammar. Consequently, in order to facilitate a similar shift in teachers’ language practices, teachers will be required to undergo targeted subject consultation and professional development. Teachers have professional obligations that must be addressed, chiefly where assessment requires clear alignment with the curriculum learning outcomes.

The Foundation to Year 10 curriculum is available online for teachers as an access point for professional development that also “facilitates ongoing monitoring and review as well as providing the opportunity to update the curriculum in a well-managed and effectively communicated manner” (ACARA, 2011, p. 25). According to ACARA (2011), the curriculum documents and other sources of professional development will enable teachers, nationwide, to contribute to a collective Australian vision in which the pursuit of common goals should result in a “substantial reduction in the duplication of time, effort and resources” (ACARA, 2011, p. 7). This is yet to be seen as the Australian Curriculum continues to be rolled out. The researcher of this study will seek English teacher perceptions of these Australian Curriculum: English documents.

Currently (in 2011), ACARA’s draft of the National Australian Curriculum: English, is undergoing a review process by an English Senior Secondary Advisory panel to validate the use of and to prepare for the implementation of the Foundation to Year 10 Australian Curriculum: English. Secondary English teachers, tertiary institutions and advisory panels of English literacy specialists have been invited to contribute to the review. Tasmania is barely represented on the advisory panel; thus, this present research is an opportunity to have the Tasmanian Secondary school perspective heard.

The Foundation to Year 10 English Curriculum was due to be fully implemented in 2012, and the senior secondary Year 11 and 12 English Curriculum is aimed to be
implemented from 2014. To meet this timeline, ideally, professional development required for quality implementation and education standards should have already commenced. Similarly, support structures should already be in place to continue the implementation of the *Australian Curriculum*, and to encourage reform efficacy which will best support the education frontline of teachers. Various professional development opportunities for curriculum reform efficacy have commenced in the form of online access to the Australian Curriculum and Assessment Reporting Authority (ACARA) website, an online subject unit and assessment support platform, Scootle (www.scootle.edu.au/cc/p/home); local professional (teacher) dialogue, professional and published forums, and nationwide conferences. These forms of professional development are beneficial; however, this professional development is highly organised by superordinate stakeholders as described by Harris & Marsh (2005).

The control of reform by superordinate stakeholders such as ACARA and school leadership alludes to a lack or exclusion of teacher input. Gardner and Williamson (2004) note teacher dissatisfaction during the bombardment of education reform, and that those teachers felt that there were “few or no opportunities to offer input into decision-making” to voice their opinion about the implementation process (p.11). This is further backed by Print (1993) who posits that a lack of professional development opportunities or schemes, particularly at the local level, do not encourage or empower teachers to expand or extend their professional knowledge (Handal, 2004; O’Brien & Down, 2002). Therefore, this qualitative case study research into teacher perceptions of the *Australian Curriculum: English*, will assist teachers and school-level or local stakeholders in describing what supports and professional development teachers require in order to work under the new curriculum. Carter (1995) asserts that “a consideration of alternative futures in education requires informed public debate by a wide community of interest within a democratic framework that is truly participatory” (p.33). This suggests that in order to clarify curriculum reform processes, teachers must be consulted about the *Australian Curriculum* and their perceptions and understanding of it.

The perceptions of curriculum reform for secondary school English teachers is an area that will be examined in this study in order to identify the possible tensions associated with the shift from the Tasmanian English Curriculum to the *Australian Curriculum: English*. It is important to note teacher perceptions of curriculum reform in order to present suggestions of how to manage their workloads, what the teachers believe will best support them in their teaching roles, and to give value to the teacher voice under changing conditions (Gardner & Williamson, 2004). It has been noted that a lack of support and information for teachers during the process of curriculum change can result in increased workload, stress, and professional incoherence (Gardner & Williamson, 2004; Watt, 2006), resulting in reduced efficacy.

Efficacy for teachers is the ability to maintain effective connections between professional learning and classroom teaching. Bandura (1997) describes perceived self-efficacy as a personalised domain of belief and judgement of one’s capabilities.
For some teachers, a high sense of self-efficacy comes from mastery or experience of a subject; or in this case, curriculum. Disruption or change can therefore affect this sense of self-efficacy. Gardner and Williamson (2004) note that teachers are emotionally attached to their work, which affects their ability to “influence[e] and engag[e] with change; disjoined change that is not understood and embraced by teachers typically is problematic” (p. 14). Further, change such as curriculum reform destabilises teachers’ professional standing and focus which causes or increases dissatisfaction with their role (Gardner & Williamson, 2004). This suggests that teachers require specific or tailored support and professional development to ensure or improve teacher satisfaction and learning when dealing with reform. Part of supporting teacher self-efficacy is to encourage the up-skilling of pedagogical content knowledge.

As part of this study, teachers’ professional knowledge and the implementation processes of the Secondary Australian Curriculum: English will be explored. This will be done through an analysis of Secondary English teachers’ interpretations and responses to pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) demands of the incoming Australian Curriculum: English. Pedagogical content knowledge is “that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding” (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). This research will provide an opportunity for teachers to develop greater pedagogical understanding and informed professional development through the prompting of curriculum awareness and discussion. This is an important facet of this study, as increased pedagogical content knowledge simultaneously improves teacher confidence, thus efficacy and perceptions of change.

The aims of this qualitative study are to examine Tasmanian Secondary school English teacher perceptions of and engagement with the Secondary English strand of the Australian Curriculum that is currently being implemented; and to identify where support and professional development for Secondary school English teachers is needed for curriculum implementation. This will enhance understanding of this current watershed period in the history of English teaching in Tasmania.

Teaching is a collaborative profession where resources and knowledge are shared in order to gain the best possible outcomes for students and teachers. In a collaborative effort, efficacy can be achieved and shared learning and understanding can occur which can be viewed as a support system – much like the moderation meetings and inter-disciplinary projects seen in the Tasmanian and Essential Learnings curriculum (Department of Education, Tasmania, 2009). Therefore, like the outgoing the Essential Learnings curriculum (Department of Education, Tasmania, 2005), educators must continue to approach education holistically. The Australian Curriculum is,

... guided by the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians, which was adopted by the Ministerial Council in December 2008. The Melbourne Declaration emphasises the importance of knowledge, skills
and understanding of learning areas, general capabilities and cross-curriculum priorities as the basis for a curriculum designed to support 21st century learning (ACARA, 2011, p. 4).

In short, the ACARA initiative suggests to teachers that they still need to work together to practice trans-disciplinary teaching whilst maintaining and building on specific subject skills.

**LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LITERACY**

The *Australian Curriculum: English* identifies three key strands of English which are Language, Literature and Literacy; whilst the core strands of the Tasmanian English Curriculum are Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening. One of the major challenges for teachers is to understand the shift in the conceptualisation and the design of the three new English strands of the *Australian Curriculum*.

The Language strand is “about the English Language: a coherent, dynamic, and evolving body of knowledge about the English language and how it works” (ACARA, 2009, p. 6). Here, teachers will assist students to understand the structure and conventions of English language use through different modes of communication, including oral, visual and written texts. Key skills to be developed in this strand include word knowledge, spelling and grammar efficacy. The Literature strand focuses on “understanding, appreciating, responding to, analysing and creating literature: an enjoyment in, and informed appreciation of how English language can convey information and emotion, create imaginative worlds and aesthetic and other significant experiences” (ACARA, 2009, p. 8). In this strand, teachers will be able to engage students with creative tasks and develop students’ critical literacy skills. The Literacy strand looks at a “repertoire of English usage: the ability to understand and produce the English language accurately, fluently, creatively, critically, confidently, and effectively in a range of modes, digital and print settings, in texts designed for a range of purposes and audiences” (ACARA, 2009, p. 6). This strand focuses on language variation and change, bringing attention to the different ways that texts are constructed, depending on their social and historical contexts, their purposes and their intended audiences.

These three strands are similar to the Tasmanian curriculum where basic literacy skills are reinforced and recreated through a wide variety of texts and activities; however, the *Australian Curriculum: English* has a greater focus on the grammatical and syntactic aspects of language use.

**THE PROPOSED STUDY – INVESTIGATING TEACHER CONCERNS AND PD FOR A NEW CURRICULUM**

Teachers are at the frontline of education reform. They assume the responsibility of implementing curriculum into the classroom where “[t]he success of an
implementation appears to hinge upon the capacity of teachers to cope with the changes expected of them” (Hackett, 2007, p. 3). Curriculum reform fatigue continues to plague the Australian school system (Carlopio, 1998). Gardner and Williamson (2011) state that “[i]t is unsurprising that teachers report feeling change-fatigued and disengaged from burgeoning change initiatives. The time is ripe for investigating possibilities that have the potential to ameliorate the effects of external policy turbulence” (p. 2). This research aims to provide an outlet for teachers to voice their perceptions of the implementation of the Australian Curriculum: English, and to provide suggestions for support and professional development during reform processes. By gathering teacher perceptions on organisational characteristics of schools and teacher needs during curriculum reform, there will be information to present to principals that will reinforce supportive structures and promote positive teacher perceptions about curriculum reform.

Recommendations such as those made by Gardner & Williamson (2004) that there should be increased teacher input surrounding curriculum implementation; show that a gap has been identified in understanding how best to provide support and professional development for Tasmanian teachers when implementing a new curriculum. Mulford & Edmunds (2009) further suggest that more research into how to support teachers during curriculum change is required, since teachers “are professional people” and need to be treated as such, including more opportunities and “quality time for professional learning” (pp. 13-14). In order to gain insight into this, the current study aims to examine Tasmanian Secondary school English teacher perceptions of and engagement with the Secondary English strand of the Australian Curriculum that is currently being implemented; and to identify where support and professional development for Secondary school English teachers is needed for curriculum implementation. This project will also observe how information is disseminated and re-constructed from the superordinate to the subordinate or school and teaching levels.

The area of curriculum innovation and teacher content knowledge is under-researched nationally and a scan of the literature to date shows no studies relating to Tasmanian teachers. Previous curriculum reform such as the Essential Learnings, had left a bitter experience in Tasmanian teachers’ memories, where “ram raid political agenda[s]” of reform were not viewed positively (Mulford & Edmunds, 2009, p. 4). Further, it should be noted that only three Tasmanian representatives were included on the twenty-six member ACARA Curriculum Advisory Panel for English (ACARA, 2009), highlighting the need for Tasmanian teacher perceptions of the Australian Curriculum: English to be recorded. This study will involve qualitative data gathering methods and require the development of innovative data reporting instruments such as graphs and scales. The findings will be of use: to administrators at the system/school level in the planning of professional development; to school level administrators as they will gain insights into how to maximise professional learning resources and, to teachers as they plan their own professional learning experiences.
METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The methodological approach that has been adopted for this qualitative case study of a purposive sample (Burns, 2000) of English teachers in a bounded system of a Tasmanian secondary school is underpinned by a post-structural framework. Inductive reasoning will be employed that will consider all possible explanations for the ensuing discourse analysis (Burns, 2000; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2012; O’Reilly, 2005). This approach is connected to qualitative constructivist grounded theory methodology (Charmaz, 2006). Grounded theorists “study empirical events and experiences and pursue [...] hunches and potential analytic ideas about them” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 3), which explains that grounded theory is constructed from data and observations are made from them. It suggests an association with a symbolic interactionist approach (Robrecht, 1995; Blumer, 1969) to the study of human behaviour – an empirical approach that is used in grounded theory.

Constructivist grounded theory produces ideas through thematic analysis from the collected data rather than preconceived or quantitative measures of extant theoretical production (Burns, 2000; Charmaz, 2006). It is a “systematic, qualitative procedure used to generate a theory that explains, at a broad conceptual level, a process, an action, or interaction about a substantive topic” (Creswell, 2012, p. 423). Constructivist grounded theory is a positive and flexible, or dynamic approach to research which enables the researcher to systematically collect data and identify categories that form a theory which attempts to explain the observations made. Constructivist grounded theory has been used to explain the actions of people, namely adults in education settings and the interactions and support of people in institutions (Creswell & Brown, 1992). Constructivist grounded theory allows explanation of observation or events through additional data collection or analysis. This is emancipatory for its ability to go beyond, direct and improve upon the phases of a study, transforming the way in which the subject is regarded through reflection (Mezirow, 1990; Pearce, 2002). This approach assists in the interpretation of the effect of implementation of the Australian Curriculum: English for secondary English teachers by positioning the researcher as an observer of individual teacher participants in the larger group of the English teaching staff at a school. Further, constructivist grounded theory is an empowering methodology that proactively examines research data allowing the researcher to create meaning from within a bounded ethnographic study such as a school. This study will take a grounded theory approach in the collection and critical discourse analysis of data. Constructivist grounded theory is an ethnographic approach to research, and a predecessor of Critical Discourse Analysis (Gee, 2004).

Research into curriculum implementation needs to be conducted within a critical theoretical paradigm that acknowledges and critiques the political, social and cultural influences that inform teachers’ work. Critical Discourse Analysis requires the researcher to: identify an issue of social concern; identify if the problem is in need of address; identify obstacles to the problem being examined; find ways to
overcome these obstacles; and to reflect critically on the analysis of the findings (Fairclough, 2001). Critical Discourse Analysis will be used in this project to provide an analytical framework from which meaning can be made as a system of representation (Gee, 2011). Gee notes that all discourse analysis needs to be critical since language itself is political. This offers deeper explanation of a social or political issue that has been identified by a researcher, such as the implementation of a new curriculum. Critical Discourse Analysis will be applied to the categories constructed as a result of the inductive constructivist grounded theory process. This will enable rigorous deductive analysis of significant connections and understandings between the various data sources (Charmaz, 2006).

Procedure
As this research project is a nascent study, the research aims as listed above, will be discussed in light of Harris and Marsh’s Authority Model (2005), which will inform the research to come. Harris and Marsh’s Authority Model explains that, typically an authoritative top-down model (see Figure 1) is used to facilitate reform in schools. Implementation processes include phases of knowledge, persuasion, decision, communication and action. The model explains that information or reform is collectively filtered from superordinate stakeholders such as the Department of

![Figure 1. Superordinate and subordinate stakeholder function over time](Reproduced from Harris & Marsh, 2005).
Education, Tasmania down to the subordinate stakeholders; that is, the principals and teachers – the frontline. Throughout the project, anonymous teacher responses will be recorded and analysed.

In the first phase, which is Knowledge, information for reform is relayed to the education departments, from whom the information is filtered and passed on via school directors or leadership then to faculty heads of staff, and then to teachers in the form of meetings or written communications such as emails, staff bulletins or publicly disseminated extant documents.

The second phase, Persuasion, is required to initiate broader discussion between official authority bodies such as ACARA and expert English literacy theorists. Schools are contacted by way of asking for professional opinion, namely in this case via internet consultation and feedback. For this case study, the participating schools will assist in creating a document information trail, illustrating how information was disseminated and how school or teacher participation was encouraged during the current curriculum reform.

The third phase, Decision Making, sees the idea or curriculum begin to form as an official movement through discussion at parliamentary level where it is voted on and recognised as a task that must be thoroughly examined and debated. However, information is still screened at this stage of refinement. This project will look at teacher involvement at the decision making phase in terms of formal recognition of the teacher voice.

Communication in the Authority Model sees filtered, nominal information surrounding the incoming curriculum, or the knowledge, gradually passed down from official or superordinate bodies through to the teachers. At the school level and for this project, Year 7-10 Australian Curriculum: English documents will be important to gather in order to record and examine the kind of information that teachers are receiving, and their reaction to it, which leads to the final phase of Action.

The Action phase is where the types of professional development and teachers’ responses to professional development will be looked at in order to identify teachers’ perceptions, concerns and questions that will enable discussion and suggestions for future teacher professional development in education and curriculum reform.

**Data Gathering**

Participants for this case study research will involve a Purposive sample (Burns, 2000; Neuman, 2006) who will include 10-15 male and female qualified practising Secondary School English subject teachers in a Tasmanian Secondary Catholic School. This sample is most “relevant to the project” (Sarantakos, 2005, p. 164) because they are practising teachers in the area being studied. The researcher is employed full-time in the Catholic education system, thus selection of a Catholic school as a research site affords easier access (Burns, 2000).
PREPARING TASMANIAN ENGLISH TEACHERS FOR CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

As the aim is to examine teacher perceptions of and engagement with the Secondary *Australian Curriculum: English*, and to identify where support and professional development for Secondary school English teachers is needed for curriculum implementation, an Opportunity and Purposive sample (Burns, 2000; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Sarantakos, 2005) will be drawn. The intention is not to generalise to other contexts hence a small sample as described is appropriate. This exploration will later assist teachers to understand the processes of curriculum reform and what to plan for in terms of professional development. Participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire, and participate in audio-recorded interviews concerning the Secondary English curriculum. These discussions will ascertain teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in relation to, and their perceptions of the implementation of the *Australian Curriculum: English*.

Collection and analysis of publicly disseminated extant texts within the school site will enable the researcher to gauge the type of information being distributed to English teachers, and how these teachers perceive the implementation of the *Australian Curriculum: English*. As the documents are not affected nor influenced by the researcher, the justification and validity of this data source is strong. Document analysis as data allows the researcher to “corroborate evidence from other sources” (Burns, 2000, p. 467). Pre-written texts assist in the selection and creation of a line of inquiry including the types of questions that could be asked in surveys, questionnaires or interviews. For example if recommendations or mandated requirements are made by a curriculum authority for a school to carry out, then questions to follow up on the success of the recommendations can be asked. This type of data analysis serves as a pivoting point in a chain of data sources where a line of interest within a document can be followed up with a surveyed question, then or as a point of discussion in an individual interview.

Questionnaires provide a base of information that is documented by a respondent. The use of a questionnaire offers fewer errors compared to interviews, as there is controlled delivery and where each participant has the same set of questions. Other benefits include reduced anxiety for the interviewee with more confidentiality due to lack of interviewer’s presence, more opportunity to contact a larger number of respondents, and no requirement to set up a contact time to complete the set questions (Burns, 2000).

Interviews are one of the richest, most useful and important data sources about the people and or places from which they are taken. This data source provides detail, insight and identification of other possible data source leads. The richest interviews are usually open-ended, semi-structured or use facilitative questions (Burns, 2000). Facilitative questions produce scope for emergent themes for discourse analysis by eliciting a dialogue about a topic or issue that the interviewee would otherwise not expand on in a questionnaire. The purpose of an interview in a case study is to validate responses that have been recorded completely and with accuracy (Burns, 2000). Benefits of the use of an interview as data include: a higher response rate...
from interviewees, good for use in smaller sample sizes such as a teaching cohort, the opportunity to have questions clarified in person which contributes to the higher response rate, and a record of extensive data including the opportunity to record body language and spoken delivery nuances (Charmaz, 2006).

CONCLUSION

Adaptation and flexibility are important teacher qualities. It has been noted however, that so called change fatigue (Edwards, 2005), particularly in Tasmanian schools, has not yet been remedied (Tasmanian Association for the Teaching of English, 2010). Recurrent waves of curriculum reform have battered Tasmanian education institutions throughout its short but rich history (Watt, 1997; 2006). These waves of reform have resulted in teachers engaging in short-term planning in order to meet strict accountability measures and to ensure that the curriculum of the time is being followed. Professional development resources are being created as an ad hoc response to these ongoing changes (Perillo & Mulcahy, 2009).

This research will be of interest to education stakeholders including teacher educators, school authorities and system-level policy developers. Through identification of interstices in professional development and support systems during the Australian Curriculum implementation, this project will highlight where research should be extended and which issues should be addressed for greater equity and empowerment for teachers. As Marsh asserts, “If reform of any kind is to succeed, teachers must believe that they will have a meaningful voice in decisions and will not become the lone scapegoats of a failure to reach goals” (cited in Hargreaves, Earl, Moore, & Manning, 2001, p. 7).
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